

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, August 6, 1958.

The SPEAKER (Hon. B. H. Teusner) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS.**DECENTRALIZATION OF INDUSTRY.**

Mr. KING—Can the Minister of Works indicate the assistance the Government is prepared to make available to an industry wishing to establish itself in my district?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—If the honourable member is asking for Government policy on decentralization of industry I can answer in a few words. The Government is prepared to assist any worthwhile industry desiring to establish itself in any part of South Australia. Subject of course to investigations by the Industries Development Committee, or similar investigations, the Government is prepared to provide finance and, where necessary, services such as power, water, housing, roads, etc., and to consider the construction of buildings for lease or similar arrangement if the industry so desires it, bearing in mind that the industry must have some prospect of economic success.

SERVICE STATIONS.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Can the Minister of Works say whether a gentleman's agreement still exists between the Government and oil companies about the erection of service stations? Does it provide that there shall not be an increase in the number of stations and that where there are substantial houses suitable for habitation they shall not be demolished to make way for service stations?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I am afraid I am not *au fait* with any gentleman's agreement between the Government and the oil companies. A year or two ago when this matter was a very live topic certain statements were made but I would prefer to look into the matter further before giving the honourable member a more considered reply.

DESTRUCTION OF SOURSOBS.

Mr. GOLDNEY—I understand that for some time experiments into the control of soursobs either by way of cultivation or the use of hormone sprays have been conducted. Can the Minister of Agriculture intimate whether any of these experiments have been successful?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—A great deal of attention is being given to the problem of soursobs which is one of the worst

weeds in South Australia. I am not able to make a statement on recent experiments but I will get a report and let the honourable member have it shortly.

BUS SERVICES.

Mr. STOTT—At present difficulty is being experienced in connection with the smooth operation of bus services in the city and concern is being caused to passengers and to one-man bus drivers, particularly at peak periods. In the United States of America and other parts of the world tickets are not issued on one-man buses, but tokens which are purchased in the street are placed in special containers on the buses. Machines, similar to the automatic cigarette machine near the Gresham Hotel, issue tokens and change. The drivers are able to concentrate on driving in the peak periods and this aids the smooth running of a service. In order to obviate the congestion and to promote a smoother service will the Minister of Works ascertain whether the trust can adopt this system of tokens?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I am sure the management of the trust is anxious to provide a better, more economic and more convenient service to the public and I would be surprised if it had not already looked into all possibilities. However, I will direct the honourable member's remarks to the General Manager for a report thereon.

Mr. DUNNAGE—At present buses from Unley travel to Prospect via King William Street. When this was a tram service there were six stopping places in King William Street between Victoria Square and North Terrace, but there are now only three stopping places—one in Victoria Square, another at the Savings Bank and the third beside this House. If we are to encourage people to travel on buses provision should be made for an adequate number of stopping places in King William Street. My remarks apply to other bus services also. Will the Minister of Works ascertain whether more stopping places for the Unley service can be provided in King William Street?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—Yes, I will take that up.

FEES OF WAGES BOARD MEMBERS.

Mr. FRED WALSH—The remuneration paid to members of wages boards in the metropolitan area was considered by the executive of the Trades and Labour Council last week and the view expressed that it was time the fee was reviewed. In 1933, when the living wage

was £3 3s. a week, the fee was 7s. 6d. a meeting. Related to the £12 16s. a week now accepted as the living wage, the fee today should be considerably above the present 25s. As these boards play a very important part in the maintenance of industrial peace, I suggest that their members are entitled to higher remuneration. Will the Minister of Education ask the Minister of Industry to review the fee?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I shall be pleased to do so and give the honourable member a reply as soon as possible.

INTERSTATE MOVEMENT OF EGGS.

Mr. LAUCKE—Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question regarding a co-ordinated and more orderly policy relating to egg sales between the States in order to minimise wasteful freight costs which must ultimately reduce the net margins to producers?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—I have received the following reply from the chairman of the South Australian Egg Board:—

During the war, under National Security Regulations, the marketing of eggs was under the Controller of Egg Supplies. He, in turn, had a Deputy Controller in each State. Under these conditions, the price of eggs to producers and wholesalers was the same throughout Australia. This situation ended in 1947. The Egg Producers' Council then became the body representing the State Marketing Boards. Since that time, there have been many attempts to introduce an egg marketing scheme on the Commonwealth basis. New South Wales, at all times, has refused to agree to this unless its own producers were given higher prices than the producers in other States. During the period since the war until 1958, South Australia has had to sell the majority of its surplus eggs in shell at export parity which, last year, returned the South Australian Egg Board 2s. 8d. per dozen.

In April, when large numbers of Victorian eggs were sent to South Australia direct to the retailers, the South Australian Egg Board was faced with a difficult situation. To meet this situation, the board found markets in Sydney which returned considerably higher values than the export market. The South Australian Egg Board being constituted under the Egg Marketing Act has, as its object, to obtain the best returns for the producers. Its activities have been directed by the difficulties caused from interstate competition in two ways. Firstly, interstate buyers have been operating in South Australia buying first grade eggs direct from the producer outside the control of the South Australian Egg Board, and thereby avoiding the board's charge of 8d. per dozen. Secondly, there has been the influx of small eggs from the Victorian Egg Board. In spite of these difficulties, the South Australian Egg Board has ended the year with a surplus.

RAILWAY EMPLOYEES: WIDOWS' PRIVILEGES.

Mr. BYWATERS—Last week I asked the Minister of Works to request the Minister of Railways to give consideration to a person in Murray Bridge whose husband died shortly before reaching retiring age. He had had 43 years' continuous service with the South Australian railways, but because he died before reaching the retiring age his widow was excluded from privilege tickets and passes. Yesterday the Minister of Works, in reply, said that no anomaly exists. If I give the Minister the name of the person concerned, will he take up the matter again with the Minister of Railways to see whether some provision can be made for this widow?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I think the answer I gave yesterday stated that she was entitled to concession tickets.

Mr. Bywaters—The employee died three months before he was due to retire and while on long service leave, so his widow was excluded.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I still think the answer I gave yesterday covered the question, but I will take up the matter again with my colleague.

SUPPLY AND TENDER BOARD CONTRACTS.

Mr. LOVEDAY—Has the Minister of Works any further information on my recent inquiry concerning Supply and Tender Board contracts in relation to unemployment at an engineering works at Whyalla?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I have discussed this matter with the chairman of the Supply and Tender Board and have made inquiries of the Architect-in-Chief and the Harbors Board. Each of these departments calls tenders for various works at various times; indeed, the Architect-in-Chief is probably engaged more in tendering for contract work than any other department. The Supply and Tender Board has considered this matter, particularly the cutting up of tenders for contracts into smaller components, an aspect mentioned by the honourable member. Unfortunately, that aspect was conveyed more by way of interjection than by question, so the *Hansard* report did not give the whole text and my first reply did not cover that aspect fully. I assure the honourable member that the matter is being actively investigated, and I shall have more information later.

EUDUNDA AREA SCHOOL.

Mr. DAVIS—Last week the member for Light (Mr. Hambour) invited the Minister of Education to attend the opening of the Eudunda Area School, and had the pleasure of having children from that school present in the House at the time. I noticed with pleasure the faces of the children in the gathering when the Minister accepted the invitation. I wish to congratulate the member for Light on being a member of a district with such lovely children; they are almost comparable with those in Port Pirie. During the years that the Minister has held office I have been loud in my praise of him. As a matter of fact, I have drawn such a picture of the Minister in the minds of the people of Port Pirie that some of them are now of the opinion, and rightly so, that he is very close to being a superman. I feel sure that, if we had the pleasure of a visit from him and the opportunity of seeing his charming countenance there for a day or so, we should be very grateful. Would it be possible for the Minister to pay a visit to Port Pirie in the near future?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I am afraid that after the glowing build-up given me by the honourable member any visit by me in the flesh would be in the nature of an anticlimax. On the other hand, in the interests of the honourable member, the Education Department and, what is immensely more important, the children attending the schools in the district represented by the honourable member, I shall be only too pleased to accept his invitation to visit there at the earliest convenient time.

ASSEMBLY CHARGE ON TIMBER.

Mr. DUNSTAN—A number of my constituents are concerned about a charge that has recently been imposed by, so far as I am able to ascertain, all major timber merchants on the price of timber to the public. In these days, when any member of the public goes to a timber yard to buy timber, he has a little stamp on his docket that says "Approved assembly charge." For all orders under £75 a 10 per cent charge on the total of the bill is added as an assembly charge, in addition to the price of the timber, cutting and planing. It is as if a man were to go to a draper's shop, ask for certain goods and be charged 10 per cent for taking them off the shelves. For over £75 the charge is 7½ per cent. Will the Minister ask the Prices Commissioner to examine this matter to see whether an agreed

price ring has been formed among the timber merchants and whether this charge is in any way justified?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—Not being the Prices Minister, I cannot remember whether timber is still controlled. I understood that the timber business was very competitive these days. I am therefore surprised to hear this from the honourable member, though I do not doubt his comments.

Mr. Dunstan—I have checked it at several timber yards, and they use exactly the same stamp.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I am not suggesting for one moment that the honourable member's comment is not completely accurate but, in view of what I understand the position to be in the timber industry, I am surprised that the competitive aspect of the trade has not asserted itself to the point where merchants would be so anxious to meet customers that this could not possibly arise. However, whether or not timber is controlled, as the honourable member is aware the Premier's policy has been that, where circumstances akin to these have arisen, the Prices Commissioner invariably has his officers investigate. I think I can say that the Prices Commissioner will interest himself in this matter and bring down some information to Cabinet. That information will then be passed on to the honourable member.

WILD DOGS.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—A number of pastoralists in the north have recently informed me that wild dogs are becoming more prevalent and that a number have been killed in recent months. Can the Minister of Lands say whether he has had a report from the Pastoral Board, or from any of his officers who may be in a position to furnish a report, as to whether there is a greater prevalence of wild dogs in those areas now than used to be the case, and, if so, whether it would be due to any weakness in the buffer fence which was erected some years ago to stop dogs from the interior invading the sheep carrying areas in the north?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—Many weeks ago I read a report which stated that one dog had been shot inside the fence, but I have not had any report of an accumulation of dogs in any particular area. I will obtain a report, particularly with regard to the fence itself but also with regard to the dogs, and make it available to the Leader.

