

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, August 2, 1961.

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

PETITION: PENSIONERS' RATES.

Mr. FRANK WALSH presented a petition signed by 2,019 age and invalid pensioners and respectfully praying that the Local Government Act be amended to allow for lower differential rating on houses owned and occupied by pensioners.

Received and read.

QUESTIONS.**INSURANCE LIABILITY.**

Mr. FRANK WALSH: My question arises from a question recently asked by the honourable member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) about a certain insurance company. I have received information that many people are involved. This is the second time I have had such representations made to me. It is compulsory to take out a third party insurance policy with a company before a vehicle can be registered, but is there any guarantee that the company concerned will meet its responsibilities in respect of that policy? Has the Premier or the Premiers' Conference considered requesting other insurance companies to assist in satisfying all claims on the Standard Insurance Company affecting third party policies taken out with that company?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Regarding compulsory third party insurance, no vehicle is registered until a satisfactory policy is produced to the Registrar of Motor Vehicles. Companies, approved by the Treasury, have to comply under the Act with certain conditions regarding policies and the acceptance of liability. The company in question is registered in another country and has gone into liquidation. The Government has no control over that, and I point out that there is no greater justification for accepting financial responsibility for this company than for any other company that may become insolvent, thus causing loss to the people who trusted in it. The Government does its utmost to ensure that several companies are available to handle this form of insurance and it is up to the individual to select the company he believes can satisfactorily serve him.

ADVERTISING OF FILMS.

Mrs. STEELE: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked on June 29 about various undesirable aspects in the advertising of films?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Since this question was asked, the Chief Secretary has queried the advertising of certain programmes and has received good co-operation from the industry. More than that, a watching committee has been appointed to examine motion picture advertising. It comprises Messrs. C. Waterman, A. Barr, C. Arnold and I. Cook. Obviously advertisements frequently create an illusion and people go to see a film hoping to see more than they do. This committee is trying to straighten out the position and if the honourable member has any specific complaints I shall be pleased to pass them on to the committee or to the Chief Secretary, who will see that the appropriate conditions are complied with.

PUBLIC LIBRARY.

Mr. HUTCHENS: Can the Premier indicate what progress has been made with the planning of additional accommodation for the Public Library?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Government authorized the Libraries Board to have plans and specifications drawn up for additional accommodation, but when the plans became available to the Government the estimate was found to be greatly in excess of the amount set down for that purpose. Speaking from memory—and these figures are approximate only—the Government said it was prepared to consider a building costing £750,000, but the building suggested after plans had been drawn up was to cost nearly £2,000,000. It would obviously have made a tremendous demand on necessary and urgent accommodation in other directions; therefore, we could not contemplate the project at the time. The plans are now being reviewed in an effort to get something within the present financial means of the State.

Mr. HUTCHENS: Last year I drew attention to a statement that 40 per cent of the Public Library staff had been lost because they were unable to obtain salaries commensurate with those paid in other States. In his reply then the Premier indicated that most of those people who had left the Public Library had been absorbed in country libraries or like establishments. I was disturbed to read in the *Advertiser* of April 10 a remark

alleged to have been made by the chairman of the Libraries Board (Mr. McFarling) that 25 highly trained officers of the Public Library had been lost to other States because they had been offered higher wages, and that several junior officers had also left South Australia. Some of these library personnel had gone into Commonwealth departments. According to Mr. McFarling, these losses of personnel amounted to 25 per cent of their highly trained and partly trained staff. Can the Premier say whether the Government has considered raising the salaries of these highly trained people to a level that will encourage them to remain in South Australia and so that they will not be enticed away to other States by higher salaries?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This problem is not confined to the Libraries Department. From time to time there is a shortage of specialists of one particular group or another, and other departments find that outside organizations frequently offer, for a trained person, a salary grossly in excess of the scale paid by any Public Service in Australia. Those organizations want these people; they do not need classifications; nor are their salaries fixed in relation to other salaries in other services. They will, therefore, pay salaries much higher than can be paid in any Government department. There has been in South Australia, and in Australia as a whole, a fairly big expansion—I believe a good expansion—of library services, and for the time being at least there is an Australian shortage of trained librarians. On the other hand, those things are apt to cure themselves. I am informed that many people are now coming into training in this field; so although we are embarrassed at present I believe that the current training will help solve the problem in due course. In any event, the Government does not fix salaries: they are fixed by a tribunal, which is appointed under Act of Parliament and which makes recommendations that operate upon gazettal. The Government has never taken any active participation in these matters because it believes that if a tribunal is appointed, that tribunal should take into account all the relevant factors and make a determination.

SOFT DRINK CHARGES.

Mr. FRED WALSH: Has the Premier obtained a report in reply to a question I asked yesterday regarding the penny a bottle increase in the price of soft drinks?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: A letter, sent on August 1 by the Prices Commissioner to the president of the South Australian Mixed Business Association and setting out the position as the Prices Department sees it, states:

Reference is made to recent press statements attributed to you as President of the S.A. Mixed Business Association, announcing that as from Monday, 31st July, 1961, an extra 1d. per bottle and 1d. per glass would be charged for all refrigerated soft drinks sold in shops. It is advised that strong exception is taken by the Department to these announcements which constitute a breach of the assurance given by your Association prior to decontrol of soft drinks that no action would be taken to increase prices for any reason without first consulting the Prices Commissioner. It is also mentioned that despite the fact that the Vice-President and Secretary of your Association conferred with Mr. A. J. Hupeden, the Senior Supervisor of this Department, in the matter of milk bottle deposits less than a fortnight ago, no reference whatsoever was made by them at that time to any action proposed on refrigerated soft drinks.

At a time when the Department is most hopeful that a satisfactory conclusion may be reached in favour of your members regarding deposits on milk bottles, the increased charge for refrigerated drinks is most unreciprocative to this Department and obviously the public—from the number of complaints already received. It is understood that many shopkeepers themselves are not in favour of the move which, in the main, will affect purchases made by children. In view of the above, would you be so good as to reconsider the position and withhold any increase. The Department considers that at this juncture the retail prices being charged prior to the announcement made by your Association are the maximum warranted for any soft drinks sold in shops.

ABATTOIRS SLAUGHTERING.

Mr. McKEE: Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether the general public has the privilege of having stock slaughtered at the Metropolitan Abattoirs and, if so, what fee is charged?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will get the information for the honourable member.

PETERBOROUGH-QUORN RAILWAY.

Mr. CASEY: It is believed in my district and in adjacent towns that a proposal is afoot to have the railway line from Peterborough to Quorn closed soon. Will the Minister of Works obtain from the Minister of Railways a report on whether such a belief has foundation?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes.

MOUNT GAMBIER BY-LAW.

Mr. RALSTON: My question is directed to the chairman of the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation. This morning the Mayor of Mount Gambier (Mr. Elliott) rang me regarding a statement that appeared in the *Border Watch* yesterday afternoon under the heading of "By-law Not Disallowed." The report states:

Mr. A. C. Hookings, M.L.C., announced this afternoon that the corporation parking meter by-law for Mount Gambier would not be disallowed by the Parliamentary Committee on Subordinate Legislation. Mr. Hookings said the information had come from the chairman of the committee, Mr. R. Millhouse, M.P. The Mayor said he was extremely concerned that the statement was released to the press of the committee's decision without being either announced in Parliament or the council receiving prior advice or the by-law remaining before the House for the prescribed time which was, of course, August 22.

Will the chairman of the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation say whether the committee has reached a decision regarding this by-law and, if so, whether the decision was released to the press with his full knowledge and approval?

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Chairman, Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation): The short answer is that a decision has been reached. As to the second part of the question, perhaps I should explain the position. I regret it if the honourable member, as member for the district, has been caused inconvenience.

Mr. Ralston: Not me.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I also regret it if the Mount Gambier Corporation feels that any discourtesy has been shown to it, because certainly no discourtesy was intended by the committee, and I should be glad if the honourable member would pass that on to members of the council. It is not the usual practice of the Subordinate Legislation Committee to convey its decision, either one way or the other, to any of the parties that have made representations to it. On the other hand, once a decision either way has been made there is, so far as I am concerned, no reason for it to remain confidential. Probably it is not desirable that it should remain confidential because, if the decision, as in this case, is not to recommend to Parliament (and we have power only to recommend to both Houses) the disallowance of a by-law and if that decision is kept confidential until the deadline, any other person will be precluded from moving to disallow the by-law. I remind

you, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Onkaparinga took advantage last year of the knowledge that the Subordinate Legislation Committee was going to do nothing and moved to disallow two by-laws that affected his district. So it would probably not be desirable that the information should be confidential. What is treated in confidence is the evidence given before the committee, either in support of or against any by-law or regulation. That is the property of the committee until tabled in the House, and it is tabled only if a motion for disallowance is being debated. However, in view of the point raised and the apparent misunderstanding at Mount Gambier, I shall refer to members of the committee what has been the practice of the committee ever since I have been a member so that the committee can decide future policy in this matter.

PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAMME.

Mr. LAUCKE: In an effort to take up the temporary slack in the employment position, can the Premier say whether consideration should be given, in conjunction with the Commonwealth Government, to embarking on a further public works programme of a stop-gap nature? I have in mind a programme which would be distinctly supplementary to the normal one and which would to the utmost possible extent use only locally produced materials. I have in my mind such works as bridges, which would require almost exclusively locally produced cement, stone, metal, steel and timber, or roads built of metal and cement. Such works would not be a drain on overseas funds. My main point is that, if we could keep outlay in the family of this country by strict adherence to a scheme using locally produced materials only, employment would be generated and permanent public utilities provided without hurt or harm to our overseas position. Will the Premier state his views on this matter?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I welcome the opportunity of stating my views on this matter. The policy which the honourable member has outlined is a policy which my Government is prepared to support to the utmost. Last week I asked the Premier of New South Wales whether he would call a conference of State Premiers and ask the Commonwealth to meet us to deal with this matter.

Mr. Frank Walsh: And a week earlier than that you said you would not waste a fivepenny stamp.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Opposition apparently does not like anything to be done to relieve the position.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I understand, for example, that a statement was made on Monday night by a Labor member that, when Mr. Heffron made this suggestion a few weeks ago, the State Government of South Australia did not support it; but let me state the facts. Mr. Heffron did not make this suggestion to me three weeks ago: he made a suggestion publicly. I do not know whether or not he conveyed that suggestion to other States, but the facts are that two other States immediately said it would not be convenient for them to go, and as a result of that Mr. Heffron did not make the approach to the other Australian Premiers. I want to correct the impression that the Opposition appears to have created in this matter. Last week I made approaches to Mr. Heffron and I have since received a telegram from him, asking me what matters I had in mind if a conference could be called. I have set out in my reply to him, in almost the identical terms, the suggestions that have been made by the honourable member in his question today. I suggested that we would approach the Commonwealth for a supplementary allocation of funds to undertake some urgent works which I believe could be undertaken at this time with great benefit to Australia as a whole and which would be of tremendous value in dealing with what appears to me to be a hard core of 100,000 unemployed in Australia. I pointed out to Mr. Heffron—as I point out to honourable members now—that this is a time when we should not be having unemployment at all, because in a few months' time will be the school-leaving period and many young people will be leaving schools and looking for jobs. I believe that one of the great tragedies of the depression years was that those leaving school found no work available for them for six months or a year. This had a detrimental effect upon them and their outlook on society.

Mr. Frank Walsh: Why did you have to wait from February until now?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The honourable member speaks with considerable ignorance. Had he taken the trouble to read the accounts of the last Premiers' Conference and Loan Council, he would have seen that South Australia of all States fought for the unemployed. When other States were prepared to accept a much lower amount of Loan money, South Australia stood out and said, "Let us have the Chairman of the Commonwealth Bank up here to see if we cannot arrange for finance

to enable this problem to be dealt with." Let me go further. The fact that the unemployment ratio in South Australia is the lowest of any Australian State stems from direct action taken by this Government.

ELECTRICAL PARTS.

