

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, August 4, 1953.

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

QUESTIONS.

POTATO SUPPLIES.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—During the week-end I received a complaint from an authoritative source in Peterborough that on Thursday last large quantities of potatoes were being sold at the Peterborough stock market for £5 a bag, which is approximately 9d. a lb. and well above the permitted price. Can the Premier say whether this practice is widespread in South Australia and whether he will take steps to ensure that potatoes are distributed through the usual channels at the fixed prices instead of being sold to those who can afford to pay exorbitant prices?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The problem of potato distribution at fair prices arises from two factors. Firstly, New South Wales has decontrolled potatoes and there is no fixed price operating there; secondly, unseasonable conditions in several States have created an over-all shortage. Figures relating to the total tonnage of potatoes in Australia at present reveal that there are no more than 80,000 tons; probably there are less. There is no power in the Commonwealth to prevent interstate trading. Once one State decontrols potato prices, marketing in all States becomes difficult in times of shortage. I am not aware of any great amount of black marketing in the sense the honourable member mentioned, but I am aware that a considerable quantity of potatoes is now being sold other than through the Potato Board. They are being sold in a manner which eliminates the cost of a merchant and the grower thus obtains a higher return without necessarily infringing the retail price order. As to the general position, the Prices Branch is looking for evasions of the Act and will do its utmost to prevent them. In the meantime steps are being taken to import potatoes into this State. Some Tasmanian potatoes were made available over the weekend, being sold for 6d. a lb., which is slightly higher than the price for local potatoes. Last Friday I arranged for a shipment of 600 tons from Western Australia and they have either been loaded or are being loaded and will help to overcome the shortage here. There again the price will be above that for local potatoes because of the necessary addition of importation costs. I can assure the honourable member

that the Government is keenly aware of the problem and will do its utmost to see that there is a proper distribution at as reasonable prices as under the circumstances can be obtained.

Mr. DUNNAGE—I noticed in the press yesterday that potatoes in Sydney had brought £70 a ton and that 3,000 tons had been imported from Victoria and were being held by merchants who were hoping for a further price rise. I understand that South Australia is importing many of its potatoes from other States. Does the Premier know whether this high price is causing a draw-off of potatoes from other States against South Australia, or whether we are still getting supplies?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I think I answered that question almost completely a few moments ago. Supplies in South Australia are inadequate to meet demands, but that is not unusual. Prior to the war it was common for large quantities of potatoes to be imported at certain times of the year. Steps have already been taken to import further supplies. While there is the lure of higher prices in Sydney it is inevitable that some growers here will be attracted to send consignments to that market, and we have no power to prevent that.

CITY PLANNING.

Mr. PATTINSON—Like many other members of Parliament, municipalists and members of the public I read with great interest and pleasure the report in Friday's *Advertiser* of a speech made by the Premier last Thursday night during which he referred to the subject of city planning. In view of the Premier's very welcome statement on this subject I shall be pleased to know if he is in a position to announce what action the Government proposes to take on the report presented to it last year, which recommended the necessary administration and legislative machinery for such planning. If the Government is not prepared to do anything in regard to that report, does it propose to introduce legislation of its own choosing, and, if not, will the Premier, in the interests of clarity, amplify the statement he made last Thursday, because the report in the *Advertiser* was necessarily condensed since the Premier then went on to speak on the more absorbing topic of atomic energy?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—There are several matters on which I desire to make detailed submissions to Cabinet in due course. In a place like South Australia it frequently happens that an investigation is necessary before a particular project can be put into effect. While the Leader of the Opposition and

I were abroad we frequently noticed the problems that arise when a town is allowed to grow without adequate planning. Traffic congestion occurs and almost insuperable problems in connection with public utilities. In my opinion we should take steps here, where we have a planned city to start with, to see future development is orderly, with proper provision for the vastly increased traffic that will arise. Since I returned from abroad I have discussed this matter with the Parliamentary Draftsman, and in due course I propose to take it up with Cabinet in connection with proposed legislation which I think would be of advantage to the State. The problem which always arises in the purchase of land for any such plan is that the moment the Government announces its intention to make a road or lay a railway line in a certain place land values rise immediately, and there is always some hopeful person who becomes possessed of a piece of the land necessary to be acquired and holds the Government to ransom as regards compensation for its purchase. Therefore the problem is not so much commencing planning as acquiring the necessary land beforehand. I assure the honourable member that the report he mentioned has not been allowed to lapse, but is now the subject of considerable investigation. In due course I will submit to Cabinet detailed proposals which I hope to have accepted for introduction into Parliament.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—When in England was the Premier's attention drawn to the fact that London town planning authorities were investigating the possibility of moving people to towns in country areas to provide for a dispersal of population? In considering the future planning of our metropolitan area will he also consider decentralizing population and industry to avoid further congestion?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—My attention was drawn to the matters mentioned, and I briefly visited one of the housing estates which had been established. The problem in London is extremely acute because Greater London's population is about 8,000,000. This Government is anxious to move as many people as possible to the country, but it has no power, nor desire, to use compulsion. The Government desires to establish industries and build houses in the country and to make conditions there acceptable so that people will move to those areas of their own volition.

Mr. O'Halloran—You voted against my motion for an inquiry last session.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I think I would be out of order in discussing that now. The motion cut across many of the freedoms I believe essential to citizens of this country. The Government is assisting country development and decentralization in many ways, including house building, providing electricity, and maintaining rail fares at low rates.

S.S. ARKABA TOW.

Mr. TAPPING—The following is an extract from a report in this morning's *Advertiser*:—

It was "absolute madness" to attempt towing the freighter *Arkaba* across the Great Australian Bight at this time of the year, the master of the tug *Allegiance 2*, Captain T. Hackett, said at Albany today. He declared he had been instructed to sail the westerly crossing against his advice.

Will the Minister of Marine ascertain from either Federal or State authorities whether such a tow from this State can be prevented in future?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—Yes, to the extent that it is within my power. Navigation is the prerogative of the Federal Government, but I take it in this case it would come within the scope of the parties concerned and I doubt whether either the State or the Federal Government has any control. I will ask the Harbors Board for comment and bring down a reply in due course.

RUM JUNGLE URANIUM FIELD.

Mr. HAWKER—Can the Premier say whether it is likely that the Rum Jungle uranium field in the Northern Territory will compete with South Australian fields, to their detriment?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The answer is definitely, No. I have no detailed information on Rum Jungle, but I say quite definitely that the more deposits of uranium that can be found in Australia, and the richer they are, the better it will be for this State and the Commonwealth. They certainly will not compete to the detriment of South Australia; they may, on the other hand, enable work to be undertaken in Australia which might otherwise not be possible. I welcome the action of the Commonwealth Government in opening up Rum Jungle and hope it will be followed by similar action in other fields, for I am convinced that one of the greatest contributions, short of food, that Australia can make to the British Commonwealth of Nations is to discover adequate sources of uranium. I am pleased to be able to say that the programme of exploration undertaken at Radium Hill has been very

successful and quite recently very significant additional lode material was discovered in that area.

TYPHOID BACTERIA IN DESICCATED COCONUT.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—The following is an extract from a report in this morning's *Advertiser* :—

Householders throughout Victoria were warned tonight that they should burn any supplies of desiccated coconut they held. The warning was issued by the Minister of Health (Mr. Barry) after Health Department officers said they had traced bacteria in supplies of coconut from Papua that "probably caused" the recent typhoid outbreak. Mr. Barry said comparison of germs found in samples of the Papuan desiccated coconut with those found in the sufferers led health officers to believe that the coconut caused a bowel infection, and was a strong possibility as a typhoid carrier. Swift action was taken as soon as the germ was traced today. Health authorities in other States were notified of the research findings and were asked to carry out similar tests on coconut samples.

Can the Premier say if the health authorities in this State have carried out similar tests of coconut samples, and what action is proposed in the matter?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Up to one o'clock today the Minister of Health had received no information from Victoria in connection with the matter. The statement that he had been advised from Victoria, as reported in the press, is therefore not correct. Any tests would take some time and it would depend on what was actually found whether or not the tests were significant. I assure the honourable member that the reports have been under the notice of the Minister and he will take the appropriate action.

STEEL WORKS AT WHYALLA.

Mr. RICHES—My question relates to a reported statement by the Director of Mines at a lecture last week. It has to do with his repeated recommendation to this Parliament that every effort should be made to establish steel works at Whyalla. I understand that last week the Director said the delay in establishing such works was a grave public concern. I assure the Premier it is a matter of very serious concern to my district. On several occasions I have brought the matter under the notice of the Premier. Another 12 months has gone by, and I now ask him whether the Government has any plans to implement in any particular the recommendation the Director made to Parliament in his special report of two years ago?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The Government is in accord with many of the things mentioned in the Director's report. The Government is not at present engaged in steel production.

Mr. O'Halloran—It is one of the few things in which the Government is not engaged.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The Government is doing a lot of good things, but it is not engaged in steel production. More to the point, it is not at present in possession of iron ore leases of any significance. It has no power to expropriate iron ore leases, so as a first step it has been investigating closely the possibilities of locating worthwhile iron ore deposits which could be used and which would not be subject to leases. Under the law anyone holding a lease has the right to work it, and at present the Broken Hill Proprietary Company is working its leases in accordance with the law.

Mr. RICHES—Has the Government any power to control the export of iron ore?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The State Government has no power at all. Trade and commerce between the States and overseas is a Commonwealth function. About 10 years ago the Commonwealth Government prohibited the export of iron ore, and raw ore has not been exported since well before the war with the Japanese. These matters are not under the control of the State Government. We have been engaged in an intense exploration of the Middleback Ranges, and have carried out an extensive boring programme to see if it is possible to locate iron ore deposits capable of being developed. I discussed the matter with the Chancellor of the Exchequer when I was in Great Britain and I have it on the highest authority that if worthwhile iron ore deposits can be located problems of finance can be easily ironed out. It all depends upon the Government having in its possession iron ore leases capable of being worked. At present it does not hold such leases.

Mr. RICHES—The following statement was made by Mr. Essington Lewis on June 10, 1948, when he gave the Joseph Fisher Memorial Lecture at the Adelaide University :—

The Broken Hill Proprietary Company is now planning a development of peculiar significance to South Australia, namely, the establishment of a steelworks at Whyalla, thus further aiding the scheme of decentralization. The Director of Mines is reported to have said in an address last week that everything necessary for the establishment of steel works was available except finance. I gather from

the Treasurer's remarks today that finance is available in England if he can satisfy himself that the iron ore is available. Have negotiations been entered into with the Broken Hill Proprietary Company with a view to obtaining ore from its leases to supply the works which the Director of Mines, no doubt after full consideration, has stated are essential to this State?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I have had discussions with the directors of the B.H.P. Co. and, as far as I can understand their attitude, they have not abandoned the proposal to establish steel works at Whyalla, but the hot strip mills at Port Kembla have proved much more expensive than was expected and this has strained the company's resources fairly heavily. In view of this I do not think it would commit itself to the construction of a steel mill at Whyalla at this stage.

Mr. RICHES—Would it supply ore to a Government mill?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I do not think for one moment it would supply ore to a competitor at present.

Mr. RICHES—I said to a Government mill.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Let me dispel any illusions the honourable member may have on that score: the Government has no intention of establishing steel mills at Whyalla as a Government undertaking. It has not the technical knowledge to enable it to undertake the work and it is deeply committed in other matters. There are many other projects requiring the finance available to the Government.

Mr. RICHES—I understood from the Premier's first reply that the Government had embarked on a search for additional iron ore deposits for the purpose of giving effect to Mr. Dickinson's suggestion. I understood the Premier to say he was confident that if sufficient quantities of ore were available finance for such an undertaking could be arranged in England. How does he expect the steel works to be built if it is not to be by the Government and if it is not to be in competition with the B.H.P. Company? Can he indicate what action, if any, the Government is taking to give some effect to Mr. Dickinson's report?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Regarding the first part of the question, we had a similar position in regard to the production of sulphuric acid in this State. The Government undertook an investigation to see if it would be possible to get iron pyrites in sufficiently

large volume and at economic cost to enable sulphuric acid to be manufactured here for our superphosphate requirements. The investigation was successful and as the result of having raw material available a company was organized and is now actively developing the resources. I would expect that if the Government were successful in finding payable iron ore deposits in quantities like those at Iron Knob a similar type of approach would be made to the problem. Without the iron ore the Government is powerless to act. I have already informed the honourable member that as a preliminary the Government is investigating the possibility of securing supplies of iron ore.

Mr. FRED WALSH—Can the Premier say whether it is a fact that in 1947 the Broken Hill Pty. Coy. determined on a policy of constructing a steel mill and later a blast furnace close to the naval reserve near Fremantle? I believe they are now in course of construction. Can he say whether it is the intention of the B.H.P. Coy. to draw its supplies of iron ore from Iron Monarch, Iron Knob, or Yampi Sound?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The mill proposed for Western Australia is for fabrication and not production of steel. To meet Western Australian steel requirements billets from Newcastle will be rolled there rather than at Newcastle or Port Kembla. It is purely a fabrication plant. A blast furnace is not envisaged for any of the preliminary work: it is rather a finishing mill to deal with the particular types and sizes of steel required by industry in Western Australia. I do not regard it in any sense as an integrated steel mill, and it is not the type of mill envisaged by Mr. Dickinson. The type he envisages would be a very large undertaking, and when fully completed would probably involve an expenditure of between £40,000,000 and £50,000,000.

ELECTIONEERING PAMPHLETS.

Mr. LAWN—Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked recently about electioneering matter being taken from letter boxes and its substitution by other pamphlets?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I made inquiries and found that there was no criminal investigation, as stated by the honourable member. A woman reported that a person had taken electoral matter from her postal box and inserted other matter, but upon the police making inquiries she told them she would not take any action, nor did she desire any action to be taken, so the police let the matter rest there.

SUBSIDY FOR BARLEY COMPETITIONS.

Mr. WHITE—It has been the custom of the Department of Agriculture to pay a subsidy on entries in wheat crop competitions on a pound for pound basis, provided the fee does not exceed 10s. an entry. This subsidy has given committees conducting these competitions great help, for it helps in organizing, provides necessary finance, and assists them in giving better trophies. The barley industry is now of great economic importance to South Australia, over 1,000,000 acres having been sown this year. It is essential that we hold markets to dispose of the increased production and to do this we must have barley of good quality. It is important to have a sample that is not a mixture of types. My experience has shown that barley crop competitions accomplish much in this regard because through them a supply of true-to-type seed is made available to growers each year. In view of the importance of the barley industry to South Australia and of maintaining a good sample of barley will the Minister of Agriculture investigate the question of paying a subsidy on barley crop competitions in the same way as is done with wheat crop competitions?

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—The subject has been raised previously, but I will discuss it further with the Director of Agriculture. I understand the Barley Board is conducting experiments with regard to barley types, but there are only about two types of barley grown in South Australia, Prior and Maltworthy, the Prior being more popular. Experiments are now being conducted at Roseworthy Agricultural College for the purpose of developing other types. I will have the matter investigated and bring down a report.

SCHOOL CHILDREN ATTENDING CONVENIENCES.

Mr. HUTCHENS—It has been reported to me by some of my constituents that a number of school teachers, upon children making a request in the mornings to leave the room to attend conveniences, write the children's names on blackboards and cancel their recess leave. I believe that is contrary to departmental regulations. Will the Minister of Works take up this matter with the Minister of Education with a view to having instructions issued to teachers to stop the practice? I was speaking to a constituent of mine in one of the corridors here recently about the matter and another person, who lives in a district far removed from my electorate, complained of the practice having been carried out in other schools.

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—On the face of it the practice is contrary to the principles and approval of the Education Department, which carries its own condemnation of the statement. If there is any complaint—which must be in respect of one particular school—and the honourable member will supply me with further information I will submit the matter to the Minister of Education. It would be defaming the whole of the teaching profession if the department wrote to several hundred people asking them not to do something they have never done.

PORT PIRIE-ADELAIDE RAIL SERVICE.

Mr. DAVIS—When the new train service between Port Pirie and Adelaide was commenced it was, in the opinion of many, the second best train in Australia, but since then it has greatly deteriorated and today is considered to be one of the worst in the Commonwealth. This morning it consisted of two old suburban coaches, one steel coach, and one old first class carriage from the Melbourne express. It has been reported to me that some of these coaches are not provided with conveniences. Will the Minister of Railways take up the matter with the Railways Commissioner with a view to providing better accommodation on the train?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—It is the first time I have heard that the Port Pirie train is one of the worst in the Commonwealth; I have usually heard the reverse. One swallow does not usually make a summer and I am surprised to hear the honourable member say that the department has fallen down on its job and that the Railways Commissioner, in trying to keep pace with the requirements of the State as a whole, has found it necessary to lower the standard. That could be the only reason, but as I do not think that is so I will call for a report.

MENINGITIS AT MOUNT GAMBIER.

Mr. FLETCHER—Recently there was an outbreak of meningitis at the infant school at Mount Gambier, in one instance with fatal results. Has the Premier received any report on the matter from the Minister of Health and can he say what progress is being made with the erection of a new school at Mount Gambier East in order to prevent the over-crowding that is occurring in school yards?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—As the honourable member advised me that he would raise this question I called for a report from the Director-General of Public Health. As it is of a somewhat reassuring nature I propose to

make it available for publication. The Director-General of Public Health reports as follows:—

Meningococcal Meningitis at Mount Gambier.