USE OF FIREARMS BY NEW AUSTRALIANS.

Mr. RICHES—At its last meeting the Port Augusta Corporation reported that new Australians had been discharging firearms in the main street of Port Augusta on a Sunday afternoon. The council is very concerned at what seems to be a growing practice on the part of new Australians in the use of firearms, and the opinion seems to be held that there is a tendency on their part to take firearms where they are not at all necessary. Can the Minister representing the Chief Secretary say whether any advice or instruction is given to new Australians on the laws of the land concerning the use of firearms and, if not, whether representations can be made to see that they are advised that firearms are not needed in this country and apprised of the regulations regarding their use?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I think it would be rather difficult to envisage any means by which new Australians could be instructed in regard to any particular matter. One might say with equal force that new Australians are not very conversant with our laws generally, and that perhaps some steps should be taken to make them *au fait* with those laws, of which the use of firearms is one. It occurs to me that possibly the good offices of the Good Neighbour Council might be availed of, because the members of that body move among new citizens quite freely and, I would add, have their complete confidence. Perhaps they could be requested to publicize this matter amongst new Australians. Apart from that, the ordinary laws of the land apply and new Australians are expected to abide by them. I have noticed a tendency amongst these people to possess themselves of firearms quite freely, perhaps because the use of them is a recreation in which they can indulge and which seems to appeal to them. However, I will bring the matter to the notice of the Chief Secretary and see whether he has any ideas by which the honourable member's object may be achieved. Frankly, I consider it would be somewhat difficult to devise a means to instruct them individually—or collectively—in the matter raised by the honourable member.

FRUIT FLY ERADICATION.

Mr. DUNNAGE—Has the Minister of Agriculture a further reply to the question I asked last week concerning the killing of citrus trees by fruit fly sprays?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—I have received the following report from the Director:—

The bait sprays used in fruit fly eradication since 1947 contained tartar emetic as the active principle. In this year's campaign in Adelaide and at Port Augusta, tartar emetic has been replaced by malathion, which is a more efficient insecticide. Whether based on tartar emetic or malathion, bait sprays are not known to have caused any significant damage to fruit trees, hundreds of thousands of which have been sprayed without ill effects in campaigns since 1947. In the relatively few instances where home gardeners have complained of damage or unthriftiness attributed to fruit fly spraying, investigation by the Department of Agriculture has shown some cause other than fruit fly operations to be involved.

I have also received the following report concerning the checking of imported bananas, about which the honourable member asked a question:—

Bananas imported into South Australia are the subject of 100 per cent inspection and are admitted only if they have been transported by rail or road and are hard and green on arrival. It is reasoned that if they are in this condition after the time involved in transport they were harvested in New South Wales or Queensland at such an immature stage as to be immune from fruit fly attack. In the course of 100 per cent inspection every crate is opened and all ripe bananas are removed and destroyed.

FISHING IN RESERVOIRS.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Can the Minister of Works say whether the Government intends to continue to prohibit fishing in metropolitan reservoirs, or will it consider suitable arrangements to permit fishing in selected parts of the reservoirs?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I discussed this matter with the Engineer-in-Chief, I think last week, and I believe a question on it was asked in another place. The Engineer-in-Chief believes it is undesirable from several points of view to permit fishing in metropolitan reservoirs, and I draw attention to two or three particular aspects. Firstly, there is the ever-present hazard of drowning. Although some reservoirs may be safe, others are distinctly dangerous, particularly where steep approaches to water level exist. For instance, at Mount Bold, where the water is deep near the bank and cold at any depth, there is a real drowning hazard. Further, a fisherman might wander around a large reservoir to a remote point where assistance might not be readily obtainable if he fell in; therefore, the possibility of drowning cannot be lightly dismissed.

A more important factor probably is the hygienic one: I think it is undesirable that people should assemble in an area from which metropolitan water supplies are drawn. Some other Australian metropolitan water supply authorities forbid any encroachment by a person, and even farming activity, within the catchment areas of their reservoirs; but that is impracticable in the Adelaide hills because any such embargo in respect of the metropolitan system would mean that much of the Adelaide hills would be thrown out of production because much of that area is actually the catchment area. So far as is possible, however, I think our water supplies should be protected from pollution, and that is the most compelling reason why fishing in reservoirs should not be permitted.

PORT MACDONNELL SLIPWAY.

Mr. CORCORAN—A former Minister considered the establishment of a slipway at Port MacDonnell and once visited the port and discussed the matter with fishermen there, although he did not commit himself or the Government to any action. I have again been approached by the fishermen since the recent appointment of a new Minister, and they wish to know what prospects there are of the slipway being established and when it is intended to do so. This is one of the most important fishing centres in the South-East, as more than 40 fishing craft are based there and have very few amenities. If the Minister of Agriculture is unable to answer the question now, will he call for a report? Further, if he cannot satisfy himself as a result of that report, will he discuss the matter with these fishermen when he visits the South-East?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—I will get a report and should I be in the vicinity, I shall be pleased to meet the fishermen and inspect the shoreline.

ACQUISITION OF AGRICULTURAL LAND FOR HOME-BUILDING.

Mr. KING—Has the Minister of Lands a reply to the question I asked last week concerning the powers of the Government to acquire freehold land adjacent to towns in irrigation districts for subdivision and resale to prospective home-builders?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I have received the following reply:—

Under the provisions of the Crown Lands Act, 1929-1957, any lands within the State may be acquired, by agreement or compulsorily, for towns and purposes incidental thereto.

RENTS OF SUBDIVIDED PREMISES.

Mr. DUNSTAN—Has the Minister representing the Attorney-General a reply to the question on rent control that I asked last week?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—The Attorney-General has supplied me with a report from the Assistant Parliamentary Draftsman (Mr. Cartledge), who is also chairman of the Housing Trust. It states:—

The Crown Solicitor has advised that, where the rent of a dwellinghouse has been fixed pursuant to the Landlord and Tenant (Control of Rents) Act and parts of the house are let separately, those parts are separate premises for the purpose of the Act from the whole of the premises and the fixed rent for the whole of the premises does not apply to the parts. This opinion is supported by judgments of the Supreme Court although it has been held that where the separate parts have been let to the same lessee, the lessor is bound by the rent fixation for the whole of the premises.

However, if the lease of the part of the premises does not come within the exemptions provided by the Act, the rent payable in respect of the part of the premises can be fixed on the application of the lessor or the lessee. The Act, from the outset, has been administered on this basis. It is apparent that the rents of the various parts of the dwellinghouse should vary according to the accommodation provided and, in a case where a person makes a business of letting parts of a dwellinghouse, it is reasonable to allow him a margin upon his head rent especially, as is often the case, if the parts of the premises let are furnished or provided with amenities.

Cabinet has not yet made any decision as to whether or not these provisions in the Act should be amended. In the meantime I suggest that tenants who consider they are entitled to redress should apply to the Housing Trust for a fixation of the rent of the part or separate premises.

FISHING REGULATIONS.

Mr. BYWATERS—Soon after the opening of the Murray cod fishing season on November 1 last year, a fisherman at Mypolonga caught a Murray cod weighing 140 lb. This fish was sent to Victoria, where this man normally sends his catches. Unfortunately, unknown to him, the Victorian fishing season does not open until December 1; consequently, the Victorian Fisheries Department confiscated the fish. The last I know of the fish is that a photograph of it was published in the *News* showing it hanging in a cold store in Victoria. It is unusual to catch a Murray cod of this size and, as fishermen along the River Murray are not rich people, I took up the matter with the Chief Inspector of Fisheries (Mr.

Moorhouse) to see what could be done for this man, but he was unsuccessful in his efforts. I then asked the Premier whether he would take up the matter with the Victorian Premier. Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether anything has come from the negotiations with Victoria?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—The Premier took this matter up with the Victorian authorities, but I understand that they objected to any compensation for the fisherman because Victoria's legislation had been contravened. The matter was then put in the hands of the Crown Law Department to see what could be done on behalf of this fisherman. I tried to ascertain the position recently, but the officer dealing with this matter was out of the State. He should be back soon and I will raise the matter with him.

BUILDING CONSTRUCTION METHODS.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—A new type of building material is being used, particularly in new schools, and I think it could be best described as an exposed aggregate. It consists of marble chippings with cement washed away from them, and this method was used on the woodworking section of the Ascot Park school. There is a great difference between the standard of workmanship at this school and that at the Marion high and Forbes schools. I believe the Architect-in-Chief agrees that the standard has dropped, that the aggregate which is exposed is not graded, and that there is now too much cement work compared with aggregate. Will the Minister of Works ascertain from the Architect-in-Chief why the standard of this type of construction has been reduced?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I will ask the Architect-in-Chief to instruct his inspectors to make investigations in the light of the matters the honourable member has raised.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from August 5. Page 276.)

Mr. HUGHES (Wallaroo)—Yesterday I was about to close my address when I discovered that an important newspaper article that I wished to read to the House had been mislaid, and the House kindly gave me leave to continue my remarks today. I am gravely concerned that this State persists in meting out

capital punishment. An article from the *South Australian Farmer* of June 27, 1958, states:—

The State must look for a Labor Government if it wants to get rid of the barbaric practice of taking a life for a life. When the last death sentence was commuted to one of life imprisonment it appeared that capital punishment had been abolished as far as the present Government was concerned. Insanity was the plea then but every murder must be perpetrated during fits of insanity. No one in his senses would subject himself to the hell he knows he will suffer with murder on his conscience, be he accused or not. It is a kindness for the State to end the torture by execution, but that is not the motive behind the primitive action. The people are not advanced by repeating a killing. If they do not get this law abolished the sound judgment of the Legislature might make good the deficiency. Labor Governments revolt against the State taking life and abolition is a plank of their platform. Members of the Government in agreeing that the law take its course should individually offer to carry out the dreadful deed of killing. Perhaps they would then reconsider their decision. No person should have to do what we would not do ourselves. Those opposed to capital punishment realize the necessity of altering the law and know that the conscience of the Government is not to be relied upon. A change will come when the public become more Christianized and have less desire to introduce their own code into their religion. Until then these times of horror will continue.

