

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, August 3, 1961.

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

QUESTIONS.

ENCOUNTER BAY WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. JENKINS: Can the Minister of Works say what progress is being made with the new water scheme for the Encounter Bay water district and whether it is likely to operate by early next summer?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: It is a week or two since I saw the docket on this matter. I will get a report from the Engineer-in-Chief and inform the honourable member.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL ENROLMENTS.

Mr. HUTCHENS: At naturalization ceremonies, conducted with credit to all concerned, in various municipalities, the new citizens are handed, in addition to their certificates, enrolment cards for both Commonwealth Houses of Parliament and for the State House of Assembly. Many of these new citizens would qualify for enrolment on the Legislative Council roll but never are they advised of this or handed an enrolment card. Will the Premier see whether it is possible for Legislative Council electoral cards to be issued to them and for the presiding officer to instruct them on their rights?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am surprised at the honourable member's statement that never are they advised that they may be eligible to enrol for the Legislative Council. I have been to many naturalization ceremonies and cannot remember where that has not been made a special feature. That is customary in many districts. They have been advised that they may be eligible for Legislative Council enrolment and, as far as I know, they are always invited to inquire about it. Obviously it would immediately cause much difficulty if, after having been given an enrolment card for the Legislative Council, they made a claim only to find that they were not eligible. They would not understand why they were refused enrolment and would perhaps think there was some discrimination against them.

Mr. Jennings: There is, isn't there?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: No, they have the same rights as any other South Australian citizen to enrol. If they were given an application form for something for which they were not eligible it would cause

much confusion and it would not be an advantage compared with the present practice. I agree with the honourable member that it is important to advise them of their rights, and, although naturalization ceremonies are not under the control of the State Government but are arranged by the Commonwealth Government and carried out by local councils, I will as far as possible see that this is done.

CARAVAN BRAKE LIGHTS.

Mr. TAPPING: The following article appeared in the press recently under the heading of "Caravan brake lights":

South Australian caravans being used in Victoria would have to have brake lights fitted to the rear of the van to comply with Victorian regulations, a Royal Automobile Association spokesman warned recently. The spokesman said that this warning had become necessary following a "test" court case in which an R.A.A. member was fined in a Melbourne court for not having a brake light attached to the rear of his caravan. Victorian regulations stipulated that brake lights should be fitted to the rear of all caravans and trailers, the spokesman added.

Incidentally, it cost the R.A.A. much money to contest the case. Will the Premier take up this matter with the State Traffic Committee or make some comment?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The honourable member is entirely correct when he points out the difficulty that arises to motorists if there are differences between the requirements in one State and those of another State, particularly when so many motorists travel interstate. On the other hand, I think he will see that if these lights are not considered necessary in South Australia it is a great imposition to require every caravan in this State to be fitted with them merely on the assumption that some caravans occasionally go to other States. A uniform code has been recommended for all Australian States, and we will examine this matter to see what the uniform code provides. Some amendments that will be introduced this year may not commend themselves to Parliament except that they are in a uniform code applying to Australia as a whole, and in those circumstances it is probably advantageous to give them the benefit of the doubt. I shall have this matter examined.

RHYNIE WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. NICHOLSON: A new trunk main is being laid to Paskerville, and landholders in the Rhynie district have sought a water supply from this main. Will the Minister of Works indicate what stage the investigation has reached?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I initiated an inquiry on this matter but the docket and report relating to it have not been sent to me. I shall endeavour to expedite the matter so that the honourable member can have a reply at the earliest possible moment.

SALK VACCINE.

Mr. LAWN: This week hundreds—one might even say thousands—of mothers are visiting the poliomyelitis immunization unit in Wakefield Street to have their children immunized. Many have complained of the length of time they have had to wait. According to this morning's *Advertiser*, one lady said she joined the end of the queue at 10.40 a.m. and left the unit at 1.40 p.m., which means that she had waited three hours, and I understand there have been similar occurrences. According to the press, the Minister of Health more or less wiped off the pleas in these matters, likening the queue to one that lines up for ballet tickets. These mothers have come from places as far away as Loxton, Wallaroo, Mylor and Penola, and then they have to wait three hours to have their children immunized. Does the Premier, as Leader of the Government, agree with the present set-up, or will he in the interests of humanity, of these mothers, and of their children see whether more mobile units can be established?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: A question was asked on this matter by another member earlier in the week, and I then explained the circumstances associated with the problem. I also said the matter was receiving close attention. I have not yet received a report on this matter, but as soon as it comes to hand I will certainly publicize it. Two problems are associated with the matter. One is that for a long time no supplies of vaccine have been available, and consequently the Government has not been able to maintain its inoculation programme. In the meantime, two or three cases of poliomyelitis brought to people's minds the need for seeing that they were inoculated. Therefore, when the supplies came to hand there was an immediate rush upon them. I checked up personally and found that the waiting time yesterday was considerably reduced.

Mr. Lawn: It was three hours yesterday morning.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This morning I again went to look and it appeared to me that there was even slightly better handling than yesterday morning. I agree that it is undesirable that any person should be kept waiting if it can be humanly avoided, but I

point out that as soon as these emergency supplies are exhausted everybody will have to wait.

Mr. Lawn: But they won't be waiting for three hours in a queue!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I accept that: they will be waiting under different conditions.

NURSES' RESPONSIBILITY.

Mr. HUGHES: The *Advertiser* of April 20 this year carried an article headed "Nurses investigate legal responsibility", which stated:

There was an increasing tendency through legal action to make nurses take their share of responsibility, particularly for mistakes in the administration of drugs, a leading English nurse told the International Council of Nurses Congress in Melbourne today. She is Miss Florence Udell, chairman of the Legal Responsibilities Committee of the International Council of Nurses. She said, "The public in many countries is becoming increasingly 'claim conscious', and an examination should be made of the need for some form of indemnity insurance for nurses not adequately covered by employers.

Can the Premier say whether members of the nursing profession in this State are adequately protected with some form of insurance by their employers in the event of a mistake being made as outlined by Miss Udell?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I know of no such insurance being effective in this State, and doubt the advisability of advocating it. Some drugs in current use require the most careful administration to patients; many drugs are very strong and could be detrimental to a patient if incorrectly given. Under those circumstances I believe that it is necessary that the persons handling such drugs should be not only qualified but also very responsible. A person handling these drugs in a chemist's shop is required to be a most competent person, and no assistant would be permitted under any circumstances to dispense drugs except under the direct supervision and on the responsibility of a registered person. Under those circumstances I doubt whether it would be advisable to give an overall insurance so that no responsibility would attach to a person. I am referring not only to nurses. I do not think nurses in hospitals dispense drugs, for a dispensary normally handles drugs so that nurses do not take such direct responsibility. I have great doubts about the advisability of doing what the honourable member suggests.

MOUNT TORRENS PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. LAUCKE: The playing area at the Mount Torrens primary school is rather restricted. There are just under two acres of

land adjoining the school grounds which, if purchased for a playing area, would relieve the situation. Can the Minister of Education say whether negotiations for the purchase of this land are completed?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON: No; negotiations are still in progress for the acquisition of the land. Unfortunately, there are difficult legal technicalities to be overcome, and these will inevitably cause some lapse of time before finality can be reached. The land, although small in area, is in the names of two or three owners under various titles. One title is held by a trustee company that has no power to sell. I hope that negotiations will be expedited and brought to a successful conclusion.

CONSTRUCTION CAMPS.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I understand that the Electricity Trust intends to close all construction camps at present occupied by its employees. This concerns me as there is such a camp at Parilla at present occupied by the Murray Bridge gang constructing the Pinnaroo extension. If this camp is to be closed, could the trust give an assurance that what is already a long protracted job will not be prolonged unnecessarily further as a consequence?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will ask the General Manager of the Electricity Trust to give me a report so that I can tell the honourable member what the trust intends to do concerning its camps and whether the removal of the main construction camp (which is, I take it, the one he refers to) will have any effect on the completion of the detailed work—that is, the connecting up of houses along the route.

BOARDING ALLOWANCES.

Mr. QUIRKE: My question concerns boarding allowances for children whose home in the country is situated five miles from a high school bus route or a lesser distance, when there are special conditions of hardship. Many parents living with this distance disadvantage send their children to school in Adelaide. Contrary to general opinion, these people make real sacrifices to send their children to collegiate schools. Often the sacrifice is demanded by the physical impossibility of children reaching their destination unless taken by car by the parents—irrespective of distance. A shorter distance is sometimes as impossible as a longer distance. The time involved, twice a day, constitutes a heavy strain, particularly when only one parent can drive a car. I have known of cases of children travelling 63 miles a day, boarding a bus at

7.30 a.m. and getting home at 5.45 p.m. when living within five miles of that bus route, yet they are ineligible for a boarding allowance. I have a reply which says that, although a road could be unsafe for a bicycle, the obligation is with the parent to arrange for the child's transport to the bus and that, therefore, there is no case for a boarding allowance. As high and technical schools are being built at great cost in the metropolitan area at intervals of 1½ miles, will the Government take a more realistic view of country residential difficulties concerning boarding allowances?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON: The appropriate regulation made under the Education Act, which regulation was approved by Parliament and deals with boarding allowances, reads:

Every qualified student who is forced to live away from home in order to attend the nearest approved secondary school which gives a course of secondary education of the kind selected by the student and approved by the Director will be granted a boarding allowance at the rate of £75 per annum for the period during which he attends such school.

The operative words in the regulation are "who is forced to live away from home" and the interpretation of that phrase becomes a matter of departmental policy. That policy has been administered on my behalf by a School Transport Advisory Committee, consisting of the Deputy Director of Education (Mr. Griggs), the Secretary of the department (Mr. Strutton), the Accountant (Mr. Young), the Assistant Secretary (Mr. Harris, who was formerly Transport Officer), and the present Transport Officer (Mr. Hindmarsh). They consider every application in great detail and then make a report and recommendations to me.

I do not always approve their recommendations but, in the main, I approve them because they appear to be sound. This policy administered by this committee was formerly to grant boarding allowances where the student resided six or more miles from a secondary school or a bus service to a secondary school, and children residing between four and six miles from the school were considered on the basis of hardship. Last November, approval was given to vary this policy so that boarding allowances would be paid to those residing five or more miles from their school and special consideration would be given to those between four and five miles in cases of hardship. It has been accepted by the committee that, where a child resides between four and five miles from a bus and has to travel

for 25 or more miles each way and be absent from home for 9½ hours or more, a case of hardship is presented.