Mr. CASEY: It has been brought to my notice that spare parts for some electrical appliances are not procurable from either retailers or manufacturers. One spare part in question is a thermostat for a well-known brand of electric iron. The owners of the faulty irons were told that they could trade in their faulty iron on new ones. As these thermostats are worth only 10s. to 12s. and can be replaced by any competent handyman, will the Treasurer look into this matter and obtain a report?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I could not undertake a general survey to ascertain whether spare parts were available for every appliance that might be in use but, if the honourable member will give me the details of this iron, where it was originally purchased and who are the agents for it, I shall be prepared to see whether arrangements can be made.

FISHING BOATS.

Mr. RALSTON: In a decision given in the Mount Gambier court some time ago regarding an offence committed under the Fisheries Act, the stipendiary magistrate ruled that the boat concerned in an offence under the Fisheries Act became automatically forfeited to the Crown on the recording of a conviction. So, no matter how minor the offence, once a conviction is recorded, if a boat is concerned in the committing of the offence, it is forfeited, irrespective of the value of the boat, whether it cost £10 or £10,000. The magistrate pointed out that he had a discretionary power in the imposing of a monetary fine. He has substantial powers that way but no powers in the matter of the boat, which is automatically forfeited on conviction. In view of the decision of the magistrate, has the Government considered, and, if not, will it consider, altering the Act to give the magistrate a discretion as to whether he orders confiscation of the boat or not?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: True, the magistrate is bound by an Act of Parliament. This provision has been in our Act for some time and the Government has not considered yet whether it should be amended. I am considering whether it should be amended and whether I should raise the matter with the Government but, at present, the Government

has not discussed whether to amend the Act. I am not sure whether it is desirable to amend it or not.

ASSESSMENTS.

Mr. LAWN: I shall preface my question by reading extracts from a letter I received this morning from a constituent who complains about his water assessment and land tax. He complains that his land tax assessment was increased from £340 last year to £880 this year, making an increase of £540 in one year. He claims to be an authority on assessing and says this in his letter:

By contract, I made a new assessment for the Meningie District Council, which is one of the largest in the State. It started from near Murray Bridge including those reclaimed swamp blockers, then as far as Keith to the east, thence to near Kingston, then back to Narrung, Point McLeay and all round Lake Albert lands and farms, also much of the land and homes adjoining Lake Alexandrina, and adjoining the River Murray, taking in seven townships. I was given a first class reference for that work by the Meningie council.

Then, referring to the Government, he says:

I was appointed by the Government to represent north-west ward in the new district council of Brown's Well. I had a mallee farm at Veitch. When living in Adelaide, I joined the firm of Rings Limited.

He concludes by saying that he has been an alderman in the Thebarton Corporation for some years. He claims that he has some knowledge of assessments. He spoke to me on the telephone and I suggested he should send me a letter. He says also that, as a follow-up to his land tax assessment, the Engineering and Water Supply Department has increased its assessment. The local council has followed the E. & W.S. Department's assessment so, being a pensioner, his rates have increased so much this year that he is unable to pay any. If I send this letter to the Treasurer, will he have the matter properly investigated and inform me of the position?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: As I understand the honourable member's question, it deals with an increase in land tax assessment this year as against last year. That is not the basis upon which land tax assessments are made: they are made every five years, so that an assessment is made now as against what it was five years ago. Therefore, the basis upon which the question is asked is obviously wrong. Councils have ways in which they can make their assessments. Some do not make them on unimproved values, so a comparison may be completely erroneous. Some councils make their assessments with due regard to

improvements on the land, which is not involved in land tax assessments. Concerning water rates, the maximum amount payable is fixed by Act of Parliament at so much an acre on the assessment. If the honourable member gives me the letter I will see whether I can straighten the matter out and let him have an explanation of the various points.

PORT ADELAIDE GIRLS TECHNICAL SCHOOL.

Mr. RYAN: This morning, while making an inspection of the Port Adelaide girls technical high school as a member of its council, I was informed that in January a prefabricated building was found to be unusable because it was riddled with white ants. The school was requested to find alternative accommodation for a special commercial course. The only building available was a gymnasium on the new school site and the commercial course was transferred there. That building is not fully lined nor is it fitted with permanent lighting and power. Shortly before the school took it over, a temporary lighting system was connected for one night. A month ago a Public Buildings Department official inspected the building, particularly the temporary light fitting that had been left there, and said that because of the fire danger the department would be down the next day to correct it. In view of the existing fire hazard in schools will the Minister of Education have this matter immediately investigated to rectify the position?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The honourable member has specifically referred his question to the Minister of Education, but as this matter concerns my department my colleague desires me to reply. Firstly, I am in the dark about this and should like to get a report on the whole matter. I can understand that prompt and immediate steps had to be taken to meet the emergency that arose, but I am surprised that it was not possible to get some other accommodation rather than a building already on the site.

Mr. Ryan: There was no other.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I think that the Finsbury works could have readily supplied a replacement building, unless it was a question of not being able to accommodate it on the site. I will examine that angle. The Finsbury workshops are able to turn out sufficient buildings to meet the full requirements of the Education Department, and with some to spare. The honourable member knows that when buildings have been destroyed by fire they have been replaced promptly.

Mr. Ryan: It means spending only about £50 to fix it up.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: If it only requires that, I cannot understand why it should have been condemned.

Mr. Ryan: It was not condemned. I am referring to the changeover building.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I am well aware of what the honourable member is referring to, but I do not want to argue the matter unnecessarily. I will get a report, but I cannot understand one or two aspects. If the building is unusable because of white ant attacks, £50 will not put it in order. It would require much reconditioning. If the building were in such a poor state of repair it could have been replaced. As to the electrical wiring in the gymnasium, about which the honourable member is concerned, that will be attended to immediately. There again, I am at a loss to understand how even temporary electrical fittings would have been installed in such a manner.

Mr. Ryan: Not by your department!

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Then who did it?

Mr. Ryan: It was done for a display at night when there was no electricity in the building.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Then it would be an unauthorized connection and I cannot accept responsibility for it. Let me make that clear. If there is a danger, it is not the fault of my department, and I think it was unfair of the honourable member to infer that an installation made by my department did not comply with electrical requirements. He should have been fair and stated that in his question. However, I will have the whole matter examined to see that it is put right as quickly as possible.

UMEEWARRA MISSION.

Mr. RICHES: The Minister of Works has been investigating means of providing a new school building at the Umeewarra Mission. If the Finsbury workshops can provide buildings as the Minister has suggested, can he give an assurance that the much needed additional accommodation at Umeewarra can be provided reasonably soon?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The question of providing additional accommodation at Umeewarra is of long standing and I have answered several questions on it. It is not simply a matter of the building accommodation. This week the honourable member asked

the Minister of Education about additional classes and opportunity classes at Port Augusta. That interested me, and I listened carefully to my colleague's reply. The question of education at the mission involves two factors: the best thing to do for the aboriginal children and, when that aspect is decided, what provision should be made for accommodation at the school. The Minister of Education and I have had several discussions about what is best from the children's viewpoint, but it is a difficult question to resolve and we have not reached finality, nor has my colleague's department in its consideration of the problem. Children come and stay at the mission for a week or two, while their parents are in hospital, and then return to the distant parts. The population is by no means fixed but, like most aboriginal populations, is nomadic. The number of children at the mission is increasing. We built several cottages on the reserve and they have attracted more people, which has increased the total permanent population. These aspects are not forgotten and I should like the honourable member's goodwill and patience while we resolve what accommodation is needed.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption, which Mr. Frank Walsh had moved to amend.

(For wording of amendment see page 140.)

(Continued from August 1. Page 196.)

Mr. McKEE (Port Pirie): I join with previous speakers in wishing His Excellency the Governor, Sir Edric Bastyan, and his Lady an enjoyable stay in South Australia. I also add my deep regrets at the passing of Mr. Frank Condon. He was highly respected by all who knew him and his passing means a great loss to this Parliament. I join with other members in expressing deepest sympathy to his wife and family. I congratulate the member for Frome on his forthright speech, and I am sure the people of Frome have made a wise choice in electing Tom Casey to represent them in this House. I assure them that he can look forward to being here for many years.

A matter that concerns me is the urgent need for decentralization. When this matter was being debated last year the Premier admitted that it demanded considerable attention. We all realize that the lack of jobs in country towns is driving thousands of people to the capital city and that country boys and girls are being forced to leave their home towns and seek

employment in the metropolitan area. Despite the development taking place at Mount Gambier and in other parts of the South-East, still no provision is being made to absorb our young people, who must come to the city to seek employment. The Industries Development Special Committee has no doubt been told about this problem in practically every country town it has visited. I therefore feel sure that people in many country towns throughout this State will anxiously await the reaction of the Government to that committee's report. It is time the Government realized that it is no good leaving decentralization entirely to private enterprise, because as soon as private enterprise finds it is more profitable to operate in the city it closes its country branch.

Mr. Millhouse: Wouldn't that apply to Government undertakings as well?

Mr. McKEE: I do not think it has yet. Most Government industrial activity seems to be operating satisfactorily, but private enterprise closes down country branches when it finds it can operate more profitably in the city. That cannot be denied; we have just experienced an example at Wallaroo. We find, too, that private enterprise and foreign investment are not particularly concerned about developing the hinterland of Australia: their main concern is to develop their bank balances. If private enterprise is failing to do the job, I believe that the interests of country people demand that the Government act to set up industries that will provide industrial employment for them.

Mr. Millhouse: Whether it is a paying proposition or not?

Mr. McKEE: If necessary the industry should be subsidized. We must make some effort to keep young people in their home towns with their families. It is wishful thinking to believe that private enterprise will establish industries in the country when it finds it is more profitable to do so in the city. This is due to city competition and high transport costs for raw materials and finished products, apart from higher fuel charges. In October, 1959, our late Leader (Mr. O'Halloran) moved that a Select Committee be set up to investigate the circumstances leading up to the different charges for fuel throughout the State. The motion was supported by every member of my Party but was opposed by every Government member. The extra charge of 3d a gallon on fuel discharged from tankers at Port Pirie is costing people in the north more than £500,000 a year, which no doubt affects every

form of industry, and certainly affects decentralization. When the motion was debated in this House I said:

There are a few citizens who favour monopolies that have the freedom to exploit them and it should be the desire and determination of any Government to investigate unjustifiable prices in an attempt to protect the buying public against unfair competition.

It cannot be denied that the oil companies are profiteering at the expense of the people in the north of the State. Recently I noticed in a press statement that a branch of the Chamber of Commerce strongly criticized differential fuel charges, and that one member of that branch said there should be a flat rate for the whole of the State. He said that the oil companies made the charges and that it would be difficult to determine whether they had Government backing. Another member of the branch said the prices were controlled by the Commissioner and therefore the Government must be aware of the position. I assure these two gentlemen that the Government is not only aware of the position but wholeheartedly supports the oil companies. Besides, we realize that it is impossible today for anyone to commence industry in a small way and hope to compete with the monopoly giants. I noticed in a press statement from Canberra last November that the Liberal and Country League Federal Council had altered its platform and that the re-drafted platform included these planks: first, the protection of the community against monopolies, combines and industrial organizations where through absence of competition they were operating contrary to the interests of the public, and, secondly, the preservation of competitive free enterprise. I am afraid that they have left their run on this issue a little late. We all know that free enterprise and free competition no longer exist.

Mr. Millhouse: Don't be silly!

Mr. McKEE: We all know that free enterprise today is the enterprise of great monopolies; I think the honourable member will agree with me there.

Mr. Millhouse: I do not. That is absurd.

Mr. McKEE: The honourable member knows about the great take-overs of smaller competitors by giant monopolies.

Mr. Clark: He calls it free enterprise!

Mr. Millhouse: The honourable member is dramatizing the matter.

Mr. McKEE: These small enterprises look to others for help. I have had people call here asking for assistance. I have mentioned before that a Mr. Oborn came here and was told that

he had to engage in a particular type of trading to suit big monopolies or he would be out of business. These small people look to the Government to legislate to deal with monopolies using restrictive trade practices, but they soon find which side the Government is on. The way the Government has allowed monopolies to gobble up small businesses proves clearly that it is definitely disposed to big business and that it tailors its policy to suit that purpose. As for protecting the community against monopolies, combines and industrial organizations that operate contrary to the interests of the general public, when I read this comment I hurriedly checked up on the newspaper I was reading, for I thought I had one of those *Dorothy Dix* magazines or something like that. I am sure that if the Government ever decided to do this it would get plenty of support from the Opposition if it tackled some of the tall poppies that I maintain it should start on.

