

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Wednesday, August 21, 1957.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir Walter Duncan) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

**ASSOCIATIONS INCORPORATION ACT
AMENDMENT BILL.**

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Attorney-General), having obtained leave, introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Associations Incorporation Act, 1956. Read a first time.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Section 22 of the Act provides that an incorporated association may, subject to giving certain notices as required by subsection (2), transfer all its property to any other incorporated association or to any incorporated or unincorporated body which has similar objects to the association or has charitable objects. The purpose of this provision is to provide that, in the event of the association reaching the stage when its members desire to determine its existence, it can pass over its property to another body having similar or charitable objects.

Subsection (3) of the section provides that a member or creditor of the association may apply to the local court for an order prohibiting the transfer of the association's property and the court is given power to decide the matter. Subsection (4) provides that the association is not to transfer its property until one month after publication under subsection (2) of notice of the intention to do so or, if an application has been made to the local court, until the court so orders. The subsection provides that any transfer contrary to the subsection is to be void.

The Registrar-General of Deeds has pointed out that the provision declaring any such transfer to be void runs counter to the provisions of the Real Property Act relating to indefeasibility of title. The Bill accordingly amends subsection (4) by striking out the words providing that the transfer is to be void and by inserting in lieu thereof that nothing in the subsection is to affect the title of any *bona fide* transferee under any transfer of any property. The object is to clear up a matter which inadvertently crept into the Bill when the consolidation measure was being passed last year.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON secured the adjournment of the debate.

MARRIAGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Attorney-General), having obtained leave, introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Marriage Act, 1936-1950. Read a first time.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Government has introduced this Bill again because it makes a highly desirable reform and there is still a strong public demand for it. Both Houses have at one time or another accepted the principle of the Bill and the Government suggests that it should now be passed. Most honourable members are familiar with the alteration of the law proposed in this Bill, and I need not deal with it at length. At common law the age of marriage was 12 for girls and 14 for boys. Children of these ages could contract valid marriages, and even children under these ages could marry and affirm the marriage upon attaining the ages mentioned. A considerable number of marriages of children take place in this State. The statistics show that in the last seven years 155 girls under 16 and 133 boys under 18 have married. It has been pointed out by social workers who have taken an interest in such matters that these marriages are usually unsatisfactory. In many cases they only take place because the girl is pregnant and because the parents force the children into marriage. It was pointed out that the same problem had arisen in Great Britain, and that country in 1929 raised the age of marriage to 16 for children of both sexes. In Tasmania in 1942 the marriage age had been raised to 16 for girls and 18 for boys. Last year the same ages were adopted in Western Australia.

The Bill provides that, in future, a marriage will be invalid if the girl is under 16 or the boy is under 18, unless the consent of the Chief Secretary to the marriage is obtained. The Government agreed to this exception when it was proposed earlier this year by Mr. Millhouse, M.P., and after further consideration believes that it should work satisfactorily. The Chief Secretary will have a discretion to allow under-age marriages, and the only restriction on his discretion is that he must be satisfied that the marriage is desirable. For the exercise of the power conferred on the Minister by this Bill it will be necessary for him to obtain reliable information about all the relevant circumstances, but with the aid of the administrative and legal officers of the Government there is no reason why this should not be done. The Minister will have to consider all

the relevant circumstances such as the means of the parties, their maturity, their character and the prospects of the marriage being successful.

The Bill also contains the clause (which was in the previous Bills) dealing with the legitimation of children of under-age parents. If the Bill did not provide to the contrary, one effect of it would be that an illegitimate child born of parents under the marriage age would be incapable of being legitimated by the subsequent marriage of the parents. This is so because of the rule that a child cannot be legitimated by the subsequent marriage of its parents if there was a legal impediment to the marriage at the time of the child's birth. There seems to be no virtue in applying this rule when the only barrier to marriage was youth. The Bill accordingly provides that the child of parents who were at the time of the child's birth prevented from marrying solely because of their youth will be capable of being legitimated by a subsequent valid marriage of the parents.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from August 20. Page 339.)