Cases Reported.—Two cases of meningitis were reported by the local board for Mount Gambier to the Central Board on July 27.

1. Michael Wall, aged 9 years, a boarder at the Marist Brothers' College, was reported by Dr. J. Willis. The boy became ill on July 18. The condition was diagnosed as meningococcal meningitis on clinical grounds and on the appearance of organisms found at the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science in a slide made from his cerebrospinal fluid. The patient was removed to hospital on July 18, the college was isolated, and day scholars were isolated at home.

2. Peter O'Donnell, a day scholar at the same college, was reported by Dr. Moore. This boy became ill on July 20.

Detailed Information.—As is always done with meningococcal infections, the local board was asked for a full report regarding these two cases. That report has not yet been received.

Third Case.—On July 31, Dr. Poynton, Director of the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science, telephoned me regarding a further case. Dr. Hill, a medical practitioner at Mount Gambier, has arranged to send pathological specimens for examination from a child who had died after a few hours' illness. The infection appeared to be the very acute, fulminating form of meningococcal infection, with severe septicaemia (blood poisoning). Dr. Poynton has informed me today that the specimens so far examined confirm the diagnosis of meningococcal septicaemia.

Preventive Measures.—This third child attended the infants' school at Mount Gambier. At my direction, the Senior Medical Officer (Dr. McQueen) on July 31 telephoned Dr. Hawkins, the Medical Officer of Health for Mount Gambier. Dr. Hawkins confirmed the information and said that the local board had arranged for each child attending the infants' school to receive sulphadiazine tablets. Instructions were issued by the medical officer regarding measures to be taken to prevent the spread of the disease. Arrangements were made to use 6,000 tablets of sulphadiazine from local supplies and to get further supplies from Adelaide. The Commonwealth Department of Health in Adelaide forwarded 7,000 tablets on July 31 and a further supply of 10,000 on August 3. The supply is sufficient for the prophylactic treatment of all the children attending the infants' school. Dr. Hawkins was asked if he thought a medical officer from this department could be of assistance and he said "not at present." Dr. Hawkins also said that, in the case of the college, action had been taken on the advice of the medical officer of the college to isolate the boarders at the college and the day boys at home and that all those pupils were being given sulphadiazine tablets as a prophylactic.

Present Situation.—This morning I telephoned the secretary of the local board of health for Mount Gambier (Mr. Sharley). He

said that no further cases had been reported, and he understood that the supply of prophylactic tablets was adequate. Dr. Hawkins was not available by telephone today, but I shall obtain further information from him from time to time. I am satisfied from the reports received that all practicable steps have been, and still are being, taken to deal with the outbreak. It is impossible at this stage to forecast the further developments. More cases may occur, but the preventive measures may be expected to render any extensive epidemic most unlikely. The modern treatment methods, if applied promptly, generally effect a cure of the illness. The case fatality rate in most countries is now under 10 per cent. At the time of World War I. the rate was about 40 per cent.

On the question of accommodation at the Mount Gambier schools, the Director of Education reports as follows:—

Enrolments at Mount Gambier primary school at present are:—Primary department, 660; infant department, 359; total, 1,019. At present there are 24 classrooms and it is considered that these provide adequate accommodation for the numbers at present enrolled. To provide for the additional enrolments expected at the beginning of 1954, two additional portable classrooms are to be constructed, and these will be available by February next. The new school at Reedy Park of 12 classrooms is now in the course of construction. The new school at Mount Gambier East of 10 classrooms is now at the stage when working drawings are almost completed. It has already been approved by the Public Works Standing Committee. Tenders should be called for this school in the next four months.

PROPOSED STATION—ADELAIDE-MARINO LINE.

Mr. PATTINSON—Last week I referred the Minister of Railways to a letter received from the Warradale Park Progress Association concerning the proposed construction of a new railway station between Oaklands and Hove on the Adelaide-Marino railway line. In correspondence with the then Commissioner of Railways the Association received a reply which stated:—

It is true that provision has been made for the construction of a new station between Oaklands and Hove when the duplication of this section of the Marino line is being carried out, but I am unable to say when sufficient funds will be available.

I realize that several stations will be required on that line, particularly one I am interested in, Marino station, but in view of the rapid growth of population in the Warradale area and the paucity of public transport there, is it possible to erect this station in advance of duplication of the railway and during the present financial year?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—Following on representations made by the honourable member I discussed the matter with the Railways Commissioner and received the following report:—It is anticipated that sufficient funds will be available during this year for the work to proceed with the duplication of the Edwards-town-Oaklands section of the Marino line. In this section we have to build platforms suitable for duplicated track at Woodlands Park, Ascot Park and the new station agreed to between Ascot Park and Oaklands to be named "Marion." I am confident that we will be able to complete the work of these three platforms this financial year, and it is obviously essential that these should have priority over the new station agreed to between Oaklands and Hove to be named "Warradale." However, provided the allocation is not exceeded and we are able to make sufficient progress on the work, it may be possible to commence construction of the Warradale station before the end of June next.

It is hoped that sufficient funds will be available to enable the work to be commenced during this financial year.

PENALTY INFLICTED BY JUSTICES.

Mr. TRAVERS—Has the Minister representing the Attorney-General a reply to the question I asked on July 30 relating to comments made at a police conference about justices of the peace?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I obtained the following report from the Attorney-General:—

The prosecution referred to in the honourable member's question was conducted by a police officer. This officer read the whole of section 172 of the Licensing Act under which the charge was laid to the Justices. He also referred them to section 81 of the Justices Act which provides for the terms of imprisonment which Justices may impose in default of payment of fines, and stated that he opposed the granting of time to pay any fine which might be imposed. I am satisfied from the report which I have received that the police officer did not deliberately suppress that part of the section dealing with the penalty nor did he press for a sentence of imprisonment. I regret very much that any attack should have been made at the Police Association Conference upon the work done by Justices of the Peace. The great majority of the Summary Jurisdiction prosecutions in country districts are held before lay Justices and without their help the administration of justice would be impossible. This valuable public service is done voluntarily and in my experience, conscientiously and well. It is inevitable that mistakes of this sort will be made occasionally and even at times by experienced Special Magistrates. There is no great danger of injustice being done in any such case as the Keeper of the Gaol invariably checks the warrant as soon as he receives it, and if the sentence is not justified by the Act he at once communicates with the Crown Solicitor who takes prompt steps to correct the mistake.

Mr. TRAVERS—Portion of my question was whether all parties concerned agreed as to what actually happened. The report does not contain the versions of all parties and I repeat my question. I have reason to believe that the accused's version disagrees with the report and I would be pleased to know whether the Justices' version agrees with the report. I would also like to know whether it is not a fact that the conviction and the warrant were drawn up by the police officer?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—Obviously I cannot be acquainted with those details and I will call for a further report.

MOUNT BARKER-WELLINGTON ROAD.

Mr. SHANNON—A section of the road between Mount Barker and Wellington has been reconditioned and surfaced, and I understand a grant has been made available for the surfacing of an additional portion of this road. The Mount Barker district council desires to continue the actual formation of the road, but a grant for that purpose has been denied. The council has local labour available for reconditioning the road, but the penetration is done by contract with one of the oil companies which does not employ any of the local labour. The council feels it would be wise to continue the re-conditioning of the road for possibly a few miles. Will the Minister of Local Government look into this matter from the point of view of keeping these local people in a job, even if the road is not surfaced? The council could put this road in trafficable order if provided with the money to do so.

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I shall be glad to take this question up with the Commissioner of Highways. As I have often stated, funds from the petrol tax rebate and motor licensing fees go straight into the road fund. The Commissioner of Highways exercises almost complete control over the expenditure of this money and therefore it does not come under my particular notice which roads are to be improved at any given period. In anticipation of an amendment to the Act this officer has been in close collaboration with me to see whether it is feasible with closer co-operation to have a better knowledge of what is happening.

MOONTA ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES.

Mr. McALEES—The suburb of Cross Roads, about a mile from Moonta proper, petitioned the South Australian Electricity Trust some time ago asking for the extension of electricity to the suburb and when it would be available

so that residents could go ahead with the wiring of their houses. Will the Premier ascertain what the present position is?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I will have the information available tomorrow.

WHEAT PRICE PLAN.

Mr. CHRISTIAN—Can the Minister of Agriculture throw any light on the wheat price plan recently agreed upon by the Agricultural Council, in the light of the fact that the Victorian Government has not approved of the suggested 15s. a bushel home consumption price? Does that mean that, in the event of there not being agreement between all the wheat-producing States, each State will fix its own home consumption price, or is there likely to be ultimate agreement upon some other basis?

The Hon. SIR GEORGE JENKINS—I noticed the report in this morning's paper, but there is nothing definite about it except that the Victorian Government had postponed consideration of the matter. Until I hear something from the Federal Minister for Commerce and Agriculture I do not intend to take any further steps. The position now is not quite clear because, I imagine, the Victorian Government is awaiting the return of the Premier from abroad before making a decision. I can say, however, that it was made quite clear to the Ministers of Agriculture that the Commonwealth Government was not interested in subsidies in order to maintain the wheat industry, believing that the industry was in a position to look after itself. That, I think, was a reasonable attitude, and because the Commonwealth Government's attitude was so clear the Ministers did not press the question of subsidies.

WIDENING OF PORT ROAD.

Mr. HUTCHENS—With the near completion of the widening of the Hindmarsh Bridge—which I commend as an excellent job—and with the proposed extension of General Motors Holdens works and the many new establishments in the western districts I feel it very necessary that completion of the widening of the Port Road be carried out as soon as possible. Does the Highways Department intend to continue that work during the ensuing year?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I have received a report from the Commissioner of Highways that it is proposed to re-commence the work of widening the Port Road towards Hindmarsh in about November next. The extent to which

it will be possible will depend, of course, on what other works may have to be given priority.

KANGAROO ISLAND SHIPPING FACILITIES.

Mr. BROOKMAN—In this morning's *Advertiser* there appears some information about the proposed improvements of harbour facilities at Kingscote. Can the Premier indicate when this project will be referred to the Public Works Standing Committee, and the number of ships likely to call at Kingscote as the result of the improved harbour facilities?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Cabinet considered the matter yesterday and decided to refer it to the Public Works Standing Committee. It will go through Executive Council as soon as the terms of reference have been drawn up—I should say within the next fortnight at the latest. I cannot give any definite information in respect of future shipping arrangements, but doubtless the shipping companies will cater for the requirements of the island and this will depend upon the intensity of development. The plan, of course, envisages improved shipping services, capacity for larger ships and much better handling of cargoes at the Kingscote end.

DISTRIBUTION OF ELECTRICITY.

Mr. HAWKER—During his trip overseas did the Premier find that progress had been made towards providing a cheaper means of distributing electricity?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I take it that the honourable member means the distribution of electricity to sparsely populated areas. There is no cheaper way of distributing it to such areas than is done in South Australia by means of transmission lines. Where the distances are great the power has to be stepped up to a high voltage to cover inevitable transmission losses. In France experimental work in connection with the distribution of direct current has been carried out but it has not been carried to the stage where it can be adopted, nor has it yet been proved to be cheaper.

SWINE COMPENSATION FUND.

Mr. MICHAEL (on notice)—

1. What was the income of the Swine Compensation Fund for the year 1952-53?

2. What money was paid out of the fund during the same period?

3. What was the financial position of the fund on June 30, 1953?

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

1. £17,217 7s. 3d.
2. £9,456 17s. 2d.
3. £64,002 10s. 7d. in credit.

PORT ADELAIDE DISTRICT PRIVATE BUSES.

Mr. Dunstan for Mr. HUTCHENS (on notice)—To what extent are private bus owners subsidized when operating on the Port Adelaide, Semaphore, and Largs Bay routes on Sundays?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The general manager of the Municipal Tramways Trust reports:—

No subsidy is paid by the trust for operation of private bus services on the Port Adelaide, Semaphore, and Largs Bay routes on Sundays.

GOVERNMENT'S INTEREST IN PRIVATE COMPANIES.

Mr. DUNKS (on notice)—

1. What amount of money lent by way of overdraft is guaranteed by the Government on behalf of (a) limited liability companies; and (b) private persons owning businesses?

2. How many shares are held by the Government in limited liability companies?

3. What is the Stock Exchange buyer value of these shares?

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

1. (a) £2,370,350; (b) nil.

2. Cellulose Australia Limited, 46,228 £1 shares; Yalata Limited, 45,030 £1 shares; Daylite Limited, 2,293 £1 shares.

3. Cellulose Australia Limited, 24s. 3d.; Yalata Limited, not listed, the Government is the sole owner; Daylite Limited, not quoted (now in liquidation).

BOOKMAKERS' LICENCES.

Mr. FRED WALSH (on notice)—

1. How many bookmakers' licences held last year were not renewed for the ensuing year for (a) the grand stand enclosure; (b) the derby stand enclosure; and (c) the flat?

2. What were the reasons for these cancellations?

3. Were the bookmakers concerned advised of any individual reasons; if not, why not?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The Chairman of the Betting Control Board reports:—

1. Of the bookmakers who held licences for the year ending July 31, 1953, the numbers of bookmakers who have not been granted licences for the year ending July 31, 1954, are:—(a) Grandstand, 3; (b) Derby stand, 4 (and 2 were transferred to the flat). (c) Flat, 10.

2. No licences were cancelled. The reasons for rejecting the applications of the bookmakers covered by 1. (b) and (c) varied. Some were rejected for reasons connected with age and capacity, others for financial reasons. It is not desirable to enter further into this matter. The bookmakers covered by 1. (a) retired.

3. Not all the bookmakers were informed of the reasons because the board, in dealing with the applications, was performing an administrative act and had an unfettered discretion to grant or refuse applications without assigning any reason. Bookmakers' licences are annual licences and applications for new licences were invited, considered and granted or rejected. This year 346 applications were received. Less than 200 could be granted. The consideration of applications involved a comparison of the qualifications and the suitability of the different applicants. It would be burdensome and impossible to give reasons to each of about 150 unsuccessful applicants. The licences which were granted, were granted to those applicants who, in the opinion of the board, were the most suitable, and due regard was paid to past experience.

EMPLOYEES REGISTRY OFFICE FEES.

Mr. HAWKER (on notice)—Is it the intention of the Government to take steps to increase charges contained in the Employees Registry Offices Act, 1915-1939?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—A Bill will be introduced dealing with this matter this session.

LARGS BAY JETTY.

Mr. TAPPING (on notice)—

1. Is it the intention of the Minister of Marine to call for a report on the condition of Largs Bay jetty?

2. If so, will consideration be given to the retention of at least 150yds. of the pier commencing at the shore end of the present structure?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—The Harbors Board has been asked to advise me as to the feasibility of retaining approximately 150yds. of the structure at the shore end.

YALATA MISSION STATION.

Mr. CHRISTIAN (on notice)—

1. When was Yalata purchased by the Government to be used as a home for the Ooldea natives?

2. What was the purchase price?

3. How many wool clips has the Government had from the property since purchase?

4. What have been the net proceeds from wool sold so far?

5. What quantity of wool has yet to be sold?

6. What is the carrying capacity of Yalata?

7. How many sheep are on the property now?

8. Have any considerable losses of sheep occurred in the last 12 months?

9. What are the reasons for the very long delay in the establishment of the mission on Yalata?

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

1. June 29, 1951.

2. Approximately £65,000 for 45,030 shares in Yalata Ltd. The property acquired included stock and plant, £5,000 in Commonwealth bonds, and the right of the company in the Wool Realization Scheme.

3. Two.

4. £36,257.

5. 191 bales weighing 63,603 lbs.

6. Records would indicate that over a period of 17 years prior to 1951 the average number of sheep on the property was approximately 15,000, but when purchased there were 7,139 on the property, including 1,416 breeding ewes purchased just prior to the sale to the Government. Following a close inspection of the property in 1951 the Pastoral Board reported—

Having regard to the existing water facilities and the history of the property generally, the board's considered opinion is that the carrying capacity of the property is in the region of 10,000 sheep.

7. Total shorn this year (May-June)—8,061.

8. Owing to its isolation, it has not been feasible to dispose at an economic price cast-for-age sheep, and during a portion of the past year when conditions were very dry and feed was short a number died. Following shearing, the weather was very wet and cold and it is known that there were additional losses of old shorn sheep. The number on hand, however, compares more than favourably with those when the station was purchased, and the manager has reported that lambing is proceeding and a satisfactory percentage of lambs is anticipated.

9. The property was acquired with a view to operating it as a pastoral undertaking and training ground in conformity with the policy of the Aborigines Protection Board to care for the natives in co-operation with a missionary organization. With this end in view, meetings of representatives of the two missionary organizations interested were held in an effort to secure a united form of control.