Mr. Millhouse: Why don't you make a suggestion now?

Mr. McKEE: I could. For instance, we have the Broken Hill Proprietary Company and Holden's and several others I could mention. We read of the millions of pounds of profits they are making every year. In addition, we must not forget the good old hire-purchase racket that has been going on for many years; those companies have a first-class party at the expense of the general public. The Government has made no effort to control hire-purchase interest rates. I am sure that the member for Mitcham will agree with that.

Mr. Jennings: He voted against it.

Mr. McKEE: Yes, but I thought he might have changed his mind.

Mr. Millhouse: Would you include the Broken Hill Associated Smelters amongst these monopolies?

Mr. McKEE: That company does not produce a balance sheet. However, any company which makes millions of pounds that is not being directed back into productive avenues is exploiting all the working people and the country as a whole. Even the banks have been allowed to go beyond the true field of banking. The member for Mitcham must realize that. They have been allowed to invest heavily in hire-purchase companies. Some such companies are wholly or substantially supported by banks. In fact, I know of a young man who approached his bank manager, seeking financial assistance to build a house. The bank manager told this person that he was terribly sorry

but he was unable to assist. He went on to say, "But with those securities you have I suggest you go around and see the finance company; I think they will be pleased to help you."

Mr. Clark: Are they in the same building?

Mr. McKEE: Practically. No doubt they were delighted to help him at about 7 per cent flat interest. I suggest that if the Government is keen to help these young people it should immediately take steps to control hire-purchase interest rates. I also noticed a press report from Canberra, dated March 22 this year, to the effect that the Commonwealth Treasurer (Mr. Holt) said that industrial growth in Australia must no longer be concentrated around Melbourne and Sydney. He said that more emphasis would have to be placed on the development of export industries, largely outside those capital cities.

Mr. Loveday: Didn't he mention Adelaide?

Mr. McKEE: No. He said that the Government had plans for the decentralization of industrial activity and intended discussing them with the States. I do not know whether that discussion has taken place. He also said that the feature of our development in the fifties was the phenomenal growth of manufacturing industries, disproportionately in Melbourne and Sydney to the rest of the Commonwealth. He went on to say that this was associated with the rapid increase in prices, costs and wage levels, and he said that we could not repeat that kind of process in the sixties because we could not afford increases in the cost levels on the scale of the past 10 years. In conclusion, he stated that it was not a good thing that the growth should proceed around those two capital cities on the scale of the past 10 years. I think that most of us will agree with what Mr. Holt had to say on that occasion.

Mr. Clark: Actually, it is not very often we can agree with him.

Mr. McKEE: Quite so, but I think we could agree with him on this occasion. It is important to us as a nation that we try to develop the whole of the country and not just concentrate on the capital cities around the coast line. I believe that in the national interest—as I explained to the member for Mitcham—industry should be subsidized, if necessary, to carry out the job of decentralization and of developing the country. In order to entice people to live in the country areas, their living conditions and amenities in the country should be brought up as close as possible to the standard of those in the metropolitan area. Where we have a limited

population, and it is beyond the means of local government to provide the necessary amenities required for recreational purposes. I am, therefore, of the opinion that the Government should try to improve its financial assistance to councils for this purpose.

Another important step toward decentralization is the improvement of our educational opportunities in the country areas where required. At present many country children are being denied the opportunity of furthering their education because it is beyond the means of their parents to send them on to Adelaide for that purpose. Because of the lack of educational opportunities in the country many people decide to live in the metropolitan area.

Mr. Millhouse: Some people.

Mr. McKEE: Most of them make that decision if they are unable to educate their children, because education is most necessary. I think that if a person had an opportunity to come to the city to have his children properly educated he naturally would do so.

Mr. Hughes: Even if they are educated they cannot get jobs at home.

Mr. McKEE: True. During Education Week I had the pleasure of being in the company of a man who had travelled extensively and held high positions in various countries, including America. During our conversation he spoke of the benefits available to teen-age students in America through the junior college system. I believe that such a system could be of great benefit in some of our country areas. These colleges are all two-year institutions, and they are designed to serve the community where they are located. The purpose is to develop a vocational skill or to prepare students for a further college education, and at the same time it gives the student an opportunity to find out what he really wants to do.

These junior colleges are also described as screening or distributing agencies to higher education. They sort out students who will go on to a senior institution for advanced work, those who will continue in specialized training, and those who will go directly into a vocation. I think we will all—including the member for Mitcham—agree that the education of our young people is most vital to our future as a nation. He will realize that we are today being faced with a challenge to keep pace with what is taking place in other countries. It is the responsibility of the Governments, both State and Commonwealth, to give to education the high priority which it deserves and which national progress demands.

Another problem that has been discussed by practically every speaker so far is the lack of water in South Australia. I was pleased to hear our Leader, the member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) and other speakers mention this problem. It is also pleasing to hear that intensive research into the possibilities of the desalination of sea water at a minimum cost is being carried out. Reports indicate that desalted sea water is being exploited in various centres overseas. We should take advantage of the experience being gained by scientific research on the desalination of sea water.

Further to assist the problem of decentralization there is the need for standardization and improvement generally within our railways. Some old carriages that are expected to serve the general public of this State without doubt should be in the museum. When the Bluebird service was first commenced on the Port Pirie to Adelaide run, it was hailed as a great occasion, the press gave it great prominence and people along the line and at Port Pirie were rejoicing: they were going to have a daily Bluebird service from Port Pirie to Adelaide. At least they thought so, but this is unsatisfactory. I approached the Minister concerned who told me by letter that the railways had not sufficient country passenger cars to supply all the country requirements for peak periods—Christmas time, Easter time and holiday weekends, or on important occasions when most people wished to come to Adelaide. He went on to say that it was regrettable that the people had to put up with this inconvenience for a few days of the year but he said they had at their disposal, and often used, other means of transport. One can hardly blame them for doing that if the Government is not prepared to provide decent rail transport. He went on to say also that the Railways Commissioner was unable to recommend the heavy expenditure that would be required to overcome the complaint, but I notice that £4,000,000 has been spent on the changeover to suburban diesel power rail-cars. I agree that the people in the metropolitan area should have speedy and comfortable transport to and from their work but, whilst those conditions prevail in the metropolitan area, one also cannot blame the people for wanting to live there.

What amuses me at times is that, when there is a shortage of first-class carriages, the authorities will hang a first-class label on a second-class carriage. It will be interesting to see what happens if someone demands a refund half way along the line. Whether he will be

put out or not I do not know. Something should be done about the unsatisfactory rail service between Adelaide and Port Pirie and I should appreciate it if the Premier would ascertain why the Bluebird service is not operating as was first intended.

I also feel that immediate action by the Commonwealth and State Governments on the standardization of the Port Pirie to Broken Hill line is most urgent. Surely after 14 years of consideration they should be getting somewhere near a satisfactory arrangement. The standardization of the line is necessary and important to already established industries, and will no doubt assist in the programme of decentralization.

It would now appear that the railway lines will not be removed from Ellen Street, although the Premier promised this in his policy speech before the last election. Also, the Chief Secretary, when he visited Port Pirie on February 23, 1959, for the switching on ceremony of the oval lights, said that there was new hope for rehabilitation of the wharves and the removal of the lines from the main street. The removal of the lines was also recommended.

Mr. Riches: It was in the policy speech?

Mr. McKEE: Yes. It was also recommended by the Public Works Committee, and these were the committee's recommendations:

Removal of the railway tracks from Ellen Street and the re-laying of them in some other location. The committee is of the opinion that the railway tracks should be removed from Ellen Street and relayed behind the buildings on the eastern frontage of Ellen Street. Although no direct economic gain will result from the shifting of the tracks the committee considers that in their present location they are a hazard and are out of harmony with modern town planning. The new wharf alignment recommended by the committee facilitates the re-siting of the tracks and the committee considers the cost of effecting the removal is justified.

Mr. Loveday: The railway station is in harmony with a good slum!

Mr. McKEE: Yes. The committee recommended:

The removal of the railway tracks from Ellen Street and the re-laying of them behind the buildings on the eastern side of Ellen Street at an estimated cost of £37,000, as at May 5, 1960. (H. H. Shannon, chairman). Those were the recommendations of the Public Works Committee.

It was first rumoured that the Harbors Board was having some difficulty in acquiring land from the Commonwealth Government. The

Pirie Council then wrote to the Minister concerned seeking information on the matter. I will now read a letter that the Pirie Council received from the Minister, Mr. Jude. It is as follows:

The Town Clerk, Corporation of the City of Port Pirie. Dear Sir,

With further reference to your letter of the 3rd inst, regarding removal of railway lines from Ellen Street, I have to advise that I took this matter up with the Railways Commissioner, who has informed me that the cost of removing these tracks and relaying them at the rear of the premises on the eastern side of the street is estimated at approximately £40,000 which figure pre-supposes that the necessary earthworks have been done. In addition, it allows for road surfacing only where the pulling up of the tracks would disturb the existing road surfaces. The Commissioner states that no benefit would accrue to his department if this work was carried out. On the contrary, annual charges to the extent of £2,000 would be incurred for which there would be no compensating saving. He feels, therefore, that he must decline to incur any such expense, and no provision has been made on his estimates.

First, we are told that, because of the difficulty in acquiring land from the Commonwealth, the work could not proceed. Then we are told by the Minister that the Commissioner claimed that his department would not benefit from the removal of the lines: therefore, he must decline to incur such expense. During the Budget debate, when speaking on this, I said that for many years Pirie had contributed largely to the State's finances and would continue to do so for many years to come, and that it was pleasing to know that at last Pirie's importance was being recognized. I went on to say how pleased I was with the amount allocated to Port Pirie for the wharf rehabilitation and the removal of the lines from the main street. I can only say now that I am disappointed.

Mr. Jennings: You were easily fooled.

Mr. McKEE: I was taken in by the rainbow painting. However, I am not greatly surprised at the Government's reversal of policy, as past experience has taught me to be wary of the Government's election promises. We can be sure that the Government will never promise the people a readjustment of electoral boundaries because it knows what result that would have. Last May I read with interest in the *Advertiser* an article from the *London Times* headed, "Twenty Years of One-Man Rule." It said that any man who had been in office longer than Sir Robert Walpole was likely to have had some electoral luck. It said that Sir Thomas Playford's luck was the gerrymander and that the Premier openly

admitted it with a gale of laughter. The fact that Parliament has been in recess for almost eight months proves conclusively that this State is being run under a one-man rule.

At the opening of this Parliament we learned of the Government's change of policy on Bedford Park, and heard of the closing down of an industry at Wallaroo because it could operate more profitably in the city. This afternoon unemployment was discussed. Unemployment vitally concerns members of the Labor Party. Unemployment in Australia is fast reaching pre-war figures. Six months ago when the Prime Minister visited South Australia he said that the position was being closely watched and that if it got worse steps would have to be taken to deal with it. The Prime Minister had the audacity to say that. Just how bad does he want the position to get? Thousands of people are almost starving and many are without sufficient blankets and warm clothing for their children. This has been permitted while monopolies, combines and industrial giants have been reaping huge profits and operating against the interests of the community.

Yesterday, the member for Gouger (Mr. Hall) blamed the credit squeeze and Communism, but I do not think he mentioned his colleagues in the Democratic Labor Party. The member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) pointed out that the credit squeeze is due to monopolies being permitted to operate contrary to the interests of the people. This is the main cause of Communism's spread in Australia. The Menzies Government is in power and it must take full responsibility for the present position. While the Liberal Government remains in office Communism will continue to increase in Australia. Mr. Hall did not mention the riots at Bonegilla or the *Sunday Mail's* appeal for blankets and warm clothing for Australian children.

Mr. Bockelberg: A lot of those blokes should have been shot during the last war.