It may be that that causes unnecessary hardship in some cases but I assure the honourable member and the House that I lived for several years in the centre of a primary producing district and I represented that district in Parliament for about eight years, so I think that I have a proper appreciation of the problems of country residents in general and primary producers in particular. I am only too ready and anxious at all times to give personal consideration (indeed, my earnest and anxious consideration) to every application that comes before me. Furthermore, if necessary, I am prepared to have the whole policy reconsidered by Cabinet.

JERVOIS BRIDGE.

Mr. RYAN: Has the Minister of Works the report he said he would get in reply to my question of July 25 about the condition of the Jervois Bridge?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: No; I regret I have not yet the report. As the honourable member has asked his question again, naturally it will appear in *Hansard* and the department will note it. I will see that it is again brought to the department's notice.

PORT PIRIE RAILWAY LINE.

Mr. McKEE: Can the Minister of Works tell me what is the position regarding the removal of the railway lines from Ellen Street at Port Pirie? In view of the Public Works Standing Committee's recommendations and what the Premier himself had to say prior to the last election, supported as he was by the Chief Secretary, regarding the removal of the lines, we were led to believe that this work would be carried out in conjunction with the rehabilitation of the wharf. The Port Pirie Council and I have been advised by the Commissioner that the necessary finance has not been made available to his department for this work. Can the Minister say whether money will be made available to the Railways Department to enable this work to be done?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: In the early planning stages it was the Government's intention and desire to remove the railway lines from Ellen Street as part of the general programme of rehabilitating Port Pirie's wharves. When this matter was before the Public Works Committee every aspect was considered, but difficulties arose regarding the overall planning as originally contemplated. As often happens

during the process of detailed examination, the original concept had to be varied. Regarding the removal of the lines from Ellen Street, I had better obtain through the Minister of Railways the Railways Commissioner's latest views. I will get a reply as soon as possible.

KERSBROOK PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. LAUCKE: On a recent visit to the Kersbrook primary school I noted how congested the students were in the accommodation provided in two classrooms. Can the Minister of Education say whether it has been decided to provide an additional classroom to overcome this congestion?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON: This question has been personally investigated by the district inspector who recommended that a single wooden classroom be erected, and that the partition between the two present rooms be removed to provide better facilities for the lower grades. As a result of this report, the Superintendent of Primary Schools has advised me that a timber classroom for the school will be considered favourably when the next priority list of timber classrooms is being compiled. I cannot take the matter further at present.

FAT LAMB EXPORTS.

Mr. HALL: We have been blessed with a favourable year for the production of fat lambs, but, unfortunately, there has been a severe price drop in the United Kingdom market that we rely on to take most of our fat lamb surplus. We have the usual channels by which our goods are promoted overseas, but many people doubt whether sufficient is being done to sell our fat lamb exportable surplus. There is a feeling that perhaps a mission, comprising growers, with the specific object of selling fat lambs might further our interests more than the usual channels that have many articles of South Australian production to sell. It is thought that the mission could concentrate on the United States market, which is so big that it could easily absorb the South Australian surplus which, by United States' standards, would be relatively small. Will the Minister of Agriculture obtain a report on the immediate disposal of this year's surplus and prospects for the next few years?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Yes, in so far as the question can be answered by the Agriculture Department and Produce Department. I think the question may have to be referred to the Commonwealth Department of Trade.

CLARE CARAVAN PARK.

Mr. QUIRKE: Has the Treasurer any information as to the fate of an application for a subsidy made by the Clare caravan park?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: If memory serves me correctly, a move was made to establish a caravan park at Clare last year. I believe it was to be associated with a beautiful plot of land known as Christisen Park. The authorities at Clare have approached the Tourist Bureau for another subsidy, I think on the expenditure of £1,600. That expenditure will be approved.

RIVERTON-JAMESTOWN BUS SERVICE.

Mr. QUIRKE: There is no passenger rail service between Riverton and Spalding because of the poor condition of the railway line. The bus service that operates between Riverton and Jamestown is to be reduced from August 27, not between Riverton and Clare but between Clare and Jamestown. This affects Hilltown, Andrews, Spalding and Jamestown. The reason for the alteration is that people are not using the bus as a passenger service, but the bus carries the mail and small goods, and the people of those towns will be denied a mail service and the quick delivery of spare parts and other essentials. The service between Clare and Spalding on Saturday has been entirely eliminated. Will the Minister of Works ascertain from the Minister of Railways whether, if it is not possible to provide a better service because of lack of patronage, an alternative service to carry the mail and small goods could be arranged?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will take the matter up with my colleague.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: SOFT DRINK PRICES.

Mr. FRED WALSH: I ask leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. FRED WALSH: Twice this week I have asked questions concerning the increase in the cost of soft drinks and on both occasions that question has been attributed in the press to Mr. Frank Walsh, the Leader of the Opposition. I should like the press to take note through you, Sir, that there are two members in this Chamber with the same name—Mr. Frank Walsh (member for Edwardstown and the Leader of the Opposition) and me (member for West Torrens). I appreciate the embarrassment that the two names cause by our being in the one Chamber, but that embarrassment may be eliminated

next year if one Party has its way at the elections; but I am concerned more about this session and request the press to note that two members in this Chamber bear the same name.

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE.

The Legislative Council intimated that it had appointed the Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph to fill the vacancy on the Standing Orders Committee caused by the death of the Hon. F. J. Condon.

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 2. Page 230.)

Mr. JENNINGS (Enfield): I rise to briefly support the Address in Reply as amended by the Leader of the Opposition. I think that the amendment is the only thing that makes the motion worthy of our support. We know that fellow feeling makes us wondrous kind, so I do not intend to inflict on other members what I have had inflicted on me by having to listen to the first few minutes of speeches devoted almost entirely to eulogies of everyone and everything. I believe we can perhaps just take that as said—and that implies no disrespect whatever to the Governor or anyone else.

I must express my deep sorrow at the death of our late friend Frank Condon. I had for him the warmest personal affection based on a genuine respect and admiration, and not the least of my reasons for honouring him is his unblemished loyalty to his Party over a long period and through numerous political crises when many lesser men did not have the fortitude to adhere to their principles. During the conscription campaigns, during the disastrous days of the Premiers' Plan, and during the more recent domestic disturbances in the Labor Party, Frank Condon never once even slightly strayed from his pledged word to his Party, and I believe that if the rest of us can serve our parties half as long or half as loyally we will have nothing to be ashamed of.

The mover of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply (the member for Torrens) started a tendency to talk about water. Several of his colleagues followed him in this respect. I can only suppose it was because they wanted to keep away from more controversial matters in the fairly unpleasant political climate in which they find themselves. However, I am willing to admit that the member for Torrens made rather an interesting case for desalination of water. At the same

time, I must confess to certain irritation about his constant references to desalination of salt water; I cannot conceive how any other sort of water could benefit from this process. As far as the rest of his speech is concerned, I must sympathize with him for trying to do the right thing according to his own lights, and yet not quite making the grade. When I say he was trying to do the right thing according to his lights I refer to what every ambitious young Liberal should know: that for him to get on, at least 100 per cent of his speech should be devoted to praises of the Premier. The member for Torrens failed by about 1½ per cent, and 98½ per cent is not nearly good enough; he will not get on that way.

We all know the old saying that imitation is the sincerest form of flattery. Perhaps it could be said that plagiarism is an even more effective form of flattery, or sycophancy, and in this respect the member for Torrens did not do so badly because his speech, as far as we were able to see, was taken mostly from the Premier's performances on television plus certain information that he himself was able to gain as a consequence of his membership of the Public Works Committee. Witness, for example, the fulsome praise of the Premier for his recent television broadcast about the balancing of the Budget over the last 23 years and the surplus for this year, even though Parliament had voted for a deficit. The Government should certainly not be praised for this; just the contrary.

This surplus was achieved only by not spending money, not because of any budgeting genius of the Premier or any added revenue (except in one case) which could not have been foreseen. It was gained only by not spending money that this Parliament had voted to be spent, and in a time of chronic unemployment it is not good budgeting not to spend something voted to be spent; it is just the opposite. If this money which needed to be spent on education, roads, hospitals and many other things, and which had been voted to be spent, had been spent, many of the people of this State who have been unemployed and are still unemployed would be employed now. We know, too, that just as employment creates employment so does unemployment create unemployment.

Mr. Laucke: What have you to say about the £1,000,000 to be spent on electricity extensions for the South-East?

Mr. JENNINGS: I think I have already converted the honourable member. This Government must take a big share of the responsi-

bility for the unemployment that is afflicting this country today. Certainly we know that it is the primary responsibility of the Commonwealth Government, but the South Australian Government has always supported the election and re-election of the present Commonwealth Liberal Government and it has also not done much in this State about maintaining a higher level of employment than we have. After all this, it is rather ironical that the Premier should now in his latest television performance be advocating a Premiers' Conference in Canberra on the subject of unemployment. A long time ago the Leader of the Opposition in this State wrote to the Prime Minister and the Premier of South Australia asking that such a conference be convened.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Is the honourable member sure of his facts?

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, and ever since, when opportunity has arisen, he has revived the matter, only to get precisely nowhere. Mr. Heffron (Premier of New South Wales) who, because he is the Premier of the senior State, has the role of arranging Premiers' Conferences, advocated this kind of conference a long time ago but received no support—publicly, at any rate—from the Premier of South Australia. No comment was made by the Premier of South Australia on that. When Parliament met in June, in the Legislative Council the honourable Mr. Bardolph asked the Leader of the Government (Sir Lyell McEwin) about convening a Premiers' Conference on the subject of unemployment and he was, to put it colloquially, scrubbed off completely. The Chief Secretary said, "There has just been a Loan Council meeting so what is the use of convening a Premiers' Conference?" In case honourable members do not know who Sir Lyell McEwin is, he is the gentleman who recently said, "Well, if it's all right to queue up all night for ballet tickets it's all right for pregnant women and their children to wait hours for poliomyelitis inoculations."

More recently, the Trades and Labor Council sent a deputation to the Premier on the subject of unemployment, and I understand that that deputation also suggested convening a Premiers' Conference on this matter. If my information is correct, the Premier said he would not even bother wasting a fivepenny stamp on a letter to Canberra about it, yet a few days afterwards he goes on television and says, "I have just suddenly thought of this new idea of a Premier's Conference on unemployment." I think it is

difficult for us to escape the conclusion that the Premier is not terribly concerned about unemployment as such but he is getting concerned, as he need be, about the political consequences of unemployment, and that is why he now comes out and says, "Alone I did it; alone I thought of it; and I want a Premiers' Conference on this matter."