Representatives, however, were unable to agree and at a later date the United Aborigines Mission intimated that they could not undertake the financial responsibility involved. Negotiations were then opened with the Koonibba Lutheran Mission and considerable

progress has been made. When the question of purchasing the property was before Parliament it was intimated that any of the land found to be surplus to the requirements of a mission would be surrendered. This question, it was then stated, would be considered after recommendations were received from the Aborigines Protection Board, the Land Board and the Pastoral Board. It is considered unfair to the Koonibba Lutheran Mission to place it in charge of the station until its experience and that of the Aborigines Board indicates what portion of the area could be alienated without detriment to the whole proposal. In the meantime, the care of the natives remains under the control and will continue to remain under the control of the Aborigines Board in co-operation with the Lutheran Mission; and the cost of maintenance, medical care, etc., is being met out of the proceeds of the station. The Government gratefully acknowledges the work of the Lutheran Mission, and active negotiations are in progress regarding taking over the control of the stock and plant and future management of the property in the interests of the natives. Many thousands of pounds are involved and this necessarily involves considerable negotiations as to ways and means of financing the project by the mission.

CHURCHILL ROAD.

Mr. JENNINGS (on notice)—When will the Highways Department commence the work of reconstructing Churchill Road?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—The Commissioner of Highways reports:—

Funds are provided annually for maintenance of Churchill Road, which is bituminous surfaced and provides reasonable, if not ideal, running conditions; but before any major improvement could be effected, very expensive stormwater drainage works would need to be undertaken. At this juncture it is not practicable to state the date on which work could be commenced.

STATE REPRESENTATION AT CORONATION.

Mr. DUNSTAN (on notice)—What was the total cost to the State of sending persons to represent this State officially at the Coronation?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The information requested cannot be given at present, as all accounts have not yet been received for payment.

EMERGENCY HOMES.

Mr. TAPPING (on notice)—Is it the intention of the Government to consider embarking

on a further scheme of emergency home building in the metropolitan area, as a means of housing families in desperate circumstances?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Under the Government emergency housing scheme, approximately 2,300 comfortable but temporary houses have been built to accommodate families in urgent need of housing. As has been previously indicated, it is not considered desirable to build too large a number of what, after all, are temporary buildings and which are expected to be removed in due course. However, whilst the building of houses under the scheme is completed, it does not follow that these houses do not become available in some numbers to persons in need of housing. The houses are administered by the South Australian Housing Trust and it is the practice of the trust to transfer from the emergency houses to the ordinary houses of the trust tenants who have the qualifications for the tenancy of trust houses. The rate of transfer is about 25 per month. In addition, about 15 tenants a month leave the emergency houses for some cause or another. It follows that about 40 emergency houses become available each month for occupation by new tenants. A further factor is that the imported house programme of the trust is now producing substantial numbers of houses and, as a proportion of the houses is available for letting, these houses are appreciably relieving the pressure for rental houses. It is considered by the Government that the building of further emergency houses is not warranted.

SATELLITE TOWN NEAR SALISBURY.

Mr. JOHN CLARK (on notice)—

1. How many acres of land were purchased by the Housing Trust for the proposed satellite town north of Salisbury?

2. What was the average price per acre paid for this land?

3. When was the land purchased?

4. What progress has been made on the building of homes there?

5. Is the land being put to any use, whilst awaiting continuation of the scheme?

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

1. 4,140 acres.

2. £61 8s. 3d. an acre.

3. In April and May, 1950.

4. No building has as yet been commenced. Preliminary planning of the area has been completed and detailed planning is now in progress.

5. Yes, all the land is occupied under either grazing or agricultural licence.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

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

(Continued from July 30. Page 237.)

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide)—I oppose the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, paragraph 1 of which states:—

We, the Members of the House of Assembly, express our thanks for the speech with which Your Excellency was pleased to open Parliament.

I cannot find any fault with paragraphs 2, 3 and 4, but paragraph 1 refers to the legislative programme of this House—and I am not in agreement with it nor with the programme of legislation foreshadowed. This Government represents private enterprise and among the rights claimed by private enterprise and vested interests is the right to hire and fire. In March last because of the political gerrymander which exists the Government circumvented the will of the people and continued to occupy the Treasury benches. The member for Burnside referred to a number of “ifs”; about the only “if” he did not mention was that if the Government had accepted the umpire’s decision on March 7 it would have resigned. The gerrymander in South Australia is as bad as that which exists in Russia, if not worse. Reference has been made to that in the *News* since Saturday, March 7, and I have recently received information that the Premier and Georgi Malenkov have been in close consultation as to how it works. I understand that since March 7, the date of the State election, Georgi Malenkov and Mr. Playford have wanted to arrange a consultation so that Malenkov could learn about the gerrymander set-up in South Australia, but Malenkov would not leave Russia because he was afraid of being stabbed in the back, and Mr. Playford could not allow the Government to be carried on in his absence when the House was in session. It would be an impossibility for the Premier to leave his one-man band in such circumstances.

Recently I had handed to me a pamphlet, printed in the Commonwealth, dealing with some of Russia’s claims, amongst which it was asserted that Russia had invented the aeroplane, the telephone, the wireless and even discovered the North Pole and is now looking to see if the South Pole is in close proximity to it. Unfortunately, Russia left the discovery of radium to the Premier of South Australia. Among Russia’s claims is the invention of the secret ballot. According to the pamphlet, when a person goes to a polling booth he is handed a number of coloured pieces of paper, the

colour representing the candidate. The candidate representing the Communist Party would be denoted by a red paper. Probably the Liberal Party's paper would be yellow. The deputy returning officer sits at the ballot box and watches each elector place the colour of his choice in the box. If a voter does not place a red paper in a ballot box he is promptly liquidated and no more is heard of him. As a result the Russian newspaper *Pravda* is able to claim a huge majority for the Communist Party.

Since the last elections in South Australia Georgi Malenkov has found that he has something to learn about ballots. Although South Australians believe they have the right to nominate candidates and vote for the man of their choice and elect a representative Government, the districts are so "cooked" that the same Government must be returned. I understand that Georgi is now in consultation with the Premier and the next step between them will enable further consultations to take place. I believe that when the Premier was in England the question was raised as to how he was able to cling to the reins of Government. It is obvious that the Premier batted with a three-foot bat and refused to accept the umpire's decision, which is most important. I think the member for Burnside mentioned something about having run up a score. Sir Donald Bradman, a great sportsman, and others have put up great scores, but have always accepted the umpire's decision when it has been against them. What sort of a score would they have been able to put up had they not accepted the umpire's decision when given out? On Saturday, March 7, I wondered whether you, Mr. Speaker, would occupy your present office in this Parliament for Mr. Playford, despite the gerrymander, doubted whether his Party would win the election. The midnight edition of the *Adelaide Mail* of that date contained the following report:—

Opposition Leader (Mr. O'Halloran), speaking from Peterborough tonight, said:—"It looks like a photo finish. There has been a decided swing to Labor, which closely follows the trend of voting in other recent State elections. I am extremely pleased with the result so far." Postal and absent votes might make all the difference in the seats where contests were the closest for many years.

The editor waited until just before that edition went to print before publishing the following report in the stop press:—

When the *Mail* went to press the Premier (Mr. Playford), said he was not in a position to comment on the election count. He said he wanted to study more closely some seats in which the result was not clear.

Apparently, at midnight the Premier was not very happy about the possible outcome. Last session I forecast that the Government would not be returned and mentioned some seats which the Liberal and Country League would lose. I am pleased to say that some of those seats were lost by the Government, but others were retained only because of the gerrymander. The member for Mitcham has taken unto himself some kudos from the fact that the Australian Labor Party did not oppose him, but I cannot see how that can be interpreted as a compliment.

Mr. McAlees—He congratulated the Australian Labor Party.

Mr. LAWN—Yes, but he did not congratulate the Communist Party or say anything about the secret alliance, the pact of non-aggression, between the Communists and his Party. Those two Parties do not oppose each other at elections, but do everything possible to oppose the Labor Party by the nomination of Communists in districts strongly held by Labor members. In the districts of Stuart, Port Adelaide and Adelaide Communist candidates were nominated with the object of supporting the Playford Government by pegging down, in those districts, Labor candidates and their helpers who otherwise could have worked in other districts and helped to wrest more seats from the Government. Deposits for these Communist candidates were made available by either the Liberal and Country League or by its supporters on behalf of the League. Some employer members of the L.C.L. have said they will never see a Communist candidate short of his deposit or elections funds when he opposes an A.L.P. candidate in a district regarded as a Labor district. Had the members for Stuart, Port Adelaide and Adelaide been released to help other Labor candidates, I do not doubt that some seats at present held by the Government would have been won by Labor. The member for Stuart was prevented from helping the Labor candidate in Newcastle and, to some extent at least, the member for Port Adelaide and I were prevented from helping in many other districts. Nevertheless, I assisted in one or two other districts, one of which is now represented by Labor. I also helped the Labor candidate in Glenelg where the Liberal candidate was almost beaten, and I would have only had to show my face in Unley for Labor to take that seat from the Government. Had Labor candidates not been pegged down in the districts I have mentioned they could have campaigned in and won Mount Gambier.

Mr. Fred Walsh—How about Flinders?

Mr. LAWN—Labor might have won that, but before going so far afield we could have concentrated on and won Torrens. The Communist Party did not oppose the member for Mitcham or, with one exception, any of his colleagues, but concentrated, as usual, on Labor candidates. The Communist Party selected its three candidates to contest the electorates I have mentioned and prepared literature mentioning all three candidates for distribution in those electorates, and it opposed Mr. Playford only because loyal Australian citizens, working on the Port Adelaide wharves, taunted Communists working there with the statement that the Communist Party opposed only Labor candidates and obtained its election funds from the L.C.L. That was solely responsible for the Communists' decision at a late hour to submit a nomination for Gumeracha.

Mr. Hutchens—Do you suggest it was a mock fight?

Mr. LAWN—Of course it was. They nominated a candidate merely to decry suggestions of an alliance between the Parties not to oppose each other. Wherever possible the Liberal Party has striven to influence its supporters to vote for Communists rather than for Labor candidates. We all know what happened in the district of Stuart and about the subsequent press controversy when it was claimed that the brass hats of the Liberal Party at Woomera voted for the Communist candidate in ignorance. I do not accept their statement.

Mr. Davis—They are the intelligent section of the community.

Mr. LAWN—They may claim to be, but they are not. The voters at Woomera were influenced by the Liberal Party to vote for the Communist candidate rather than for Mr. Riches, who is tenacious and never afraid to press the Premier on behalf of his constituents. In 1949, Neil Carruthers, the then secretary of the Gas Workers' Union, opposed a Labor Party candidate in the Bowden ward of the Hindmarsh Council. It was a straight out contest between the A.L.P. and the Communist Party. Mr. Carruthers received 31 votes and it is significant that in the following year when there was a straight out contest in the same ward between the L.C.L. and the A.L.P., the Liberal candidate also polled 31 votes. In that district there was an anti-Labor section which would vote Communist rather than support the A.L.P. In 1938 the Liberal candidate for the district of Adelaide polled 1,541 votes out of more than 15,000, but on March 7

this year the Communist candidate polled 1,093 votes out of 12,000. Once more the ratio is approximately the same. These people voted for the Communist candidate because it was their only way of voting against the Labor Party. At the last elections a woman went to a polling booth in a district where there was a straight out conflict between the Communist Party and the Labor candidate, and when handed a how to vote card on behalf of the A.L.P. said she wanted to vote for the Liberal candidate. When she was told there was no Liberal candidate she wanted to know whether she could go to another district and vote for a Liberal candidate. That woman was so intent on voting against the Labor Party that she would have voted for the Communist Party.

I welcome the new members for Victoria, Prospect and Norwood on this side of the House. I am not going to welcome the new Government members. I have nothing personal against them but as a true member of the Labor Party and a true democrat I do not believe they should be here and I will not be a hypocrite and extend a welcome I do not mean. I congratulate the members for Prospect and Norwood on the initiative they have shown in obtaining and clearing a small room in this building in order to carry out properly their district work. About three months prior to my coming to this building I bought a new suit but after a few weeks here I tore my trousers on the old wicker chairs in the Party room. Those chairs are similar to the type my parents used when we could not afford better. I had to wait many years, and until I came here, to find the same type of chair. The Party room has two small lights which hardly illuminate the room. Sometimes the only way of telling whether they are on is to push down the switch. I have had to change my glasses since I have been here and I have no doubt that the bad lighting has affected members' eyes. The Party room accommodates nine members but there are only six drawers in the main table. Members should have some place in which to keep letters from constituents and private notes. There were two typewriters on small tables in the room but one has since been removed and that table has been converted to a member's use. I do not know why the typewriter was removed because only one typiste is provided for all members of Parliament. She has to do all the work for 52 members, which is unfair to her. The Labor room is so overcrowded that at times it is necessary for members to go into the interviewing room or

into this Chamber to perform their work. On occasions when I have dictated letters to the typiste late in the afternoon they have been returned to the Party room after I have gone and have been placed where I normally sit—if I am lucky—but other members have shifted them and ultimately I have discovered them among a pile of *Hansards* and various Bills. That is not only my experience; it also applies to others. No filing system is provided for members in the House and therefore they must improvise their own or dump their papers in a little cubicle 10in. square in the Party room.

The Government employs non-union labour, both male and female, in the House, the sole object being to stop them from seeking decent wages and conditions. I understand that the wage of the male staff is not much above the basic wage and the female employees, of course, receive still less. At its first sitting this session the House did not rise until 3.45 a.m. on the second day. The refreshment room remains open for half an hour after adjournment, and it closed on this occasion at 4.15 a.m. The staff then had to clean up and I suppose had a cup of tea before retiring, and for the additional hours they received only about 12s. 6d. That is shocking and disgusts me. I understand that the same practice applies to the male staff. If the House sits until 9 p.m. the staff receives an additional 4s. or 5s., if it remains in session until midnight an additional 5s., and if they go right through the night they get an additional £1. It is the Government's and Parliament's duty to enable these people to get a fair go. The Government is opposed to compulsory unionism and wherever possible even to unionism. It will not allow rural workers to be covered by the Industrial Code, they not being permitted to organize as a body to seek award wages and conditions. Also, the Government will not allow the House staff to join a union and thus get decent wages and conditions. I challenge the Government to declare that this staff is free to join a trade union and to meet that union and negotiate an agreement on wages and conditions. I understand that in the last three years an officer of the House, in giving information to the Public Service Commissioner, claimed that about the sum total of messengers' duties was emptying the wastepaper baskets. Every honourable member knows the value of these employees. Occasionally a person under the influence of liquor who wants to see a member makes himself objectionable. It is the duty of our messengers, in a gentlemanly and tactful way, to pacify such people.

Last May the Government announced an amnesty for prisoners because of Coronation Year and it was stated that first-timers would have one-sixth of their sentence remitted, second-timers one-twelfth and the remainder one-eighteenth. From inquiries I made I have come to the conclusion that the Government did not know what it was doing when it arrived at that decision. Although the Yatala Labour Prison is not in my district I have received requests from its inmates to make inquiries on their behalf and I did so in regard to the proposed amnesty. I was asked to ascertain whether the Government's announcement in the press and over the air was correct, because the amnesty was not being applied in accordance with the Government's declaration. I believed that the prisoners were wrong, but to ascertain the true position I approached the Chief Secretary, as I understood that the Government's declaration was being applied. I asked him to look into the position and make a press statement that the Government's decision was being carried out and to let the prisoners at Yatala know that I had endeavoured to have the matter cleared up. I thought it would be cleared up satisfactorily in a day or so, but was surprised to find that it was so complicated that no one was able to advise. The Chief Secretary was unable to tell me whether the Government's policy was being carried out, nor could a member of the Sheriff's staff, in the absence of the Sheriff, and ultimately the Chief Secretary had to get an opinion from the Crown Law Office. Such a long time elapsed in getting the information that one must conclude that the matter was very involved. I received the following letter from the Chief Secretary in reply to my inquiry:—

Following your inquiry as to the method that was being adopted in giving effect to His Excellency the Governor's Order commuting certain sentences of prisoners as a Coronation gesture, I requested the matter to be investigated both by the Sheriff and Comptroller of Prisons, and the Crown Solicitor's Department. I am advised that the method adopted by the Sheriff's Department which is, in effect, to treat all sentences as being covered by marks and then subject them to reduction with marks earned for remissions granted, is quite correct in the view of the Crown Solicitor, but that he disagrees with the Sheriff's former decision that offences committed by persons whilst in goal were to be disregarded. The Crown Solicitor has expressed the legal opinion that such sentences do come within the meaning of the warrant and that, therefore, they too, are subject to a reduction, but as anyone whilst in prison would automatically become a second or third offender as the case may be, they would automatically lose the one-sixth

reduction on the original sentence and revert to one-twelfth or one-eighteenth. Your inquiry has revealed a circumstance which, I fear, is of detriment to the persons concerned.

In view of the last paragraph I asked the Chief Secretary whether it meant the Government intended to apply the Crown Solicitor's opinion, and he replied in the affirmative. That means that the prisoners will receive less remission than they were to have received at the time they opened their mouths on the matter. The Premier has often invited members to approach him for any information they require and it is wrong for the Government, as the result of a legitimate inquiry by a member, to accept this interpretation of its decision; because of it an offence committed after a person is committed to Yatala becomes an offence within the meaning of the Government's decision, whereas quite obviously the Government intended it to apply in respect of first appearances in court. When a person is brought before the courts of Adelaide his police record—if any—is announced to the court, and it is those previous offences of which the court takes cognizance. Any misdemeanor in gaol should not be deemed to be a further offence, and the Government should have known what its decision entailed. I am not complaining of its original decision, but of its subsequent acceptance of the Crown Solicitor's interpretation. No-one in the community should be penalized simply because a member legitimately brings a matter under the Government's notice.