Mr. McKEE: I challenge Mr. Hall to blame the present position on any Party other than the Liberal Party. I support the amendment.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I join with other members who have already spoken in conveying congratulations where they are due, welcomes and felicitations where they are due, and in conveying my condolences to the recently bereaved families of members of Parliament. I support the Address in Reply as it was originally moved without the amendment that has been added by the Leader of the Opposition. Firstly, I shall comment on

that amendment. I must confess that I was somewhat surprised when the subject matter of the amendment was known, because I had thought, on good grounds, that the topic with which it deals was as dead as the dodo.

Mr. Clark: Did you say "thought" or "hoped"?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I said "thought" and I had good grounds for thinking that by the lack of enthusiasm with which it has been debated by members opposite. The fact is that this issue was killed stone dead by the Premier at the end of last session.

Mr. Jenkins: And buried.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. There has been a remarkable lack of enthusiasm on the part of members opposite who have participated in this debate to say anything about it. Of course, that does not apply to the Leader of the Opposition. He quoted a couple of extracts from the judgment of the Arbitration Commission in the differentials case. I have a copy of that judgment and it is obvious when one compares the judgment with the Leader's speech that he made a couple of quotations from it and for the rest was prepared to adopt, as his own, certain passages from it. Unfortunately, as all too frequently happens with the Leader of the Opposition, there was a lack of exactness in his phraseology, which made it extremely difficult to understand what he was complaining about in the judgment. He used such phrases as, "It was on the matter of the cost of living basis that members on this side were so critical of the Government", and then he accused the Government of supporting the employers' application to reduce "the living standard of workers in this State." That, unfortunately, does not do much more than cloud the issue, because, in fact, the differentials case dealt with three applications and it is impossible to tell from the Leader's speech to which of those applications he was referring at any particular time. I am afraid that whoever prepared the material for him did not refer to the full judgment. What did the Commission say was the basis of this case and the part played by the South Australian Government in it? I shall take the liberty of quoting briefly from the judgment, which appears at page 190 of the *March Industrial Information Bulletin*. The Commission said:

The South Australian Government appeared as a party in all three cases. In the F.E.D.F.A. case it opposed the unions' application by giving general support to the employers' position, whereas in the South Australian employers case, while supporting the application as far

as Adelaide was concerned, it offered no submissions or evidence as far as the country differential claim was concerned.

That was the position, but what do we find the Leader of the Opposition accusing the Government of doing? Perhaps a comparison between a passage in his speech and that passage in the judgment will be revealing, because I suggest that the Leader or whoever prepared his material was misleading the House by the words he used. The Leader said:

The South Australian Liberal Government appeared as a party in all three cases and opposed the unions' application for the abolition of the country differential by giving general support to the employers, and it also supported the South Australian employers in their application to have the Adelaide basic wage reduced in relation to that of Sydney. Regarding the country differential wage, employers submitted evidence as to increased freight, raw material, repairs and power costs away from the metropolitan area.

He then went on to deal with those. If members compare this quotation from the Leader's speech with the quotation I have already given from the judgment they will see that he has adapted the words of the judgment only to suit his own case and not to bring out the fact that the South Australian Government offered no submissions or evidence regarding the country differential claim.

Mr. Loveday: That was only after we raised an objection, wasn't it?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am not concerned about when this was done; I am merely saying that the Leader unfortunately misrepresented the position to members of this House. He has used the judgment for his own ends and has adapted it only to suit himself; he has not given the full story. He went on in support of his amendment to discuss the actions of Mr. Gilbert Seaman, the Under-Treasurer, in this case. Again he took a couple of quotations from the judgment and used them to help himself, but what he did not mention—and I will make it clear by referring to the judgment—was:

Apart from the difficulties of measurement the South Australian employers were faced with the situation that Mr. Seaman, who was vital to their cost of living argument, does not agree with their case about the relative capacity of South Australia as compared with other States. Mr. Seaman did not agree with South Australian employers on that matter, but we did not hear that from the Leader when he moved his amendment to the Address in Reply. One would think from his speech that Mr. Seaman agreed with and supported the employers in everything they said, but that was not so. The judgment continues:

Even if growth were necessarily related to capacity, Mr. Seaman said that on a wide view the industrial growth of South Australia had since 1953 on a percentage basic wage been better than any other State. He agreed with statements which had been made by the Treasurer of South Australia that the progress of South Australia in post-war years had been unparalleled in Australian history and that the dominating feature of the South Australian economy after the recent drought was once again the powerful impetus to expand.

In other words, although Mr. Seaman happened to agree with part of the submissions made by the South Australian employers' representative (Mr. Robinson) he entirely disagreed with the submissions made regarding the country differential; in fact, the Government did not make any submissions or call any evidence on that matter. That is something that did not come out in the speech made by the Leader of the Opposition when moving this amendment. The gist of the judgment is, I think, fairly well summed up in this paragraph:

In our view neither the material dealing with the cost of living, nor the material dealing with the relative capacity, nor a combination of both, leads to the conclusion that we should alter the present relationship which the basic wage for Adelaide has with the basic wage for Sydney.

That was the application to make the Adelaide basic wage 90 per cent of that of Sydney. The judgment then went on in fairly picturesque vein to deal with the application to make the differential between country South Australia and city South Australia 12s. instead of the present 3s. It stated:

In saying all this we do not overlook the nostalgic references made by Mr. Justice Higgins in the Timber Workers case in 1920 to the joys of the simple rural life. It appears to us that both he and Banjo Paterson oversimplified the problem and certainly in the light of more modern experience the clearness of the country air does not appear to outweigh the attraction of the "foetid air and grit of the dusty, dirty city." Using our general knowledge as well as the material before us, we consider that at the present time the attractions of the city would seem to outweigh the attractions of the country in the eyes of the average person. The employers' witness from Kapunda was somewhat resigned that nothing would stop the flow of young people from the country to the city. We conclude that so far as employees are concerned there is no advantage in working in the country which should be expressed in the form of a basic wage lower than that of the appropriate capital city.

Mr. Loveday: Not even free firewood!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, the Commission rejected that. We on this side of the House, at any rate, accept the decision of the Commission on that matter.

Mr. Dunstan: You cannot do much else, can you?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, and we do not want to: we abide by arbitration. It is the Party opposite that bucks at arbitration from time to time. That is the gist of the differentials decision, yet the Leader of the Opposition made it appear, or tried to make it appear to those who did not bother to read the judgment, that the South Australian Government and the employers coincided exactly in their opinions. That was not the case, and I suggest that it throws a great deal of doubt upon the sincerity of the Leader in moving this amendment.

What was the real reason why the South Australian Government, the Chamber of Manufactures and the Employers' Federation made these applications? Perhaps it lies in the word used so frequently by the member for Port Pirie in his speech—decentralization. Last session I had the honour to be appointed, I think by the unanimous vote of this House, to a special committee to deal with decentralization. I regard that as a great compliment, and I take this opportunity to thank all members for the confidence they showed in me thereby. The inquiry upon which we are now embarked is a fascinating one, but the problem is exceedingly difficult. With the best will in the world, it is not easy of solution. If a solution can be found the members of the committee will certainly do their best to find it, but what is often overlooked—and the member for Port Pirie forgot it—is that, when a manufacturer from the United States or the United Kingdom is thinking about coming to Australia, he naturally thinks of establishing his works either near Melbourne or near Sydney, and the very fact of coming to South Australia at all is to him a measure of decentralization. Had the application of the employers (which was supported by the Government) to have the basic wage in this city fixed at 90 per cent of that in Sydney been successful, that would have been some inducement to manufacturers to come to this State. It would in fact have been an inducement towards decentralization. And, of course, exactly the same thing is true of the application to make the differential between the city and country in this State 12s. instead of the former 3s. In fact, the applications, made in good faith by the Government and by the employers, were designed to assist in this process of decentralization, about which we hear so much from members of the Opposition.

Mr. Loveday: From the employers, too.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My word! As I have criticized the Leader of the Opposition for quoting some parts of the judgment and leaving out others, I think it only fair that I should quote that part of the judgment that deals with this question of decentralization. It reads:

From time to time during the course of this case reference was made to decentralization. It was suggested to us that decentralization was desirable for a number of reasons going to defence, the form of society, and economics. We had no real information before us about any action being taken by Governments to enforce or sustain any decentralization policy. We do not think it is our role to attempt to bring about decentralization of industry, and indeed we think the amount of money involved in this case could be of no real significance one way or the other in attempting to achieve decentralization.

I read that part in all fairness, because it is against me. The reason, I suggest confidently, why these applications were made was to encourage decentralization within Australia and within the State of South Australia, and if members of the Opposition could see a bit further than the ends of their noses, which I feel they cannot, they would have realized that too. I am therefore prepared to oppose as vigorously as I can the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition.

I do not propose to say very much about the details in His Excellency's Speech. The Speech discloses, I suggest, a very satisfactory period of progress in the State of South Australia and wise plans for the further development of this State. I must confess that there are one or two matters—and maybe this will not surprise all honourable members—in which I am disappointed. Paragraph 29, for example, is not one which is to my liking. It reads:

My Ministers are satisfied that the current economic situation warrants the retention of the prices legislation and the Landlord and Tenant (Control of Rents) Act for a further period of 12 months in each case, and measures for these purposes will be laid before you.

That does not give me any joy at all, and probably at some stage later in the session I shall have an opportunity to say a little more about it. I am very pleased to see—and I have seen evidence of it with my own eyes—that the Clarendon, Belair and Blackwood water scheme is progressing satisfactorily. One other matter is the unceasing struggle—as it now seems to have become—by the respective Attorneys-General of the six States of Australia to achieve uniformity in company legislation. I think that is something which is beyond the realms of possibility, certainly

permanently and probably at all. The only point I make here—and perhaps this may be commented upon by other members—is that if it is so necessary to try to achieve uniformity between the six States in such a matter as this, then perhaps the best thing we can do is to refer the power to the Commonwealth Parliament anyway, because that, after all, is why we have a federal system in Australia.

That is all I propose to say about the contents of the Speech, which overall I consider to be most satisfactory. I take this opportunity of congratulating the new member for Frome (Mr. Casey) on the speech which he made a day or so ago—his maiden speech in this House. Unfortunately, I missed the first part of his speech and only came in in time to hear him make a spiel for State aid for church schools. However, I have since read the whole of his speech with a great deal of interest. I think he will make a valuable contribution during this, the only session when he will be a member of this House. I could not, however, quite understand his praise of his predecessor, who was a true Labor man at a time when the honourable member was a member of the Liberal and Country League. I could not quite square that praise for the late Mr. O'Halloran as representative of the Frome electorate with his complaint about the long standing ills of the district, ills which hardly indicated a high standard of representation in the past. Either the late Leader was not quite the representative the honourable member now makes him out to be, or things in Frome are not quite as bad as the honourable member would like them to appear for the purposes of this debate. I realize, of course, that at the time the late Leader of the Opposition represented that district he and the present member were not political friends, and maybe that has something to do with the matter.

Mr. Casey: That is your opinion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: What do you mean by that?

Mr. Casey: Just what I said: that is your opinion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Presumably you were not political friends if you were a member of the Liberal and Country League.

Mr. Casey: That is your opinion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not quite follow the honourable member.

Mr. Casey: I don't follow you.

Mr. Dunstan: I do.

Mr. Quirke: You are both running on the spot.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Are we? I do not know that I need take the matter any further than that.

Mr. Hall: The member for Frome was an active Liberal member.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: There is no doubt about that.

Mr. Fred Walsh: The member for Gouger knows everybody's business but his own.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I think everybody knows that the member for Frome was an active Liberal member.

Mr. Fred Walsh: The member for Gouger knows what I think.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not think there is any need to say any more about the member for Frome than I have said, but I do congratulate him and welcome him to the House for the brief time that he will be here.