After the speech of the member for Torrens we heard from the member for Chaffey. Following that, we heard from our Leader, and I am glad to say that, although this was the first time he has spoken as Leader on the Address in Reply debate, he rose to the occasion, and I am certain that he will continue to speak at such a high standard as he did on this occasion. The most important part of his speech was concerned with his amendment, and although we have since heard much legal argument about this, the point nevertheless still remains that we saw in this application to the Arbitration Commission one of the closest liaisons we have ever seen in recent history between the Government and employers. That cannot be denied, and it must be accepted, together with the attitude of the Government on workmen's compensation, the Industrial Code, long service leave, and many other matters, as evidence that this is surely the most anti-worker Government in Australia.

The member for Barossa (Mr. Laucke) spoke in this debate and was nauseated. Well, he did not have that on his own, and, I might add, he contributed to the nausea in the Chamber. I thoroughly agree with him on one point that he mentioned, namely, that we should trade with Red China. If that statement had come from a member on this side, he would have been immediately labelled a Communist. I do not know what the member for Gouger and the member for Mitcham are going to do about their colleague, the member for Barossa. I do not know whether there will be a motion before the next Liberal and Country League conference for his expulsion.

The member for Gouger treated us to an exhibition of moronic mendacity such as we have never before witnessed in this Chamber. I do not know whether to compliment the honourable member or not on maintaining the astonishingly high standard of imbecility that he has built up . . .

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is out of order in his remarks, and I ask him to withdraw his remark about imbecility. Does the honourable member withdraw?

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, Sir, certainly. I must say that much objection would have been

taken to some of the remarks of the member for Gouger, associating members on this side of the House with Communism, if they had emanated from a more responsible source.

Mr. Hall: I am pleased to see that no-one is objecting.

Mr. JENNINGS: Certainly no-one is objecting, because it is hard to get into a state of high dudgeon about something that is said by somebody who, you know, has not the slightest sense of responsibility; therefore, the remarks of the member for Gouger have not offended us in the slightest. I must say that the remarks of the member for Gouger and, later, of the member for Mitcham about Communism were designed to influence the vote for the third Senate seat in South Australia.

Mr. Lawn: Obviously.

Mr. JENNINGS: They are trying to create the atmosphere now which they think may have that effect, but I am sorry to disappoint them. I believe that, after the next Commonwealth elections, Senator Buttfield will be no longer a member of the Senate, and although some members in this House may regard that as a disaster, from what I have been able to sense it will not be regarded as a national calamity by many of her Senate colleagues.

Mr. Hall: Would you approve of your third Senate candidate's election?

Mr. JENNINGS: Certainly. The member for Mitcham also spoke a long time about Communism and I thought that his different approach to the subject was because, almost inevitably, he was more astute than the member for Gouger. I find, however, from things I have heard, that I may have paid too great a compliment, that his different attitude was probably dictated by an instruction from higher up, and that he certainly was not going to make such a galah of himself as had the member for Gouger. The member for Mitcham posed a question when he was talking about Communism. He said that he had gone to many people, had asked them why they were not Communists, but they could not answer. I do not really believe that the member for Mitcham did this at all, even though he told us—and he apparently felt it necessary to tell us—that he was a Christian. I have become rather doubtful of his veracity ever since he told us in this House that, when calling at the Trades Hall to get a copy of the Labor Party platform, he had walked over plush red carpets, whereas we all know that one could not find a square

yard of carpet in the Trades Hall. So, as a consequence, I have come not to take as literal truth everything the honourable member says.

Anyway, let us assume that on this occasion he was being truthful, and imagine that he had approached a person in the street and said, "Why aren't you a Communist?" When a person who does not take a great or active interest in political affairs is asked suddenly why he is not something, the honourable member for Mitcham would get exactly the same bewilderment as if he had gone up to a man in the street and said, "Why don't you play baseball?", or anything else like that. Generally speaking, we know why we are something but how can we explain why we are not something? I think, however, that, if the member for Mitcham had asked members on this side, who have given much thought to and have studied the matter, why they were not Communists, they could have given him many reasons.

He, under cross-questioning, said that he was not a Communist because it was fundamentally atheistic. That is all right: it is as good a reason as any. He will not find any dispute with that on this side of the House, either, but we could certainly give many more reasons than that. For example, we could say that we do not believe in a system that has as a fundamental premise that the end justifies the means. No member on this side could subscribe to a philosophy like that. We do not believe that any creditable end can ever be achieved by discreditable means. We do not believe, similarly, that it is right to use armed force to change a Government. Sometimes we are tempted to.

Mr. Lawn: We would like to do it in South Australia!

Mr. JENNINGS: We can talk about that later. It has been done in many other countries, but we do not believe in that because, first, we do not agree with the morality of it and, secondly, from a purely practical point of view we realize that any organization that has sufficient force to take over a Government by armed force can inevitably retain government by that force. The honourable member for Mitcham said he was a Christian.

Mr. Jenkins: Is that anything to be ashamed of?

Mr. JENNINGS: Certainly not, far from it. Nothing I have said has suggested that there is any reason to be ashamed of that, but I should have thought that in his reference to the late Mr. Healy he might have

shown a little more evidence of Christian charity instead of saying, as he did in effect, that, when Mr. Healy died, because he was an atheist he had nowhere to go. I thought it rather presumptuous of even the member for Mitcham to consign a person to eternal damnation instead of exercising a little bit of Christian charity in his own way by praying for the immortal soul of Jim Healy. He may have received a secret message from somewhere or other. The honourable member for Mitcham quoted extensively from a book by Douglas Hyde.

Mr. Ralston: He never said so.

Mr. JENNINGS: He did not admit it, but it had a familiar ring to me when he was making the quotation.

Mr. Lawn: He is not denying it now.

Mr. JENNINGS: When I got home last night, just to confirm my suspicions I had a look at the book and found that what the honourable member for Mitcham said was almost word for word out of Douglas Hyde's book *I Believe*.

Mr. Millhouse: The honourable member infers that I have read it?

Mr. JENNINGS: You certainly read extracts from it.

Mr. Millhouse: No, I have not read the book.

Mr. JENNINGS: Someone else may have prepared it for the honourable member.

Mr. Millhouse: I have never opened the book.

Mr. JENNINGS: Anyway the honourable member quoted from it, whether or not he has read it and, if he wants to continue his education on Communism, anti-Communism, or whatever he likes to call it, he should read the whole book and in it he will find, as appears in all Douglas Hyde's writings and lectures, that he joined the Communist Party because he was a young idealist, and, unlike most ex-Communists who have been bought, he is still just as intolerant as he ever was of the social injustices and evils that made him join the Communist Party in the first place. The question was implied by both the member for Gouger (Mr. Hall) and the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) about what we on this side of the House were doing about being anti-Communist or in opposition to Communism. Of course, they were effectively answered by the honourable member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan) who told the House clearly that what we were doing about Communism was the only positive approach that could possibly be made to this problem—ridding the world of the social injustices on which Communism thrives.

Let us look at those places in the world where Communism has become the supreme force: in Russia, where previously there was a brutal and repressive system of government; in China, where there was corrupt government; and in many other places where the ordinary democratic aspirations of the people were repressed. Let me say here and now that, if there had not been in England at the end of the war a Labour Government which gave independence to India, the whole of Asia would be Communist today. Instead of that, we have not a Communist India but an India that is doing its level best to be a buffer between China and the West.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: But surely Mr. Churchill (as he then was) promised India independence?

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, the Churchill war-time Government promised India independence, but the Atlee Labour Government gave India independence long before it was generally expected that it would gain independence.

Concerning what members on this side of the House are doing about Communism, we come a little closer to home now. I will not come into this picture at all personally but I can point out a few members on this side of the House, without making invidious distinctions, who have fought Communism tooth and nail over a long period. Witness, for example, the member for West Torrens who has been privileged to hold the highest offices in the Australian Labor Party in the trade union movement in this country and who has, all his life, fought bitterly against Communism, just as he has fought against every evil. Before he came to this House the member for Adelaide was secretary of the second largest union in South Australia. He also violently opposed Communism (and very effectively in that union), thus earning the undying hatred of Communists and, consequently, he is always opposed by a Communist when he stands for Parliament, which is more than can be said for the members for Gouger and Mitcham. The member for Port Pirie, before his election to this House, was a member and official of the largest union in South Australia—a union that has, in its constitution, a provision that most effectively prevents any Communist from standing for office in that union. The member for Port Adelaide is well known in the waterside workers' union as a resolute opponent of Communism. The first time he stood for Parliament he had a Communist opponent, because of his opposition to Communism.

Mr. Riches: I have had a few Communist opponents, as has the member for Whyalla.

Mr. JENNINGS: True. These members have fought Communism where it exists: in the factory, on the water front and on the job, not in Parliament where there are no Communists and not by a pious resolution at some political convention. They fought Communism when it was fashionable at the end of the war and when half of the cocktail parties in Adelaide were inundated by Reds and near-Reds because Russia was our glorious ally and even Churchill was proclaiming the heroism of the Red army. Our members, knowing the basic nature of Communism, were fighting it even when it was popular. It is easy to fight it now that it is unpopular. Our members will always fight it. I agree with what the member for Mitcham described as a definition by the Prime Minister (but which, of course, was a description) of Communism as being an alien philosophy. As such, we are resolutely opposed to it. What the Prime Minister discovered, too, to his sorrow, was that what he proposed to do about Communism was also alien to the Australian people. He discovered that at a referendum. I hope that we will not have too much of this talk in this House or elsewhere about Communism.

Mr. Hall: I bet you do!

Mr. JENNINGS: I hope not because I should like to see the high standards of this House maintained. I certainly hope that we will be able to go to the Commonwealth and State polls without having red herrings distributed everywhere, which might confuse the people in the serious decision they have to make. I have, as well as I possibly can, advanced the case for the adoption of the amended Address in Reply and trust that, in its amended form, it will be adopted.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide): I rise to support the motion as amended by the Leader of the Opposition. First, I pay my tribute, along with other members, to the late Hon. F. J. Condon. He was a trade unionist for many years—longer than I can remember—and a member of Parliament for over 30 years. He never failed the movement in all of the crises he witnessed—the depression years, the Premiers' plan and other matters that have been mentioned. He always remained loyal to his principles, which were the principles of the Australian Labor movement. This Parliament has suffered through his loss, as have the constituents of his district. After a lifetime of service to the people, industrially and politically, it is sad that a member, irrespective of

his politics, should die in harness. I deplore the fact that a man who has stood by his ideals all his life should not be able to enjoy his last few years in retirement. I am deeply sorry at his passing, and I pay tribute to him on the work he rendered the State.