We are living in a changing world and things have altered from the days of public hangings in this State. On reading notes on a rare piece of South Australian history I found it was in 1858 that the South Australian Parliament by Act ordered that hangings should be carried out within the walls or enclosed yard of the gaol. One hundred years later, in this 20th Century, we pride ourselves on being a progressive State, but I find it hard to understand why a community that prides itself on its Christian principles still persists in the most barbaric practice of capital punishment. What is to be gained by continuing this practice? The only argument that can be advanced in its favour is that it is a more effective deterrent than any other form of punishment, and I very much doubt that it is. I implore the Government to discontinue the practice. I would hate to have it on my conscience if an innocent person were hanged. Mistakes are made in most things and I do not think any court of law is infallible.

Mr. Riches—Do we make our hangman available to Victoria, as has been reported?

Mr. HUGHES—Because they cannot get them to do it over there?

Mr. Dunnage—Do you think the court made a mistake?

Mr. HUGHES—There is that fish caught in the mesh of a net in such a way that it can no longer swim out into God's boundless ocean. There is that lark that is caught in the snare of the fowler that can no longer rise into God's azure blue and there pour out its song of praise. Animals fret and pine away from their natural haunts. The same thing applies to human beings. It is obvious that capital punishment is not a complete deterrent because there have been 19 acts of capital punishment in this State since 1904. We have no right to ask officials to perform something that we should have a moral objection to doing ourselves. I strongly object to capital punishment being carried out in this State. I support the motion.

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE (Burnside)—The print of the speech with which His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor was pleased to open Parliament is a valuable document which should give great encouragement to all who study it. I join with other members in congratulating the new Minister of Works, and the Minister of Agriculture on his first appointment to Cabinet. With other members I express great admiration for the long, distinguished and honourable service rendered by Sir Malcolm McIntosh, and I deplore the death of Mr. Fletcher who served his district in this House faithfully for many years. Some remarks by the Leader of the Opposition in this debate call for reply. He referred to monopolies. It should be placed on record, lest it be suggested that monopolies are politically one-sided affairs, that it is equally a monopoly if a trade union demands that its members shall be the only persons to supply certain types of labour as it is if a certain company controls the sale or manufacture of some goods. If any action against monopolies is contemplated it will, of course, cover the tightly disciplined union as well as the so-called capitalist who is alleged to be profiteering. It is, too, equally profiteering to ask for the full price for labour of poor quality, just because it is union labour, as it is to ask a more than proper price for goods in short supply, or under so-called monopolistic control.

Mr. O'Halloran—What evidence have you that union labour is of poor quality?

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE—I did not say that. I said that if there is labour of poor quality it is equally profiteering to ask the same wage for that as it is to ask more

than a proper price for goods in short supply. I raised a hypothetical question. There was also a reference to Labor's attitude on unification or centralization. Mr. John Clark properly rejected the idea of Federal control of education although at the same time making a claim for additional financial assistance. He at least amongst the Opposition is aware of the dangers of a centralized form of government, yet on several occasions Mr. Dunstan has in this House said "Unification is Labor's policy." Is unification Labor's policy?

Mr. Dunstan—Unification of Sovereign power but decentralization of administration.

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE—The honourable member has assured the House in the past, without any mental reservation or equivocation whatsoever, that unification is Labor's policy.

Mr. Dunstan—I have never said it outright in those words and I give the honourable member the lie direct. Quote my words.

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE—On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, it will all be found in *Hansard*. I will look up the reference for the honourable member; that is, where he replied to interjections made by the present Minister of Agriculture and myself, and said that unification is Labor's policy. The honourable member said that and it can be found in *Hansard*.

Mr. Dunstan—Quote the rest of my words.

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE—I am not making any mental reservation. I am quoting what the honourable member said in reply to interjections. If he has some reservations, let us hear them in due time. I understand that unification is Labor's policy. Perhaps it is not strange, because Labor speaks with many voices, but Mr. Calwell, rather than wanting fewer States, wants more States. The other day he advocated that the Northern Territory should be a self-governing State. That is rather a different point of view from that expressed by the member for Norwood.

Mr. Dunstan—He has expressed exactly the same point of view as I.

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE—It is rather strange if on the one hand the Labor Party seeks to abolish State Parliaments—and I have always believed this to be Labor's policy—whereas on the other Mr. Caldwell suggests that the Northern Territory should become a new State. What is Labor's policy? If the member for Norwood will enunciate in simple terms where Labor stands on unification then the House will know the exact position. I ask him to do so without equivocation or mental

reservation. Until I have been convinced to the contrary by a flat denial from him I shall believe that unification and the socialization of the means of production, distribution and exchange are two fundamentals in Labor's political philosophy. That cannot be reconciled with the speech of the member for Gawler (Mr. John Clark) who claims it would not be a good thing if education were administered Federally. If unification, or centralization of government is desirable for the purpose of unifying policy and social standards as well as economies in costs, which incidentally never materialize, how can that view be reconciled with Labor's lip service to decentralization of industry in which they profess belief, but apart from the member for Stuart do little or nothing about? If it is good for government administration to be centrally situated one would expect equal advantages from the centralization of industry. That would be a natural assumption to draw from Labor's views expressed in this Chamber.

The view of my Party is that there should be a proper division of powers between the Commonwealth and the States carrying out the constitutional functions for which each is best fitted. Similarly, we believe that some industries should be in the city and some should be in the country but—and this is most important—the task of guiding men, money and materials should be performed economically. In other words, the mere idea that an industry should be in the country is completely untenable unless there are more good reasons than otherwise that it should go there. I was recently asked to express some views on this matter in reply to an inquiry from the country. Without committing my colleagues on the Industries Development Committee I answered the inquiry in this manner:—

“Firstly I should say that the Industries Development Act requires the committee in every case where recommendation is made for assistance to state (a) that the industry is likely to be profitable—and that is a requisite of the Act under which we work—and (b) that it will maintain or increase employment in the State. The committee does not seek out industries for assistance nor does it dictate where they should go. Many of the industries assisted—for example, barytes, cellulose and pyrites—are placed where their raw material is found. Others assisted are near labour, transport or markets, all of which are basic elements in deciding where the industry will start.”

I believe it was Bernard Shaw who said, in effect, “If you must work for a capitalist, be sure it is one who is making a profit.” It is fundamental that no industry can carry out its function unless it makes a profit. It

would not be sound just to make a condition of assistance to the industry that it should go to one town or another unless all or most of the points of view suggested that it should go there. The old view that industries should be dispersed for defence reasons seems to me to be invalid in this atomic age. There must be some real advantage to attract an industry to a town. An American writer recently put it this way:—

An economy approaches peak effectiveness, and thus the greatest possible production, to the extent that each resource, human and physical, is employed in the job at which it is most efficient. The subordinate task of guiding resources to their best employments, moreover, should be performed economically. My reply to the query I received from the country continued:—

I would suggest that if there is need for an industry in your town it should set about forming a committee to look into the question, then get together all the necessary facts so that they can be put in the hands of the Government and be available either for industrialists seeking a suitable site or for investors looking for opportunities. You would need to set out the advantages, such as the existence of raw material or suitable labour, and how much local capital is available, bearing in mind that the industry thus established would need something to compensate it for distances from the market unless the product had a considerable or substantial country sale. All those requirements are fundamental if a flourishing industry is to exist. The whole secret—if it is a secret—of raising living standards is increased production with increased efficiency. Nothing can be less helpful to increasing the productivity of the State and the diversification of industry and decentralization than the parrot cry, “Why hasn't the Government given such and such a town a new industry?” It would be much more helpful to say, “Here are the reasons why an industry would flourish at this particular town, raw materials, water, electricity and suitable labour and transport are available” and some local capital could be found. When that information can be put before the Government or the Chamber of Manufactures then even more industries will go to the country, but it should not be overlooked that the cost of transportation is one of the biggest ingredients in the cost of goods in Australia and it is quite unhelpful to suggest that an industry should be put in the country unless it is able to compete with similar industries in other parts of the State or in other parts of the Commonwealth. An examination of the work of the Industries Development Committee and the subsequent action of the Government will show that well over £3,000,000 has been

guaranteed in some form as assistance to industry and the reports of the Housing Trust show that homes have been built in 120 country towns. These are listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Quarterly Notes of the Housing Trust dated July 1. I ask that this list be incorporated in *Hansard* without being read.

Leave granted.

The list was as follows:—

Ambleside	Mount Barker
Angaston	Mount Compass
Ardrossan	Mount Gambier
Balaklava	Mount Pleasant
Barmera	Murray Bridge
Beltana	Myponga
Berri	Nairne
Birdwood	Nangwarry
Blanchetown	Naracoorte
Booleroo Centre	Nuriootpa
Bordertown	Orroroo
Brunkunga	Parafield
Burra	Parndana
Bute	Paskeville
Ceduna	Penola
Clare	Peterborough
Cleve	Pinnaroo
Cockburn	Port Augusta
Cookes Plains	Port Broughton
Cowell	Port Lincoln
Crystal Brook	Port Pirie
Cummins	Port Vincent
Eudunda	Quorn
Frances	Radium Hill
Gawler	Renmark
Gladstone	Riverton
Glencoe West	Robe
Glossop	Robertstown
Greenock	Roseworthy
Gumeracha	Saddleworth
Hallett	Salisbury
Hamley Bridge	Snowtown
Happy Valley	South Para
Hawker	Spalding
Jamestown	Stansbury
Kadina	Stenhouse Bay
Kalangadoo	Strathalbyn
Kapunda	Streaky Bay
Keith	Struan
Kimba	Swan Reach
Kingscote	Tailem Bend
Kingston, S.E.	Tanunda
Lameroo	Thevenard
Laura	Tintinara
Leigh Creek	Truro
Lobethal	Tumby Bay
Loxton	Tungkillo
Lucindale	Turretfield
McLaren Vale	Victor Harbour
Maitland	Waikerie
Mannum	Wallaroo
Meadows	Wanilla
Melton	Warooka
Meningie	Whyalla
Millbrook	Williamstown
Mil Lel	Willunga
Millicent	Wilmington
Minlaton	Woodside
Minnipa	Yankalilla
Monash	Yorketown

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE—This is a fine record of decentralization, but the real attraction for the decentralization of industry is reward. All human activity is based on a promise of reward—not necessarily material reward. It may be the satisfaction of a job well done or the achievement of an ideal, but the hope of reward in some form is generally the moving force. I can assure the Opposition that if real advantages exist in a special locality, industry will go there and go with the support and goodwill of the Government. However, the key note is efficiency if living standards are to be raised by the establishment of new industries. I know of no other justification for the establishment of an industry.