I turn now to something which I feel is of considerable importance to us. All the matters which I have already mentioned and which have been raised during this debate rather pale into insignificance when we compare them with the great issues of the age in which we live. I often regret that it is not possible in a document such as the Governor's Speech to deal more directly with these matters. It may be in the nature of things that it cannot be done, but when one sees what is going on in the world outside South Australia, but of which we must always remember we are a part, many of the domestic matters with which we busy ourselves in this place cease to have much relevance. The great issues to which I refer are two in number. They are the supremely important questions of this age, and on the answer to them will depend the fate of the world and certainly of the rather insignificant part of it known as South Australia—our fate either for good or for evil. I refer, of course, to the clash of colour which is going on in the world today, and to the menace of Communism in our world. These are the matters that will ultimately determine the pattern of our lives and those of our children and our children's children, and I am afraid that they are rather more important than the success of the uniform company legislation or even of any of the other matters, admirable though they may be, mentioned by His Excellency.

Mr. Fred Walsh: Or any particular candidate in the Parliamentary elections.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. I do not want to follow up the remarks made yesterday by the member for Gouger, with which I wholeheartedly agree. I do not want this to be regarded as an attack on any political Party in this country, except the Communists themselves.

Mr. Loveday: And yet you agree with the member for Gouger?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do; I may deal with that in a moment. We, as a community, give little thought to the great issues confronting us. Our horizon is, I am afraid, habitually limited. We tend to bury our heads in the sands of our parochial lives and leave the important questions to others as though we had nothing to do with them. But that is a grave mistake on our part. We are citizens not only of South Australia but of Australia and the world. We in this place are supposed to be the leaders in this State. Therefore, the responsibility of playing a part in the solution of these matters is doubly ours and, if we will not give a lead to our people, whom can we expect to do it? It is no good saying that these matters are simply foreign affairs and come within the province of the Commonwealth Parliament, and we have no good reason to discuss them. They are matters that affect us all, because ideas have no bounds. That is something we tend to forget in this place.

Of the two questions I have mentioned, history will probably show that the clash of colour is in the long-run the more important. I am not going to say much about that today, but it is presented to us in South Australia in one particular form—our attitude and actions towards our own aborigines. It is on that that we, as South Australians, will be judged by the outside world. His Excellency said in paragraph 24 of his speech:

In furtherance of the policy of raising the standards and increasing education facilities for aboriginal natives with a view to their assimilation,

and so on. He set out there the policy of the Government, which is one of assimilation. It is a policy that I wholeheartedly endorse. That is good. Rumour has it that the honourable member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan) is anxious to introduce a Bill on this subject but that he is having some difficulty with the members of his own Party. The Labor Party is always inexplicable to me. Here, we have the member for Norwood, the President of the Labor

Party in South Australia and a Federal Vice-President of the Party. One would have thought that he was the most influential Labor man in South Australia. As I say, it is entirely inexplicable to me that here the man who is the head of the Labor Party in South Australia, who is one of its senior members throughout the Commonwealth, is apparently having difficulty with the Parliamentary Labor Party over his desire to introduce this Bill. I make it clear that I hope that the Bill appears and, if I can do anything to help the member for Norwood to convince the members of his own Party that it should, I shall be glad to do it. I also make it clear that I do not commit myself either one way or the other on the Bill. I do not know what it will contain, and cannot make up my mind on it until I see it, if it comes in. If it is introduced, there is likely to be no more important measure debated in this Parliament this session. That is why I hope that it will come in and that it will be given every consideration.

Mr. Fred Walsh: Will you support it?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for West Torrens is asking for my support. I do not know whether the Bill has his or not. I cannot commit myself until I see the Bill, and I am not going to, but the subject matter of the Bill is of overwhelming importance, because it is upon our attitude and actions towards our aborigines that we in South Australia will be judged on this question of colour. I shall not say anything more about that now. The other supremely important matter I should like to touch on is Communism.

Mr. McKee: It is your Government that is bringing it about!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I heard that and I may have something to say in answer to the honourable member in a moment. I link my remarks—because I know that you, Sir, are watching with your usual eagle eye to see that what I say is relevant to the Speech—with paragraph 42, but I emphasize again that I raise this matter not in an effort to score off the Opposition. The threat and deadly danger of Communism to all of us goes far beyond the question of Party politics: it goes to the very foundations of our society and I hope the members opposite will realize that and that it will be clear to them in what I say. I know that the Labor Party is so often full of its own woes and divisions that it is sensitive about this particular matter and concludes that any time this subject is raised it is meant to be an attack upon the Labor Party; but it is not.

Mr. Loveday: This is the great exception.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Whyalla is only underlining the point I am making—the extreme sensitivity of members opposite on this subject. He or other honourable members may ask me why I am speaking about this matter at all. The answer is that I am afraid that we in the West are losing the battle of the cold war now going on everywhere throughout the world.

Mr. Quirke: We have reason to be afraid.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The honourable member is right in saying that. This battle is a battle not of arms but for the minds of men. That is why it is the concern of every one of us. We are losing it, I am afraid, at present by default because we are not willing to face up to it and to see what is going on here in our own community as all over the world.

Mr. McKee: I am pleased you admit to that!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Indeed I do. I hope the honourable member will listen to what I have to say because I think it may do even him some good.

Mr. McKee: That will be interesting.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: We must face this question before it is too late, and we must face it fairly and squarely, which the community is not doing at present. I have said it is a battle of ideas, and so it is. Our opponents realize this. One has only to remember that strung right round the borders of Soviet Russia is a chain of stations jamming all broadcasts beamed into that country by the West, to keep out our ideas. We, of course, do not do it that way. Ideas can circulate freely in this country and we rely upon our own ideals and way of life to be superior to the Communists. But that, of course, is where we are at present breaking down.

It seems to me that the first step in fighting any opponent—and the honourable member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) as an old soldier will agree with me in this—is to know what he is fighting for and what his methods are. That is a truism yet how many of us on either side of the House know those things about Communism? The answer is “Not very many”. The older members here—and, with due respect, I include you, Sir, among those—will often have heard it said, if they have not said it themselves, “My word, if only we had read *Mein Kampf*, we should have known what Hitler was going to do and been able to head him off.” What is true of Nazism is absolutely true of Communism. If we take the trouble,

as members of Parliament and of this community, to read the writings of the Communists—Marx, Lenin and Stalin—we can see that exactly. But so few of us take that trouble. I freely acknowledge that the honourable member for Norwood has read those works—I would not deny it for a moment—but he is one of the very few in this House who have. We have only to read these things to see exactly what are the aims and methods of Communism. I think the best description of Communism is one given by our Prime Minister in a policy speech. He said that it was an alien and destructive pest. I think that is the best definition.

Mr. Dunstan: Not a definition.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The best description.

Mr. Casey: The work of the devil.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the honourable member wants to put it that way all right, but I think what I have said is the best description. We all agree that we hate Communism, but how many of us could answer the question: “Why are you not a Communist?” Very few of us could give a pithy answer. Some time ago I found that I could not give the answer, and I have been putting the question to other people since that time and few have been able to give me the answer. I suggest that this is a serious matter. It is a question of ideas and most of us do not know the fallacies and defects of the beliefs of the opponent.

Mr. Quirke: Have you found the answer?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I believe that I have found the germ of the answer and I will give it to members today. I have asked many reputable and highly intelligent people, but most of them have not been able to give me the answer. How can we hope to defeat the enemy if we do not know whether his beliefs are right or wrong, let alone knowing what are our own beliefs? Obviously we cannot defeat the enemy if that is so. One has only to look at any corner of the globe at present to see the giant strides that Communism is making, and has made especially in the last 12 months—

Mr. McKee: Since the Commonwealth credit squeeze came.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The honourable member is not with me. I am serious about this matter, even if he is not.

Mr. McKee: I think the Menzies Government should take some responsibility.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is nonsense and shows the smallness of the honourable member's mind, that is if he really thinks the Menzies Government is responsible for world Communism.

Mr. McKee: Menzies is responsible for its growth in Australia.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Then why not say so, instead of trying to belittle what I have said.

Mr. Jennings: You are making the speech.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, and I am getting some assistance from members opposite.

Mr. Shannon: I think Dr. Evatt was on their side on some occasions.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: We will not go into that now. I am being distracted by the littleness of the interjections by the honourable member for Port Pirie. Judging by the giant strides that Communism has been making recently, one might be forgiven for believing that some people believe that Communism is right and just, and will win. I have found that to be the belief amongst intelligent people to whom I have addressed the question. They believe in their heart of hearts that Communism in some form or another will win. To me that is a shocking admission to make, yet we find it here in our own community. It is, of course, the idea that Communists have sedulously encouraged amongst their enemies. They believe it themselves.

Mr. Fred Walsh: They develop a fear complex.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, and if they can make us believe it they have gone more than half way towards winning the battle. I believe that there are people even in this building who believe it, according to their admission to me, but nothing is further from the truth. I believe that Communism is based on a fundamental fallacy and therefore I believe that the whole system of Communistic ideas is wrong and evil, and that it will eventually fail. The danger is that we shall be engulfed before it fails. As I understand it, Communism is based on the Marxist interpretation of history, known as dialectical materialism. I do not intend to examine the fallacies of dialectical materialism, but merely to assert that it is a false interpretation of history. The dialectic does not hold the complete explanation of history, valuable though Marx's historical analysis may be, nor are we all motivated all the time by ideas of mere material gain. It is misleading to interpret history by means of

the dialectic if only because history having no beginning and no ending, but being a continuous process, makes it impossible to know what phase is thesis, antithesis or synthesis. I invite Mr. Dunstan and Mr. Jennings to elaborate on that if they care to do so.

It is also wrong to assert, as Communists do, that the slow driving force of history is the operation of changes in the organization and methods of production. Most of us most of the time may be spurred on by such materialistic motives, but it is not true of all people all the time, and it is not a true enough basis on which to found a whole philosophy of life, as the Communists do. My point is that the Communists absolutely believe it, and from it some very important consequences flow. The Communists are dedicated to it: to them it is a matter of faith; their whole lives and actions are governed by it. I am examining the position of Communism and saying that fundamentally it is a fallacy. Nevertheless, 1,000,000,000 people in the world are in the thrall of Communism. At the beginning there was not more than a handful, yet in 60 years that is what has happened. I have said that some results flow from the Communist belief. I will mention only three or four. Firstly, Marx taught that Communism is bound to come as the goal of the whole course of history. That is why Communists are completely self-confident: they believe they are on the winning side. We do not presume to foretell the future. We believe that the future is in God's hands alone. Obviously, this is one of the reasons for the attractiveness of Communism: people like to be on the winning side.

My second point is that Communists believe that people who live in a historical era (and they say we are living in the capitalist era) think in capitalist terms. They say that a capitalist society can never be transformed by democratic means into a Communist society. The ruling class, the property owners, will never give up their position until compelled by force or the threat of it. Thus, to the Communist a revolution is necessary and the whole policy of the Communist Party throughout the world is to foster and hasten that revolution. That is the point that we should remember: Communists are concerned not with improving or reforming the present social order, but with hastening its collapse. Hence anything they can do to foment disorder in any community they will do.

Mr. Jennings: You are quoting from an ex-Communist.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, but I have, for once, written this out fairly carefully so that I shall not go off the rails in my speech. My point is that the Communists, by making wage claims or supporting wage claims that they know cannot be granted, simply hope to weaken the capitalist economy. Someone on the other side of the House, or perhaps it was the member for Gouger, mentioned the late Mr. Jim Healy. As we all know, he was a Communist and I thought it was the supreme irony that even after that man was dead (and unto him death was absolute because he was an atheist) he was able to stop the work on the Australian wharves twice at the time of his funeral.

Mr. McKee: Now now!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Do you deny that that was so?

Mr. McKee: How could he? He was dead.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The very thing he was doing all his life, disrupting the affairs of the country, he was able to do twice even after death. That was the supreme irony which underlies the tactics that the Communists employ. Communists, in the short run, will co-operate with any Party—especially the Labor Party—that they think will help further their ends, but they have the greatest contempt for Socialists who, they say, are traitors to the class struggle. They say that it is an entire fallacy (I know my friends opposite believe this) to believe that one can employ democratic means to change society. However—and this is why the Labor Party is so vulnerable—Communists will co-operate with any Party which they believe in the short run will further their own ends.