Last week I asked the Minister of Railways a question in regard to curtailment of the services of the Man-in-Blue at the Adelaide Railway Station. I was not concerned with the individual occupying that position but with the service rendered to the public. The Man-in-Blue, in effect, sells railway service and it was the curtailment of that service with which I am concerned. In replying the Minister said that the Arbitration Court award prescribing 10 shifts a fortnight was one reason for this curtailment of service but in my opinion that was not correct, so I asked him further if it were correct that the Railways Commissioner had found it necessary to give the man concerned barrier duty in order to comply with the award. The Minister then complained that I was raising questions in respect of each individual employee of the railways; he previously had made the same complaint against the member for Port Pirie who had asked a question regarding delays on the Port Pirie line. The Minister should have

realized that I was not concerned with the individual, but with the curtailment of a service both valuable to the public and to the department.

In reply to another question last week as to the shortage of building materials the Premier said that control of building materials had been abolished with full approval of Opposition members. When the Premier introduced the Bill last year he conveyed information to the House which we then accepted but which, apparently, has been found to be incorrect. At page 361 of 1952 *Hansard* he is reported as follows:—

It is proposed to repeal the existing Act and to set up a new system for the regulation of building operations. As before mentioned, the control proposed by the new legislation will be very much less stringent than that now provided. It is considered by the Government that the time is appropriate to take such a course. In general, the supplies of building materials have increased appreciably and, in addition, the labour position has eased. There are still, however, considerable numbers of people lacking proper dwellings and it is felt that the time has not yet arrived for the complete relaxation of controls and that it is still essential that the resources of the building industry should be principally devoted to the provision of dwellinghouses.

Last week the Premier was questioned about black marketing in galvanized iron and he in replying claimed that the Opposition was in accord with the Government's policy of lifting all controls on building materials. Unconsciously or otherwise the Premier misled the House last year when he intimated that building materials were in greater supply, for it has since proved that they are still in short supply and that some are the subject of black marketing. When this was discovered he should have announced the Government's intention to reimpose controls.

Mr. Dunstan—You would not expect him to interfere with Elder Smith & Coy.?

Mr. LAWN—Unfortunately, this Government represents vested interests and it is not in its interests to worry about the person who needs a bag of cement. In view of the Commonwealth Government's so-called health scheme I desire to draw attention to the allowances prescribed for sickness and injury under the Workmen's Compensation Act. This imposes a limit of £50 for medical benefits.

Mr. McAlees—It is £75 now.

Mr. LAWN—I may be wrong, but whatever the amount is it should be increased. Any person who subscribes to an approved medical benefits society is entitled to a subsidy from

the Commonwealth Government towards doctors' fees or hospital charges and I believe that the scale of payments prescribed under the Workmen's Compensation Act is quite out of proportion with those provided under the health scheme. At the same time the person who is covered for accident or sickness under the Workmen's Compensation Act is excluded from benefits under the Commonwealth health plan and consequently it is now more than ever necessary to increase the benefits under the Act.

Paragraph 4 of His Excellency's Speech reads:—

4. During the financial year now ending, South Australia has experienced gratifying prosperity in both primary and secondary industries. The recent recession in industrial activity throughout the Commonwealth was relatively mild in this State, and was no more than was inevitable in a change from inflation to a more stable economy. In South Australia the unemployment associated with the change was unusually low, being less than 1 per cent.

The production in the secondary industries of South Australia continues to grow both in value and in quantity; and further increases can be expected from new undertakings, both public and private. As the inflationary factors in the Australian economy have been reduced during the year, comparative stability in prices has led to greater stability in wage rates, and a reduced labour turnover has brought a sharp increase in production.

That would lead anyone to believe that everybody was satisfied, but during the three years that I have been in this place Government members have complained about the turnover of labour, lack of production, need for greater production, more stability, and more developmental work. If the statement in the Governor's Speech is correct, it seems that increased production and greater stability have been achieved, and retrenchments avoided, but in the *News* of July 16 there was a statement by Sir Henry Gullett, "We are pricing ourselves out of markets, out of houses, and out of work," and since his return from abroad the Premier has said in this place that we are pricing ourselves out of world markets. The housewife complains about the high cost of living and the shortage of commodities, particularly potatoes, and when he spoke in this debate Mr. Dunks was full of complaints about this matter. South Australia has the highest basic wage ever. Mr. Stott, the farmers' authority, complained that they are not satisfied with their returns. Potato growers are not satisfied with prices. The wage earner in industry is not satisfied with the basic wage or his margins. Margins have not been increased since 1947. Yesterday the unions

decided to appeal to the full Arbitration Court against Commissioner Galvin's decision not to alter margins. I cannot understand why such a statement appeared in the Governor's Speech, because nobody seems to be satisfied. In reply to a question I asked on July 21 this year, as reported on page 82 of *Hansard*, the Premier told me that the average weekly number of wages and salaries employees, males and females, during the year ended June 30, 1952, was 81,858. He also said that the actual figure in January 1952 was 83,397, and the estimated figure for January 1953 was 76,100. This shows a reduction of 7,000 approximately, yet the Governor's Speech says that unemployment has decreased and that there is more stability in industry.

Paragraph 11 of the Speech says:—

Despite the limitation of Loan funds the Government has steadily pursued its policy of improving harbour and port facilities throughout the State..

Then reference is made to the satisfactory progress made with a number of works. We know that the various States have been unable to get from the Commonwealth Government all the Loan money they require to carry on public works because, as we have been led to believe, during the last two or three years the public would not lend money to the Commonwealth Liberal Government. I dealt with this matter at great length last session and shall not repeat what I said then, but I want to draw attention to an illogical happening in our capitalistic system. We have recently come out of a second World War. We were told that the Allies were victorious and that our enemies, Japan and Germany, had lost the war. We were led to believe that there was much devastation in those countries, particularly in Japan as the result of the dropping of an atomic bomb, yet I have been told by people who visited those places recently that there is far greater progress in rebuilding than we have in developing natural resources.

Mr. Hawker—Have they a 40-hour week?

Mr. LAWN—Two years ago the honourable member and Mr. Dunks opposed the introduction of a 40-hour week, and they were the only two Government members who declared themselves on the matter.

Mr. Christian—Nonsense!

Mr. LAWN—I suggest that the honourable member look at *Hansard*. I do not make incorrect statements. In the 1951 debate I spoke mainly about the 40-hour week, and as each Government member followed me I challenged him on the matter, and only Mr. Hawker and Mr. Dunks said they were opposed to a 40-hour

week. Mr. Dunks indicated he preferred a 48-hour week, and I think Mr. Hawker wanted a longer working week. No other Government member said he was opposed to the 40-hour week. Mr. Whittle, the then member for Prospect, made it clear by interjection that he and the Government did not oppose it. In 1952 prior to the State Election the Premier said in no uncertain terms that he was not supporting the employers' application to the Arbitration Court for an increase in working hours or a reduction in the basic wage. Now since the elections Government members seem to be declaring themselves opposed to the 40-hour week.

Mr. Christian—Have you never heard me on many occasions in this place draw attention to the complete failure of the 40-hour week?

Mr. LAWN—Last session I gave some figures on employment in South Australia and in other States, and quoted statements by various Premiers. I said I went through the New South Wales Railways Department and saw a graph showing the progress of production over many years, and it showed an increase since the 40-hour week was introduced. I also quoted in this place Commonwealth and State Statistician's figures showing increased production. On July 21, 1953, as reported on page 81 of *Hansard*, I put the following question to the Minister of Railways:—

1. When did the South Australian railways commence operations?

2. What were the numbers of (a) passenger coaches in use; (b) locomotives in use; (c) other rollingstock in use; (d) miles of permanent way laid; (e) employees; and (f) hours per week worked by these employees, as at the date of commencement of operations and at June 30, respectively?

In reply the Minister said that when the railways commenced operations on April 19, 1856, the train operating staff and gatekeepers worked approximately 12 hours a day for six days a week, and labourers probably 10 hours a day for six days a week. Respectively they worked 72 hours and 60 hours a week. Today the salaried staff works only 38 hours a week, and all others 40 hours. The reply then referred to miles of permanent way laid and numbers of rollingstock. When the railways first operated there were 11 employees per mile; today there are only 4.6. In 1856 there were 3.2 employees per vehicle; today there are 1.1. Wherever we look for figures in respect of production, facts belie statements made by Government supporters that it has decreased since the introduction of the 40-hour week. If the dictatorship on the other side of the House had its

way it would adopt a move made by Hitler and burn all records, but the presence of Commonwealth, State and other Parliamentary libraries, where records are kept to disprove its statements, prevent it from doing so, because it would not accomplish anything. Government members still refuse to accept statistics. They even refuse to accept the statement of their own Government, for paragraph 4 of the Governor's Speech states:—

Production in the secondary industries of South Australia continues to grow, both in value and in quantity.

There is a straight-out declaration by the Government, and it goes on to claim that one of the reasons for this state of affairs is the reduced labour turnover in industry.

Mr. O'Halloran—Probably the 40-hour week has brought about greater efficiency and less fatigue.

Mr. LAWN—That is sound reasoning, which commended itself to the Arbitration Court when it heard the application for a 40-hour week. A few months ago a case in the court, in which I participated, closed after going on for years. In their evidence the employers were forced to admit that labour turnover had considerably decreased during the last 18 months and had to admit that that had a beneficial effect on production, so despite the statements by Government members they must face the fact that production is increasing, notwithstanding the 40-hour week. A man can work at a greater pace for eight hours a day than for 12, so greater efficiency naturally follows. Those countries that were devastated in World War II. have practically rehabilitated themselves. There was no devastation in Australia, but we are unable to develop our natural resources or find the necessary money under a capitalistic system. The L.C.L. Party says money must be borrowed to develop the country, but that the people will not lend it.

Mr. Pearson—Were the European nations rebuilt on a 40-hour week?

Mr. LAWN—I do not know, but that is not the point. They certainly did not work a 60-hour week, for there would have been a revolution in Europe if that had been forced on them. Those countries did not put forward excuses such as no manpower or no money. In 1950 I frequently heard the Minister of Works say the Government did not have sufficient labour or materials to carry out Government works, though they had plenty of money; in fact, both he and the Premier said they were unable to spend all the money they had. Twelve months later the Ministers said that manpower

and materials were available, but they had no money. That is an example of L.C.L. policy. Why has Europe been able to accomplish so much that Australia could not? The Governor's Speech stated that there were few unemployed, but the Labor Party has a policy of full employment. Why should Government supporters urge an increase in working hours to increase production when there is a small army of unemployed? They should advocate full employment before doing that. Lengthening hours would only throw more men on the unemployed scrap heap. During the last 12 months I have had to seek employment for some of my constituents but have found that employers do not want men over 50. That is a disgraceful state of affairs, for not long ago we had full employment in Australia. It is reminiscent of the depression years, when a man was too old at 35. On July 30 the *News* published an article stating:—

Canada is booming. It is a land of expansion and hard work, but there are few new jobs for the middle aged and elderly so the Government started a bureau to find work for men over 45.

Employers prefer their workers to be under 45. If the working week were 48 hours they would be too old at 35. In his speech on the Address in Reply the member for Mitcham called the Premier "Atomic Tom." This is what he said of him:—

Let us consider the wonderful part he has played in the destiny of this fair land since he has been leader of my Party and Premier of the State—in the advancement of secondary industries, development of the Leigh Creek coalfield, water reticulation, the broadening of railway gauges, afforestation and milling operations, the Mannum to Adelaide pipeline, which we hope will be working in another two years, the reticulation of electricity in many parts of the State, and the development of Radium Hill.

All of the projects referred to were socialistic in character.

Mr. O'Halloran—Not a bad record for an anti-socialist Government.

Mr. LAWN—They are all operated by the State Government, yet the same honourable member would say he was opposed to Socialism. Mr. Hawker again raised the question of a supply of electricity to Burra. He wants the benefits of a socialistic enterprise, yet he would say he did not believe in Socialism. The Labor Party believes that electricity should be made available to all South Australians.

Mr. Macgillivray—Yes, but your Party advocates Socialism.

Mr. LAWN—Yes, we do not deery it, but the member for Mitcham does, yet he commends the Government for its socialistic operations. Mr. Stott used "co-ordination" frequently in his first speech this session and I commended him for it. I said that before long I would convert him to Socialism. He advocated another socialistic enterprise, bulk handling of wheat. He wanted the taxpayers to provide the wheatgrowers with this system. I do not know whether he would oppose Socialism, but it is evident he unconsciously supports it.

Mr. Macgillivray—He was recommending a co-operative scheme and not a socialistic one.

Mr. LAWN—On page 148 Mr. Dunks stated:—

It may be said that some business men are making profits, but if they are it is because they have had to work hard and buy well. They must pay the iniquitous pay roll tax whether they make a profit or a loss and they must act as agents for the Government in collecting sales tax.

In its financial and market notes of July 29, the *News* states that industrial gold continues strong, but nowhere can we find where profits are declining or shares weakening. On the contrary, on the front page of the *News* of that date there appears a statement that the community is prospering and that we are to have a new week-end paper. Members are aware that newspapers are not run merely for sale, but that the profits come from advertisements. I was surprised to hear Mr. Dunks say that he is in agreement with me and I cannot understand how he supports my statements. On more than one occasion I have said that the employer buys on the cheapest market and sells on the highest. On the other hand, the labourer is forced to buy on the cheapest market and sell his labour on the highest market. Mr. Dunks said that the employer must buy well, but he did not say he sells better. He also said that, as a businessman, he must buy his potatoes well and as cheaply as possible. He wants to turn them into pies and pasties and sell them to the public at the best price he can get. There cannot be any unanimity because all employers want to buy on the cheapest market and sell on the highest, not only their labour, but their goods. In effect, he subscribes to the argument that, under the capitalistic system, one must buy on the cheapest market and sell on the highest, but it is the reverse so far as the employee is concerned. Businesses are not so much concerned about the services to the public. We also find that pies and pasties, according to last week-end's press which are made on

Fridays are sold to the public on the Monday. I cannot understand how educated intelligent members can oppose Government ownership and Government enterprise. The service to the public would be improved if the pies and pasties were distributed by the Government. Take the question of private transport. I have noticed how women are ridiculed and abused by drivers of private buses if they want to put a pusher on the vehicles, but have only heard commendation of the service that is provided by the Government.

Mr. Dunks referred (page 148 of *Hansard*) to a newspaper report about increased prices throughout the world and in Australia. The sharpest rise that occurred in Australia was from 170 points to 245 points between 1950 and 1952. Mr. Dunks said:—

Is the sharp rise which took place between 1950 and 1952 a recommendation for price-fixing? Has price-fixing achieved what its authors said it would? Has it done anything to increase workers' real incomes? The answer to the economy problem is not price-fixing but competition of the sort which we knew before World War II. and which put Australia in a strong position before price-fixing operated.

There was a real increase of 7s. in the basic wage in December, 1946. In the following year, because of the economic policy of the Commonwealth Labor Government, the basic wage increased by only 1s. Last year I gave figures showing the increases that had occurred following the 21s. basic wage increase in December, 1948. The highest increase in prices in Australia occurred between 1950 and 1952 because there was no economic policy on the part of the Commonwealth Liberal Government.

Mr. Dunks—But we still have price-fixing.

Mr. LAWN—We have not; six different authorities in the Commonwealth are applying price control. There is an application before the court to decide who is the authority to fix prices—the Minister or the Prices Commissioner—and because of the different prices in the various States South Australia cannot buy potatoes to manufacture into pies and pasties, because better prices can be obtained in other States.

Mr. Dunks—State price control is useless, according to you.

Mr. LAWN—It is not a proper price-fixing system, similar to that which operated under Commonwealth control. The honourable member opposed Commonwealth price control and promised people that if they dispensed with it he would help to give them better price control here. The Premier said, "My Government can and will." Today he says that we

cannot give people decent price control under six different authorities. The people should be given another referendum and we should revert to what we had previously—effective price control by the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. Dunks—When did I say that?

Mr. LAWN—The Premier said, "My Government can and will give more effective price control." Does he suggest that he knew his leader was misleading the people and yet he did not deny the statement? The member for Mitcham advocates a reversion to the "survival of the fittest" rule, but I remind him that the Prices Commissioner has refused applications for price increases totalling millions of pounds. Without even the present semblance of price control our economy would have collapsed, and any reasonable person, not actuated by greed, would support the reversion of price control to the Commonwealth. Mr. Dunks also said that some traders had gone out of business, but I do not know of any. I doubt whether the Adelaide Finance Company is going out of business, but, if it is, I commend the member for Mitcham and the directors and other shareholders who, realizing that they were indulging in usury, a practice contrary to Christian principles, have decided to discontinue their filthy business. Paragraph 23 of His Excellency's Speech states:—

The problem of returning to the States their rights to impose taxes on incomes has been discussed at several conferences between representatives of the Commonwealth and of the States, and recommendations as to ways and means have been made. My Government believes that a satisfactory scheme can be evolved, and is willing to join in any arrangements which will secure to the State an adequate field of taxation and will be reasonably simple in administration.