I have listened with interest to the debate. I do not know whether you, Mr. Speaker, detected any move among Government members, but I did. I do not know whether there is some dissension on that side, whether there is anything in the suggestion that the Premier will retire and therefore all members opposite are breaking their necks to get his job, or whether they are trying to boost their own morale. However, it is most interesting to examine what members opposite have said. The member for Torrens, in moving the motion, referred to the Governor's Speech (which is prepared by the Government—and we all know that the Premier is the Government) and said:

What was the public reaction to this Speech? What was the impression gained by the people, the workers and the community? Let us look at the comments of our two daily newspapers as reported in their leader columns the next day, *i.e.*, Wednesday, June 21. The *Advertiser*, always noted for its sober and careful appraisal of the facts, said:

and he quoted from that paper. Obviously he was out to please his master and give him that little pat on the back, as does the member for Unley, who sits behind the Premier, when he wants to get in the Premier's good graces.

Mr. Jennings: The member for Unley won't be here much longer.

Mr. LAWN: Probably this will be your last year, Colin, but I wish you well in the future. The member for Chaffey followed, and he said:

I cannot let this occasion pass without also congratulating the Premier on representing us as our leader in this House for so many years. The member is obviously a candidate for some position that is, as yet, unknown. He was built up in this House by the member for Gouger, who nominated him as a member of some big committee—possibly the only member of that committee. He would be so important that he would supersede the Premier of this State. The honourable member, however, did not suggest what the committee was or what it should do.

Mr. Ralston: Drink water!

Mr. LAWN: It may have been. Then we come to the member for Gouger, who also says:

I congratulate the mover and seconder of this motion. I think that they performed their duties outstandingly well, and that the matters they mentioned were of vital importance to the State.

He went further, and said:

I congratulate too the member for Barossa on his spirited defence of arbitration.

He was not satisfied in stopping at the three, but went a bit further and said:

I feel that in some ways we are wasting the talents of a man such as the member for Chaffey, who has a great knowledge of the resources and the needs of the Murray Valley. I would say that his speech will be a reference that we can use in *Hansard* in future discussions on the Murray Valley. I should like to see his researches carried further, perhaps in a semi-official capacity. If a man such as the member for Chaffey were to inquire (or be a member of a committee that could inquire) into water resources and the needs of this State, I am sure that he would devote his talents in a way that would benefit all.

The member for Gouger was not only going to congratulate the Premier: he congratulated the mover and seconder of the motion (the members for Barossa and Chaffey). He was making it pretty wide, hoping that among some of the members he mentioned he would get some support. The member for Mitcham then followed and said:

I join with other members who have already spoken in conveying congratulations where they are due, welcomes and felicitations where they are due, . . .

Then he went on with condolences. He made his congratulations and felicitations as wide as the Parliament; he made his remarks general; he did not particularize. He was not going to take a chance that in congratulating some he might forget others.

Mr. Clark: He offered congratulations to all who thought they were entitled to them.

Mr. LAWN: Yes, he made his congratulations so wide that they referred to all those who thought they were entitled to them. The member for Stirling apparently thought it was better to play safe and not congratulate anyone, and consequently offend nobody, because the only congratulations he offered were to the Governor on his appointment as Governor, and he paid a small tribute to the member for Onkaparinga upon the honour he had received from the Queen. He thus made sure he was not going to offend anyone in next year's race, which may be for the leadership of the Opposition among their Party. We now come to the remarks of the mover of the motion and, as other members have indicated, one would have thought they were listening to the Premier's features—I would not say performances—over 5AD and ADS7. This reminds me of the old racehorse that has been flogged a little too much—Propaganda, by Playford out of Public Works.

Mr. Coumbe: Not bad breeding.

Mr. LAWN: I do not know that the breeding is so good, but the speeches are given over 5AD and ADS7 on Thursdays.

Mr. Riches: You shouldn't advertise those sessions here!

Mr. LAWN: I do not know how many people read *Hansard*, but I do not think there will be any other advertisements, as I do not think the press would publish any criticism of the Premier or of members opposite. There is a political relationship with that other old nag—Bob, by D.L.P. Preferences out of Wedlock. Then, of course we have that young colt who has just received his name—Gouger's Pride by the D.L.P. out of Conceited.

Mr. Ralston: He was only named this year, I think.

Mr. LAWN: Yes, he has just reached the stage of being named. He was an unknown yearling colt recently but he has apparently turned two years of age now. The speech of the member for Gouger—

Mr. Clark: Did he make a speech?

Mr. LAWN: Much of it, of course, was written out for him by a prominent Democratic Labor Party member who visits his home. I shall not mention that person's name; the honourable member will know to whom I am referring. We know him, as we know he has claimed to have written the part of the speech that dealt with the D.L.P., Communism, the *News Weekly*, and so on. He added a few other things, and started to advocate one price for electricity throughout the State. I do not know if he has been reading *Hansard*, but two or three years ago the late Mr. George Hambour, the then member for Light, was here when I showed the House that we could give the people of this State an equal rate for electric light and power. In that year the Electricity Trust had shown a profit of about £460,000. I said:

Over a period of three years the Government could give the people of this State a uniform tariff.

Of course, the greatest benefit would have been for the country people. Now the honourable member has come forth and is advocating a uniform tariff. He said:

I now turn to the question of Electricity Trust tariffs and their application, especially to country areas in this State. I believe that our goal should ultimately be one price for electricity throughout the State. Some people will ask, "What is the justification for that?" I would say at the beginning, however, that the great proportion of the trust's funds is supplied by the Treasury of this State. As an analogy, I think we could perhaps turn to another

department of the State (namely, the Railways Department) and ask "What is the financial investment of the railways?" If we asked that question we would find that most of the investment was in the country because obviously that is where most of the lines are. However, because those lines are in the country, would any member say that they are there especially for the country man? No, because the rail lines bring the produce of the country to the city and to the ports.

He continued along that line. He was a bit disjointed, which was not unusual for the honourable member, but he was obviously trying to convince someone that country people should receive electric light and power at a cheaper rate than at present. I assure him that he does not have to convince me, as I advocated that in this House two or three years ago.

Mr. Jennings: It is our policy.

Mr. LAWN: As the honourable member reminds me, that is the policy of the Socialist Labor Party. That is Socialism. The member for Gouger would be offended—or would pretend to be—if I said he was a Socialist, yet he stood up and advocated Socialism, because he advocated that nowhere in the country should people pay a higher rate for electric light and power than the people in the metropolitan area. That is the policy of the Australian Labor Party, and that is Socialism. Apparently the honourable member does not realize that. I recall that the member for Rocky River strenuously opposed the Government's taking over the old Adelaide Electric Supply Company, as did the former member for Burra (Mr. Hawker).

Mr. Heaslip: Not the present member for Rocky River.

Mr. LAWN: We have heard the honourable member get up and rant about Communism and Socialism. He did not agree with Socialism; he was a Tory. The Government's action in taking over control of a privately-owned company was not in accordance with the way the member for Rocky River speaks in this House. Mr. Hawker condemned the Government for its action, and he and the member for Rocky River opposed the Government on the matter, yet now the member for Rocky River congratulates the Government for bringing electricity to thousands of people in his electorate. I have heard him asking the Government how many more homes it could connect with the supply. That is Socialism, and the Government's action in taking over the electricity company is near Socialism. I think the only difference there would be under a Labor Government would be that we would see that the board was answerable to a Minister who, in turn,

would be answerable to Parliament. That is a little different from the present position of the Electricity Trust, and that is the only difference between the trust's set-up and complete Socialism. Government members support the trust and what it is doing throughout the country, and they are full of praise for the Government's passing the first £1,000,000 surplus which it showed on the trust's operations this year on to country development. They get up here and moan and groan about Communism and Socialism and say that they are Conservatives, anti-Communists, and anti-Socialists.

Mr. Shannon: Would you explain the Labor Party's interpretation of Socialism?

Mr. LAWN: The best interpretation of Socialism is its application. Have a look at the Woods and Forests Department, at the Electricity Trust, and at Leigh Creek, and you can see Socialism. Members opposite do not like that statement and will not accept the fact that we have a Socialist enterprise at Leigh Creek.

Mr. Hall: Set up purely by private enterprise.

Mr. LAWN: That is a laugh! I have met many people in the community who honestly thought the Premier owned Leigh Creek, but I never thought that a member of this House would say sincerely, as the member for Gouger did, that Leigh Creek is wholly set up by private enterprise. Well, we live and learn. I think the member for Gouger will be in for another lecture tonight, just as he was on Tuesday night. The honourable member referred to comments in various newspapers, including the *Advertiser*, the *News*, the *News Weekly* and other journals. I say to him that those comments were made for what they were worth, because the same day—and I kept a copy of the newspaper—the *News* said that Mr. Frank Walsh, the member for West Torrens, had asked a question about the proposed penny a bottle increase in the cost of cool drinks. The member for West Torrens made a personal explanation about this today. This morning's *Advertiser*, another newspaper quoted by the member for Gouger, said that yesterday the Premier replied to Mr. Frank Walsh, the Leader of the Opposition, on the very same question. The Premier was replying, of course, to Mr. Fred Walsh (member for West Torrens). The member for Gouger probably knows the story about the landlady who came home and found a piece of paper in the fireplace. When she challenged the boarder he claimed that he did not know anything

about it, and she said, "Yes you do, I saw it in the paper." The boarder replied, "You cannot believe everything you see in the newspapers." The honourable member has the audacity in this House to quote from these newspapers, including even the *News Weekly*. Let me tell the House this: there is a newspaper known as the *Waterfront*.

Mr. Hall: What about the *Seamen's Journal*?

Mr. LAWN: That is just what I might have expected from the other side of the House. What a clown the honourable member is. He should tell his constituents the performance he puts on in this House. *Waterfront* is published by the steamship owners, and it is put in every member's letterbox in this building. I get mine and take it home and put it in the wastepaper basket. Some members do not even take the wrapper off. Government members think it is a waterside workers' publication or, as the member for Gouger said, the *Seamen's Journal*, and they throw it in the wastepaper basket without taking the wrapper off. Yet it is printed by the Steamship Owners' Federation. That is what the member for Gouger and other Government members think of newspapers.