Mr. Dunstan: They certainly try to hang to its coat tail.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am glad to hear the honourable member for Norwood say that because it is too often forgotten. The third result that flows from the Communist beliefs is that it is a serious mistake for any of us to view Communism as merely another political Party. I am afraid I must emphasize this with great regret because I heard a senior and prominent member on this side a few days ago say Communism was merely another political Party. The fact is that Communism is a religion more than a political Party. Its aim is not to work within the framework of our society but to destroy it altogether and to put another framework entirely in its place. That is something I feel we all should bear in mind much more than we do.

The final matter of supreme consequence flowing from dialectical materialism is that the Marxists believe that dialectical materialism is the only scientific explanation of reality. It is therefore utterly opposed to all religion: it is militantly atheist and that to me is the very core of its evil and I think probably, from the interjection by the member for Frome earlier, that he would entirely agree with me there.

I am a Christian and I do my best, very imperfectly, to live up to my Christian beliefs. That is my personal answer to Communism but it is one which each of us, as an individual, must decide for himself for the other side of the coin that I have been discussing this afternoon, that is, knowing and understanding our enemy, is something that we all, as members of the community, share in common and it is only by talking about it that this will be done. Thank God there seems to be a growing anxiety in the community about this matter.

Last week the Returned Soldiers League, at its annual sub-branch conference, said that the Commonwealth should do something about Communists. I have grave doubts whether the legislative action suggested by the league will help at all. This country, 10 years ago, had a referendum on this subject. I did not vote then because I was too young, but I think I would probably have voted for those powers even though I may have had second thoughts since.

Mr. Clark: Simply driving them underground.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Probably, but the suggestions have been made that we must wake up to ourselves if we are not all to be engulfed by Communism. I believe other members had, as I had coincidentally, a little booklet some time ago entitled *The Red Pattern of World Conquest*. I read only one page of it and I do not know that I shall read more, but I think it shows what is the truth: that the Communists believe they will have achieved world domination some time between 1970 and 1980. That is their time table and according to that book by about 1973—another 12 years—they will have achieved their objective.

That is what deeply perturbs me and I guess it perturbs every member in this House, but we have never before raised it in this place. I did not marry my wife and bring children into the world to be Communists before they are grown up. I do not contemplate with equanimity the thought that this world may be Communist before I am 45. I am going to do

my damndest to stop that happening and the first step I believe is to think and talk about these matters. It is a responsibility that is doubly on us as members and leaders of the community.

Mr. Quirke: And the great Australian custom will brand you as a crank.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Probably it will but I do not care if it does.

Mr. Quirke: That is what everyone who talks like this is up against—the inability of Australians to think.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That may be so but I raise this point because we all ought to be thinking and talking about it more than we are and that is why I have taken up more of the time of the House than I otherwise would have. I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

Mr. DUNSTAN (Norwood): Mr. Deputy Speaker, along with other members I express my sorrow at the deaths of the members whom we have lost from this House and from another place and my sympathy for their families. All of us are well aware of the loss this State, this House, and the other place have suffered by their deaths. In rising to follow the honourable member for Mitcham I am delighted to know that at least the honourable member has done what so few members of his Party have yet even begun to do.

Mr. Fred Walsh: Or even think about.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Yes, or even think about and that is to find out what the various political beliefs are because if one reads the turgid nonsense that comes out of the Liberal Party week in and week out it reveals one thing very plainly: they have not the beginnings of an inkling of what people who differ from them politically think about or, if they do know it, they are prepared recklessly to misrepresent it. I hope that the honourable member will continue on his course of investigation because he will be led to a conclusion, which he does not seem to have arrived at yet, that the reason why Communism is making giant strides overseas (and as the member for Port Pirie claims is starting to make strides in Australia currently) is not that people have been converted on a large scale to the extraordinary nonsense contained in the writings of dialectical and historic materialism—a philosophy so strange and so perverse that it is difficult to understand without obtaining a glossary of terms first.

Mr. Clark: Do you think anyone has read the whole of *Das Kapital*?

Mr. DUNSTAN: I know about three who have. I confess that I balked about midway through the third volume.

Mr. Millhouse: You were near the end of it by then!

Mr. DUNSTAN: I had had it by then. Many people do not realize it, but *Das Kapital* is not the central work of Communist theory. Communist theory appears much more plainly in works like Marx' *Critique of the Gotha Programme*, Engels' *Anti-Dühring*, and a number of other philosophical works including Marx' *Theses on Feuerbach*, and his correspondence, all of which I have read. The point is that that philosophy has not converted people to its support. Communists manage to get support in the world today because they are able to represent themselves as the opponents of existing injustice.

Mr. Millhouse: They do it by particularly good propaganda.

Mr. DUNSTAN: It is not merely propaganda. Every time we perpetrate an injustice—an economic injustice or an injustice of race—and every time the Prime Minister gives tacit or implicit support to a situation such as exists in South Africa, it plays the game exactly as the Communists want it played. Injustice is the bed of Communism and the way to prevent Communism is to prevent injustice in the world. The one force today that is concerned with injustice everywhere, and the one place where that force has been in power is where democratic Socialist governments have been effective. Communists are unable to make headway.

Mr. Millhouse: What examples have you in mind?

Mr. DUNSTAN: The Scandinavian countries. While the British Labor Party was in office Communists could make little headway in Great Britain. In Australia while the Labor Party's programmes were in force, and in New Zealand while Labor's programmes were in force, and the social security system initiated by the Labor Party remained, Communists were able to make little major headway among the population.

Mr. Millhouse: What was the situation in the late 1940's?

Mr. DUNSTAN: During the war years, when Russia was an ally of this country, there was a tendency for Communists to appear to be a little more respectable than now and

consequently they made some headway, but immediately afterwards we were able to see that they suffered signal reverses—and the reverses were brought about by the people who actually did something about fighting Communism and not by those who talked McCarthyism. The Opposition has had a long experience in fighting injustices of all kinds. To us Communism is a terror and a tyranny that we will oppose on every possible occasion. The people who play the game of Communists are those who support injustices and economic policies which are unnecessary and which produce unemployment and misery. They are the people who talk McCarthyism against those who are really fighting Communism.

Let me turn to another matter with which the honourable member for Mitcham dealt, I suggest inadequately. The Leader of the Opposition moved an amendment to the Address in Reply which I wholeheartedly and enthusiastically support.

Mr. Shannon: Did you frame it?

Mr. DUNSTAN: No, but I appreciate the compliment. As a member of the Labor Party I wholeheartedly support it.

Mr. Millhouse: Can you explain why your Leader did not quote adequately from the judgment to show just what the South Australian Government did?

Mr. DUNSTAN: I thought that honourable members already knew sufficient of the matter, but the honourable member obviously does not and I shall tell him. At the outset of the case the employers made two basic applications: the first was for a progressive reduction in the South Australian basic wage, and the second was for a reduction of the country wage—that is, an increase in the country differential from 3s. below the city wage to 12s. below the city wage. Initially the Government appeared in support of the employers' applications. That was made the clearer, despite the frantic protests of the Premier and members Opposite during the Frome by-election, when we protested in this House at the Government's action. During that week the presentation of the employers' evidence was drawing to a close and a discussion was held on the future course of the case. Mr. Wells, the Crown counsel, was asked to indicate how long he thought the case would take and whether the South Australian Government was supporting the employers' application, and Mr. Wells said "Undoubtedly". There was no reservation, no exception. The Government was supporting

both sections of the applications. Then came Labor's protest in this House. We saw alarm on the Government side. The next week, when Mr. Wells rose in court, he said that he was supporting the employers' application not for the country differential but only for a progressive reduction in the South Australian basic wage.

Mr. Millhouse: Why do you think the judgment does not refer to that change of front?

Mr. DUNSTAN: I do not know whether the judgment refers to it, or that it needs to do so. If the court felt that was not the case, it was extraordinary that it should not have drawn attention to the fact that it had been grievously misrepresented publicly, not only by people opposed to the employers and the Government but by such responsible journals as the *Financial Review*.

Mr. Millhouse: Are you suggesting that Mr. Seaman turned around and said something contrary to the evidence he had given before?

Mr. DUNSTAN: I suggest that he did not present some of the evidence he intended to present.

Mr. Millhouse: But he gave views contrary to those of the employers' representatives on the country differential.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I do not know if during the week before that the Premier had been apprised of the fact that the employers' representatives were going to present the figures which they did present (through the partner of the member for Mitcham) as being truthful documents, and I have not heard any criticism that they were not correct. When I invited the Premier to comment on them he said, "You can do anything with figures; I shall not comment on them". These indices showed clearly that in the last decade South Australia's rate of industrial growth—take what measure of that you like—was the worst in the Commonwealth.

Mr. Millhouse: The point I am making is that Mr. Seaman said the opposite.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I appreciate that he said the opposite. That was after the Premier had protested here about the evidence presented by the employers. It would have been extremely inconvenient having a senior public servant directly below him going into the court and contradicting him.

Mr. Millhouse: You suggest he is so dishonest as to change the tenor of his evidence?

Mr. DUNSTAN: I do not say he changed the tenor of his evidence; I suggest he had no evidence on that score to give before, but he was careful not to say anything contradictory to what the Premier had said. He certainly said in his cross-examination that he would not go quite as far as the Premier in talking about the way in which the State had expanded. As yet, the Government has not produced any cogent evidence apart from this rather general statement of Mr. Seaman to dispel the conclusions that one would arrive at from examining the exhibits of the Employers' Federation. I hope the honourable member is not suggesting that his partner would put forward something blatantly untruthful in the court.

Mr. Millhouse: I am not suggesting that; I am suggesting that Mr. Seaman would not do it either. You are apparently suggesting that he would change the evidence he was going to give.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I did not say anything of the kind. I said clearly and adequately what I had to say. If the honourable member is trying to put words into my mouth I suggest that he read afterwards what I have said.

Mr. Millhouse: All I say is that this is the irresistible implication of your speech.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Nonsense!

Mr. Millhouse: We will read it afterwards and see.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I shall be happy if the honourable member does—that is, if he can. What happened was that the Arbitration Commission did not agree that wages in this State should be reduced as compared with other States, and it did not agree that the country differential should be increased. What this Party protests about is that there is a move by the Government to reduce wages in this State. It is all very well for the member for Barossa to get up here and say that, when we say this, it nauseates him. I am prepared in my charity—

Mr. Laucke: I do not want any charity.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I am pleased to hear it. The Government moved to reduce wages in this State, and it did this at a time of economic stress. It proposed that this State's basic wage—

Mr. Laucke: Tell us the truth.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Just be quiet until I say what I intended to say.

Mr. Millhouse: But it is not right.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Of course it is right. This Government supported an application to reduce the basic wage in this State to 90 per cent of that of other States.

Mr. Millhouse: Not to reduce the wage.

Mr. DUNSTAN: It was a progressive reduction of wage levels in this State.

Mr. Millhouse: Comparative wage levels.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Of course. That means that when the other States had adjustments on the cost of living this State would be reduced in comparison.

Mr. Millhouse: In comparison, but not absolutely. You said "reduced wage levels".

Mr. DUNSTAN: Of course it was by reducing wage levels, because it would be lessening what the people would be entitled to in the future on decisions of the court.

Mr. Lawn: They would have got 9s. increase this year instead of 12s.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Exactly. That was a proposal to reduce the spending power of the working people in this State progressively, and to do even more (as far as the employers were concerned, and as far as the Government was concerned at the outset) against people in country areas. The extraordinary thing about it is that the Premier said in this House, "My Government is determined to do something about unemployment." No greater deflationary policy could be better designed to further unemployment than that to reduce the spending power of the working people, because that reduces their effective demand. The Government took that action which, had it succeeded, would have considerably worsened the unemployment position, and in addition, despite protests about its views on unemployment, it ended the year with a Budget surplus. I am astonished at the praise of the Government by members opposite about ending the year with a Budget surplus. After all, the unemployment situation has not been with us only since yesterday; the Menzies Government introduced it some time ago. How can any Government concerned with unemployment say that it is justified in ending the year with a Budget surplus? Orthodox economic policy is for deficit budgeting in a time of unemployment.

Mr. Millhouse: Can you explain why you are the first member on your side really to tackle this?

Mr. DUNSTAN: I am not the first member to tackle it by any means, and I am sure I shall not be the last.