Much of the diversification of industry has been brought about by hire purchase. A lot of nonsense has been talked about hire purchase by those who have views not necessarily backed by fact, and have not examined the whole implications. I am satisfied that the hire purchaser—the man making the deal—really does not care a rap what rate of interest is charged. He is concerned with three things. First, does the chattel satisfy his need; secondly, is the weekly payment within his means; and thirdly, is it worth to him what he has to pay. If he does not like it, he does not buy it. If the weekly payment is too high he should not buy the article, and if it is not worth what he expects to pay, he will not buy it either. Each of these decisions multiplied many times over will in their cumulative effect, quite effectively keep a check on the business houses which sell on hire purchase, although the resistance might not be felt instantaneously. The remedy lies in the hands of the buyer. If it is carried out on a large scale, any excesses in hire purchase will be disciplined. I have not seen any satisfactory suggestion for removing abuses—if there are some—from hire purchase, because so much rests on human frailty. The remedy rests in the hands of the buyer.

Mr. Dunstan—Therefore, you do not agree with anything said by the Premier of Victoria or Queensland?

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE—I am not responsible for the Premier of Victoria, any more than the honourable member is responsible for what Mr. Calwell says. Mr. Bywaters said that people had been lured into hire purchase. I do not know whether he suggests that they will be lured into the hire purchase company sponsored by the trade unions.

Quite frankly, I commend the unions for this activity as it will give them the opportunity to show by example rather than by precept whether, in fact, hire purchase on a fairly large scale can be conducted efficiently on lower terms than are generally charged. It is true that there are cases of excesses in these matters, that some people do not know their limitations in using hire purchase as they do not know their limitations in many other human activities, but that does not condemn hire purchase, which has brought to many higher standards of living than their fathers could dream of or their counterparts in the socialist-communist countries are within sight of achieving.

Here are some facts which put hire purchase in Australia in its proper perspective. From the latest statistics available, the total wages and salaries paid in Australia were £2,807,000,000. Of this £448,000,000 was spent on clothing, footwear, drapery and the like, £396,000,000 on tobacco, cigarettes, beer, etc., and £308,000,000 on hire purchase. Nearly 33 per cent more was spent on tobacco, cigarettes and beer than on hire purchase, but for the £308,000,000 there was at the end of that year some tangible assets in hundreds of thousands of homes. Members can make their own assessments of the relative value of the £369,000,000 spent on tobacco and liquor and the value of the £308,000,000 spent on hire purchase.

Mr. O'Halloran—About half of the first figure went back to the Federal Government in excise and duty.

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE—I agree, but it still came out of the pockets of those who paid it. The people must have thought it was worth much more to spend their money on the £396,000,000 for beer and tobacco and cigarettes than £308,000,000 on hire purchase, for which they had something to show. If honourable members opposite examine the figures and draw conclusions from them, I think they will find there are some avenues of expenditure to be deplored more than that on hire-purchase.

The Leader of the Opposition asked a question which needs an answer. He said that if we can find money for war, why can't we find it in times of peace? We can find it in times of peace if in peacetime we simulate the economic conditions of war and the psychological atmosphere of war and legislate ahead of public opinion. We can do it easily if we overcome these very grave and difficult conditions. To start with, we can have rationing, pegged wages, higher taxation, controlled production, registration and direction of employment, limitation of building,

no Father Christmas and snake proof trousers and have all the rigmarole that goes to prop up a strictly controlled economy. When a bush-fire threatens a home every drop of water available is used to quench the blaze without thought of even drinking water for tomorrow, and when war hangs over us every resource is pledged to the task. The urgency of the present then is so desperate that most people will submit to the controls necessary to find the money. With only about two per cent of the Australian work force unemployed as against eight to nine per cent in the U.S.A. it is evident that Australians will not submit to those controls necessary to find equivalent sums in times of peace as they do in times of war. I remind the House that when supreme efforts were being made to finance the war many people in that effort said, "We will be satisfied if we come out with our lives and our homes." So desperate was the emergency, in that atmosphere only could the money be found.

I will now say a few words about a press reference to the business management of the Adelaide University. It was suggested that the professorial board was expected to carry on the business of the University. I shall refer to some of the details of the business management of the University. I have had the honour and privilege to be a member of the council for more than 10 years. Here is the pyramid of business organization. The council, to which Parliament appoints five members, is at the apex. At the stage below is the finance committee appointed from the council, and then from the finance committee, the building committee, the superannuation committee, the investments committee and at the next level the accountancy staff. The finance committee comprises Mr. K. A. Wills, who is chairman and a well known business man of wide experience and high integrity. The deputy chairman is Mr. R. A. Simpson, a well known industrialist and businessman. Then there are the Hons. Sir Frank Perry, M.L.C. and L. H. Densley, M.L.C., the qualities of whom are well known to members. Sir Frank Perry has had wide experience in industry and business matters in this State. Then there are the Hon. Sir George Ligertwood, Mr. A. J. Hannan, Q.C., Dr. Ray Hone, Dr. I. B. Jose, Professor Karmel (Dean of the Faculty of Economics) and myself, with some small experience in accountancy matters. I might say that the Chancellor and Vice-Chancellor are *ex officio* members of all committees, while Sir Mark Mitchell is a member

of several committees in his own right, as well as acting Vice-Chancellor. The Building Committee comprises Mr. K. A. Wills, Mr. R. A. Simpson, the Hon. Sir Frank Perry, M.L.C., the Hon. L. H. Densley, M.L.C., and the University architect; the Superannuation Committee, Mr. K. A. Wills, Mr. R. A. Simpson, Professor P. H. Karmel, Mr. A. J. Hannan, Q.C., and myself; the Investments Committee, Mr. K. A. Wills, Mr. R. A. Simpson, Sir George Ligertwood, Mr. A. J. Hannan, Q.C., and Mr. A. Fairweather, who has had a lifetime of experience in these matters. The Finance Committee and its sub-committees have the advice of a leading firm of real estate agents and of a highly reputable stock and share broking firm. They also call upon expert advice when assessing the needs of the University for insurance.

The Assistant Registrar (Accounts) is an accountant with both commercial and University experience. He holds three reputable accounting and secretarial diplomas and has on his staff two qualified accountants and a bachelor of economics. Over the past few years the accounts of the University have been completely recast, and the financial records and data placed before the Finance Committee and Council are first class by any standards. The auditors are two leading firms of chartered accountants with a wealth of experience and of the highest integrity. A Treasury official makes a number of visits each year to the University, which submits a most carefully prepared and documented budget to the Government. This, I believe, is examined in detail by the Treasury in a similar fashion to that in which the State Budget is examined by the Commonwealth Grants Commission. The published accounts of the University are models of their kind. I hope this will allay any fear that the financial affairs and business management of the University are not conducted efficiently.

Several questions have been asked in the House about the so-called alpha-numero system of numbering motor vehicles. On this subject I make it clear that I am expressing my own views and not those of the State Traffic Committee, because opinion there is divided. I am opposed to the system. First, we will not run out of six-figure numbers until the year 2050, taking into account the increase in population and car registration. In other words, we will not have used all the numbers up to 999,999 until we have a population of about 3,000,000

or 4,000,000, because it seems to me that the maximum motor car population in the foreseeable future is not likely to exceed one to every three or four people. Then, too, the letters allotted under the recommendations of the Australian Road Traffic Code Committee do not provide, as is generally thought, for an unlimited number of registrations to be available. The letters that have been allotted to South Australia for a prefix, if the system were adopted, are from RAA to TZZ and they, in conjunction with three figures, will give 1,728,000 combinations; so, whatever one's views about this system of numbering, no change is urgent. Then too, the practice is not general in the United States, where the greater number of States do not use the system.

It is true that the change, if it were thought desirable, could be made gradually as new cars were registered or old cars transferred, but then we would have the hotchpotch numbering that still exists in other States where the change is not complete. In Victoria and New South Wales a considerable number of two letter plates still exist. The change would involve the motorist in extra cost, and put out of business the several plate makers in Adelaide, as the plates would have to be issued from the office of the Registrar of Motor Vehicles. Then, too, on practical grounds, there is nothing to recommend the alpha-numero system. Its advocates urge it on the ground that it is easier to memorize or recognize a plate. This is purely an uninformed guess, and too many opinions are expressed on this type of matter without any real backing. In telephoning, numbers are required to be remembered more often than numbers in any other day to day task. Overseas experience has shown that seven digit numbers, using all numerals, are easier to enunciate and understand than those using both letters and numerals, and there is no evidence to show that the alpha-numero system is easier to remember. On the basis of overseas experience, Australian telephone numbers will become all numerals, and the prefix letters will be dropped. In Switzerland, where subscriber to subscriber dialling operates on a nationwide basis, telephone users are accustomed to dialling an additional three preliminary digits for automatic trunk connection to a distant city. To sum up, even if the system were good, it is not necessary for nearly 100 years, it can only cost the motorist money, and it has no outstanding advantages in any case.

I now come to another rather minor matter. I have recently asked questions in this House about the South Australian lift regulations, which to my mind are completely out of date when applied to modern automatic lifts, and I am pleased to say that the Minister of Industry is having the regulations examined with the object of revising them. The recent announcement of the Minister of Education that a new School of Arts is to be built is welcome news indeed. The South Australian School of Arts and Crafts will celebrate its centenary in two or three years and it will be a fine thing for it to start its second-century in a new building. I do not know if a site has yet been selected, but I think it should be as near as possible to the Teachers' Training College because of the large number of student teachers who take their art training at the school. This school has been something of a Cinderella for many years, but devoted work has been done by the staff and some fine artists have been students there. I deplore a recent press suggestion that students know less of art after attending the school than they did before. It is true that more staff is required, but I have always held the view that first things must come first, and the claims of primary and secondary education have placed pressing burdens on the Government ever since the war, so the School of Arts has had to wait. However, the promise of a new school has given encouragement to all who have the interests of the school in their minds.