Mr. Hall: I am not referring to that journal.

Mr. LAWN: I referred to the *Waterfront* and the honourable member said it was the *Seamen's Journal*. Coming to another point: a recent press announcement in Adelaide stated that nine people had shared in the reward given for information that led to the kidnapper of Graham Thorne. That statement in the press has since been contradicted by the Commissioner of Police in New South Wales, who is to allocate the reward and who is definite that the matter has not been finalized. Listening to the member for Gouger on Tuesday, however, one would have thought it was the Gospel he was quoting when he was quoting all these newspapers.

The *News* of Friday, June 30, came out with a headline "Worst of Credit Squeeze at End." I am sure that thousands and thousands of people in South Australia since June 30 have felt the squeeze who did not feel it before. They are out of work today. I have people coming here to me, some last week, some this week—men out of work. Only yesterday there came to me a lady whose husband was out of work, and they had four children. One person who came in last week has nine children, including a married daughter. The daughter and her husband are living at home with the father and mother; they have no prospects.

They came to see their member to see whether I could help. Last year, only four or five people came to see me about a job and I was able to help place every one of them. Always I have found it hard to help a man find employment if he is over 45 years of age, particularly if he is over 50.

Early last year I was able to find employment for two men 62 years of age but, because of the action of the Prime Minister and because of the credit squeeze today, it is impossible to find anyone a job, even a boy under 21. Only last week I rang the employment bureau. A father who was with me in the interviewing room was out of work and his son-in-law was living at home with him. He has boys aged 19, 18, and 15, and I could not get them a job through the Commonwealth Employment Bureau or by any other means, yet there is the *News* of last June saying that the worst is over!

We have a depression and, if any man wants to know what a depression is, he should ask himself whether he is in or out of work. If he is in work, there is no depression; if he is out of work, there is a depression. We have a Government sitting opposite us talking about the prosperous condition of the State and saying how buoyant our economy is with a £1,000,000 surplus. The Government handed over £1,000,000 to the Electricity Trust of South Australia to provide country people with electric light and power. We also had another £1,000,000 surplus. That is what the Treasurer told us in June. He said that the first £1,000,000 surplus was handed over to the Electricity Trust.

Mr. Nankivell: For power lines in the South-East. It is for industries; it is not broken down.

Mr. LAWN: I have not said anything about it being broken down. It is for country expansion for E.T.S.A. The honourable member is quibbling about words.

Mr. Nankivell: Your whole speech is quibbling.

Mr. LAWN: I do not criticize the Government for giving that £1,000,000 to E.T.S.A. No-one has criticized it. It is to provide power for industry. Further, the Government also shows a surplus of over £1,000,000 while, at the same time, in a Christian community we have families out of work. Unlike the honourable member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse), I do not say that I am a Christian: I say that, as far as I know, we are all Christians. We claim to be Christians, but are we? Do we practise it or do we only preach it? Here

are people in our districts, all citizens of the State whatever district they come from, out of work. They have no hope, no enjoyment, no pleasure. Many wage-earners cannot go home with a pay packet at the end of the week or fortnight and hand it to their wives knowing that their wives and children will share in the spending of that money on pleasure, clothing, or perhaps something for the home, yet we boast about being a prosperous State, that our finances are buoyant, so buoyant that we are building up surpluses. Honourable members have said that it is wrong to boast about surpluses when we have unemployment. According to the *News* of Tuesday, August 1:

Figures released today show that of the 9,035 people registered as unemployed in South Australia at the end of June, 4,042 were receiving unemployment benefits. The amount paid to South Australians in Commonwealth unemployment benefits during June totalled £71,683. Unemployment figures were released today by the Deputy Commonwealth Statistician, Mr. D. L. J. Aitchison. Figures showed that in the second quarter of this year the Commonwealth paid a total in South Australia of £169,458 in unemployment benefits.

We know that thousands of unemployed here do not claim benefits, but we spent nearly £72,000 in June on unemployment relief. If the Commonwealth Government came and met the State Government with its £1,000,000 surplus and if the State Government did not want to carry out any works, municipal councils are crying out for money.

Mr. McKee: They could spend a bit in Port Pirie!

Mr. LAWN: The same applies in the metropolitan area with the Municipal Association, which has stated that, if the Government is prepared to find the money, it can find the work. The Commonwealth Government would be saving the £72,000 a month that it is paying out now in unemployment relief.

The honourable member for Gouger (Mr. Hall) also had a crack at unity tickets. I do not want to discuss that fully but I merely say that at the time he was talking about unity tickets (and, of course, all his stuff was written by the Democratic Labor Party, as honourable members on the other side know, because they probably know the name of the person concerned), I did interject pointing out to the honourable member for Gouger that in South Australia this year two members of the Labor Party were expelled, one for having had his name on a unity ticket (I will not say whether or not he was guilty; I have heard that there was some doubt). The fact remains that the Labor Party did expel him because

his name appeared on a unity ticket. Another member was expelled at the same time for associating with the Communists. The honourable member for Gouger is not sincere in his comments on unity tickets because unity tickets do not apply in South Australia.

In the only instance we know of, this year an investigation was held and the person concerned was expelled from the Party. It was implied in the House that the Labor Party was associated with a unity ticket on conditions pertaining in other States. The honourable member was not prepared to admit what I said to him when I interjected. As was mentioned by the honourable member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings), with the exception of my first election, I have had a Communist oppose me on every other occasion, and also a D.L.P. candidate. That applies to many other members on this side of the House..

Mr. McKee: I had one oppose me.

Mr. LAWN: Yes, a number on this side have opposition from Communists and the "Dummy Liberal Party" candidates.

Mr. Ryan: Isn't that a unity ticket?

Mr. LAWN: Yes, the honourable member for Port Pirie reminds me about financing the D.L.P. It is well known that in Victoria many people who are known to be wealthy, whose interests are solely within the Liberal Party, and who do not want to see the Labor Party in office, subscribe handsomely to the funds of the D.L.P. so that it can organize with the object of canvassing for votes to pass their second preferences back to the Liberal Party.

Mr. Millhouse: Does that explain the 3 per cent increase in its vote at the last election?

Mr. LAWN: The honourable member does not want to forget that there is much dissent among the people at the Commonwealth Government's policy. It is easy for people to express that discontent by voting for the D.L.P. They do not want to vote for the Australian Labor Party.

Mr. Millhouse: They certainly do not!

Mr. LAWN: I am referring to Liberal Party supporters who are so disgusted with the Commonwealth Government that, to express their disapproval, they vote for the D.L.P. If there were only two Parties they might vote for the Labor Party, but by voting for the D.L.P. their preferences go to the Liberal Party. In last night's *News*, under the heading "L.C.L. to Contest More Seats at Federal Poll," Mr. R. Y. Wilson called for nominations for certain districts. That part of the report does not concern me, but under the sub-heading, "Eleven Contests" the article states:

The two Communist candidates, announced by the secretary of the Communist Party in S.A., Mr. J. Sendy, will be Mr. A. Miller, who will contest Bonython, and Mr. P. Symon, for Adelaide. Both seats are Australian Labor Party strongholds.

Mr. Ryan: Mr. Symon will contest Port Adelaide.

Mr. LAWN: That is another mistake by the *News*. The point I make is that both these districts are held and represented by Australian Labor Party members. Members opposite talk glibly about Communists and imply that I am a Communist, not knowing half of what I have done against Communism. I oppose Communism just as much as I oppose this Government. They are both dictatorships!

Mr. Ryan: For the same reason.

Mr. LAWN: There is no difference, except that this Government is a little more subtle than the Communist Party. I do not believe in dictatorships. People should have the right to elect a Government of their choice. I believe in the system that applies in the House of Representatives. I have no fault with it, and I have yet to find a person who has any fault with it. The Communist Party intends to nominate two candidates at the next Commonwealth election, and both will contest seats held by Labor Party members, which proves that there will be no opposition from the Communist Party in seats held by Liberal members in South Australia. To any impartial person we have given the complete answer to the rubbish handed out by the member for Gouger on Tuesday.

Last year, during the Address in Reply debate, I asked the Government to consider sending some members of this Parliament overseas each year to gain greater experience. I do not want to labour this point. We are aware of the information that has been brought back by Mr. Veale and other officers to aid the City Council. Mr. Fred Walsh and Mr. Shard have been overseas and I have listened to them and to other members who have gained much experience from such visits. I have instanced the fact that departmental officers go overseas, but Ministers do not. Except for a visit to London for the Queen's Coronation, no Minister from this House has been overseas until recently. The Premier had a rush visit to England and back. Two Ministers from the Legislative Council have been overseas and I agree with that, but New South Wales and Victoria send two Government members and two Opposition members overseas every year. The executive of the Commonwealth Parliamentary

Association in Victoria nominates the country to be visited. Members cannot go where they wish to go, as though on a holiday. They must go to countries within the British Commonwealth of Nations. This year, when I received certain information, I thought our Government was going to follow that lead, but apparently not.

I commend the Government for sending Sir Cecil Hincks overseas. I am not sure why he has been sent, and I can only go on press statements, but if he has gone to Japan to sell our iron ore deposits I shall oppose that idea tooth and nail. If Japan can take our iron ore and convert it into steel at a profit, then there is something wrong with the Broken Hill Proprietary Company if it cannot do the same. If it cannot, we should take over the B.H.P. Co. I believe that Parliament will benefit from Sir Cecil's visit, but unfortunately he is to retire at the end of this Parliament, so I understand.

Mr. Millhouse: You don't want to believe everything you read.

Mr. LAWN: I did not read that in the paper: I was told. If the Minister is retiring at the end of this year, obviously Parliament will not receive the benefit of his experience for long. That experience may be used in some other way after his retirement, to the benefit of the State, but no rank and file member is ever sent overseas.

Mr. Millhouse: What about Mr. Hutchens?

Mr. LAWN. I am coming to him, but he is not being sent by the Government: he is being sent by the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association to attend a C.P.A. conference. I remind the honourable member that the Victorian and New South Wales Governments send four members away each year, two from the Government and two from the Opposition.

Mr. Millhouse: Do you think this Parliament would benefit if you went overseas?

Mr. LAWN: I am not interested in going overseas at present, so that is an unimportant and hypothetical question. I think that, with the exception of the member for Gouger and a few like him, this Parliament would benefit from the experience of all other members (Opposition, Independent and Government) if they were sent overseas.

Mr. Clark: What if it were suggested that they should not return?