Mr. Millhouse: After what I have said, I am sure you will not be.

Mr. DUNSTAN: After what you said! The honourable member flatters himself. I shall now refer briefly to a matter of considerable concern to people in my district. It concerns not only those in my district, but people throughout the State, although the incidents to which I refer have all occurred in the district of Norwood. I refer to action by certain police patrol squads under the Lottery and Gaming Act. Many years ago the State was having some difficulty in detecting lottery and gaming offences in a certain well-known hostelry in King William Street. It happened to be close to a place where certain gentlemen who were fond of wagering and gambling had recourse from time to time. There was a lane at the back, and it was found that the only way the police could catch the wagerers was to get rid of the nitkeepers. But in order to get rid of the nitkeepers they had to have wide powers of getting them out of the way, and as a result (I think in 1917, so far as my researches have gone), a section was written into the Lottery and Gaming Act to cope with this situation. It is section 63, which states:

No person standing in any street shall refuse or neglect to move on when requested by a police constable so to do, or shall loiter (whether such loitering shall cause or tend to cause any obstruction to traffic or not) in any street or public place after a request having been made to him by any police constable not to so loiter. Penalty—Twenty pounds, or imprisonment for two months.

If that were used to look after nitkeepers, nobody really could object greatly. We have another section in the Statutes which deals with loitering. It is section 18 of the Police Offences Act, which states:

Any person who lies or loiters in any public place and who, upon request by a member of the police force, does not give a satisfactory reason for so lying or loitering shall be guilty of an offence.

Unfortunately, the police use that section very rarely and they have been criticized by magistrates in the courts for not using it. The section they do use is section 63 of the Lottery and Gaming Act, which I have mentioned. Let me show the House how they use it. Not so long ago there was a prosecution in the Adelaide Police Court, and the defendant was a gentleman named Holland, a driver for a towing service. There was an accident in my district, in Luhrs Road, Payneham. A car had crashed and this person had got to hear about the accident, and, as is the case with

most towing services, he wanted to be first on the spot so that he would get the tow. In fact, he was the first towing service on the spot. When he got there he was met by a police constable who promptly told him that the tow had been taken care of—although there was no other towing service there—and that he was not going to get the tow. The driver said, in effect, "I am going to stick around to see what the situation is; I am not going away and have to come back again; this is my livelihood."

The police constable refused to allow him to speak to the driver of the crashed car and ordered him several times to move on. Then, although he was not obstructing the traffic or interfering in any way with what was going on there, he was arrested, because he refused to go away from the scene of the accident, and charged with failing to move on. It was found by the court that in those circumstances he had to be fined. I have the evidence here in detail, and it includes some extraordinary statements by the police constable who did the arresting. For example:

The closest the defendant got to the crashed car would be 2ft. away. He walked past the tree and when I was speaking to the defendant we were both standing by the defendant. He could have been inspecting the damage. He never actually spoke to the driver of the crashed car or anyone connected with the crashed car. According to me he was within a few feet of the offside front door. The defendant's was the first towing vehicle in attendance at the scene. I do not know anybody in Freeman Motors or Suburban Motors. Constable Jordan was about the scene at the time and he heard me speak to the defendant. He is still in the police force.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Who was acting for the tow truck driver?

Mr. DUNSTAN: Mr. P. N. Waye was his solicitor, and I believe Mr. C. J. Philcox also acted as consulting counsel in the matter. The defence counsel relied on a statement which appears in a judgment of Mr. Acting Justice Hannan in the case of *Morley v. Bond* (1955 South Australian State Reports).

Mr. Millhouse: That would be binding, wouldn't it?

Mr. DUNSTAN: Yes, but unfortunately the magistrate does not seem to have acted on it.

Mr. Millhouse: He could distinguish, could he?

Mr. DUNSTAN: Apparently he could. I have not seen his judgment *in extenso*. In that particular case the police at Port Adelaide had been called to a house where there was a

fracas going on; they hauled one of the people involved out into the street in front of the house—into a public place—and then told him to move on. He said, in effect, "I belong here; I don't want to move on." They arrested him for failing to go somewhere else. It was found by Mr. Acting Justice Hannan that they could do so, but he had this to say about the section:

Mr. Villeneuve Smith sought to interpret the relevant words of section 63 so as to limit the power to request a person to "move on" to circumstances where the person is suspected of being about to commit some contravention of the criminal law or at least some contravention of the Lottery and Gaming Act. I think that the answer is that the words themselves are plain and unambiguous, and admit of only one meaning, and that meaning must be enforced, even though the court may think that it is not expedient, or indeed may be mischievous, that a police constable should be invested with such power. . . . It appears, however, that the police constable making the request must be doing so as a police constable intending to act in the course of his duty, *e.g.*, in obtaining evidence of offences against the law, in preventing crimes, and in ensuring that there shall not be a breach of the peace.

None of those things would have been involved in the case of the towing company, yet the man was ordered to move on and the magistrate found the words of the section so general and unambiguous, apparently, that the person involved had to be fined. Precisely what wrong that man was doing at the scene of the accident, or what was the crime, the commission of which the constable was supposed to be preventing, does not appear. Unfortunately, the police go rather further than this. On March 22 of this year I received two separate sets of complaints from people who had been dealt with by a police patrol in my area. I make it clear that the police involved in these complaints are not stationed in my district.

Mr. Millhouse: They might be stationed there later.

Mr. DUNSTAN: They may be; in that event I shall take the same attitude to them then as I am taking now. The senior police officers in my district are good police officers, and they certainly would not be involved in a thing of this kind. I have had two separate sets of complaints about the activities of a police patrol in ordering people to go away from a public place, and in one of those sets of complaints I received a series of signed statements.

Mr. Riches: Would this be the anti-delinquent squad?

Mr. DUNSTAN: I do not know. This series of signed statements was from three Italian men who are well respected in the Italian community, the leaders of which community—a very large one in my district—are respectable people. Mr. Velli made the following statement:

On Tuesday night, March 21, 1961, about 10.30. . . . and I came out from the billiard room at Baliol Street, College Park, to go into a delicatessen. On turning the corner we met Mr. . . . We all stopped and began talking about some private business. A car pulled into the kerb. It was a police car. One of the policemen in the car had a torch and he shone it at us. We did not take much notice because we were not doing anything wrong. The man holding the torch said, "You come here", in a very angry tone. We then approached the car and he said, "Do you know that it is an offence to loiter on the footpath?" Where we were standing talking was a well-lighted part of the street. After he spoke we did not answer. He then repeated his question in an even angrier tone. He said, "Do you understand English?" I said, "Yes". I then tried to leave and go into the shop to buy a drink which had been my original intention.

He called me back again and said, "You are not going into that shop, you are going home." The other man then said, "I want to buy a packet of cigarettes." He (the policeman) said, "Why didn't you think about that before?" He then got out of the car quickly hitting the other man with the door while doing so.

The policeman said he could not go into the shop and said:

"Are you going home, or are you coming in the car with us?" at the same time grabbing him and pushing him into the car.

The police then said to the man making this statement:

"Do you want to come too?" He said, "All right you can take me if you want me." One of the policemen then pushed him away and said, "No, you go home."

He then tried to go into the shop but was refused the right. He then tried to go to his car but they would not let him go in the direction of his car. They chased him away and said "Go on, you get going!" They made a number of threats of violence. That was serious. It was corroborated by the signed statements of the other two men. The man who was put into the police car said he was abused by the police in the police car and was allowed to go, and they were chased away from the area. They were doing nothing to call for any kind of action by the police.

I was seriously concerned about this. I took the signed statements and immediately saw the Commissioner of Police, who courteously heard me. I supplied copies of the statements to

him and he decided he would have an immediate investigation made. As a result of that investigation, he wrote to me on April 7 stating that Messrs Velli and Marchette had been seen by the police, they showed no inclination to assist the inquiry and were not prepared to furnish statements. I said they had already furnished statements in full (and had signed them) to the police. The Commissioner did not deny, and has never denied, that what took place was as these men said. He simply said "In consequence of these inquiries, we are satisfied that the police officers were acting strictly in accordance with their lawful duties, and the inspector exonerates them from any allegations of misconduct." He has not told me what he says occurred. I have not been given any opportunity to judge the matter at all. He does not contradict what these men have said. Could it be, then, that the Commissioner of Police does protect the right and maintain the right of police officers to order people not only to move on but to go right away from their path? If they want to go into a shop, they cannot go there but must go in some other direction—is that what he maintains? Most unfortunately, it appears that he does because, after I had made this complaint to the Commissioner of Police and while the investigation was going on, another matter occurred in my district.

This time it occurred with something of a blaze of publicity because the person involved was the well-known swimming identity, Miss Dawn Fraser. Let me say at the outset that I have obtained details of this particular matter, and it is quite apparent that Miss Fraser did absolutely nothing wrong and was grievously mistreated. She was a passenger in a car that went up the Parade at Norwood and drew up near the Norwood Arcade with a squeal of brakes. Police officers in a patrol car got out and went over to speak to the driver. While that was happening, Miss Fraser got out of the car and said something, which I have been unable to discover, to the police officer. They told her to move on and she said she wanted to go into the coffee shop. They told her she might not and that she had to go away from there. When she protested and tried to insist upon the entirely proper and reasonable course of conduct of going into the place to which she had come, they arrested her and placed her in the cells. It is true that they withdrew and apologized the next morning but, Mr. Speaker, it appears that the Government has maintained throughout this matter that

the police had every right to take the action they took, and it appears that the Commissioner of Police also suggests that what the police officers did in those circumstances was perfectly proper.

I must protest. I am concerned that citizens of this community should have the right within the community to go about their proper business without this most improper interference with them by members of the police force everywhere. There is no reason why police officers should not have the power to move people on if they reasonably suspect that some crime is about to be committed or if they reasonably apprehend a breach of the peace or an obstruction of traffic. The police should have the power and it is proper, but this wide power, to be used in this way, of simply ordering people out of the ordinary and proper course of their activities is grievously wrong. These are not the only incidents in respect of which complaints have been made to me. I have had many citizens in my district approach me on precisely this matter.

I myself was ordered to move on in my district while I was about my perfectly proper duties as a member of this House because, at one stage of the proceedings, there was a bit of an upset between some Australian youths and some migrant youths in my district. In consultation with the local sergeant of police, I made arrangements to go and talk with some of those youths in a milk bar, all of whom were known to me and took notice of me, with the result that with the sergeant concerned I went to the Parade at Norwood. He stayed in the car on the other side of the Parade with his senior constable and I went across to talk to the lads at the milk bar, and they grouped around me on the footpath talking together in a perfectly ordinary and satisfactory manner. There was no question of improper loitering or anything of that nature. A police patrol car not from my district came screaming down the Parade, constables got out of it and they ordered, with a loud shout, everybody to move away from the place or they would be arrested there. The boys talking to me, according to the arrangements I had made with the sergeant melted out of sight on their bicycles and in their cars and were away leaving me staring at the police constables in some annoyance. Whereupon they asked, had not I understood the order that I was to move on? It was only then that they recognized me. I pointed out to them that there had not been any improper loitering and that they at least

might have found out what was going on before they did this.

Unfortunately, too many people are "quick on the draw" under this section. I ask that the Government take some action in this matter. Unless it is prepared to give an assurance to this House that some action will be taken to see that the powers to move on are used only in proper cases that are within the purview and purpose of this section, as mentioned by Acting Justice Hannan, then I hope that in a short time the House will have an opportunity itself to debate some legislation on this matter. I support the amendment.

Mr. JENKINS (Stirling): I support the motion for the Address in Reply. I congratulate the mover (Mr. Coumbe) and the seconder (Mr. King) on their speeches. We have heard from the honourable member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) and from the honourable member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan) outstanding addresses. As was mentioned to me when I was occupying the Chair in your place, Mr. Speaker, just now, it is a pity that two such great debaters should be speaking one after the other on this occasion. They made two excellent speeches and covered ground not covered previously in this House. Their speeches deserve to be considered closely. Mr. Dunstan condemned the Treasurer for having a surplus last year, but from it £1,000,000 has been allocated to the Electricity Trust for the building of a power line to the South-East, which will undoubtedly mean the employment of men. Since January the Government has employed other men by using some of the surplus money, and it has not been by additions to the salaried staff but to the outside staff for the purpose of providing services and amenities.