During my recent trip abroad I made many observations, probably the most important of which was that of the countries I saw none with the exception of the United States had as high a standard of living as this State, and in the United States there were many hundreds of thousands with a lower standard than people in this State. I came to the firm conclusion, too, that we should not slavishly copy British, European or American practice in any activity, but should benefit from their experience and adapt it to our use. We in Australia are in a fortunate position as we can make a choice of the experience of the two hemispheres, and so far we seem to have made a fairly good choice. Our tradition and our way of life are modelled on the British way, and our industries, architecture and home furnishings are following more closely the pattern of the New World. The pattern set by the Government for the future development of the State as

set out in the address of His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor will add to our development and raise our standard of living even higher. I support the motion.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide)—I oppose the motion because I disagree with the first paragraph: I am not pleased with His Excellency's speech. Although I am in full accord with paragraphs 2 and 3, I disagree with paragraph 1. I have had the pleasure of sitting on this side of the House for the past fortnight watching the "brains trust" opposite address themselves to the Address in Reply. In the absence of their master, it is obvious that they are competing with each other for honourable mention when he returns. From this "brains trust," of course, comes the Cabinet, and from the Cabinet the master. Some would say that it was a tragic performance, others that it was pathetic, but I can see the humour of the situation. I will give my views of the situation as I have seen it during the last fortnight.

Honourable members on the Government side may say "Well, it is as we are," or "It is as tho' we are looking in a mirror"; I will leave it to them. Somebody will have the unenviable task of reporting to the Premier when he returns on the behaviour of his boys in his absence. So far eight members from the Government side have spoken, six of whom have read their speeches. Some were well read, but as regards others I recall the words of the honourable member for Light who said that the product of our schools today can neither read nor write. I will not comment further on that.

I have questioned every member who read his speech except the last. When the member for Chaffey spoke last week, I interjected four times. On the first three occasions he did not answer, but looked at me over the top of his glasses; he was not going to be trapped. I happened to glance up at the press gallery and saw that a girl sitting there was taking no notice of the member for Chaffey, but was fiddling with something on her lap. I thought she had just been paid and was checking her notes to see if they were correct. In the other section of the press gallery were two gentlemen, one of whom was reading a newspaper, and the other looking down on the House, but no-one was taking any notes of the honourable member. I asked "Have you given a copy of your speech to the press yet?" and even before he could look over the top of his glasses he

said, "Not yet." He unconsciously let out the fact that the gentlemen on his side of the House were giving copies of their speeches to the press. He certainly was not going to be caught as was one of the Government members who preceded him and gave his speech to the press before he read it to the House. On that particular day, however, Questions lasted longer than usual and, when the *News* got on to the streets that particular member was much concerned whether his speech had already been reported in that paper.

I do not think the "Master" when he returns, will commend the honourable member for Victoria for the way he addressed the House. He represents a country district and I should have thought he would address himself to matters concerning the country. However, the member for Victoria said this:—

I have purposely confined my remarks to items close to rural matters, with the knowledge that many speakers to follow will fully cover the great importance of the proposed expansion of steelworks, ship building, many new industries, etc.

From that I thought that the honourable member would confine his remarks to items close to rural matters, and leave it to other speakers, as he said, to deal with steelworks, ship building, new industries and so forth. The honourable member then went on to say this:—

By imposing import restrictions and high tariffs the finished articles of our secondary industries, which employ one-third of our work forces, enjoy a protected home market. Only a limited number of these items can ever be sold overseas in competition with other countries, unless our own users are overcharged thus building up excessive profits for manufacturers, and allowing the surplus articles to be sold to some overseas countries at a loss.

Obviously the honourable member does not know that we in Australia are producing the cheapest steel in the world. For some years we have been selling it in America more cheaply than the Americans can manufacture their own steel. We are already being overcharged. The honourable member said the Holden car could be quoted as one instance. We are certainly being overcharged here on the Holden car because £40, £50 or more could be taken off its price and it would still show a handsome profit. They are selling the Holden car in other countries at a price equal with the Australian price, and not as a result of the company's excessive profits. In its annual report it was said that even more could be sold if available.

Mr. Harding also said:—

Our heavy secondary industries, such as iron steel, shipbuilding, locomotives, farm machinery and engines, piping and all fencing mater-

ials, minerals and oil resources must of necessity continue to expand. The question is how long can we continue to encourage more or less non-essential industries at the expense of rural development?

The honourable member was trying to convey to the House that the industries he mentioned were all non-essential and were expanding at the expense of rural development. The Government and its supporters lead us to believe that they are encouraging secondary industries to expand and we are led to believe that the Premier is overseas now trying to get a secondary industry to commence development here. Is the honourable member at variance with his leader?

Mr. Hambour—We are allowed to be.

Mr. LAWN—Are you? When the Liberal and Country Party holds its Caucus meeting, the "Master" allows his members to say only what he wants them to. They cannot even cast a vote but have to accept what the Government tells them.

Mr. Hambour—You have been peeping through a keyhole!

Mr. LAWN—Can the honourable member deny that members opposite are not allowed to vote on any question? When the master—the Premier—tells members of his Party what the Government is going to do, I say that is the last word.

Mr. Hambour—You are a fool.

Mr. LAWN—Some members may be allowed to speak.

Mr. Hambour—That is a stupid suggestion.

Mr. LAWN—Will the member for Light deny that members of his Party do not get a vote on all questions?

Mr. Hambour—You do not know what you are talking about.

Mr. LAWN—When the Premier tells members of his Party what legislation he proposes to introduce, the Party is not allowed to vote on whether it wants that legislation or not.

Mr. Hambour—Don't be silly.

Mr. LAWN—Liberal and Country League members know that is true, and the Opposition knows it is true. Government members are only allowed to say what pleases the master, and are not entitled to take a vote on anything.

Mr. Shannon—We are not tied by our Caucus; we can come here afterwards and vote as we like.

Mr. LAWN—The member for Onkaparinga is not denying the statement that I made. Members of his Party are not given the right to vote at caucus meetings as to whether or not they favour a measure, or whether they

would like it amended. Government members do not even know what decentralization means, and if we read the speeches some of them have made we find that they have varying ideas. The member for Light, when he first came here in 1956, made a few remarks concerning decentralization.

Mr. Hambour—That is correct.

Mr. LAWN—He then went on to say that he would take aged city people into the country, away from the noisy city tramcars, where they could grow their own food. What a brilliant suggestion with regard to decentralization! The member for Eyre (Mr. Bockelberg) told the House when speaking in this debate the other day that decentralization means shifting a few people from the City of Adelaide to Elizabeth. What a colossal suggestion! Does he call that decentralization? What would the master think? The member for Burnside (Mr. Geoffrey Clarke), who spoke last, was not quite the same as other members. They sang the praises of the master from the time they got up until the time they sat down, and I think if Standing Orders had permitted it they would have sung the song instead of saying the words. I know that Government members are trying to make a good show in the absence of their master, but that is probably not the only reason they are so vociferous in their praises. This Government may not be here next year; in fact, it is not expected that they will. There is a saying, "Join the Liberal Party and obtain a knighthood," but especially "Become a Liberal member of Parliament and obtain a knighthood." When this Parliament is in session we sit for three days a week, so it means that we have more knights than days. We have Sir Thomas, Sir Malcolm, Sir Lyell, Sir Walter, Sir Arthur, Sir Frank, and, of course, that 60-30 man, Sir Collier (I prefer 50-nil). We now have a few more in competition for such an honour. The member for Light will not be satisfied with a knighthood; he wants to become a count, but I prefer to call him a baron—spelt "b-a-r-o-n." I suggest that his master—the Premier—would prefer to crown him.

When the honourable member came here in 1956 he unconsciously wanted to wreck the Government. He advocated several select committees and royal commissions to investigate many of this Government's activities, and I told him then that the Premier would make him toe the line before this Parliament ended.

He replied that he was allowed to have a mind of his own, and I said "Not in your Party." I told him that instead of criticizing his master he would soon be singing his praises. Last year the honourable member improved on his 1956 effort and began to commend the Government, so much so that he was told:—"Well, you can move the adoption of the Address-in-Reply." In his speech this session he started paragraph by paragraph:—"I congratulate the Government" To show his complete capitulation—I told him he would capitulate to the master within three years—he said that the master helped to put the coal in the mines at Leigh Creek. Have members ever heard such nonsense? The newspapers for years have been implying that the Premier put the coal at Leigh Creek, but not one newspaper has had the courage to say it outright because they know they would not be believed. They have been trying to create the impression in people's minds that he did, but the member for Light has had the privilege, if it can be called that, of saying it. He said:—

I would like the member for Stuart to express his gratitude or otherwise when he rises to his feet. With regard to the Leader of the Opposition, I know he has the Leigh Creek coalfields in his area and they are not doing a bad job.

According to *Hansard*, Mr. Hughes then interjected "The Premier put them there, of course," and the honourable member replied "He helped." How did the Premier help to put them there? I always thought that what came out of the ground was put there by somebody else, not by the Czar, the dictator of South Australia.

The SPEAKER—Order!

Mr. LAWN—I know that Government members worship their master; they sing his praises; they will rush down to the airport and welcome him back. The member for Barossa (Mr. Laucke) and other members opposite said that Sir Thomas would come back to this State with armfuls of advantages and no doubt they will be down there with a pipe band to welcome him back the morning he arrives; but when he knows that one of his supporters in this House has said he helped put the coal in the Leigh Creek coalfield, I guarantee he will say, "Is that so?" Mr. Hambour will not get much credit from the Premier for making such a stupid statement. What I said two years ago is true. Mr. Hambour wanted to appoint Select Committees and Royal Commissions to investigate the Government's activities, but since then he has toed the line. Indeed, in the

following session (1957) the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. O'Halloran) moved for the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into decentralization, but Mr. Hambour opposed the motion because he knew that it was contrary to the wishes of his master. In his first session Mr. Hambour did not think he would change by 1958, but this session he has changed so much that he said his master put coal in the ground. I do not think, however, that he will get a mention in the New Year's Honors List.