The Commonwealth Government is anxious to vacate the income tax field which is bringing it into disfavour with Australians. At present, claimant States such as South Australia must appear before the Grants Commission and state a case for a grant. Having been informed by the Premier as to the workings of the Grants Commission, I have taken out figures showing the net per capita taxation collections by each State for the years 1939-40 to 1941-42, the three years immediately prior to the Commonwealth taking over the whole of the income taxation field. As the schedule is rather lengthy I ask the leave of the House to incorporate it in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

	N.S.W.			V.			Q.			S.A.			W.A.			T.			Average.		
Year.	£	s	d.	£	s	d.	£	s	d.	£	s	d.	£	s	d.	£	s	d.	£	s	d.
1939-40 . . .	2	10	10	2	10	2	3	7	10	3	19	0	2	2	11	1	17	10	2	14	8
1940-41 . . .	2	16	0	2	12	10	3	16	4	4	3	5	4	8	11	2	0	0	3	2	1
1941-42 . . .	6	0	5	3	0	5	3	13	11	4	13	2	4	17	9	4	12	7	4	12	5

Mr. LAWN—In 1939-40 the South Australian tax was £1 4s. 4d. higher than the "all States" average, and in 1940-41 and 1941-42, despite a goldmining profits tax of 8s. per capita imposed by the Western Australian Government, the South Australian figures were £1 1s. 4d. and 9d. higher than the average. In appearing on behalf of this State before the Grants Commission the Premier must supply particulars of his Government's revenue and expenditure. The commission compares those particulars with the revenue and expenditure of the non-claimant States, and if, say, South Australian rail fares or freight charges are 3d. a mile more than those in a non-claimant State, the commission credits South Australia with such excess in fixing the grant. On the other hand, if such charges are lower than those in the non-claimant States, credits built up by South Australia are offset by that deficit, and its grant is reduced. The commission subsidizes the South Australian Government on a pound for pound basis according to the rates charged by its public utilities, and if, after resuming its taxing powers, South Australia was imposing a lower rate than that imposed in the non-claimant States the commission would reduce its grant accordingly; therefore, the public are being misled when told that the resumption of taxing powers by the States would mean lower taxation for South Australians.

Mr. Quirke—If South Australia resumed its taxing powers, would the Grants Commission still operate as at present?

Mr. LAWN—Yes, unless it were abolished, and then the South Australian Government would have to raise more revenue directly from the people.

Mr. Fred Walsh—The Commonwealth Government would have to vacate certain fields of taxation.

Mr. LAWN—The sum at present received by the Commonwealth through income taxation would be raised by the State, which, consequently, would lose at least part of its present grant; therefore, South Australians would be worse off if taxing powers reverted to the States. Further, I cannot visualize the present Legislative Council passing any financial measure which did not give substantial relief to those in the higher income groups, and, although

it may be said that it cannot amend a financial measure, I point out that it can refuse to pass it. Even if a Labour Government framed its budget to assist those on lower incomes, I cannot visualize the Legislative Council passing it; but in the Commonwealth sphere we have a more democratic set-up by which Australians can change their Government if it is not giving satisfaction. For those reasons I will oppose the resumption by the States of any taxing powers; indeed, I would prefer to see more powers given to the Commonwealth Government. I cannot find fault with the democratic method of electing the House of Representatives, a method in direct contrast to that of electing our House of Assembly in which, because of the gerrymander, the Government retains office against the wishes of the majority.

Paragraph 24 of His Excellency's Speech refers to the probable increase, from six to eight, of the number of Ministers, but until certain things are done I will oppose an increase. I do not deny that Ministers may hold too many portfolios, and more than Ministers in other States, but more than the question of additional Ministers must be considered. In other States electoral systems operate which enable electors to effect changes of Government. This Government should amend our electoral laws and then examine the salaries of the Premier, Ministers, and members before deciding to enlarge the Ministry. It is interesting to compare the salaries paid in this State with those in other States. In New South Wales the Premier receives £3,455 plus an entertainment allowance of £750; in Victoria, £2,750 plus £500 entertainment allowance and £250 country allowance; in Queensland £3,025 plus £300 entertainment allowance; in South Australia, £3,000; in Western Australia, £2,790, and in Tasmania, £2,000 plus £300 entertainment allowance. Ten years ago managers of private industries in South Australia were receiving £60 to £100 a week and no doubt those salaries have since greatly increased but the Premier, who is the leader of the Government, receives less than they, and is one of the lowest paid Premiers in the Commonwealth. The salaries paid to Ministers are—in New South Wales, Attorney-General, £3,095 plus £250 entertainment allowance, other Ministers, £2,945 plus £250; Victoria, £2,250 plus £100, plus £200; Queensland, £2,575; South Australia,

£2,500; Western Australia, £2,490 to £2,540; and Tasmania, ordinary Ministers, £1,750, and honorary Ministers, £1,450.

South Australian Ministers are lower paid than any other Ministers although they control more departments. When a South Australian Minister is discussing matters with which he is concerned with Ministers from other States he must consult more than one Minister because they do not hold as many portfolios. It is interesting to note that the Leader of the Opposition in this State receives a lower salary than any other Leader of the Opposition. The respective figures are—New South Wales, £2,375 plus £250 entertainment allowance; Victoria, £1,550 plus £100 if a country member; Queensland, 1,875; South Australia £1,725; Western Australia £1,790; and Tasmania, £1,350 to £1,550. The salary I have mentioned as being paid to the Leader of the Opposition here includes his allowance as a country member. The salaries payable to members are—New South Wales, £1,875; Victoria, metropolitan members £1,050, and country members £1,150; Queensland £1,375, which is to be increased by £400 made up of £200 additional salary and a £200 allowance; South Australia, metropolitan member £1,150 and country members £1,200 to £1,225; Western Australia, metropolitan member £1,240, country member £1,290, and Tasmania, £850 to £1,050. According to the *News* of July 30 it has been decided to increase the Victorian salary by £384 per annum. In some States allowances are paid for telephone calls, telegrams, and stamps, the latter being a greater amount than that paid in South Australia.

In South Australia members subscribe to what is called a superannuation scheme but I do not think that is a correct description. If I used what I consider suitable words, they would be described as unparliamentary. I pay £58 10s. per annum for what is virtually a pension of £1 12s. 6d. per week. I, and probably most members of the Opposition, would be eligible to receive the old age pension of £3 7s. 6d. a week, but by subscribing to this superannuation scheme I can receive a pension of £5 per week. In other words, I pay £58 10s. to receive £1 12s. 6d. weekly above the old age pension. Many Government members have outside business interests and probably members' salaries are based on the assumption that all members have similar interests and do not devote their full time to Parliamentary duties. A member must subscribe to the scheme for 12 years to become eligible for superannuation. A further qualification is that if, at the end of

12 years, he does not contest an election he will lose any benefits unless he can satisfactorily prove he had valid reasons for not doing so. If he obtains other employment in the Government services he loses his pension. No matter what way I look at the scheme it does not commend itself one iota. My income during the last year comprised the following items—Parliamentary salary, £1,150; Savings Bank interest, £5; graft and bribery, nil; director's fees, nil; company dividends, nil; and income from all other sources, nil; a total of £1,155. Next year I will not receive £5 Savings Bank interest, as I had to spend over £100 on campaign costs for the last election. Some members had to spend about £450 on their campaigns particularly in districts where contests were keen. The Government should examine the salaries paid to the Premier, Ministers, members and staff. Travelling allowances and fees received as members of Committees should also be considered.

The member for Mitcham has advocated the lifting of price control, but I do not know whether he subscribes to the same principle as regards houses. My attention was recently drawn to the fact that a certain person, acting on behalf of a city business undertaking, purchased three two-storey houses in Adelaide which were occupied by 25 persons. They were bought on May 23 and on May 27 the tenants received their first lawyer's letter as follows:—

Our instructions are to inform you that our client company requires possession of its premises at the earliest possible date, and we ask you to make strenuous efforts to obtain alternative accommodation since we are instructed to take the necessary legal proceedings to obtain recovery as soon as we are legally permitted to do so. Please treat this matter as urgent.

Mr. O'Halloran—That letter is very cunningly worded.

Mr. LAWN—I agree. Apparently the company was not satisfied with the progress being made by that legal firm, for it transferred its business to another firm of solicitors, and on June 10 the following letter was sent to tenants:—

We have been instructed by Mr. —, who has purchased the property in which you reside. Our client requires this property for his own purposes, and this letter is to inform you that it is desired that you will find accommodation elsewhere as soon as possible. I do not know why this person required three two-storey houses for his own purpose, except that he had communicated to tenants

verbally that they were required for his business. On July 21 the following letter was sent to tenants:—

We have received no response from you and must ask you to let us know whether you can give us some definite indication of the date upon which you will be able to vacate our client's property.

In addition the owner of the properties has advised clients to get other accommodation, giving 28 days' notice. When they informed him that they could not get other accommodation he told them to get out, even if it meant his demolishing the buildings over their heads. As he said, "There are means of getting you out. Money talks." That is a threat. I believe he was unaware of the provision of the Landlord and Tenant Act regarding 12 months' probation. Apparently, he did not know he had to get a permit to convert these houses into showrooms. The solicitors who advised him in the second instance said I was wrong if I understood that the Act provided that if a person is a British subject and had owned the house for five years or more he had the right to take action for eviction without having to prove hardship, but where a person was not a British subject or did not own the premises for five years he must wait 12 months before he could give a month's notice to the tenant and then he must apply to the court for possession. These solicitors are adamant that the owner in question can get possession. I told him I intended to raise the matter in the House. I emphasize that it is still necessary for the Government to maintain these controls, otherwise many people in Adelaide and in the suburbs will have owners demolishing houses and forcing them out, using the properties for factory purposes.

I asked the Minister of Works a question concerning a certificate granted by the Local Board of Health during the past 12 months declaring certain houses unfit for habitation, and I inquired how many were owned by the Franklin Transport Ltd. Subsequently, I ascertained that five tenants of this firm had received notices declaring that the houses were unfit for habitation, and they gave me a copy of the letter they had received from a solicitor in September, 1951, relating to an application for possession. It is as follows:—

As the result of negotiations between the solicitors for Franklin Transport Ltd. and myself, it is likely that at an early date arrangements will be made as the result of which neither you nor any of the other tenants will have to leave your homes. It will not be necessary for you or any of the others to

come to court on Monday next, 24th instant. Would you be kind enough to tell each of them this? The cases will all be adjourned pending further discussion between the opposition solicitors and myself.

You and the other tenants need not trouble further about the matter until I write you again. In the meantime, let me assure you that there is no necessity for the continuance of the mental strain from which you have been suffering. If you wish to do so, by all means call and see me and I will explain matters further.

Agreement was arrived at between the firm's solicitors and the tenants that no further action would be taken, but now the houses have been condemned by the Central Board of Health. I have ascertained that for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953, 14 houses were condemned in Adelaide as being unfit for habitation, five of them being owned by Franklin Transport Ltd., and in the present fiscal year eight houses have already been condemned, five of them owned by the same company. I am voicing a protest on behalf of the tenants, who seem to have been singled out. The Adelaide City Council is apparently doing everything possible to assist this company to develop its business, but its action is resulting in families being pushed into the streets, who otherwise would not be so placed, although it is not declaring houses unfit unless forced to do so. I ask leave to have inserted in *Hansard* a copy of the terms, covenants, and conditions upon which a house is let by the South Australian Housing Trust.

Leave granted.

The statement was as follows:—

1. Any premises let by the trust shall be let upon a weekly tenancy unless the trust and the tenant expressly agree in writing to the contrary.

2. The rent to be paid in respect of any premises let by the trust shall be paid to the trust weekly in advance, the first payment to be made on the day that the tenant first goes into occupation.

3. A deposit of £4 shall be paid to the trust by the tenant prior to going into occupation, which deposit shall be refunded at the termination of the tenancy. Provided that such deposit or any portion thereof may be retained by the trust in payment of any rent owing or as a setoff against any claim for other charges, damages, or leases the trust may have against the tenant.

4. All rates and taxes and other like imposition shall be paid by the trust, but any excess water rates shall be paid by the tenant.

5. Subject to the permission of, and to any conditions fixed by the trust the tenant may install in the premises any stove or cooking appliances other than those provided by the trust.

6. The tenant shall pay promptly all charges for gas or electricity consumed in the premises during the tenancy.

7. The tenant shall, together with his family, personally reside in the premises, and shall not permit to reside in the premises any person other than the wife and the unmarried children of the tenant. Provided that with the previous written special permission of the trust any other person (other than a boarder or lodger) may be permitted to reside in the premises for such limited period and upon such conditions as are set out in that permission.

8. The tenant shall comply with all laws, by-laws, and regulations in force relating to his use and occupation of the premises, and the tenant shall comply with all directions and instructions lawfully given to him by any governmental authority, local government body, health authority, gas company, electric supply authority, or insurance company.

9. The trust at all reasonable times shall be entitled to enter the premises to examine the condition thereof and all fixtures fittings meters and other additions thereto, and the tenant shall provide all reasonable facilities to enable the trust to enter upon the premises and effect such repairs as the trust may deem advisable.

10. The tenant shall keep the premises and all fixtures and fittings meters and other additions in good and substantial repair and condition, fair and reasonable wear and tear excepted as determined by the trust.

11. The tenant shall immediately upon any repairs of any kind becoming necessary report that fact to the trust and the tenant shall effect only such repairs as the trust may direct in writing. All other repairs shall be effected by the trust.

12. Except where repairs are necessary as a result of fair and reasonable wear and tear as determined by the trust the cost thereof shall be borne by the tenant.

13. The tenant shall keep the closet and all pipes and drains in a well cleansed and sanitary condition and shall pay to the trust all costs charges and expenses that may be incurred in making such closets pipes and drains sanitary or in cleansing or clearing them of any stoppages caused by the tenant.

14. The tenant shall keep the premises cleaned to the satisfaction of the trust and shall wash or cleanse such walls ceilings woodwork ironwork or part thereof or such other parts of the premises as the trust may direct in writing. The tenant shall keep the premises clear of all refuse of any kind.

16. The tenant shall make and cultivate and maintain in a proper manner a garden or gardens so that the premises shall present a neat and tidy appearance. The tenant shall plant at least one fruit or ornamental tree if no fruit or ornamental tree is already planted on the premises and the tenant shall prune and preserve all trees in a proper manner and shall replace if and when required by the trust any that may perish through decay or accident and shall leave all trees planted in good order and condition. Any hedges on the premises shall be kept and maintained in a proper manner.

If the tenant fails to comply with any requirements of this paragraph, the trust may carry out any work necessary to make good the default of the tenant and the cost of carrying out that work shall be paid to the trust by the tenant.

17. The tenant shall not make any garden within a distance of 3ft. from any wall of the dwellinghouse comprised in the premises or any rainwater tank stand nor plant any tree within a distance of 10ft. from any such wall or stand.

18. The tenant shall be responsible for the orderly conduct of his children so that no nuisance or annoyance shall be caused to other tenants or members of the public and shall not use or permit the premises to be used for any illegal or improper purpose or make or permit to be made on the premises any disturbance noise or annoyance whatsoever prejudicial to the premises or to the comfort of any occupant of adjoining premises or any other inhabitants of the neighbourhood or of any member of the public.

19. The tenant shall not—

- (a) Assign the tenancy of the premises either wholly or in part.
- (b) Underlet the premises or any part thereof.
- (c) Use the premises or any part thereof as a shop or workshop or other place for the carrying on of any business or the storage of the implements of any trade or business.
- (d) Expose in the premises or any part thereof any articles or materials for sale or hire.
- (e) Drive or suffer to be driven nails or any other matter into the walls of the premises.
- (f) Suffer or permit pictures to be hung otherwise than on picture hooks of the type fastened to the wall by three small tacks.
- (g) Make cause suffer or permit to be made any alteration in or addition to the premises or any apparatus or fittings (including water heating or lighting fittings or apparatus) installed or fitted therein.
- (h) Keep fowls ducks or pigeons on the premises nor keep any other bird of any kind whatsoever except pet cage birds.
- (i) Keep any animals of any kind on the premises other than a cat or dog. Provided that not more than one dog shall be kept on the premises and that no dog shall be kept which is used for commercial or sporting or breeding purposes and no dog shall be kept which is savage or which acts in any way to the annoyance of the neighbours.

20. The tenant shall not without the previously written permission of the trust—

- (a) Carry on any trade or occupation on the premises.
- (b) Affix to or exhibit on the premises any notice nameplate or advertisement.
- (c) Erect any structure on the land appurtenant to the premises.

- (d) Erect any wireless aerial or make any attachment to the premises in connection therewith.
- (e) Paint or paper any part of the premises.
- (f) Accommodate boarders or lodgers.