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH (Central No. 1)—I support the motion, and compliment the mover and seconder and all those who have contributed to the debate. I join with other members in expressing my appreciation at the extension of the term of office of His Excellency the Governor. All members of the Labor Party subscribe to the view that the Crown is the symbol of unity of the British Commonwealth of Nations, and under it the Party system of Government has weathered and endured political and economic storms for over 300 years. Other nations where the monarchy has been superseded, whether by a totalitarian regime or a regime allegedly elected by the popular vote, often have Governments that last no more than a few days. I think we can compliment ourselves on maintaining that standard of political development and political Government of which we are all extremely proud, irrespective of Party.

Before discussing the Governor's Speech, I want to make reference as charitably as I can to some remarks made yesterday by Sir Arthur Rymill. He prefaced his remarks by saying that he was a comparatively new member, and as this is the case members who have been here

a number of years desire to be charitable and to place his footsteps on the right track, but in some of his statements about the Party to which I have the honour to belong he was either misinformed or has not been here long enough to know the aspirations of members of my Party.

The Hon. C. R. Story—Do you agree with what he said about housing?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I am not discussing that now, but will come to it later. Sir Arthur Rymill eulogized Liberal principles. Although I agree that that is what he is here for, he then said:—

I mentioned Liberal principles. Now I want to refer to the Labor Party, because I am one who always thought that the Labor Party in this State was inclined to be perhaps more moderate than those elsewhere in Australia, but recent manifestations suggest to me that those of us who held this view may have to reassess it. One sees a certain section of the Party bowing its head to Socialism and to a dictatorial type of resolution which was passed, I think, by the Party's central executive. Certain members of this House are being dictated to to the extent that they are to be compelled to cast their vote a certain way whether they feel like it or not.

He has been totally misinformed about this. Regarding the Liberal's talk of socialism, I remind members that in the crisis in the early stages of the war, a crisis that threatened our democratic institutions as well as our economy, it was a Socialistic Labor Government that geared the nation for war. Right down through the years the Australian Labor Party has had to suffer misrepresentation and vile propaganda. As an instance of this, I have with me a booklet issued by the Federal executive of the Liberal Party entitled *Towards Disaster—The Truth about Democratic Socialism*. The contents are a vile misrepresentation about a Party that lifted the country to a war footing in a time of disaster. Since the Labor Party has been a political Party it has played an integral part in the economy of this country, and it has had to stand a barrage of misrepresentation. In support of my argument I will quote from the publication *The Student Liberal*, the journal of the Australian University Liberal Association, the officers of which are Kim Paterson of Perth (President), Margaret McLachlan of Adelaide (Vice-President), Malcolm Beveridge of Sydney (Secretary), Phillip Lynch of Melbourne (Treasurer), and Howard Nathan of Melbourne (Editor). This publication is circulated among student Liberals in the various universities of

Australia. I think by quoting from it I can answer Sir Arthur Rymill's charge that members of my Party are disastrous Socialists, and that we want to close all businesses and to bring the country to a state of chaos. I shall quote from the editorial, and everybody knows that an editor expresses the opinions of his particular organization. The editorial states:—

Controlled capitalism of this type would mitigate the abuses of exploiting industry and yet still be flexible enough to produce what we want and also what would be most beneficial to us. Socialists will argue from this conclusion that the complete control of a nation's resources will be even more efficient, and thus advocate complete governmental regulation.

As a member of the Labor Party, I want to say that the Party's policy is not that the individual lives for the State, but that the State exists for the individual. However, to create a fear complex in the minds of the people, the propagandists of the Liberal Party are trying to inculcate in the minds of the electors that the Labor Party stands for a totalitarian regime. The article continues:—

Controlled capitalism under this system, an overall efficient use of a nation's resources should be planned and the execution and extraction of those resources handed over to progressive firms which show initiative. This idea is not new. We can see the benefit of master plans by looking at India's six-year plan or even the overall scheme for developing the city of Melbourne. Secondly, and most important, is the necessity for preserving competition. Under our present system, monopolies have evolved; to counteract the evils of this type of capitalism something more than anti-trust legislation is needed. Under the scheme proposed, Government sponsored firms should be established to ensure competition between industries, thus monopolies would be impossible, as always there would be at least two firms: the private one, and that one operated as a Government agency. An example of this is the A.N.A., T.A.A. situation in Australia.

It was the Labor Government that established Trans Australian Airlines; it did not abolish A.N.A. but established airlines in competition with it. It seems extraordinary that although propagandists of the Liberal Party malign the Labor Party, they advocate a policy which has been implemented by a Labor Government, thus proving that Labor's policy is the right one.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe—You should give Parliament the credit, not the Government.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—The article continues:—

There is no need to be complacent or satisfied with the present capitalist set-up if we wish to withstand the wide propaganda and appeal of Communism.