Mr. Hambour—Don't you like the Premier?

The SPEAKER—Order!

Mr. LAWN—I have already mentioned the member for Eyre (Mr. Bockelberg). He was going to town about decentralization, saying that this Government was giving effect to a policy of decentralizing industry and population. He quoted the Government Statist's figures to prove that between two given dates the population in country areas had increased, but he did not realize that during that period the town of Elizabeth had been established and that its population was included in his figures. Government members have said, "You can't tell industry where to go," but I point out that the Government is telling people where to live. It seems that it is all right to talk that way to ordinary people—the people that we on this side represent. It seems that it is possible to direct them where they shall live, but that no Government must direct industry. No, the God of Mammon—industry—is sacrosanct! You must not touch it! Hands off it! Even a sovereign Parliament has no say over R.I.P.—rent, interest and profit. The Government, however, tells people in my district that they must go to Elizabeth or there will be no home for them. Metropolitan members on this side, including the members for Enfield, Hindmarsh, Semaphore and West Torrens, will bear out my statement that there are no homes available for their constituents in the metropolis. The Government is making it easy for landlords to evict people so that they can demolish their houses or relet them at a higher rental. The tenants so evicted have to go where a house is available and this Government is directing them to Elizabeth. Then the Government claims that it is giving effect to decentralization.

It may seem strange for me to say that I agree with a member of the brains trust on the other side of this House, but I do agree with the statement by the member for Barossa (Mr. Laucke) that the next Governor should be a South Australian instead of an overseas personality. Mr. Laucke has had the benefit of a

much better education than I, but his statement in this debate was similar to mine during the opening days of this session. He commended the Lieutenant-Governor in terms far better than I could use and, as I sat listening to his remarks, I thought, "Well, I'm not a lone wolf on this subject." I commend Mr. Laucke for his remarks about the way the Lieutenant-Governor (Sir Mellis Napier) carries out his duties, and I hope that other Government members will join Mr. Laucke and me in this regard and realize when Sir Robert George retires, that we have people here as competent as, if not more competent than, people from overseas to carry out the duties of Governor.

Mr. Fred Walsh—We might make Mr. Laucke Governor.

Mr. LAWN—I like to think of some others. I know of nobody better able to do the job than Sir Mellis Napier, and I can think of two others without going much further: Sir Robert Nicholls and the Hon. R. S. Richards.

Mr. Jennings—How about the count?

Mr. LAWN—I don't think I would suggest Mr. Hambour. When Mr. Laucke was reading his speech to the House I could tell that he was rather sorrowful.

Mr. Jennings—It was almost an adios!

Mr. LAWN—Possibly. I wondered what the trouble was until the honourable member said, "At present we are without the company of the Premier." Those words explained why Mr. Laucke's speech seemed so sad: he lamented the absence of his master. Like myself, Mr. Laucke was saddened by watching the performance of the brains trust on the Government side and expressed his sorrow like this: "The master is away; the mice are playing and making a bad job of it." At present the Premier is away and I can well visualize the honourable member at the Liberal and Country Party caucus meeting expressing regret in these terms: "At present we are without the company of our beloved master."

The champion question asked this session was that asked by Mr. Dunnage a fortnight ago; it is the highlight of this session so far and indeed, the highlight of my nine sessions in this House. Mr. Dunnage's question regarding the feeding of fruit-fly infected fruit to inmates of Government institutions is one of the gems of all time in this House. I do not know what the Minister of Agriculture has done to the member for Unley, but we have heard many rumours. When Parliament met in June members on this side of

the House drew attention to the long delay in appointing a new Minister. It was announced in the *Advertiser* on May 15 that Sir Malcolm McIntosh, after many years of valuable service to the State, had tendered his resignation as a Minister. The Hon. G. G. Pearson, who was Minister of Agriculture, became Minister of Works, and the member for Alexandra (Mr. Brookman) was appointed Minister of Agriculture, and that was announced on June 26.

All members of the Liberal Party know there is a great chance of the Government being defeated at the next State elections. I admit that the Premier is a shrewd man, and he realizes that one of the Government's most vulnerable seats is Unley. Because he wished to build up Mr. Dunnage's prestige so that he would be able to retain Unley the Premier desired to appoint him to the Ministry, but it has been rumoured that the Liberal Club, which has its headquarters on North Terrace, desired the appointment of Mr. Brookman to the vacancy. Three or four years ago I heard a rumour that a pressure group at the Liberal Club headquarters wanted Mr. Brookman as the next Leader in this State, and I mentioned that in the House. The Liberal Club had its way, for Mr. Brookman is now in the Ministry. However, I do not think that is why the member for Unley asked his question about making jam from fly-infested fruit, but he can give an explanation if he speaks in this debate. I hope he will speak, but the circumstances will not be the same as on previous occasions. He does not speak often because when the House goes into Committee he is in the Chair.

Unfortunately, the master of the Government Party is overseas, so the member for Unley will not be able to put on his usual performance. We on this side of the House always look forward to hearing the member for Unley on the Address in Reply. His seat is directly behind the Premier, and he always tells us what a champion chap the master is and how much he is doing for South Australia. At the same time he pats the Premier on the shoulder, and as we watch the Premier's face we can see he laps it up like chocolate. As the Premier is still away the honourable member cannot put on his usual performance this time.

Mr. Dunnage—The Premier will be back next week.

Mr. LAWN—I do not know whether he will be back in time for the honourable member to

participate in this debate with the Premier in front of him.

Mr. Dunnage—I hope so.

Mr. LAWN—I hope so, too, because I shall then see the honourable member again patting the Premier on the shoulder. The honourable member asked the Minister of Agriculture whether there was some alternative means of disposing of fly-infested fruit. He suggested that this fruit, which must have been green or householders would have picked it, should be made into jam instead of being dumped in the ocean. What a man! He thought that perhaps the criminals at Yatala could make it into jam for the inmates of the Royal Adelaide Hospital and our mental institutions. When the member for Unley asked his question I nearly split my sides laughing, and I had to get out of the House as quickly as I could. I have had a lot of laughs lately. Outside this House people have asked me what I have been laughing at and I would say that something had struck me as funny, or that it was the jammy question that had been asked by Mr. Dunnage. I began to wonder whether I had dreamt about it, but when I looked up *Hansard* sure enough there it was. I eagerly awaited the Minister's reply. He must have thought it rather jammy because he referred to only the first part of the question about dumping the infected fruit into the sea, because he did not touch the jam. When the Minister did not refer to it I thought I would visualize the position myself.

If the Minister had taken the question seriously and gone to the doctor in charge of the Royal Adelaide Hospital he might have said, "One of our bright boys has suggested bringing fruit fly infected fruit for the patients in your hospital." The doctor's reply might have been something like this: "Mr. Minister, we attempt to cure, not to kill our patients." Then the Minister might have gone to Dr. Birch, who has rendered yeoman service to the State in looking after unfortunate people in our mental institutions, and put a similar question to him. He might have said, "Doctor, one of our supporters in the House has suggested that instead of dumping the fruit fly infected fruit into the sea we make it into jam to feed your patients." I can visualize Dr. Birch looking surprised and saying, "That is a cure we have not thought of up till now." Then the doctor, with his medical knowledge, would surely realize that he was being taken for a ride and say, "Surely Mr. Minister you are only joking."

What a man to put forward such a jammy question! This is all going on in the absence of the master. Someone will have the unenviable job of reporting to the master just how some members have been behaving in his absence. One other member of the Government side has not yet spoken in this debate—

Mr. Dunstan—Do you mean the member for Mitcham?

Mr. LAWN—Mr. Millhouse is another member of the brains trust, and although he will never shake the rafters of this building he can always be relied upon to favour members with his toothpaste smile. Every time we look across the Chamber we see the smile. In the front benches among the Cabinet Ministers—

Mr. Riches—What about the member for Torrens?

Mr. LAWN—Mr. Coumbe thought he would be a little different from the other members who were congratulating the Government and trying to say something about decentralization. He thought the report to the master about him should be different so he said he would get into the Opposition and mentioned a unity ticket. Mr. Dunstan asked "What is a unity ticket?" and Mr. Coumbe replied about the card vote that someone represented 20,000 people. When the master hears about that he will be surprised. Surely members should know something about the subjects they mention. Mr. Coumbe does not know anything about unity tickets. The rules of our Party do not permit its members to run a ticket with members of the Communist Party.

Mr. Coumbe—Why do they do it?

Mr. LAWN—They do not. Some members make all sorts of statements. Mr. Geoffrey Clarke invited us, as he has done for many years, to tell him what unification means. When Mr. Dunstan told him he could not understand it.

Mr. Dunstan—We have told him many times and it is in *Hansard*.

Mr. LAWN—Mr. Dunstan told him it meant sovereign powers in one Commonwealth Government, with the State Parliament looking after delegated matters. Mr. Clarke interpreted that to mean the abolition of State Parliaments. I leave it to intelligent people. It is untrue, but it does not stop Liberal members from saying it. Apparently they believe in the saying that constant dripping of water wears away the hardest stone. Mr. Coumbe spoke about the unity ticket with the Com-

munist but he did not cite any case. Our rules are against it and we do not do it. The Liberal Party does not believe in democracy; otherwise we would not have the present electoral system. Anyone with a sense of decency and fairness would not make statements without attempting to prove them. Mr. Coumbe said that one delegate at our conference had 20,000 votes but not one delegate or organization has that number. In this Parliament I represent 21,500 people.

Mr. Hambour—Not too well.