21. The tenancy shall be determinable at any rent day upon the giving of one week's previous notice in writing by either the trust or the tenant. Provided that if and whenever the rent or any part thereof shall be in arrear for seven days whether legally demanded or not or if and whenever there shall be a breach of any of these terms covenants and conditions of tenancy or if the tenant shall be adjudicated bankrupt or assign any of his effects for the benefit of his creditors or give a bill of sale upon any of his property or if the tenant has made any false statement with respect to any material particular furnished to the trust by the tenant, then in any of such cases it shall be lawful for the trust to re-enter upon the premises, and thereupon the tenancy shall absolutely determine.

22. At the termination of the tenancy the tenant shall peaceably and quietly deliver up possession of the premises and all fixtures fittings meters and other additions thereto whether such additions were made by the trust or the tenant, rate the trust in good state and condition fair wear and tear excepted as determined by the trust.

I have carefully perused the foregoing conditions of tenancy and declare that I will conscientiously carry out every condition thereof.

Mr. LAWN—Paragraph 3 of the conditions provides that a deposit of £4 shall be paid to the trust by the tenant prior to his going into occupation, and the deposit shall be refunded at the termination of the tenancy. I know that in this regard the Government will shelter behind the cloak that the trust is not a government department. My reply to that is that it should be made a Government department. The trust must be holding thousands of pounds of tenants' deposits. I should like to know whether this money is in the bank earning interest or whether it has been invested by the trust in its housing programme. I consider it is wrong for the trust to require such a deposit and I enter a strong protest. Paragraph 7 sets out that only the tenant and his family shall reside on the premises. This prevents a person with a small family who has been allotted a large house from taking in a boarder or pensioner. I feel that this is an unnecessary provision. A tenant is required to keep the premises and fittings in good repair and condition. I have no fault to find with that.

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.]

Mr. LAWN—Prior to the tea adjournment I had, by leave, inserted in *Hansard* a copy of the Housing Trust's tenancy agreement and

I wish now to refer in more detail to some aspects of it. Clause 16 requires the tenant to plant at least one fruit or ornamental tree if none already exists on the premises, and to prune and preserve all trees in the proper manner or replace any that perish; to maintain any hedges in a proper manner and if he fails in any of these requirements, the trust may carry out the work at the expense of the tenant. Clause 19 is very comprehensive and among its numerous provisions it forbids the tenant to display any articles or materials for sale, or advertise on the premises his trade or calling. This means that if a tenant is in business on his own account as, say, a painter and decorator or furniture maker, he may not advertise the fact by displaying a notice on any part of his dwelling. How many people do we find in our constituencies advertising the fact by a notice on their premises that they are in business of some description? It is further provided that they may not keep ducks or fowls. Here we have a Government which is constantly appealing for greater food production prohibiting a tenant from running a few fowls or ducks to provide himself and family with eggs or poultry. The tenant may not keep any dogs for commercial purposes. This Government and its supporters claim to be the champions of freedom. After reading this agreement can any member tell me that a tenant of the Housing Trust has any freedom? Clause 21 provides that the tenancy shall be determinable upon any rent day upon the giving of one week's notice in writing by either party, and whenever the rent or any part of it shall be in arrears for seven days, or if the tenant be adjudicated bankrupt, or give a bill of sale upon his property the trust may re-enter the premises and terminate the tenancy. This body is in no way answerable to Parliament and the sooner the Government winds it up and transfers its activities to the State Bank the better.

Mr. Teusner—How many tenants have been evicted as the result of a breach of those regulations?

Mr. LAWN—I cannot say, but I would not think that any tenant would keep fowls or ducks in defiance of the agreement and I would not think many people would be going bankrupt. As regards arrears, although there has been some unemployment, it is not so bad as it was in the depression years when some hundreds of tenants of the State Bank could not pay their rent. I hate

to think what would happen to tenants of the Housing Trust if they became unemployed, for they would not receive the same consideration as was extended by the State Bank. During the past three years I have had occasion to take up cases on behalf of constituents requiring greater accommodation; in some cases they were under threat of eviction. While I do not propose to deal with this at length, I do wish to say something about the claims of those with large families. In one case a family with six children was living in a garage and the motor car had to be kept out in a side street. Admittedly this family went to the country because of housing difficulties and that probably accounts for the fact that they have had to wait 11 years. Another family with five children has been waiting for eight years. The difficulty in finding homes for these families is not that they were not good class people, or because their application were of brief duration; they qualified in all respects, but the trust claims that the difficulty arises because it is not building many large homes, but has concentrated on the smaller type. I listened to the Premier's Friday night broadcast one evening in January when I heard him extolling the virtues of the Housing Trust. Following on that I wrote asking if he would supply me with a statement as at December, 1952, of the types of homes built by the trust, the number of rooms and so forth. He was good enough to reply to that correspondence, as he usually does, setting out the information I desired. Curiously enough, however, the letter was placed in my letter box on March 7, the day of the election, so I could not use it without infringing the provisions of the Electoral Act. I again seek the indulgence of the House to incorporate it in *Hansard* for the information of members and the public without reading it.

The SPEAKER—In the case of a schedule the House usually takes a lenient view, but a statement may contain debatable or irrelevant matter, or may be personal, or something which ought to be replied to. I think I should have an assurance from the honourable member that he does not propose to insert anything of that nature.

Mr. LAWN—I proposed to insert only the schedule accompanying the letter and not the letter itself. It simply sets out the number and types of houses built by the trust to December 31, 1952.

Leave to insert schedule granted.

The schedule was as follows:—

Houses Completed by the Trust as at December 31, 1952, Showing the Number of Houses of Different Sizes.

Permanent Houses for Letting—			
Three Rooms.	Four Rooms.	Five Rooms.	Six Rooms.
(1)	(1)	(1)	
191	2,252	3,703	236
Permanent Houses Sold—			
Four Rooms.	Five Rooms.	Six Rooms.	
562	5,374	14	
Soldier Settlement—			
Five Rooms.			
580			
Temporary Emergency Dwellings—			
Two Rooms.	Three Rooms.	Four Rooms.	Five Rooms.
(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
120	718	1,225	199

(1) 2,017 three-room, four-room, and five-room rental houses built prior to 1945 have also sleepouts. Sleepouts are not now provided, except in some country towns.

(2) All emergency dwellings comprise large kitchen-living room and from one to four bedrooms.

The trust's permanent houses are all designed to provide kitchen, sitting room and one, two, three, or four bedrooms. Since 1945 three-bedroom houses have been regarded as the standard, but a limited number of houses with one, two, and four bedrooms is provided.

Mr. LAWN—It will be seen that of the 4,392 permanent houses built for letting only 236 contained six rooms. All parties in this Commonwealth have for many years advocated increased population. We hear and read all sorts of statements to the effect that if we want to keep this country to ourselves we must populate it. All Governments, Labor and Liberal, in recent years have been encouraging immigration, yet here we have an authority for which the Government claims no responsibility, which is not catering for the larger family. Under the temporary homes scheme the trust built 199 five-roomed houses, but no six-roomed, and I find in making representations on behalf of large families that the trust simply hasn't got the larger-type home to allocate even to those deemed deserving of them. As I have said, one family with five children waited for about eight years for a house, and another with six children lived in a garage before they got a house. Both families have now been satisfied. I negotiated for the first family from the time I became a member of this House. One Sunday I referred to them in a speech at the Botanic Park and a report of the matter appeared in the press on the Monday. That week the family was asked to call in and get the key of a house. Action was taken because of the

publicity given to the matter. I sent a letter in regard to the other family and then they received a house. Today I interviewed another lady about getting a trust house. The husband had recently arrived from Port Lincoln. There are five children in the family. For some years they lived in a bag humpy at Port Lincoln and the roof consisted of borrowed iron. I understand they approached Mr. Rex Pearson when he was a member of this place. They showed me a photograph of the humpy. I understand from the lady—it has not been confirmed by the trust—that they applied for a trust home about 11 to 12 years ago, that their application lapsed, and that it was renewed in 1948. Nothing could be done for them whilst they lived at Port Lincoln. The husband came to Adelaide and interviewed his parents who have a three-roomed house. They have a kitchen, bedroom and a spare room. The parents told the son that he could not continue to live at Port Lincoln under such conditions and that the family could share their house, which they are now doing.

We have before us a motion thanking His Excellency for a speech prepared by his Ministers and referring to the Government's past and present policy. The speech stands condemned when we think of the happenings in our midst. The Government cannot find homes for many people, yet they have occupied the Treasury benches for 20 years. I could condemn the Government for many of its actions, but I shall deal only with housing. Here is an Australian family with five children unable to get a house. We hear a lot about the need to have large families and this is a family for which we should be doing something. The Housing Trust, which is a Government housing authority although we are told it is divorced from governmental control, is unable to find a house for that family.

I now want to say a few words about capital punishment. During the recess I read with interest a press report regarding a man named McDermott in New South Wales. Some years previously he had been convicted, on circumstantial evidence, for murdering a person in a garage. A recent inquiry, authorized by the New South Wales Government, showed that the circumstances were such that McDermott should be released. He was released and given a grant of money, but no money can compensate a man for the stigma of having been charged with murder and having been in gaol for some years. This case, however, was dwarfed to some extent by the recent murder trial in Great Britain of a man named Christie.

Subsequently Christie was found guilty of one murder, although it was alleged that he had committed several. During his trial Christie admitted that he had murdered a woman named Evans. The child of the woman had been murdered about the same time, and the husband had been charged with the murder of both wife and child. He was found guilty of murdering the child. The charge of murdering his wife was not proceeded with. Evans attributed the two murders to Christie, but Christie denied it. The evidence he gave at the trial of Evans helped to convict Evans. At his own trial Christie admitted murdering the wife but not the child. Subsequently the Government appointed a committee of inquiry, but in my opinion it was not an adequate investigation. If there had been a proper inquiry it would have been necessary either to postpone carrying out the death sentence imposed on Christie or commute the sentence. So that the inquiry could be completed before Christie's execution, a Queen's Counsel was appointed to make the investigations. He interviewed Christie and as a result of what he was told he reported that there had been no miscarriage of justice in the Evans trial. He based his findings on statements made to him by Christie in the cell and the reading of the evidence given at the Evans trial. He concluded his report by saying that Christie was unreliable. There is a grave suspicion in the minds of many people in Great Britain and elsewhere that there was a miscarriage of justice at the Evans trial. Evans could not read nor write. When such a person is on trial he cannot give clear evidence, and it is possible that some people like that have been wrongly convicted. I base my objection to the death penalty on religious and social grounds. I ask that the Government hold an investigation into all matters associated with capital punishment, with a view to determining whether or not it has a deterrent effect. I am doubtful if it has that effect.

Mr. Travers referred to applications to the High Court for leave to appeal in cases of murder and of manslaughter. I am interested in the death penalty, and I read some Commonwealth Law Reports on the matter. The following notes were taken from No. 59 C.L.R., page 633:—

On appeal from the Court of Criminal Appeal of South Australia, application for special leave to appeal by the King. Coventry R. V. convicted in the Criminal Court of Adelaide for driving a motor vehicle in a manner dangerous to the public and thereby causing the death of a boy R. A. Howlett. The Court of Criminal Appeal quashed the conviction on the

ground that the summing up of the trial judge, Richards J., was inadequate, inasmuch as it failed sufficiently to instruct the jury as to the mental element involved in the offence of driving to the danger of the public, though the Court of Criminal Appeal thought that there was sufficient evidence to support the conviction. From that decision the Crown applied for special leave to appeal to the High Court. Held that upon a prosecution under that section, i.e., section 14 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 (S.A.) for driving in a manner dangerous to the public the test of liability was objective and impersonal and did not depend on the state of mind of the accused at the time of the alleged offence.

Although the High Court had a different view from that of the Court of Criminal Appeal, it dismissed the application of the Crown for leave to appeal. The following notes are taken from 73 C.L.R., page 566:—

On appeal from the Supreme Court of South Australia, application for special leave to appeal from the Supreme Court of South Australia. C. P. O'Leary was tried at the Circuit Court at Mount Gambier South Australia on an information which charged him with the murder of one W. E. Ballard on 7/7/1946. He was found guilty of murder and was sentenced to death. O'Leary appealed to the Full Court of the Supreme Court; appeal dismissed. An application was made to the High Court on behalf of O'Leary for special leave to appeal from that decision. Held, among other decisions, that the misdirection was not such as to warrant special leave. Here again, the High Court refused leave to appeal. We often talk about British justice and the fact that the accused should be given every opportunity to prove his innocence. We claim that our system of justice allows leave to appeal to higher jurisdictions, but we have our enthusiasm dampened when we find an appeal court saying that an inferior court did something wrong, yet denies the accused the right to appeal. How do we know that justice was done O'Leary? The High Court said the Supreme Court of South Australia erred in giving a certain direction to the jury, yet it refused the accused leave to appeal and have a fresh trial. In Great Britain as late as the 19th century there were 200 offences for which a person could be hanged, and hangings were in public. Crowds collected to see the gruesome sight as hundreds each year "danced upon the air." Nowadays hangings are for one offence only. Those who support capital punishment claim that it is a deterrent to murder.

Mr. Shannon—I think high treason is punishable by death.

Mr. LAWN—Perhaps it is, but that makes only two offences punishable by death, compared with 200 some time ago. What happened

or what followed the repeal of hanging as a punishment for the other 199 offences? Supporters of capital punishment would say you can walk the streets of Adelaide today much more safely than you could walk the streets of London 100 or 150 years ago. The reason for the greater safety from theft is that we have a better police force, a better educational system, and a greater sense of social responsibility on the part of the people. None of these improvements is the result of capital punishment, nor do I claim that the improvements are the result of the abolition of capital punishment. While public hangings were taking place in England for stealing 5s., numbers of pickpockets at the foot of the public gallows operated quite freely because they knew it was easy pickings as the crowd were so interested observing the contortions of those on the gallows and were therefore less careful to guard their purses. These offenders were not deterred by any death penalty. Later, during discussions as to the abolition of the death penalty, it was suggested that it should be retained for thefts of 5s. or more. How shocking it is to think how starving people could have been hanged or deported for stealing a loaf of bread. In 1810 Sir Samuel Romilly introduced a Bill into the House of Commons proposing that the death penalty should be abolished for this offence. Opposing the Bill with all the weight of his authority the then Lord Chief Justice, Lord Ellenborough, said:—

Repeal this law and no man can trust himself for an hour out of doors without the most alarming apprehension that on his return every vestige of his property will be swept off by the hardened robbers.

In effect, what he said about the death penalty and its relation to thefts is being said in its relation to murder. Future generations will laugh at this just as we laugh today about what Lord Ellenborough said. What is the experience of other countries which have abolished capital punishment? I am indebted to the Howard League of Penal Reform for an up-to-date pamphlet stating what other countries have experienced. The countries in which the death penalty has been abolished are:—

Argentina, abolished 1922.
Austria, abolished 1919; restored under the Nazis; abolished 1950.
Belgium, no execution since 1863.
Brazil, abolished 1891.
Colombia, abolished 1910.
Costa Rica, abolished 1880.
Denmark, no execution since 1892; abolished 1930.
Dominica, abolished 1924.

Ecuador, abolished 1897.
 Finland, no execution since 1826; abolished 1949.
 Holland, no execution since 1860; abolished 1870.
 Honduras, abolished 1894.
 Italy, abolished 1889; restored under the Fascists; abolished 1948.
 Iceland, abolished 1944.
 Luxembourg, no execution since 1822.
 Maine, abolished 1887.
 Mexico, abolished 1928.
 Michigan, abolished 1847.
 Minnesota, abolished 1911.
 Nepal, abolished 1931.
 North Dakota, abolished 1895.
 Norway, no execution since 1876; abolished 1905.
 Panama, abolished 1903.
 Peru, discontinued this century (restored for some political crimes, 1949).
 Portugal, abolished 1867.
 Queensland, abolished 1922; no execution since 1913.
 Rhode Island, abolished 1852.
 Roumania, no execution since 1838; abolished 1864 (restored for some political crimes, 1938).
 Sweden, no execution since 1910; abolished 1921.
 Switzerland, no execution since 1924; abolished 1942.
 Travancore, abolished 1944.
 Uruguay, abolished 1902.
 U.S.S.R., abolished 1947 (restored for some political crimes, 1950).
 Venezuela, abolished 1853.
 West Germany, abolished 1949.
 Wisconsin, abolished 1863.

In New Zealand capital punishment ceased, as a matter of Government policy, as from 1935. In 1941 it was formally abolished. In 1950 it was reintroduced on change of Government. For the 13 years preceding 1935, deaths from murder and manslaughter per million of population equalled 9.1; for the 13 years following 1935, they equalled 8.4 per million—that is a decline since abolition of 8 per million. No responsible authority in New Zealand has claimed an increase in the murder rate during the abolition period. The reasons for reintroduction were emotional, sensational and political. In Queensland murders and attempted murders per 100,000 population were as under:—

	Per Annum.
1903-1907	3.6
1908-1912	2.8
1913-1917	2.6
1918-1922	2.6
1923	1.6
1924-1929	3.2
1929-1934	1.7
1934-1939	1.0
1939-1944	1.2
1944-1949	1.1

Those figures were provided by the Queensland Government Statist. Capital punishment was abolished in Queensland in 1923, but we find that murders or attempted murders per 100,000 population were 3.6 in 1903 to 1907, but only 1.1 in 1944 to 1949. The murderer either does not think he will be caught or does not care. Those who live by the knife or the gun will die by the knife or the gun. We have no right to take a life: "Thou shalt not kill." I base my objection to the death penalty on religious, humane and social grounds. We claim to be the lawful custodians of the State, but we have no right to take the life of any person. The death penalty encourages newspapers to give wide publicity to trials and the last moments of prisoners. Two blacks do not make a white, and two wrongs do not make a right. It is the death penalty itself which attracts people to queue up outside the court for admission to a murder trial. It is the morbid interest in the spectacle of a man or woman fighting for his or her life. It is a pity that all who support capital punishment cannot be forced to take their turn as the public hangman. How many condemned persons have to be drugged to enable them to go to the gallows and what effect does this have on warders, prison authorities and all those present at the hanging?