Mr. LAWN: I would not mind sending some members overseas on that condition, and I would nominate the Premier and one or two others. I urge the Government to consider this sug-

gestion further. Some other Minister should go overseas next year. I do not advocate sending two or three Ministers and a handful of members, but the Government should send someone overseas each year so that in two or three years we would have the benefit of their experience.

I am pleased to learn that the Highways Department has at last decided to widen the Keswick bridge, and I suggested previously that it be taken northward, over the top of the Keswick railway station in a line with West Beach Road. According to press reports, that has now been decided. I am not going to urge the Government to do it next week, but there should be no delay in widening this bridge.

I come now to railway parking. Last year, in reply to a question I was advised that it was not in the interests of railway personnel or the travelling public to build a parking station above the present Adelaide railway station. When the reply was given I thought that possibly the Railways Commissioner might have something. I would not have asked the question if trains had still been steam-driven, but, having in mind the conversion to diesels, I thought this would have been all right. However, I accepted the opinion of the Railways Commissioner, believing that he should know more than I.

This year the member for Victoria made, I think, a better suggestion: that instead of putting the parking station over the railway station it should go a little further westward and be over the railway lines, where the trains would not stop underneath but would go straight through. Again the Premier said that the Railways Commissioner considered that the fumes would inconvenience railway personnel and the travelling public. There are several railway tunnels in the hills, one of which is a mile long, and even in the days of steam trains these did not inconvenience passengers, as I know from travelling on the trains. Whether the train crews complained I do not know. However, we now have diesels and we still run trains through these tunnels, but the Railways Commissioner does not seem to be concerned about the railway personnel and passengers. If the parking station were placed over the lines between the Morphet Street bridge and the Adelaide railway station trains would be moving through and would be under the parking station for only a few seconds, as the building would be no longer than a quarter of a mile.

Mr. Jenkins: It will come in time.

Mr. LAWN: Yes. I cannot understand why, in his answer, the Premier also said that he had stayed overseas in a hotel built over a railway station. He admitted that not a parking station for cars, but a hotel for people to live in, had been built over a railway station overseas and the fumes did not worry the people. According to the press (and again I make that proviso) a car park is to be built over the railway lines in Sydney. I urge the Government to look at this matter again, because I believe that the Railways Department could build a car park, that the revenue from it would more than pay for the cost of erection, and that it would serve the travelling public well.

I noticed an announcement that it was proposed to shift the Government Printing Department from its present site in King William Road to a position near the west parklands. Over some years the Leader of the Opposition and other members (including me) have advocated the construction of certain Government buildings, particularly in Victoria Square. Had plans been prepared, this would have been an ideal time for the surplus to be spent on Government buildings. Let us try to get our Government departments housed as near as possible to each other for the convenience of the people of this State. People have to go to Rundle Street for the Hospitals Department and to Victoria Square to pay their water and sewerage rates. I have lost track of the Highways Department; I do not know where it is now. I have just been reminded that it is in Foy and Gibson's building, but a year ago it was in Currie Street. The State departments are scattered higgledy-piggledy everywhere, and we have been urging that the Government establish its offices from Gawler Place to Victoria Square and from Flinders Street to Wakefield Street. As Mr. Speaker knows, it is difficult to arrange accommodation for members of Parliament in this building. I urge the Government, when it transfers the Government Printing Department, to remodel the building and add it to Parliament House. Much more space could then be found for members and the staff working here, as those who work in this building know how overcrowded it is.

While on this subject, I mention again the old Land Tax building next door. I see no reason why it should not be demolished. A 10-storey building could be erected there; it would make a tremendous difference for the various Government departments and would also make much more space available than there is at present on this site.

Mr. Quirke: A flat-sided building there would not look very nice, would it?

Mr. LAWN: I think that a nice building could be constructed on that site.

Mr. Quirke: As long as it was built so as not to clash with the architecture of this building.

Mr. LAWN: Exactly. I raised this matter with a previous Minister of Works (Sir Malcolm McIntosh) who objected to any alteration because he wanted to preserve the present architecture. Surely we are not going to preserve that forever. I do not think anyone is taken up with the architecture of that building. It does not impress me, and I know many people whom it does not impress. I think that a suitable structure could be erected in its place.

The member for Hindmarsh today asked a question relating to naturalization ceremonies, and I shall make representations on this matter. At a naturalization ceremony those being naturalized are handed a card for enrolment on the Commonwealth electoral roll, and this, of course, is used for enrolment in the House of Assembly districts of this State. Much preparatory work is done before these people appear at a naturalization ceremony at which they are handed various papers. There would be no difficulty if, during inquiries made before the service, the town clerk ascertained whether each person was paying rent or owned a property. He could then give an enrolment card to those entitled to enrol in the Legislative Council. This afternoon the Premier said we were advocating that everyone at these ceremonies receive an enrolment card. Of course, we believe as a matter of policy and justice that everyone who is enrolled for the House of Assembly should be on the Legislative Council roll, but we are not advocating that on this occasion: we are merely asking that in the preliminary inquiries being made concerning an applicant for naturalization it be ascertained whether or not that person is entitled to be enrolled for the Legislative Council. If so, this Government could include an enrolment card for Parliamentary elections, the same as the Commonwealth Government does. The member for Hindmarsh and other members, including me, feel that applicants who are entitled to enrol for the Legislative Council should be handed an enrolment card.

Concerning parking in front of Parliament House, several members, of whom I am one, have complained for many years about the lack of parking facilities. The front of the

House is under the control of the Minister of Local Government, and the back is controlled by the Joint House Committee. Only members of Parliament and certain staff are entitled to park at the rear of the building; other members of the public come in there from time to time without having the right to do so, but at least the Joint House Committee is endeavouring to do the right thing at the rear of the building. The front of the building is used by members of this House and Commonwealth members and their wives, and recently I have noticed one Commonwealth member and his wife drive up in two cars and park side by side. This Government should be condemned for permitting that to happen. A member has his work to do and is entitled to park, but he is not entitled to reserve that space for his wife and family.

Mr. Riches: How many are involved?

Mr. LAWN: Several wives and daughters drive up there, and I know of a son-in-law who parks there. We know where the women mainly go: to a certain building in the city to play bridge. That is their business and I am not concerned about that, but I am concerned about their right to park in front of this building. The numbers of their cars are given to the police officer on duty outside, so nothing can be done about it because the Minister assures them of their right to park there by having their numbers included on the official list. It does not stop at that. I am the member for the city and represent that part of the metropolitan area, but if I park in the city for more than a certain time I am given a sticker. I cannot go up to the Supreme Court and park in front of the judges' offices, but those people have the right to come and park in front of this building.

Several years ago, while the magistrates occupied an office in the Land Tax Building, they were allowed to park in front of Parliament House. They no longer occupy those premises, but they are still permitted to park in front of the building, and when they do so at 5 p.m. they go over to the Adelaide Club. They are allowed to park in front of Parliament House at any hour of the day. Members cannot, with impunity, take their cars away at lunchtime, go home for tea, or go out at any other time during the day to visit their constituents, because when they return they find that no parking space is available. This week I have not been able to find a park in front of the building early in the morning, and have had to go to the back of the building. That area is cramped, and if one parks under the

shelter and other cars are parked against the building it is difficult to get out. The constable on duty at the front of the building, realizing the difficulty and trying to help members as much as he can, asks members and other people using the area to park their cars as close together as possible, and the result is that when we go out we sometimes find we cannot get into our cars.

Mr. Jenkins: It would be a good idea to extend the area to the taxi stand in front of the Land Tax building.

Mr. LAWN: No, we should cut out the judges, the daughters, the daughters-in-law, and others. Only members should have the right to park there. I do not deny a person's right to let another person get out there, or to come and pick him up, but I say it is wrong that a Commonwealth member and his wife should be able to come up together in separate cars and park there. I suggest to the member for Stirling that we should take away the right of the magistrates, the judges, the members' wives, their sons and daughters, and sons-in-law and daughters-in-law to use that area.

Mr. Loveday: One family, one car.

Mr. LAWN: Yes. One member of the Legislative Council has four cars on the list. I voice my protest and I do not think that I shall be the only member to voice a protest in this matter. At about the time the Government appointed two extra Cabinet Ministers I wrote to the late Sir Malcolm McIntosh (who had previously been the Minister of Local Government) believing that the front of the House was under his control. I pointed out some of these things about which I now complain, and his secretary rang me and told me that the Minister of Local Government (Mr. Jude) was then controlling parking. My letter was sent on to Mr. Jude, but to this day I have not received an acknowledgment. That shows what the Government thinks about members' interests at the front of Parliament House.

Mr. Jennings: You're a bit impatient, aren't you?

Mr. LAWN: I think the Minister should have acknowledged the letter.

Mr. Riches: Give him time!

Mr. LAWN: If I have any complaints against any Government Department I shall voice them, and because of certain complaints expressed here recently I consider that unless I dissociate myself from those complaints it may be assumed that I support them. Concerning the Police Force, I have had every co-operation both as a citizen and as a member. I have taken up matters with the Police

Department; I have had complaints concerning noisy people and children and other people congregating in certain areas of the city to the annoyance of other people, and I have taken up those matters with the Police Department and received a promise that the department would do its best to deal satisfactorily with those complaints. The department has often assured me that if I have any matters to take up it will be only too happy to oblige. If I had people driving motor cars up and down the street and stopping with shrieking brakes, or people riding motor cycles and tooting their horns, I would go to the police and ask them to see that these things were stopped. In the same way, if people were pulling up at night clubs and other places and annoying other people, I would ask the Police Force to stop it, and if the officers are stopping that practice I congratulate them. If other members have complaints about happenings in their district they are entitled to speak about them on behalf of their constituents. However, I do not want it thought that I am necessarily a party to those complaints. Concerning my district I have a happy relationship with the Police Department. I take it for granted that the remarks made in this House go further than just being made here. I know that some things said here are forgotten as soon as they have been said, but some matters are referred for further action and in some cases we get a report. In the case of references to the Commissioner of Police about the actions of his officers, I do not deny the nature of the complaints made, but I want it on record that I have had all the assistance I have asked for from the Police Department in that respect.

In regard to the last matter I was speaking about when I said I sent my letter to the then Minister of Works (Sir Malcolm McIntosh), his secretary rang me and said it was not the baby of his Minister, and sent the letter on to the Minister of Local Government. Section 151 (2) of the Road Traffic Act states:

If any person, whether holding any other licence, permit, or other authority or not, leaves any vehicle or animal stationary in any prohibited area proclaimed under this section, without the permission of the Minister of Works, he shall be guilty of an offence.