Mr. LAWN—They are the best judges. Mr. Coumbe also represents 21,500 people. Just prior to the 1956 State elections a commission divided up metropolitan seats so that as near as possible each would have 21,500 electors. In the country each member, represents 6,500 people, plus a lot of sheep, goats and galahs. Mr. Coumbe told his 21,500 electors that they were worth no more votes here than the 6,500 electors in a country district. I do not want to claim more voting strength than any other member, but my Party says each member should represent as near as possible a similar number of electors, and have a system like that in the Commonwealth sphere. In the last redistribution of Commonwealth seats the commission was instructed to divide the districts so that there would be as near as possible 42,000 electors in each, with a tolerance each way. Our State Government does not like that. When our first State Parliament was elected it was on the basis of six districts, each having as near as possible the same number of electors. Each of the 36 members then represented a similar number of electors. We have not got that today.

At the 1956 elections the Australian Labor Party polled 129,853 votes, the Liberal-Country League 100,569, Independents 20,118, the Anti-Communist Party 20,384, and the Communists 3,185, a total of 274,109. Labor polled 47.4 per cent of the total, the Liberal-Country League 36.7, Independents 7.3, Anti-Communists 7.4 and the Communists 1.2. The seats won by the Parties were 11 by the Liberal Country League, nine by the Australian Labor Party and three by Independents. It required 14,428 votes to elect one Labor member, 9,143 to elect a Government member and 6,706 to elect an Independent. The figures I have quoted are actual votes recorded and not the number of electors in a district. Since the two by-elections I have brought the figures up to date. The Labor Party members represent 207,158 electors, Government

members 203,087 and Independents 17,791. In other words it took 12,185 electors to elect one Labor Party member, 10,154 to elect a Liberal, and 8,895 to elect an Independent. There is nothing wrong with the card vote and why should not the 21,500 people I represent have equal representation as compared with a member elected by only 6,500 people? Card voting applies at shareholders' meetings because a shareholder votes according to the number of shares he holds. It is all right for them but it is not right for the public to ask for it. It is wrong to direct a company or vested interests but it is all right to direct the worker and to stipulate how his voting shall be applied. Before I touched on this subject I intended to comment on the Cabinet. In the absence of the Premier four Ministers have sat opposite us, including the Minister of Agriculture, a highbrow.

Mr. Stott—Do you say that because he is bald?

Mr. LAWN—If an experienced photographer were asked to snap the group he would probably re-arrange them and have the Minister of Agriculture occupying the seat normally occupied by the Minister of Education because his glow would probably blind the other Ministers. Among the Assembly five members of the Cabinet there is one who has a good pair of lungs and plenty of wind to blow a trumpet. As a result he has been made the Leader and sits at the northern end of the front row nearest the Speaker and members opposite call him "The Master."

Mr. Stott—Are you referring to the "purple people eater"?

Mr. LAWN—His supporters call him "Master," and will be grateful for the smallest thing he brings back with him to South Australia. Yesterday Mr. Coumbe spoke about card voting, unity tickets and the expulsion of Mr. Chambers. At least we do not have accusations of stabbing in the back from our own members. A few years ago a Government member stated in the press that he was being stabbed in the back by colleagues. When Mr. Coumbe referred to Mr. Chambers I interjected and said, "Tell me what Dr. Forbes did at Mount Gambier," but he replied, "We know about that." I went to Mount Gambier and participated in the by-election campaign. Government members were directed to go and help their candidate. As members know, the late Mr. John Fletcher announced some time ago his coming retirement and said he would not contest the 1959 election. At that time the Labor Party had already selected its candidate.

Following on the announced resignation of Mr. Fletcher, the Liberal Party called for applications from its members to contest the 1959 elections. One nomination was received, namely, Mr. Angus Cocks. If the Liberal Party had anything against him it should not have endorsed him, but it did. Upon reconsideration, Mr. Fletcher announced his intention to contest the election next year, and the Liberal Party then went to Mr. Cocks and asked him to withdraw.

Mr. Hambour—Who did that?

Mr. LAWN—The Liberal Party; I do not know who the person was, but we all know that Mr. Cocks was asked to withdraw. The honourable member should ask Mr. Cocks.

Mr. Hambour—You ask him.

Mr. LAWN—The honourable member wants me to say that Mr. Cocks is the man who told me. Can he refute my statement? After the unfortunate death of Mr. Fletcher a writ, naming the date on which nominations would close, was issued. Before that date Dr. Forbes was staying with Mr. Cocks at Mount Gambier and was interviewing prominent members of the Liberal Party asking them if they would put in a nomination for an Independent Liberal, and promising Liberal Party support. Government members know that because they are closer to the people concerned than I am.

Mr. Hambour—I do not know that.

Mr. LAWN—The honourable member does know it. A pamphlet containing a great deal of propaganda was placed before the people of Mount Gambier to get them to vote for the Government. It was headed, "Playford Government's Recent Achievements," and members opposite get up time and time again and speak in a similar strain. It set out what the Government had done in respect of education, hospitals, water supply and sewerage—the last is a laugh! No matter what Party occupies the Treasury benches, whether Liberal or Labor, I will demand adequate educational facilities for the people I represent, and I cannot see how any Government can claim the provision of those facilities as an achievement. A water supply should be made available to all people irrespective of where they live; it is not an achievement on the part of any Government to give it. This Government had the audacity to tell the people of Mount Gambier that it was an achievement to build the hospital now being erected there. Had Mr. Fletcher lived he would have claimed the credit for this hospital, because for many years he has been urging the Government to build it, yet the Government

claims it is an achievement. Another achievement it claims is the broad gauge railway to the South-East, but the Leader of the Opposition exploded that claim recently when he said that seven-tenths of the money was made available by the Commonwealth.

Mr. O'Halloran—All of it was, and the Commonwealth bore seven-tenths of the cost.

Mr. LAWN—I was going to put it in a different way. The Commonwealth made all the money available, and the State has 50 years to repay three-tenths of the cost, yet the pamphlet to which I referred said that £5,750,000 has been spent by this Government on the South-East railway system in the last five years. The member for Mount Gambier (Mr. Ralston) dealt with housing yesterday, and gave figures of contracts that had been let and cancelled in Mount Gambier. I understand that one of the reasons for cancelling contracts is that the Housing Trust cannot build homes at Mount Gambier, Whyalla and Halletts Cove too, but whatever the reason, they were cancelled, yet the Government claims housing as an achievement and promises a great housing effort for Mount Gambier.

I have heard the Government criticized by members on both sides in relation to highways. Yesterday the member for Torrens (Mr. Cömbe) was complaining about them, although he said he was not complaining, but urging: I do not know what the difference is. He does not want anyone to go to the master when he returns and say "The member for Torrens criticized you in your absence." Whether it is criticizing or urging, members on both sides of the House have been asking the Government to improve highways, yet in the pamphlet the Government claimed as an achievement that it had provided highways in the South-East. The people there are still waiting for a sewerage system. Mr. Ralston mentioned facts and dates in respect of this matter, yet all the Government is doing is making £20,000 available for a survey. The Government also claims as an achievement the establishment of forests and the milling industry and the provision of electricity to the South-East. I was a boy when the Gunn Government was elected in 1924, but I worked for my Party at the elections, and know that that Government established the forests that are claimed to be an achievement on the part of the Liberal Party. As a result of afforestation carried out from 1924 to 1927, hundreds of workers in the South-East are engaged in planting, felling, carting and milling timber,

with the result that more houses and light and power are needed. That is a result of the actions of the Gunn Government in 1924-27. Many people in the South-East have spoken to me. They were not going to be bamboozled by this leaflet issued by the Government.

If members have seen this leaflet they will know that it is produced in beautiful colours, depicting a swimming pool, a hospital and Reidy Park School, to make it attractive to the people. The swimming pool is claimed as a Liberal and Country League Government achievement. This is the story as told me by the residents of Mount Gambier. They said that the land was made available by the council, there was a council election on the Saturday before the Parliamentary election and, of all the councillors who stood for election, only one was unopposed—Mr. Ralston. As a councillor he played a great part in the establishment of this pool. The Hammer sisters, too, played an important part in the organization of this pool, as did many residents of Mount Gambier. Comparing the efforts of the people of Mount Gambier for their swimming pool with those of the Government, members can judge for themselves the effects of the pamphlet upon the electors of Mount Gambier.

A committee of Mount Gambier citizens undertook to construct the swimming pool at a cost not exceeding £25,000. Public subscriptions, free donations of materials and voluntary labour by the local people were calculated at £15,000, so ultimately it was expected that the pool would cost about £40,000. There are similar pools in Victoria valued at £40,000, which is what the people of Mount Gambier claim theirs to be worth, having regard to the money spent and the value of the voluntary effort and materials made available. The local council granted a loan of several thousand pounds toward the project, which has to be repaid by the people of Mount Gambier. Lastly, the Government's donation was £3,000, and yet it claims credit for the swimming pool.

Mr. Jennings—I am not sorry; it was worth a lot of votes to us.

Mr. LAWN—It certainly did not lose us anything. I now draw attention to two statements made by the Premier during the campaign in case they should be forgotten. He attended two meetings at Mount Gambier. While I was there he said the following at a meeting at the showgrounds:—

There can be no half-way measures in this by-election. If you want a Labor Government, vote for it. If you want a Liberal

Government, vote for it. It is your choice, your right.

Mr. John Clark—They took his advice.

Mr. LAWN—That is a statement of fact. They voted for Labor and told him what he could do with his Government. In no uncertain terms, they told him they did not want a Liberal Government. It was not for want of speakers that the Party opposite failed. The Minister of Works was also there, and I do not know how many others. There was no lack of canvassing.

Mr. O'Halloran—The Premier said that the Liberal candidate was one of the best he had ever seen.

Mr. LAWN—I was there and did not hear anything against Mr. Cocks, but I heard much comment about the Premier. The Premier said, "If you want a Liberal Government give us a majority, because we cannot work without one. We have carried on in the past because we have had a majority." The people of Mount Gambier were not concerned with a majority; they wanted the Government out and the sooner the better. The Premier spoke about the Whyalla works and Elizabeth. Before I left, many people, including representatives of the Chamber of Commerce and the Chamber of Manufactures spoke to me. I do not know whether they are members of the Liberal Party. Those interested in decentralization said, "The Premier came down here and talked about north of Adelaide, but said nothing about Mount Gambier."