Mr. Shannon—The honourable member suggests that torture be substituted for capital punishment.

Mr. LAWN—No, my opposition to capital punishment is not because of its severity but because I believe no person has the right to take the life of another. Usually, less than a month elapses between the passing of the death sentence and the execution of the prisoner, after which he is free for eternity, whereas a person convicted of murder would be more severely punished by being sentenced to life imprisonment with hard labour, and the latter punishment would be a greater deterrent. How often before committing the crime does the murderer consider the penalty? If he does, he either does not care about it or thinks he will go undetected. Recently in Victoria a person found guilty of murder pleaded with the judge for the sentence of death rather than that of life imprisonment, for he knew that at the end of a month he would be free from all earthly worries.

Mr. Shannon—In substance, you agree with torture, for you would lock up a person and make him work harder for the rest of his life.

Mr. LAWN—With equal logic I might say

that the honourable member believes in torture because he is a member of a Party which believes in a working week longer than the present 40-hour week, and, whether a man's work is done in Yatala or anywhere else, it is just as torturous. Indeed, a South Australian judge, who, incidentally, was not appointed by a Labor Government, recently commended Yatala as something of a rest home.

Mr. Shannon—There is no waiting list of people waiting to get in.

Mr. LAWN—Recently, Mr. Justice Ligertwood was reported in our daily press as having said that conditions in Yatala labour prison were better than those in many places outside its walls. An extract from the *British Journal of Delinquency* (page 144), volume 2 of October, 1951, states:—

Researches on the alleged preventive effect of capital punishment and on methods of prevention of crimes of violence.—On May 4, 1950, Dr. Edward Glover, Chairman of the Scientific Committee of the Institute for the Study and Treatment of Delinquency, submitted on behalf of the institute of memorandum to the Royal Commission on Capital Punishment, and gave oral evidence before the royal commission. Both in his memorandum and in oral evidence Dr. Glover drew the attention of the royal commission to the problem of psychopathy. Emphasizing the importance of this problem he stated: "Many crimes of violence are the result of pathological conditions which, although not recognized under the M'Naghten rules, are nevertheless characteristic forms of mental disorder capable of great improvement, sometimes of cure, by scientific processes of treatment. This applies particularly in the clinical group described as the psychopathic states, in which crimes of violence, both sexual and non-sexual, are a common feature."

From the recognition of the importance of psychopathy in crimes of violence, including murder, two problems emerge. Firstly, there is the problem of early detection and treatment of this condition. The memorandum makes clear that "it is a general rule that in cases of pathological outbursts of violence it can be established that disordered acts of the same kind have occurred in early childhood."

"If sufficient trouble were taken pathological cases liable to commit murder could be detected during early childhood; in other words, pathological murder is potentially preventable, or, at least, the tendency can be detected at a time when measures of prevention can be taken." Dr. Glover suggested that the early diagnosis and treatment of potential murderers could be dealt with by an adequate service of child psychiatry; this "would strike seriously to the root of the problem of murder and its prevention."

Secondly, there is the problem of deterrence. It has been found that in most pathological cases the threat of punishment is not deterrent, and in some instances acts as an additional incentive to criminal conduct. In some

instances the accounts of executions given in the press have been found to have deleterious effects on the delinquents under treatment, who became more negativistic to psychotherapy and more prone to relapse. On the other hand, the experience of the Institute for the Study and Treatment of Delinquency has shown that the pathological group to which some murderers belong can be dealt with by suitable scientific treatment along medico-psychological and social lines. It has also been found that the particularly important psychopathic group, often regarded as intractable, is almost as amenable to treatment as the psycho-neurotic group, provided the treatment is maintained for a long enough period. A statistical analysis made by T. Grygier of 2,079 consecutive cases of both sexes treated at the Portman Clinic (I.S.T.D.) showed no significant difference between the two groups with regard to responsiveness to treatment.

The most important conclusions of the memorandum were:—

- (1) The problems of murder and of capital punishment have not yet been subjected to a satisfactory scientific examination such as would be considered essential in the case of problems of natural science, medical science, and psychological science.
- (2) Such reliable evidence as exists points to the necessity of subjecting these problems to an exhaustive scientific examination.

These conclusions seemed to be recognized as important enough to be considered by the Royal Commission in some detail, and on June 27, 1950, Dr. Glover and Mr. Grygier presented, in accordance with the wishes of the Royal Commission, the second memorandum on (a) "short-term" methods of research on the effect (deterrent or otherwise) of capital punishment, and (b) on a method of preventing crimes of violence. This second memorandum has not been published.

At page 147 of the journal an article headed, "A method of prevention of pathological crimes of violence, including murder" and prepared by Edward Glover, M.D., chairman of the Scientific Committee, I.S.T.D., consulting physician to the Portman Clinic, I.S.T.D. (formerly senior director, Psychopathic Clinic), states:—

The suggestion made in Dr. Glover's memorandum was that since, in the great majority of observed cases of pathological crimes of violence, some indication of the pathological tendency has been found to exist since childhood, it would be possible to "screen" the child population of Britain in order to detect such cases at an early stage and to keep under medico-psychological supervision and/or treatment of all children or youths who show abnormal tendencies to violent conduct. On the question being raised whether this would not involve a costly and extensive investigation which might not be justified by results, Dr. Glover pointed out that a skeletal psychiatric organization already existed and would in the

ordinary course of events be expanded, which with a little adaptation and expansion would serve the purpose of a preventive screening system. The main outline of the preventive scheme is as follows:—

- (1) Assuming that the Royal Commission thought fit to recommend to the appropriate authority, *e.g.*, the Home Office, that the preventive scheme be initiated, it would be necessary for that authority to issue a joint directive to the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Education.
- (2) As far as the Ministry of Education is concerned, the aim would be to screen the existing school populations. There are two methods of approach to this problem. Each school child at present has a statutory examination three times during his school career. Attention is paid to physical difficulties but some school medical officers with psychiatric knowledge are able to detect early behaviour and emotional problems. Recent legislation also permits the educational authorities to give complete vocational guidance to children leaving school and several authorities already do so; the best example being that of Warrington, Lancashire. These vocational examinations involve the use of mental tests and provide an additional check on the mental stability of children already examined.

The second approach involves the co-operation of teaching staffs. Teachers of experience can readily recognize behaviour problems, and the potentially anti-social and violent child is one of the most easily detected educational problems. They should be instructed to report such cases to the head master, who in his turn would refer them to the school medical officer. What is urgently necessary is an expansion of the psychiatric side of school examination, and this will certainly take place irrespective of any special aim such as is indicated here.

The Government should refer this question to a committee of inquiry to ascertain what is being done to prevent murder, whether the death penalty is the deterrent it is claimed to be by its sponsors, and whether, having regard to all the circumstances, it is a proper penalty. I do not speak on behalf of the murderer, but I claim that if the Spirit of Christ lives in our hearts we should at least have this matter investigated. Some people have asked me, "What would be your attitude if your own wife or child were murdered?" If a person requires to be revenged on the murderer of a loved one, surely life imprisonment would be greater punishment than death 28 days after the passing of sentence. I do not advocate leniency towards the murderer but

I have regard to public interest and Christian principles in claiming that neither the Government nor the individual has the right to take life. I sincerely appeal to the Government to appoint a commission to investigate and report on this question. In conclusion I wish to clarify a statement I made earlier in answer to an interjection. I understand that Federal members are leaving this building at the end of this year and I suggest that the Government seriously considers allocating some of the vacated rooms to Opposition members.

Mr. PEARSON (Flinders)—I am perhaps unfortunate in commencing my speech towards the end of a long and tiring day. There are many things I admire in the member for Adelaide—his quick wit and his quick intelligence—and I am particularly envious of his stamina. I believe that over 1900 years ago a remark was passed by the wisest of men when He was criticizing some people of the hollow class, to the effect that He presumed they hoped to be heard on account of their much speaking. I do not suggest that the member for Adelaide is of the hollow type. Much of what he said was well worth hearing and much was relevant even to the wide ambit of this debate, but at times I wished his explanations or development of certain points had not been so lengthy. Lest I fall into the same criticism I shall confine my remarks somewhat.

I join with other members in supporting this motion and in paying my tribute of loyalty to Her Majesty the Queen. I also join in the welcome to His Excellency the Governor and his lady, and express to you, Mr. Speaker, my congratulations on your having again been appointed to your high and important office. Since this debate commenced we have experienced the ending of another war—the war in Korea which has lingered so ineffectually for so long. We all hope that that cessation will be permanent. If that war has taught us anything, it is the absolute futility of war in modern times. It serves no purpose and achieves no real results, and I hope that the people who are apparently the only protagonists of that weapon in our civilization have learned the lesson we learned and knew beforehand: that wars do not pay, no nation wins them, and they cause suffering and the wasteful expenditure of manpower, materials and resources and leave the whole world poorer.

I compliment the mover and seconder of the motion on their able speeches. It is some time since this House enjoyed two better speeches

on such an occasion. I also listened with interest to the two new members of the Opposition, and I regret that those young men saw fit to use in their remarks certain language which I thought somewhat an affront to this House. I regret it because they obviously have a good deal of ability and personality, but cynicism does not do them credit nor increase the prestige of this House in the public eye.

Mr. Stephens—Are they the only ones who do that?

Mr. PEARSON—I would not say they are, but I regret that they saw fit to indulge in cynicism because it gets us nowhere. I particularly objected to the charge of insincerity levelled at Government members. The member for Prospect said:—

... when members opposite speak pious platitudes about democracy they are speaking hypocritically and paying lip service to something in which they do not believe.

If it had not been his maiden speech he would not have got away with it. He continued:—

... To members of the Labor Party, all of whom genuinely believe in democracy, it is nauseating to have to take part in the traditions and procedure of Parliament, knowing that this Parliament is only a masquerade of representative Parliament and that the traditions and procedure which were born with the origin of representative Parliament are here in South Australia only a facade to hide the suppression of democratic representation.

The member for Norwood, in a much better speech, said:—

... Normally a member of a Party supporting a *laissez faire* economy is wholly concerned in making clap-trap remarks and pious utterances.

I regret that these young men should have made such errors in their maiden speeches.

I hope I shall be excused for discussing parish pump matters, for I realize there are not many opportunities in proceedings in this place for members to discuss purely domestic matters related to their own electorates. The first matter is the welfare of railway employees on Eyre Peninsula. This is a matter of long standing and was first raised by my brother in 1948. Actually there are two matters involved. One is the payment of a zone allowance of 1s. a day to employees living in remote areas. In memorandum M.R. 91/48, dated 11/5/53, the following appears:—

Although there are no definite departmental records available to show the reason for the payment of the extra 1s. per day to employees stationed on the West Coast, it is generally recognized that the allowance was originally granted as a developmental or isolation allowance, and not for any climatic or cost of

living reasons. Similarly, with employees under the A.R.U. Award, a zone or district allowance was payable.

As from 1/11/1930, the Commissioner discontinued the payment of the zone or district allowance to all employees. So far as the loco. running employees are concerned a provision was included in the Log of Claims submitted to the Commonwealth Arbitration Court by the A.F.U.L.E. in 1935 and 1941 proceedings, for the granting of a district isolation and/or zone allowance, but on each occasion the court directed that the payment of any such allowance was at the discretion of the employer, and the Commissioner has declined same.

The decision for payment of a zone allowance rests with the Railways Commissioner, but he should have given some just reason for the discontinuance of payments. Some assistance should be given to rail employees on Eyre Peninsula in connection with holiday travelling to and from the mainland. That question is covered in the same memorandum. The Commissioner has declined to meet requests and has given reasons and suggests it might embarrass Railways Commissioners in other States. I maintain he is wrong in that connection because, so far as I am aware, in no other part of Australia are railway employees so completely isolated from the mainland. The position is that if an employee commences his leave before he can use his railway pass or other concessions he has to provide his own and his wife's fares to the mainland and that involves him in a straight out expenditure of over £14 before he commences his annual leave or before he is on the same footing as any member of the railway staff on the mainland. I ask that the Commissioner, in his wisdom, reconsider this matter with a view to putting railway men on Eyre Peninsula in the same position as mainland employees when it comes to enjoying annual or other leave.

I pay a tribute to the effectiveness of the work of the Eyre Peninsula railways division—both management and staff—in moving grain and other produce during the last two years. I have always maintained that our primary needs were more engines, more labour and running staff. I shall not analyse the causes which have led to this improvement, but figures I obtained recently reveal a satisfactory position with grain movement. In the period November 1, 1950, to June 30, 1951, 166,550 tons were moved, in a similar period ending June 30, 1952, 219,000 tons and in the period ending June 30, 1953, 256,000 tons. Another interesting point emerges—that although it is so frequently said that wheat production in South Australia is declining, the quantities

moved during those periods were 67,100 tons, 82,300 tons, and 82,700 tons respectively. That reveals a steady increase in wheat production on Eyre Peninsula during the last three years. And they were the three years when we were told that wheat production had declined.

Mr. O'Halloran—Do you know the quantity of wheat shifted by road in the same period?

Mr. PEARSON—If that were included it would probably improve those figures. Movements by road were mainly in the year ended June, 1952. Barley moved by rail for the year ended June 30, 1951, amounted to 26,350 bushels and that figure receded to 22,500 in 1952, but increased to 51,400 in 1953. I compliment the railway staff on their fine effort in the last two years.

Mr. Christian—A good performance when you consider the state of the permanent way.

Mr. PEARSON—Yes. The maximum tonnage moved by the railways in any one week is also interesting. In 1951 it amounted to 4,647, in 1952 to 6,400, and for the year ended June 30 last 8,056. That is getting close to double the tonnage shifted each week when I first came into this House. I do not claim any great credit for that result, but it is gratifying. The Railways Commissioner has at last done something about passenger comfort by modernizing one of his rail cars and is now modernizing others. As Mr. Christian interjected, the most pressing need is for something to be done about the track. I know it is easy to talk about our needs, but not so easy to supply them. If the track is to carry the tonnages now asked of it expenditure on its improvement must receive early consideration. I asked the Minister of Railways recently a question regarding sleeper supplies on Eyre Peninsula. I know that this position is difficult, but we all meet difficulties both in private and public life and they are made to be overcome. If the Eyre Peninsula railways are to continue to cope with increasing production this matter must receive urgent consideration. There are not sufficient sleepers on the Eyre Peninsula division to meet requirements for any sizeable derailment resulting in a bogey being dragged along the line for half a mile.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—Every penny available either by loan or revenue has been applied to the same end, and with more money we could get better services.

Mr. PEARSON—I am relating facts which cannot be denied.

Mr. O'Halloran—Some of those tracks were laid with secondhand rails 40 years ago.

Mr. PEARSON—Exactly. Early this session by way of question I referred to the need for better office accommodation for the waterworks staff at Port Lincoln, and I hope that what the Minister of Works said in reply eventuates, namely, that when the Estimates are prepared this year this matter will receive consideration. I know that much money has been spent on Eyre Peninsula in the last 10 years to improve water supplies, but we cannot expect the people who attend to the administrative duties to work in an old gaol where the roof leaks and the plaster is falling off the walls. I hope the Minister will not think I am trying to be hard on him. On Eyre Peninsula we have fewer than 50 miles of sealed roads. The position is that all those roads are in my electorate and I do not think there is one mile of sealed roads in the district of Eyre. The position has not changed since my brother first represented the district in 1941.

Mr. Davis—Did not he do anything while he was a member?

Mr. PEARSON—He had the war years to contend with. I looked up *Hansard* and found that he made strong representations on many occasions, but got about as much result as I have.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—I do not know where the money goes, but it is spent.

Mr. PEARSON—That is the point. At a meeting at Cummins last year speaker after speaker said, "We have been 30 years in the district of Flinders spending money on roads and we still have not got a road." As the member for Victoria has said, in summer the roads blow away in the form of dust and in winter are a mass of slush.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—Eyre Peninsula has had more money spent on it per head than any other part of South Australia.