It is under the Road Traffic Act which, I think, is administered by the same Minister, the Minister of Roads. Anyway, whoever the responsible Minister is, I make that observation. There may be some doubt as to which Minister is responsible but Mr. Kneebone, the

secretary to Sir Malcolm McIntosh, informed me it was the responsibility of Mr. Jude (Minister of Roads).

I come now to another matter, and I shall occupy some time on this. Yesterday the honourable member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) said:

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.

Then Mr. Clark, the member for Gawler, said:

Did you say "thought" or "hoped"?

Mr. Millhouse replied:

I said "thought" and that 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.

I assure the honourable member that it is very much alive; it never was killed, it never died. I shall not ask the House or anybody else to accept my opinion or my version of what the action of the Government was last year.

First, I remind the House of one brief statement of the Premier last year when he referred to the application by the employers for a reduction in the basic wage in South Australia—and I emphasize the word "reduction" because I shall prove that that was what the application was for. That application by the employers was supported by the State Government of South Australia. Mr. Wells appeared on behalf of the State of South Australia. The Premier said last year:

There is no suggestion of a reduction in the basic wage at the present time so far as the State is concerned. The employers have not asked for it.

The Premier says the employers have not asked for a reduction. I say they have, but I do not ask the House to accept my word or that of the Premier. Three judges heard the case. One was Chief Justice Kirby, who was President of the commission; the other two were Justices Ashburner and Moore, who were Deputy Presidents of the commission that heard the application. I shall read to the House their judgment so, if anyone wants to say it is untrue or that I am lying, the charge of untruthfulness or lying must be relevant to the three judges.

There are before us three applications; one is by the Federated Engine Drivers and Firemen's Association of Australasia to eliminate from the Engine Drivers and Firemen's (General) Award, 1955, those differentials which make the basic wage for country areas less than the metropolitan basic wage in New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia and

to alter a number of basic wages in Tasmania, these being the four States in which this award applies; the other two applications, which are in identical form, are by the Metal Industries Association of South Australia and by members of the South Australian Chamber of Manufactures Incorporated and the South Australian Employers' Federation seeking the following variation of the Metal Trades Award:—

“1. By deleting the words ‘elsewhere—3s. less than the basic wage for Adelaide, viz. £13 8s. 0d.’ appearing under the subheading ‘South Australia’ in subclause (a) of clause 2 of the abovenamed award and inserting the following:—

‘Elsewhere—£13 8s. 0d.

Provided that—

- (i) Upon any variation increasing the basic wage prescribed in this award for Sydney the amount by which the basic wage above prescribed for Adelaide is increased shall be 25 per cent less than the amount of the increase for Sydney until the proportion which the basic wage for Adelaide bears to the basic wage for Sydney is reduced to 90 per cent.’”

At that time it was 95.6 per cent of the basic wage for Sydney. I shall read again the Premier's statement so that members opposite can form their own judgment as to whether their Premier was speaking the truth or whether the judges were. The Premier said:

There is no suggestion of a reduction in the basic wage at the present time so far as the State is concerned. The employers have not asked for it.

Mr. Wells, on behalf of the State Government of South Australia, appeared in support of the application, and here is the judgment. The application concludes by asking that the basic wage awarded for Sydney shall be decreased by 25 per cent for Adelaide and that that shall continue until the basic wage for Adelaide is reduced to 90 per cent of the Sydney basic wage. If anyone can tell me that that is not a reduction, then he is an imbecile. The judgment continues:

- “(ii) Upon any variation increasing the basic wage for Adelaide the amount by which the basic wage above prescribed for places falling under the subheading ‘Elsewhere’ shall be 25 per cent less than the amount of the increase for Adelaide until the basic wage for places falling under the subheading ‘Elsewhere’ is 12s. less than the basic wage for Adelaide.’”

At that time when we raised the matter in this House while the commission was sitting in Adelaide the Premier said that the employers had not asked for a reduction, but there is the judgment of the judges which quotes the

three applications. The employers, first, ask for a reduction in the basic wage increase in Adelaide of 25 per cent less than what they would receive in Sydney until such time as the Adelaide basic wage fell to 90 per cent of the Sydney basic wage. The second part of the application was that, instead of, as at that time, the basic wage in the country areas being 3s. less than in Adelaide (that was the position last year), it should be reduced to 12s. less than the basic wage for Adelaide. That is a quotation from the application.

One or two other statements were made by the Premier last year. He tried to treat this matter as a joke. First of all, he denied—and if honourable members listen to the quotations I make they will see that the Premier denied there was any application for a reduction—that the Government was supporting it. He then tried to make fun of it and offered me a copy of Mr. Seaman's evidence, autographed by himself, before it was presented to the court. Of course, we all knew that no member would get a copy of that evidence! I never received a copy, autographed or otherwise. He tried to make a joke of it so that members opposite could go to the Frome electorate and say, “The Premier has offered Mr. Lawn a copy of Mr. Seaman's evidence before it is given in court, so it is obvious that the Government is not going to oppose the application.” He said that the Government would direct policy and that he did not know what Mr. Seaman's evidence would be. I do not expect members to accept my statements, but I shall quote what the Premier said so that members cannot claim that I have quoted incorrectly. He said:

As a special favour for the honourable member—I cannot guarantee that for every honourable member—I will autograph it myself as an authentic copy.

Later he said:

If the honourable member asks me whether the Government is supporting the case as outlined by Mr. Robinson I can tell him honestly, without any heat at all, that I have different views to a lot of the stuff Mr. Robinson has put over today.

Again he said:

If our cost of living is higher, then we support an application that our workers get more.

Then he said:

As far as I am concerned the honourable member can have Mr. Seaman's evidence as soon as it is prepared—even before it is presented to the court.

Later he said:

The honourable member can have the evidence as soon as it has been prepared. It

has not yet been submitted to me, so it has not yet been approved to be forwarded.

I said:

The Treasurer has said that, so far as the application of the employers' federation and the metal industries' association is concerned for a 10 per cent basic wage lower than that in Sydney, the Government is supporting it.

Then the following report appeared in *Hansard*:

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford—I have not said anything of the sort.

Mr. Lawn—The Treasurer said they are supporting an application for a differential rate between Adelaide and Sydney.

Mr. Shannon—The Treasurer never said anything of the sort.

Mr. Shannon: And that was right.

Mr. LAWN: Let the honourable member listen. I am quoting from *Hansard*, and *Hansard* does not make mistakes. The Premier said:

I believe that the cost of living is an essential of wage justice and, if Mr. Seaman's figures show that we should have a higher basic wage in South Australia and that is proved, then I shall support a higher basic wage. I am saying that the Government supports a differential between the States:

That is what the member for Onkaparinga denied.

Mr. Shannon: I have not denied anything.

Mr. LAWN: Not now, but the honourable member did last year. He said that the Premier never said anything of the sort, but the Premier immediately followed the honourable member and said that the Government supported a differential between the States, "not between here and Sydney but between all the States—based on the complete cost of living figures." The member for Whyalla said:

Mr. Robinson is speaking as if he knows what Mr. Seaman's conclusions are, and yet the Treasurer is telling us that he does not know what the evidence is. Mr. Robinson says he knows it, and he has said to the commission that he does know it.

I said:

I am not trying to harass the Government. The trade union movement believes that if the cost of living in Sydney is higher than in Adelaide, Sydney should have a higher basic wage and, conversely, that if the Adelaide cost of living is equal to that of Sydney, our basic wage should be adjusted accordingly. Does the Treasurer believe in that?

The Premier replied, "Yes." Later he said:

Mr. Wells will make submissions to the court in accordance with his directions from the Government. I have told members what the Government's policy is. Mr. Wells' submissions to the court will be in accordance with Government policy.

I interjected, "But you will direct policy?" and the Premier replied, "We direct policy." I said, "Will you direct the Government officers to oppose the application?" and the Premier replied:

We will direct our policy in accordance with what I have said and I am not going to say any more.

I have quoted from *Hansard* to remind members what happened last year. I shall now read from the commission's judgment. I ask members to remember that the Premier made it clear that this Government directed policy. He also made it clear that he did not know what Mr. Seaman's evidence was because it had not been prepared. Mr. Loveday referred to the fact that Mr. Robinson, addressing the commission, announced what evidence he was going to call from Mr. Seaman. If members peruse the judgment they will find, as will any person who reads it, that the Government presented the employers' case. Mr. Seaman presented the evidence on which the employers relied. The judgment contains the following statements:

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.

The F.E.D.F.A. had asked the court to remove the 3s. differential for country areas and the Government opposed it, along with the employers. The court granted the unions' application and the differential was removed. The judgment stated that the Government supported the employers' application as far as Adelaide was concerned. It supported the lot, until the debate in this House last year and then Mr. Seaman continued to give evidence in support of Adelaide, but offered no evidence about the 12s. differential between the country and Adelaide. The Government did not proceed with that matter. It still pressed its support for the reduction of the basic wage in Adelaide to 90 per cent of the Sydney basic wage, which would have meant that the 12s. granted by the Arbitration Court this year would be only 9s. to employees had the employers' application been granted. The judgment continues:

It is proper to conclude that as far as the employers are concerned: (1) they were all opposed to the F.E.D.F.A. application to eliminate the country differential, (2) only the South Australian employers sought to increase

the country differential and then only in South Australia, and (3) only the South Australian employers, supported by the South Australian Government and, with modifications, by the Queensland Chamber of Manufactures, sought to change inter-capital differentials and then only with regard to the differential between Sydney and Adelaide.

That is a clear statement by the commission that the South Australian employers, supported by the South Australian Government and, with modifications, by the Queensland Chamber of Manufactures, sought to change inter-capital differentials, but only with regard to the differential between Sydney and Adelaide. In the judgment, under the heading "Inter-capital city differentials" the following appears:

As far as capital cities are concerned, the only issue is about Adelaide and is an issue that the present relativity with Sydney which is 4.2 per cent or 12s. less than Sydney should over a period of time be changed to a relativity of 10 per cent less.

Last year the Premier said the Government was not supporting a reduction: the employer did not ask for it. At that time the three judges to whom I have referred said that the basic wage was 4.2 per cent, or 12s., less in Adelaide than in Sydney, but the application asked that over a period of time that 4.2 per cent should become 10 per cent less than the Sydney basic wage. Now let Government members get up and deny the judgment and the fact that their Government supported an application by employers for a reduction in the basic wage! It was bad judgment on the part of any Government.