I join with other members in expressing pleasure at the appointment of Sir Edric Bastyan as the Governor of South Australia. I am sure that he and Lady Bastyan will quickly settle into our way of life and that will prove popular and efficient. Sir Edric was every inch a soldier in two world wars and one who merited high praise from Sir William Slim who commanded the 14th Army in Burma. Whoever was responsible for the choice of Sir Edric as Governor should be highly commended.

With members on both sides of the House I join in paying a tribute to the Hon. Frank Condon who was always fair and a friend to all. He will be sadly missed by all members and I express sympathy to his family.

All members agreed with the distinction conferred by Her Majesty on Mr. Shannon, because it was so well merited. His work as chairman of the Public Works Committee, without anything else, justified it.

I shall confine my remarks in this debate to district matters. Earlier I asked the Minister of Works for a road to by-pass the Goolwa barrage works. I advocated a tourist road from the barrage to the Murray mouth but as I was not successful I now compromise for a work to cost much less. Will the Minister consider building a road to by-pass the barrage works so that holiday and weekend visitors may take their trailer boats beyond the barrage and unload them at suitable launching spots? Now many people who want to take their trailer boats to the Murray mouth have to launch them between Goolwa and the barrage. Then they have to go through the lock, which entails much waiting and messing about, as well as work for the barrage caretaker. If the road were built some sandhills would have to be removed, but it would not be a large work. There would then be a road to circumvent the barrage and not cause inconvenience to the caretaker if fenced. A good anchorage would be available for people who wished to leave their boats there until the next visit. They could go in and out without calling on the services of the caretaker and other people. I commend the Minister of Roads and the Highways Department for the excellent highways in South Australia. A tremendous improvement has taken place in the last five or six years, but some secondary highways and district roads need attention.

Three weeks ago I had the honour of opening the Dairy Factory Managers and Secretaries Conference held in the auditorium on South Terrace. Delegates from all parts of Australia were present. After the opening the president of the association, Mr. Schubert of Victor Harbour, called on the delegates to speak, and one from New South Wales said that he had travelled 1,500 miles on our highways and considered them to be the best that he had yet driven on. That was a compliment to the Minister of Roads and the Highways Department. Last week I questioned the Minister about other roads in my district, but I have not yet had a reply. I am concerned about the five miles of gravel road between the new Callington bridge and Woodchester. Last year I asked that a new bridge take the place of the existing broken-down bridge and was told that it was planned to build one in the year

1961-62. These five miles are a link from Murray Bridge to Strathalbyn, the lakes and the south coast. The road carries much traffic over the week-end, and I hope that the Minister will consider the building of the bridge this year, and at the same time seal the balance of the road. Then there is the Ashbourne to Double Bridges road, which in the summer is dusty and in winter full of potholes. This causes much grading work and maintenance costs are considerable. If it were sealed there would be a link with the bitumen at Ashbourne, and it would provide a link with Adelaide through Echunga and Bulls Creek.

Then there is the road from Langhorne Creek to Wellington. Last year about two or three miles of the road were completed through Langhorne Creek. It would be a costly work, but it is now a bad road to maintain because in the rainy period it is full of potholes. If the Minister cannot go on with the whole job now perhaps he could have done two or three miles where the bitumen ends at Langhorne Creek and then continue with the work from year to year.

Over the past few years improved methods of production have come into being and many scientific improvements have been made available through agricultural advisory services. The improved methods and the better animal husbandry and farm management have enabled our producers to hold their own in competitive markets at home and abroad, but the entry of Great Britain into the European Common Market may be a great threat to our primary industries through the loss of export markets. That would be a great blow to the producers. I think the dairy industry would be affected adversely to a greater extent than any other industry. Cheese manufacturers depend on sales overseas for about 60 per cent of the production, and over the last few years they have had difficulty in making full sales. Butter is also difficult to market at times, but certainly the dairy factories now process a greater range of cheese and milk products and have spread the demand for powdered milk, ice-cream and other such goods. In addition, migrants have created a demand for several kinds of cheese about which we had not heard before 1955.

Times and methods change and I pay a tribute to our dairying people within the Department of Agriculture who keep an expert eye on all dairying trends, often coming up with the right answer to meet all rising challenges. I shall read an extract from a

paper prepared for me by some of those men in the department. The paper, which is most useful and which I have found to be a great help, clearly indicates the value of the services rendered to our dairymen and the way they apply the knowledge passed on to them by the Department of Agriculture. The paper reads:

The Commonwealth Government allocates money as bounty for butter and cheese. The average butterfat production of cows under herd test in South Australia is 269 lb (1959-60 season). There is a noticeable upward trend of recent years as shown by the following:—

1953-54—	236 lb. fat per cow.
1954-55—	245 lb. fat per cow (a rise of 9 lb.)
1955-56—	258 lb. fat per cow (a rise of 13 lb.)
1956-57—	265 lb. fat per cow (a rise of 7 lb.)
1957-58—	262 lb. fat per cow (a drop of 3 lb.)
1958-59—	260 lb. fat per cow (a drop of 2 lb.)
1959-60—	269 lb. fat per cow (a rise of 9 lb.)

The average per cow production for all cows in South Australia has remained fairly constant at about 210 lb. butterfat per cow.

The drop in the years 1957 to 1959 was due to one of the most serious droughts we have ever experienced in South Australia. That caused many herds to drop in numbers principally because old cows were disposed of to conserve highly priced feed. The total rise in butterfat production from 1953 to 1960 was 33 lb. a cow, which represents a substantial increase. Although dairy cow herds dropped in numbers because of the drought I believe that we are well on the way to picking up the numbers again.

Another good thing that has arisen because of the efforts of the people who keep a tab on the trends in the dairying industry is that the lactation period has increased. The paper continues:

In 1955-56 cows under herd test milked on the average 244 days. In 1959-60 the length of the lactation period had increased to 253 days. This is a desirable movement, and is no doubt due to improved herd and farm management. In general, dairy cattle feeding is better, and milking practices are improved.

I wish to examine some factors affecting the progress of the industry over the years. In 1865 Gregor Mendel (an Austrian monk) discovered the theory of heredity: that heredity or breeding in dairy cattle was responsible for maintaining or upholding butterfat production. That theory is now being challenged because in those circumstances it was considered that breeding was responsible for about 80 per cent of butterfat and milk production, and environment and feeding for only about 20 per cent; whereas dairymen and departmental experts now claim that this position is almost

reversed and that environment and feeding are responsible for nearly 80 per cent of the production, and breeding for only about 20 per cent. That has been proved by the fact that, in crossing Hereford bulls and Jersey or any other breed of cow, the milk production and butterfat production is not lost. There is an advantage in this as the calves from those unions are suitable for butchers after they have finished their milking period. That is one advantage that shows how ideas change.

In 1880 one of the other factors that contributed to the dairying industry's progress was the importation of some excellent bloodstock from overseas and even today some of our best herds bear the mark of the bloodstock that was purchased then. In 1923 a bull subsidy scheme was introduced and up to May of this year the cost of 4,236 bulls has been subsidized by £73,538—an average of £17 7s. 2d. That has had a big influence in building up our dairy herds. Page 2 of the statement deals with herd recording and states:

The herd recording organization is subsidized by the Commonwealth and State Governments. The fees paid by dairymen are approximately one-third of the cost. Present legislation requires dairy farmers to pay bull licence fees. These are paid into a Dairy Cattle Fund, and used to "improving the standards of dairy cattle, and to providing and encouraging the dairy industry". The Subsidy Bull Scheme is assisted from this fund.

Changes are taking place rapidly and an artificial insemination pilot centre has been established to evolve better methods of breeding better dairy cattle. Concerning this the paper states:

In 1958, a single-unit pilot trial was set up in South Australia to establish techniques to prove the practicability of artificial insemination, to test the reaction of farmers, and to analyse the costs involved. From the experience gained, the department recommended that the trial be extended to the main dairying areas. In 1959-60, programme, a total of 5,000 cows were inseminated. This year it is expected the number will be about 15,000 cows. Plans to promote artificial breeding on a much wider scale are envisaged.

This scheme will affect the bull subsidy and we can expect to lose some of our smaller studs which will give way to the service. However, this is a great move that should benefit the dairying industry. We must use scientific methods and observe modern trends if we wish to progress. Honourable members may laugh at these things, but they are vital to the interests of our dairying people today and, when we look to what might happen, we must thoroughly examine every prospect and aspect

of the dairying industry to pare the waste and economize as much as we can.

Mr. Riches: Would it help to decentralize the treatment plants?

Mr. JENKINS: They are well distributed now. They are springing up all over the country wherever dairying centres have sufficient production requiring processing.

Mr. Riches: Some butter is being made in Adelaide.

Mr. JENKINS: That may be so. In my district are some factories. There is a small one on Hindmarsh Island, and the Amscol factory, which has been enlarged recently, is producing a large volume of cheese and whole milk, and there is also one at Jervois. The Myponga factory is nearby, in the district of the Minister of Agriculture. Two or three years ago the United Dairy was constructed at Mount Compass and today it is producing almost 100 per cent more than was estimated. There are two factories in Meadows. If we are to compete on the open market we need all possible improvements.

Mr. Riches: Could not butter be produced in the milk-producing areas?

Mr. JENKINS: It probably could. Our butter is classified as second-grade and is difficult to sell overseas, probably because most of the cream, which is produced by wheat-growers who run a few cows as a sideline, is not collected daily as in the more closely settled areas. The cream is separated and sometimes held for a week before being carted long distances over rough roads and in hot weather, which causes its deterioration before it is processed. That problem will no doubt be overcome ultimately.

In 1899 there were 31 factories in this State, 21 producing cheese, nine producing cheese and butter, and one—the Gumeracha factory—producing only butter. At that time there was no Bureau of Statistics and everything was estimated. It was estimated that 2,000 tons of butter was sold that year; 1,800 tons of dairy butter at 9d. a pound and 200 tons of factory butter, produced at Gumeracha, at 2s. 9d. a pound sold at auction. Since then the number of factories has increased, as people have realized their value in processing and treating milk. The dairy factories should be given credit for the excellent way in which they have progressed. Today 88 factories are licensed. Some produce seven or eight different products, including whole milk, cheese, butter, dried milks and ice-cream.

The increase in production has been tremendous. They have done well in processing and marketing, but there is still scope for improvement.

One new method is the bulk handling of milk, which I examined recently in the Jervois area. Farmers are pleased with the method which saves much labour and is hygienic. The milk goes straight from the cows through the machines into a tank, which is fitted with a dip stick to indicate the quantity of milk. A pick-up service, fitted with a hose somewhat like a hydrant, sucks the milk out of the tank and takes it to the factory for processing. I have been informed by factory personnel that it is an excellent plan. I hope that it will be extended to other dairying districts. It will not be an easy scheme to implement because unless there is a concentrated area of dairy farms the pick-up will not be economic.

We must study the economics of pick-up services, which overlap in some areas. If it could be satisfactorily arranged by the factories to have zones to equalize their pick-ups, which would not be easy, a considerable saving could be effected. About 60 years ago the swamp lands from Wellington to Woods Point were held by three people, but today 60 families obtain good livings from the area and produce big quantities of some of our

best milk. When the Irrigation Branch installed the watering system the engineers designed it so that the area could be watered once a month and the water pumped off periodically. However, some farmers have been watering fortnightly and others at odd times; consequently, problems have arisen. The water table is rising, causing concern, and many varieties of weeds have become evident. Now, to cope with the problems, the Engineering and Water Supply Department, the Department of Agriculture, and the Irrigation Branch have become associated in an experimental farm at Long Flat which is investigating watering and dewatering processes to determine the best method of farming this area. If successful, this could prove most beneficial to those dairying in the area and place dairying on a more scientific basis. We must examine every aspect of this industry. If we can make it successful we will be going a long way towards meeting the challenge that will arise when Britain joins the European Common Market. I support the motion.

Mr. JENNINGS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.30 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, August 3, at 2 p.m.