Mr. PEARSON—That may be quite true, but the facts are that Eyre Peninsula has a scattered population and to give anything approaching equivalent service the cost per head must inevitably be higher. A firm operating a fleet of motor vehicles in South Australia said to me, "We find that any one of our staff cars which goes to Eyre Peninsula suffers as much depreciation in the first 15,000 miles of its life as cars on the mainland suffer in 30,000 miles." I believe members representing city electorates honestly and sincerely submit their problems about roads, railways and so on, but they have no conception of the problems with which country people are faced. I think something is wrong with our road administration. If we cannot have more

money for roads we can at least spend more wisely and effectively the money we get. The member for Eyre in a short and wise speech at a recent council conference emphasized that point and I think the delegates to a man agreed with what he said. I have in mind a short road at Tumby Bay which is to be bituminized. It forms the base of a triangle, the other two sides of which have already been bituminized. We have not reached the stage yet when we can start duplicating bituminous roads. Such action does not indicate to me wise administration. I noticed that a member of the Legislative Council asked a question about what was to happen at Port Augusta and the reply indicated that the Highways Commissioner intended to undertake an expensive and elaborate scheme for that township. In travelling around overland from my electorate I noticed also that a lot of money had been spent in a double road in the town of Melrose and further on I observed that an expensive new bridge and approaches had been completed south of Clare. As the Minister of Works often says, "Let us do first things first." Surely the first thing is to provide one road or one bridge and not duplicate them.

I believe the Highways Department is a very expensive one and I do not think we always get good service for the money spent. I am not criticizing the men so much, but the administration. If we reverted to the system of subletting road work to private contractors to a greater degree, I believe we would get much more work done for much less money. I know one private contractor with a good plant who has been forced to abandon it because when the department got short of money it cancelled his contract. He is a definite loss to Eyre Peninsula because he is not permitted to continue this work. To a greater extent private contractors should be employed on this work; then I am satisfied we would get a more economic job.

The price of petrol is a very sore point in my district and I have asked many questions about it. I emphasize the disabilities under which my constituents live and work. I have asked a number of questions regarding the prices at Port Lincoln and other places compared with those operating on the mainland, but I have still been unable to get a real answer to some of them. The figures supplied were those given by the Prices Commissioner and were obtained by interrogation of company officials under oath. I have made a cross check as to the tonnages of various fuels

coming into Port Lincoln, but they do not appear to fully agree with the answers I have been given. I wrote to the Royal Automobile Association and obtained the prices operating in 12 different South Australian towns for petrol bought from bowzers on a given date. At Adelaide the price was then 3s. 6½d., Port Pirie and Jamestown 3s. 9d., Port Augusta 3s. 10d., Whyalla 4s., Hawker 3s. 11½d., Murray Bridge 3s. 8½d., Lock 4s. 3d., Cummins 4s. 2d., Port Lincoln 4s. 1d., Pinnaroo and Bordertown 3s. 9½d.

Mr. Davis—Have you not a depot at Port Lincoln?

Mr. PEARSON—Yes. An examination of the figures shows that Port Lincoln is 4d. above Port Pirie and 3d. above Port Augusta. All these towns are on the same gulf and two have bulk installations, although admittedly they are bigger at Port Pirie. Cummins is 5d. above Jamestown—each is about the same rail distance from the seaboard—and 4d. above Port Augusta. Lock is 3½d. above Hawker, which is one of the remotest of the farming areas. When my constituents continually press this matter I really cannot blame them. Of course, none of the bulk installations on Spencer Gulf can cater for anything like a full tanker load, and tanker owners are very tough when it comes to the question of discharging small quantities.

Mr. Shannon—That does not apply in Victoria. Portland gets part cargoes and the price of petrol there is the same as in Melbourne.

Mr. PEARSON—I am very interested to hear that. I believe that with the completion of several refineries around Australia the companies may be able to employ smaller tankers instead of the large ocean going vessels and that may relieve the situation somewhat. The crux of the question, however, appears to be the provision of larger storage accommodation at Port Lincoln and that matter is, I know, being considered and I trust that this project will be pushed on as early as possible. I point out that, in addition to the higher price, it is necessary to use more petrol a head of population than on the mainland. My nearest town is 14 miles away. The nearest place where I can conduct any volume of business is Port Lincoln, which is 48 miles from my home. The amount of travelling involved to serve our daily needs is so much greater than on the mainland yet our price for petrol is higher and these two factors make the position very difficult.

Another of our serious problems is the freight rates between the mainland and Port

Lincoln. I have obtained from relevant sources the freight rates on several items which I shall quote because they are of interest. They are as follows:—

	Landed at Cummins. £ s. d.
One No. 4 McKay header . . .	43 0 0
One D4 caterpillar tractor . . .	49 7 6
One ton of fencing material . .	6 4 3
One ton of cement	5 14 6
One ton of general groceries . .	6 18 3

On the return journey the freight on one bale of wool is £1 5s. 11½d. so both coming and going it seems that, to use a popular phrase, "We cop the lot." When thinking of freights we seem always to think of the Adelaide Steamship Company and the iniquitous organization which some people believe it to be. Incidentally, there is one most important item I omitted; the freight on furniture for a five-roomed house consigned by steamer in what is termed "a five-roomed box," Port Adelaide to Port Lincoln is £90; so everybody occupying a home in Port Lincoln, or every newly wedded couple has to put out £90 before they start. The same quantity of furniture can be taken around by motor transport for £45. If Lee's Transport could handle the whole of the furniture offering it would be a material saving to the West Coast people, and the answer, of course, is fairly obvious. As I said, as a rule we think of the people who are operating the steamer service as being responsible for the high charges. Recently, when freight went up I asked the Adelaide Steamship Company for the reason. The reply was that it was due to an increase of the basic wage. I retorted that when the basic wage fell in February the rates were not decreased, but when it went up in May they were. I was then informed that the decrease applied to South Australian employees whereas practically all the Steamship Company's employees were under Federal awards so the company did not get the benefit of the reduction in February but suffered the increase in May. I quote the letter from Mr. Waddy the Secretary of the Company, in which he says:—

Our recent increase in freight rates is due, in the main, to the 6d. per hour increase which operated from the 27th March in watersider workers' pay, following an adjustment in the "divisor" which is calculated by the Arbitration Court on the number of hours of work available each week for the average watersider.

He goes on to illustrate that the company has made savings wherever possible. However, I want to say a word about this "divisor." It seems to me that a system which calculates

the hourly rate by dividing the average number of hours worked into the basic wage, thus increasing it if the number of hours falls from say, 32 to 30—as I understand it did in this case—is quite unrealistic. I wonder what sort of system we are working under. It means, if we project that argument much further, that if we work 10 hours a week we will get three times the hourly rate.

Members interjecting.

Mr. PEARSON—I know members opposite do not like this sort of thing but I am giving them facts. I simply ask what sort of system are we working under? If members opposite try to justify that sort of system it explodes entirely any confidence the electors could possibly have in the economic brains of the Labor Party. I do not think that the men on the waterfront are any more unreasonable than other men and if they were properly led and advised we would have much less trouble than we have been having. Waterside workers are doing the same as many other people in Australia—pricing themselves right out of a job.

Mr. Riches—You know you are quite wrong in that statement?

Mr. PEARSON—No. People are getting around the shipping position in every possible way. Many farmers on Eyre Peninsula travel overland with their trucks for the purpose of bringing over wool and taking back fuel. Many storekeepers have purchased their own vehicles and are coming around to Adelaide. This is all taking work away from the waterfront. The people responsible for the larger part of the problems are the men on the Stevedoring Industry Board. I read with some interest and some disgust the report of Mr. Bishop on the waterfront position. I must confess that in my experience many of the statements are true. I believe the board has been of no assistance whatever to the industry. In fact, it seems to be one more hurdle to jump over when we want anything done. The sooner we can reconstruct the board, if it is to be retained, the better it will be if it functions in the interests of the industry, not only of the men, but of the employers of maritime labour. The board should be either abolished or reconstructed, and then perhaps we might get somewhere. Unfortunately one of the unions still under Communist domination is the Waterside Workers' Federation.

Mr. Stephens—That is a lot of rot.

Mr. PEARSON—All members opposite say that, but I am making my own observations. I hope that this union, in common with many

others, will get rid of the unfortunate control which appears to guide its movements so frequently. The Prime Minister of Australia, Mr. Menzies, has done more for the workers than any other Prime Minister ever did. When he brought down legislation which actually works, and not legislation which no-one wanted to use, he enabled the unions to become democratic again and get rid of the people leading them.

The potentialities for development on Eyre Peninsula are probably greater than in any other part of the State. One thing we want now is the bulk handling of grain. I am pleased that the chairman of the Public Works Committee was able to tell me in private conversation that the committee is making real progress in the matter. Eyre Peninsula is better suited for bulk handling than many other parts of the State. The other day I listened with interest to Mr. Corcoran speak with pride on the potentialities of his district. I think he is justified in his pride as the South-East has enormous possibilities, but Eyre Peninsula is capable of a tremendous amount of land development in the future. Soldier settlement has proved a great boon and a success. I am pleased that 80 settlers are on their blocks on Eyre Peninsula, and the majority of them look like succeeding. The cereal growers around Tumby Bay have been eminently successful, due of course to fortuitous circumstances of prices and seasons. They are now well established, and I believe there has not been a single complaint from any one of them.

There are still problems in connection with the Wanilla settlement, which is a grazing proposition. There have been many deputations, discussions, and conferences, as well as complaints in connection with the 36 to 38 settlers in the area. I commend the Minister of Lands for his patient, fair, and consistent handling of the many difficult problems. I am satisfied that the matters worrying the settlers are not capable of settlement on a "group" or "block" basis, but must be solved individually. While many of the men are satisfied, and most are sincerely applying themselves to the problems, it is inevitable that there will be some who will not succeed. I would not countenance our returned soldiers enduring hardships even remotely comparable with the conditions which the pioneer settlers on Eyre Peninsula endured, but I wish sometimes that a few of the dissatisfied ones had more of the pioneering spirit and realized the potentialities and ultimate possibilities of their blocks. They should appreciate the privilege

and opportunity they have with a block containing good soil, a home and congenial surroundings, which provide them with a life for which their training and instinct has made them best suited. These things are essential to a successful life on the land. Without them I do not think anyone can succeed.

Apart from soldier settlement, there is a wide area of land from Stokes to Green Patch which enjoys a very consistent and good rainfall. It is capable of a lot of pasture development. At present it is being developed slowly and I believe that the tempo of the development will increase for two reasons. One is that a developed pasture rapidly becomes unmanageable if the acreage is too big, and the other is that when families grow up and marry it results in automatic subdivision of large holdings. We shall see a very important development of the livestock-carrying capacity in the area. It is possible to do a good deal more in afforestation on some of the wilder land at the foot of Eyre Peninsula than we have ever attempted. In this regard I recommend to the Minister of Forests the enlarging of our activities in the Wanilla area a little, and perhaps putting down experimental plots of pines in some of the country south of the West Road, and in the Cape Catastrophe area, to see if it will take pines. It would have two benefits. It would bring into use additional land for production, and provide a source of a valuable timber in an isolated part of the State.

Land development on Eyre Peninsula is being retarded because of the absence of good markets for fat stock. I have preached this story to the Minister of Agriculture, stock firms and people interested in production in that district on many occasions, for we will not get increased production until we have an outlet for it. Secondly, we will not get an outlet until there is evidence that sufficient animals will be raised.

Mr. O'Halloran—It sounds like the dog chasing its tail.

Mr. PEARSON—Yes, but I am sure the honourable member will appreciate the soundness of my point. Whatever industrial expansion takes place in the Port Lincoln area it will not be sufficient to cope with increasing primary produce, therefore we have to find markets on the mainland and have the meat brought to the metropolitan area in a fresh or chilled form. This would help obviate the shortages of meat which occur from time to time in Adelaide. Progress is being made in

this direction, but I point out to the Government that we must simultaneously develop markets and increase fat stock production on Eyre Peninsula.

So far I have devoted my attention to matters which concern particularly my own electorate. I make no apology for that because I believe a member's first duty is to the people who sent him to this place and who entrusted him with the duty of expressing their views and participating in the decisions which Parliament makes. I thank the electors of Flinders for returning me to Parliament. I pay a tribute to them for their cordiality and friendship, not only from those who voted for me, but also from those who voted against me. Every member strives to the best of his ability to serve the interests of his constituents.

Some speakers have referred to democracy. There has been an organized and deliberate attempt over the years to hold up the Labor movement as the only protagonist and protector of democracy. This may not be well received by members opposite, but there has been a persistent attempt to gain acceptance of the view that the great Labor movement is the only one that supports democracy. Further, there is a tendency to suggest that Liberalism, or anything that supports private enterprise, is undemocratic and, by implication, unchristian. Even a superficial analysis of the position will explode this view. The foundations of democracy are surely freedom of the individual to live, work, play, worship, speak, write, think and act as he himself may choose, consistent with the rights of others.

President Roosevelt was an outstanding democrat in a race of people fanatically democratic, and he was a co-author of the Four Freedoms. Surely the Labor Party's policy of compulsory unionism and the closed shop is the very antithesis of individual freedom. There is scarcely a job in any city in Australia at which a man can work without a union ticket. The cost of his ticket is not for him to decide. He will pay the amount demanded—or else. The actual work he performs and the hours he works are not for him to decide. The union prescribes that, either by imposing its own condition or by submitting a log of claims to the Arbitration Court. If a dispute occurs the individual may not determine his own attitude on it; he will be told whether to work or stay out. In many cases he may merely be told he has to leave the job without being given any reason, except that the union representative said so. If he goes to a union meeting and expresses views

at variance with the union's he may be shouted down, held up to ridicule, called rude names, or he may even suffer violence.

Mr. Fred Walsh—Have you ever been to a union meeting?

Mr. Stephens—Those things happen at Liberal Party meetings.

Mr. PEARSON—I am not talking about things that never happen.

Mr. Fred Walsh—You know nothing about it.

Mr. PEARSON—Don't I? I have many relatives who are members of various Labor organizations. I am not speaking without book when I make these statements. I have not gained my information from press reports, but from factual reports given to me by members of Labor organizations. I know these things are not palatable, but I want to indicate to the public and the world at large that many undemocratic things are occurring within the Labor movement, that great organization which claims to carry the whole load of democracy on its shoulders. What humbug! If a unionist has heavy family commitments or sickness necessitating greater than normal earnings or is ambitious to get on in life financially, he may not work longer hours or increase his output in order to earn more. He may not even choose the union he will join, for that is prescribed for him by the trade in which he works. He may not buy the necessities of life at a shop declared black, and there are many other restrictions, prohibitions and obligations imposed on him whether he likes them or not. Is this democracy? The great Labor movement has done much to build up the conditions of its people. I have always said that, for I have read my history books and know of the development and emergence of the Labor organization and the way in which workers and the community have benefited from its activities. I give it full marks for that, but like so many other organizations, as it has gained in popularity, power and control, it has become subject to abuse. Today thousands of workers, who really and deeply resent and deplore the totalitarianism of unionism, would break away from it if they could. In my view—and I am entitled to it—compulsion in itself is a proof of weakness. If the organization concerned is rendering a service and giving value for dues paid, it will commend itself and workers will join it without compulsion. I believe the workers are being exploited by unionism at present and that compulsion is merely a means to retain control over the unwilling unionist and to

enable his money to be used largely for maintaining the organization that binds him and for building up political strength. Even the Labor member of Parliament is obliged to resign his freedom before he is accepted as a candidate for election. The whole trend of socialism, of which unionism is an indispensable and vital part, is the submergence of the individual and the predominance of the State—whatever that may be or mean. It is a cynical and insidious prostitution of the old ideal of "The greatest good for the greatest number." A reign of Communism or of extremism in any form inevitably begins with the submergence of individual freedom. The principle of "submerge the individual and elevate the State," that nebulous, soulless, cynical organization, leads to an Adolf Hitler or Josef Stalin and something entirely the opposite of democracy in the long run. The class hatreds taught in connection with this principle are both unchristian and completely at variance with economic law. It compulsorily levels down and thereby supersedes the spirit of charity which the good Book says is the greatest of the great virtues.

Mr. Stephens—Don't talk about the good Book. That is all hypocrisy.

Mr. PEARSON—I think I can recall two or three speeches last session—but we will say no more about that. I say these things for I believe it is time this propaganda myth were exploded, if for no other reason than to help the thousands of dragooned men and women who resent the conditions imposed upon them. I hope thinking people will ponder these thoughts, for the end of the present road is Imperialistic Communism, inevitable and complete. Although members on this side have been labelled as spineless, and hypocritical and insinuations made that they lack intestines,

heads, and hearts, I believe that is quite untrue, for all have suffered backaches, stomachaches, headaches and even heartaches. I know the farmers have, anyway. Even if all other members on this side are nitwits there is one among us who does not qualify for that description. He is the leader of our Party and the Premier of this State. I am sure every one of us is proud of his work overseas. We are all extremely pleased to see both the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition back, and we regret the accident which prevented Mr. O'Halloran from seeing the Coronation. I believe Premier Playford is the greatest South Australian we have ever had and that he is wearing himself out in the service of this State, not for money, for the rewards of politics are small, nor for glamour, because after 15 years as Premier all the glamour has gone, but because he is Tom Playford and because he has given himself in the service of this State and its people. He has become a world figure, but he is still the same to us and everyone he meets. South Australia is in safe hands under his guidance, and, what is more important, the people know it. I support the motion.

Mr. McALEES secured the adjournment of the debate.

DENTAL HOSPITAL EXTENSIONS.

The SPEAKER laid on the table the report of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works on the Dental Hospital extensions, together with minutes of evidence.

Report ordered to be printed.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 9.40 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, August 5, at 2 p.m.