The Premier also said, "This Government has not sacked a servant in 20 years." The Trades and Labor Council sent two or three deputations to the Premier to save his sacking employees. One related to employees at the Glanville pipe works. Since then there have been two deputations from the Trades and Labor Council to the Government to save the sacking of employees of the Engineering and Water Supply Department. About six weeks ago a gang was working on the earthworks at the back of Parliament House and they, with their foreman, were all sacked. That happened a few weeks before the Premier made his statement at Mount Gambier that the Government had not sacked one servant in 20 years. That was in the press. We were able to say, "People have been put off by the Government." On Tuesday last I asked a question in this House whether in the last two years any Government employees had been put off and, if so, what were the numbers and what were the future

prospects? The answer was, "The State has more employees today than ever before." That did not answer the question. It proved that the Government had retrenched labor in the last two years, and indeed over the last 20 years, but is not prepared to give figures. Rather than say whether or not it had retrenched labor, it says, "We have more employees overall." I do not dispute that, Mr. Speaker, but it was not an answer to the question.

The member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes) referred to capital punishment. I say at once that I am opposed to it. Three or four years ago I dealt with this subject much more fully than I intend to do today, and on that occasion I gave particulars of cases where people had been condemned to death and subsequently their innocence was proved. I now wish to refer to two more instances which occurred this year. In the *Advertiser* of July 7 there appears a story concerning James Foster in America, who was saved from death at the electric chair because of the confession of a Mr. Rothschild, an ex-policeman, who admitted having murdered the man of whose killing Foster had been convicted. Foster was to have been executed on June 25, but was reprieved pending a review of his case and two days prior to the date of the execution the ex-policeman came forward and confessed to the crime. A miscarriage of justice almost took place. The ex-policeman could have confessed to it at a later stage and it would have been too late.

I am also opposed to capital punishment on the grounds that we as a State have no right to kill. "Thou shalt not kill" means what it says, whether it be applied to an individual or to the State. Another case is reported in the *Advertiser* of March 27 under the heading "United Kingdom Baby Slaying Case Reopened." A man was sentenced to death in November, 1956 for the murder of his own child, but in March of this year the mother confessed that she had done it. I mention these matters because we have had two triple murderers charged in our courts since last session. One case is known as the Sundown Case, and the other concerned the killing of three people at Southwark. The Government reprieved the Greek concerned in the Southwark murders, but did not reprieve the person concerned in the Sundown murder case; it claims that it believes in capital punishment, so there is no reason why it should not have allowed both sentences to take their normal course.

Mr. Shannon—There were totally different circumstances in those two cases.

Mr. LAWN—I know the circumstances of the man who was reprieved. He went into a shop in the city of Adelaide with every intention of carrying out the deed. Whatever happened at Sundown, the murderer did not even know a few hours before the shooting took place that the people concerned were going to be there. I make no special plea for that murderer, but I point out that the person in Adelaide purchased a gun with the deliberate intention of going out to shoot three people; he hired a taxi, had a couple of practice shots, and went and shot three people, and I fail to see that there are any extenuating circumstances there. The Government reprieved that person, and therefore it is a party to the murder of the three people at Southwark.

The SPEAKER—Order! The honourable member is going a little too far.

Mr. LAWN—I do not think so, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER—I ask the honourable member to withdraw his last remark.

Mr. LAWN—I withdraw, Mr. Speaker. I do not accuse the Government of being a direct party to the murder, but it is a party to it because of the very legislation on the Statute Book.

The SPEAKER—I ask the honourable member again to withdraw.

Mr. LAWN—Very well, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw. Some time ago we had an amending Bill before us dealing with the registration of firearms, and I drew attention to the fact that if people have certain weapons they must have a licence but with other types of weapons it is not necessary. The Minister informed us that certain weapons did not need a licence because they were not concealable, and that the Government was of the opinion that a licence or a permit was only required for a weapon which could be concealed. I remind members that everyone could see this Southwark murderer go into a shop and buy a rifle. This Government, by permitting people to walk into shops and purchase rifles and guns, is not taking all the necessary precautions which a responsible Government should take to stop murders. People come here from Victoria and purchase rifles and guns.

Mr. King—They can buy one over there.

Mr. LAWN—I do not think they can. I am told that they come here and purchase them because they cannot purchase these weapons in Victoria without registering them. I ask the Government to tighten up our firearms legislation. I know it says that people may want to go shooting pigeons or ducks, as a Minister did two years ago when the Marriage

Bill was before the Legislative Council. On that occasion only one Minister out of three was in the House to vote, and one of them had gone to the South-East because it was the opening of the duck-shooting season. People who wish to use rifles and guns for these purposes can purchase them without any restriction whatsoever, and that also applies to the person who wishes to purchase a rifle or a gun to commit murder. Even if the Government is not actually responsible for the murders that took place, in the interests of the people it must amend the legislation to make it compulsory for all firearms to be registered. Not so long ago a person alighted from a train at the Adelaide railway station with a rifle that went off and shot a woman. I do not know whether that woman was killed or not, but I remember reading in the newspapers that she was in a critical condition.

Mr. Corcoran—She died.

Mr. LAWN—On another occasion a person got out of a car at Fullarton with a shotgun and shot one or two people. One can see how easily these things can happen because of the Government's attitude. It can attempt to induce a big chemical company in America to invest money here, but it does not trouble to take any action in a vital matter such as this.

Mr. King—Does your argument apply also to rat poison and knives?

Mr. LAWN—I do not know whether the honourable member is being facetious. I now wish to refer to the recent increase in the cost of living, which was highest in South Australia and Queensland, namely, 6s. a week. Wages are pegged in South Australia: they cannot automatically follow rises in the C series index. I consider, however, that it is only fair to freeze prices if wages are frozen. Government supporters would agree that it would be wrong to freeze prices and let wages go unchecked, and if they are honest to all sections, they should see to it that prices are frozen as at the date of freezing of wages.

Mr. Quirke—If you unpegged wages would you drop all price control?

Mr. LAWN—No; the Prices Commissioner would adjust prices upwards or downwards, and three months later wages would follow the Statistician's figure. Under price control there would be no need to freeze wages because, if prices increased, wages would automatically follow. If, on the other hand, price control reduced the cost of living, wages would fall automatically three months later. That system

operated here for years and should still be in vogue.

Recently, at the instigation of the member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan), the press reported that in two adjoining houses in an eastern suburb one tenant paid £6 10s. a week rent and the other £1 9s. 6d. That discrepancy is a direct result of this Government's legislation. Because the tenant of one house either left of his own freewill or was evicted, the owner was then free to let the house on lease. That has happened not only at Norwood, but also in my district. About the time this report appeared in the press I saw eight or 10 attached houses in Thomas Street, Adelaide. Some tenants were paying a low rental that had been fixed by the trust, but others were paying several guineas a week because the original tenant had left and the house was now let under a lease. Those tenants paying rent under a lease are free to stay there, whereas those paying the rent fixed by the trust have been asked to leave, the reason being that the owner wants to renovate the house. We all know what will happen when the tenant goes: the owner may or may not renovate the house, but the next tenant will pay four or five guineas a week under a lease. This is going on in several places in my district, including the Thebarton subdivision. People are paying rents as high as £8 8s. a week, and other metropolitan members have mentioned rents of £10 10s. a week under the same conditions.

I have previously referred to the desirability of including rural workers under the provisions of the Industrial Code. Whenever I have quoted statements made by workers in the country on this matter they have been denied by Government members, who say that they pay rural workers higher than award wages. I draw the attention of members, however, to a case that came to my notice last month. A worker was employed as a labourer at Chain of Ponds and provided by his employer with a house. The worker was married and had a two-year-old child. On June 5 he became sick and two days later was admitted to the Royal Adelaide Hospital. He was discharged from his job on June 20 and told there would be no home for him to return to. On leaving hospital, he had to go to a relative's place in Adelaide and later came to me about a Housing Trust home. What chance had he got of getting such a home? He did not apply for one until the end of June. He did not need one previously because he had been using his employer's house until he took sick.

Mr. Coreoran—It's hard to believe.

Mr. LAWN—Yes. Many employers would not do this to a worker, but others would; therefore, it is the responsibility of this Parliament to see that these things cannot happen. These people should be covered by the Industrial Code and have their conditions of employment set out in an award. Then in case of sickness they would be provided for. Employers might even agree to the provisions of an award to be ratified by the court, but even if conditions were not agreed to by employers, the Arbitration Court would be able to adjudicate in such cases. I am certain that the court would make certain provisions in the awards to take care of such cases as I have mentioned. It is the responsibility of the Government, but the Government cannot handle every individual case. It can, however, ensure that the large section of rural workers in this State are covered by an award.

When members on this side introduced a Bill on long service leave the Premier said it was an innovation by meddlesome politicians and a matter for the Arbitration Court. Similarly, we have been told that many other matters should be left to the court, but when we ask that a section of workers should be brought within the jurisdiction of the court, we are told, "Leave them out. Many of our members and their friends employ them." Parliament is not justified in leaving out country workers from the provisions of the Industrial Code. The man to whom I referred was admitted to the Royal Adelaide Hospital two days after he became seriously ill; then he, his wife and child were thrown out of their house whilst he was in Adelaide.

Mr. Frank Walsh—There have been similar cases.

Mr. LAWN—Yes. On a previous occasion I spoke about a single person living in the City of Adelaide. The owner of a South-Eastern property brought him to a spot near the Old Gum Tree on Glen Osmond Road, dumped him there, and told him to get into the city the best way he could. He was being paid only 10s. a week of seven days, although I do not know the number of hours he worked each day. This man is a pensioner, and is ill, but he took that job to augment his pension, and that is what happened to him.

Mr. O'Halloran—The member for Gawler had a similar case recently.

Mr. LAWN—The Government should amend the Industrial Code and allow the court to fix wages and conditions for rural workers. Is

that unfair? Am I asking too much? I hope the Government will consider my request and bring down legislation to make the necessary amendment to the Industrial Code. I thank members for the patient hearing they have given me, and I shall be pleased to sit back now and see whether the three remaining members of the "brains trust" can improve on the

speeches of their colleagues who have preceded them in this debate.

Mr. STOTT secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.12 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, August 7, at 2 p.m.