Mr. Loveday: It is bad policy.

Mr. LAWN: It is bad policy at any time to use the people's money, which pays public servants, for this purpose. It is bad policy for any Government to use the taxpayers' money and to use public servants to present a case to the Arbitration Commission against some section of the taxpayers who are contributing taxes to the Government. The Crown Law Office, the Under Treasurer, or anyone else should not be used by the Government to appear in cases, give evidence, or prepare economic evidence or any other type of evidence in support of only a section of the community.

Mr. Jennings: Against the people who are paying them.

Mr. LAWN: Yes, against the taxpayers who are paying the Crown Law officers. I am in no way criticizing Mr. Wells or anyone else who had anything to do with the case. I am not criticizing Mr. Seaman. I do not know him, but he is a public servant and has reached the position he now occupies of Under

Treasurer, so he must be a conscientious and loyal servant of the people of South Australia. I therefore believe that next year when we have a Labor Party Government he, as Under Treasurer, will just as faithfully and loyally carry out the policy of the Labor Government or what is expected of him on behalf of the Labor Government as he is carrying out a policy this year for a Liberal Government. I make it clear—and I emphasize again that the Premier made it clear—that his Government directs policy. I accept that. The Premier or the Government (it is the same thing, of course) directed Mr. Seaman to prepare evidence in support of the employers' application and then instructed the Crown Law Office to get Mr. Wells or someone else to enter an appearance on behalf of the Government in support of the application. I make it clear that although Mr. Seaman's name comes up in the judgment, I am in no way criticizing him. I am (and I make no apology for it) criticizing the action of the Government. The judgment continues:

The case for the South Australian employers that the amount should be increased was presented in two ways, first of all on a cost of living basis and then on a capacity basis. We turn now to consider the argument about the cost of living which we do without making any decision of principle regarding the relevance of such an argument to the fixation generally of that basic wage. Whether Mr. Robinson succeeds . . .

I invite members opposite who are interested to listen instead of holding their own private conversations. The member for Barossa has had much to say about his believing in arbitration, so I think he will be interested in the next few words:

. . . or fails in this argument depends almost entirely on the view which we take of Mr. Seaman's evidence because he can succeed only if we agree that Mr. Seaman has achieved such a better or more precise result than the present one that we are prepared to act on it. Although Mr. Seaman was called by the South Australian Government Mr. Robinson relied on Mr. Seaman's material for this branch of his argument.

That is the commission; it is not the member for Torrens, the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Whyalla or someone else making the statement, but the three judges, who said that although Mr. Seaman was called by the South Australian Government, Mr. Robinson relied solely on his evidence to succeed in his application. On page 9 the judgment says.

It follows that Mr. Seaman made an act of judgment upon which to base his evidence. The regimen and weights of the Interim Retail Price Index were chosen by the Commonwealth Statistician for his purpose of ascertaining

price movements in particular cities, not for the purpose of ascertaining relative price movements. Of course as an expert in this field Mr. Seaman was entitled to make such an act of judgment, and, indeed, his task may have been even more difficult if he had not done so, but for our purpose the significant thing is that Mr. Seaman did make an act of judgment of his own.

What are we to understand from that? The Government instructed the Crown Law Office to put in an appearance, directed Mr. Seaman to prepare evidence in support, and Mr. Seaman had to act on his own judgment to try to make a case and present some evidence in compliance with his instructions from the Government—from the Premier. Mr. Seaman is not to be condemned for that; it is the Government. The judgment continues:

The other acts of judgment which Mr. Seaman has made and to which we wish to refer are those relating to fuel, fares and rent. He did make others but we consider that these are the most important and that reference to what he has done about these three items is sufficient for our purposes.

On page 11 the judgment states:

It will be seen from the examples which we have given that Mr. Seaman's judgments, although given by a highly qualified expert who has studied the subject for many years, are judgments which if made by other experts might have achieved different results.

Of course, Mr. Seaman was acting in accordance with his instructions. The judgment continues:

The importance of this fact and of accuracy in judgment will be appreciated when it is realized that the difference between the present position and the position aimed for by the applicants is the difference between 4.2 per cent and 10 per cent.

Members opposite deny that their Government supported an application to the commission for a reduction in the basic wage, but I ask them to consider this last passage. In other words, the commission is stressing the fact again that the application by the employers' organization, supported by the South Australian Government, was to reduce the Adelaide basic wage, which was then 4.2 per cent lower than in Sydney, to 10 per cent below the Sydney basic wage. The judgment continues:

One other matter to which Mr. Seaman referred was his judgment that it was not proper to take the June 1960 price of meat in Adelaide because there was an abnormal season in that city and therefore the price of meat was abnormally high. He therefore took figures for meat for 1957-58 whereas if he had taken the figures for 1960 the effect would have been to increase the level of Adelaide costs overall as compared with those of Melbourne and Sydney by "closely 2 per cent."

Their Honours referred earlier to fuel and something else, and the application was based

on the metropolitan area. Port Pirie, being in the country, was to get 12s. a week less. Instead of Mr. Seaman's being free to help the court by giving figures showing the cost of living in Adelaide and the price of meat, he had, to act in accordance with his instructions and prepare evidence that would support or help to support a reduction, to go back to 1957-58 meat figures.

Mr. McKee: He had to give figures to suit his purpose.

Mr. LAWN: Exactly. He had instructions from the Government to support this application by employers to reduce the basic wage in Adelaide.

Mr. Loveday: It must have been very hard for a sincere statistician to do that.

Mr. LAWN: Yes. The commission thinks the same, because it referred to his undoubted ability. Only a man with ability could have done that. The judges said that had the evidence been given in accordance with 1960 figures the increase, would have been 2 per cent in Adelaide, instead of the difference between 4.2 per cent and 10 per cent decrease. That is the commission's judgment, not the speech of the member for Adelaide.

Mr. Shannon: It is shocking to attack Mr. Seaman in this way.

Mr. LAWN: If you know Mr. Justice Kirby better than I do . . .

Mr. Shannon: I know Mr. Seaman, and what you are saying about him is unfair.

Mr. LAWN: The judges have said it; I am reading their judgment, which, at page 11, states:

We have come to the conclusion that we cannot act on Mr. Seaman's measurement of relative living costs for the purposes of this case. We do so, conscious of the effort and thought which Mr. Seaman put into the matter, but even more conscious of the fact that the kind of exercise undertaken by Mr. Seaman on the material available cannot furnish an answer precise enough to establish the applicants' case. There were involved too many acts of judgment and too many estimates to enable us to use this exercise as a ground of changing the basic wage differential.

If that last paragraph is not a clear indication that Mr. Seaman indulged in exercises for the purposes of this case, in preparing a document in accordance with his instructions, then I am a Dutchman. It is clear that he was instructed by the Premier, for the Premier said last year that he would direct the policy; he told us that in no uncertain manner. The judges said that those acts of judgment—those are the commission's words—of Mr. Seaman were so involved, that there were so many of them, and that there were so many estimates, that

it could not accept his evidence. The judgment goes on:

We would not dispute, as was put to us by Mr. Wells, that in the exercise of our jurisdiction both in these and other cases we must continually make acts of judgment as best we can on material which is not by any means mathematically precise, and, making such a judgment on the material in this case, we reach the conclusion that we are not prepared to act on Mr. Seaman's study.

That is a complete condemnation of the Government's action in asking Mr. Seaman to support the employers' application in this case. Obviously, the figures show that there should have been an increase of 2 per cent in the basic wage in Adelaide, instead of a reduction. The judgment continues:

That leads us to deal with the second aspect of Mr. Robinson's submissions, namely, the relative lack of capacity of South Australian industry to continue to pay the present relative basic wage. There was no submission of absolute incapacity. It was only put that, relatively, Adelaide employers could not continue to pay a basic wage which maintained its present relativity with the Sydney basic wage. Virtually the only material put to us on this aspect was certain statistics which purported to show relative growth between States. No effort was made to do what Mr. Whitehead suggested, that is, to seek information from individual manufacturers.

One of the employers' submissions in support of the application was incapacity of the State to pay the present basic wage, but the commission makes it clear that there was no submission of absolute incapacity. However, it was put to the commission that the employers were unable to pay the same basic wage as applied in Sydney. Part of what I just read out was agreed to by the Premier last year, for he said that if the cost of living was greater in Adelaide than in some other place, the basic wage should be greater. The Governor's Speeches year after year refer to our prosperity and our surpluses, yet the employers go to the commission and claim the incapacity of the State to pay the basic wage. Obviously, this Government joined employers to get cheap labour by reducing the basic wage payable to the workers in this State. It sided with the employers. Already our Factories Act and our Workmen's Compensation Act give the worst conditions of any State in Australia, and now the Government wants to help the employers get cheap labour by directly supporting them in their application to the commission for a reduction of wages. We must not forget that over the last few years this Government has been represented before the Arbitration and Conciliation Commission and opposed every application by the Australian Council of Trade

Unions for an increase in the basic wage. The judgment continues (on page 13):

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 the other States.

Obviously, Mr. Seaman is the Under-Treasurer, and, as the Premier is always talking about the capacity and the prosperity of South Australia, he could not go before the commission and say that South Australia was incapable of paying this basic wage, for in doing that he would be denying all that our Premier has said. I take my hat off to Mr. Seaman; he was given a job to do and only a man with his ability could have done it. He was instructed to go in and support the employers, and there was a trap he could easily have fallen into, but he did it in such a way that he did not plead incapacity and so rubbish all that the Premier had said about South Australia being so prosperous and about its capacity to do anything. At the bottom of page 13 the judgment continues:

We accordingly come to the conclusion that we would not be justified in changing the present relativities on any alleged differences in relative capacity.

If any Government member wants to come out in any district now or during the next election campaign and deny that this Government was appearing in the case in support of the employers or presenting a case upon which the employers relied, then I say he will be doing it although knowing at the same time that he is lying. I hope that if any Government members sincerely believed that the Government was not supporting a reduction in the basic wage, they will change their mind now that they realize the true position and support the motion as amended by the Leader as a condemnation of this Government's action in appearing in this case in support of the employers' application for a lower basic wage after deliberately telling this House last year that it would not support an application for a reduction. The commission's judgment to which I have referred this afternoon makes its abundantly clear that the Government did support the application for a reduction in the basic wage. No-one on either side of the House would question the truthfulness of the three judges who signed that judgment. I support the Leader's amendment.

Mr. LOVEDAY secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.01 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, August 8, at 2 p.m.