I quite agree. It concludes:—

However, as can be logically seen, there is a moral justification for the competitive industries. They have brought us to the standard of living we enjoy at the moment; nevertheless, our vigilance to improve the lot of our fellow men should never falter.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—That is one point you can expand.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I will expand it. The Commonwealth Government under a Labor regime bought 51 per cent of the shares in Amalgamated Wireless. Who was it sold those shares? None other than the Menzies Government. The Commonwealth Oil Refineries were in a similar position. The Government held the balance of power in that private organization which gave an efficient service to the public in its industrial sphere. However, it was left to a Party supported by the honourable member to undo something which was beneficial to the people of this country. It too was sold. I suggest the honourable member himself should dwell upon these issues and see what he can do in influencing his own Party to correct these anomalies.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—You won't hear from him again this afternoon.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I pay a compliment and a tribute to the trade union movement in this State, and I mention the fairness that characterized the Attorney-General in opening the Wallaroo campaign when he paid a tribute to the workers in South Australia. If approaches were made by responsible people in our political life and economy, it would do some good in creating that feeling not of distrust but of confidence in the economic system under which we live. I pay a compliment to the trade union movement for the work it has done and the part it has played in the economic life of South Australia. In reading the Governor's Speech one would think all these things were brought about by the Government. It reminds me of that comic personality Bill Adams who won the Battle of Waterloo. Everything that has been done and achieved, whether it be bountiful harvest or very heavy rainfall, is credited to the Government which steps in and takes the bow. Naturally, it is done for political reasons.

With regard to the question of decentralization, I point out that all the Ministers of the present Government, with the exception of the Minister of Education, represent country electorates, but not one part of their alleged decentralization programme has been carried into effect. I do not want to be charged with

using the floor of this Council for political purposes in connection with the by-election campaign at Wallaroo, but I mention that when the grain distillery at Wallaroo was built under the urgency of war and later it was not considered necessary to continue with it, it was handed over by the Labor Government to this Government virtually for nothing in order that it could establish some industry in that area.

The Hon. L. H. Densley—Didn't the Government provide money for an industry in that area?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—Yes, an application was made by a certain firm for assistance in establishing a ceramic industry. I was a member of the committee that recommended the guaranteeing of the money, but that firm went insolvent. No effort was then made by the Liberal and Country Party Government to establish another industry in the area. I instance the point raised yesterday by Mr. Story with regard to a co-operative cannery. The advocacy of my honourable friend since he has been a member has been the only Government effort in setting up a co-operative cannery. It was illuminating to hear him say yesterday that the Government did condescend to set up a committee to make the necessary inquiries, and I was waiting for him to tell me who the committee were to report to as to the desirability or otherwise of establishing that industry on a co-operative basis. If the Government does it, it will be on the lines advocated in the *Student Liberal*, namely, in competition with private enterprise.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan—What about the Abattoirs?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I thank my honourable friend for reminding me of that. Surely the Government cannot take any kudos for the establishment or extension on an engineering project that had been established in Murray Bridge and to which the Industries Development Committee had recommended the loan of money. That project went through the purging fire of investigation by that committee.

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—Having been referred to the committee by the Government.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—In terms of the Act. I am not denying that, but the Government cannot take kudos for things that have been done by a responsible committee created by Parliament. All these things that have been done have been done by Parliament; they may have been initiated by the Government. As Sir Arthur Rymill said yesterday,

many suggestions are made by persons in this Chamber and in another place but are not considered by the Government. It appears to me that in many instances the bureaucracy with which the Premier has surrounded himself is the Government of this State. I think the time has arrived when this Parliament and members in this Council and another place should call a halt and make Parliament the responsible authority to determine what should be done from time to time.

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—Do you think the Traffic Committee and the Industries Committee should report to Parliament?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I would have no objection to that but I think my friend will agree that on occasions very private and confidential information is given to the members of the Industries Committee regarding the financial status of applicants and it would be totally unfair for that information to be made public. I now come to the Electricity Trust and I make it clear that I am not a carping critic; I voted, with other members here, for the acquisition of the Adelaide Electric Supply Company.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—And it was carried by only one vote.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—It was, and the Government should be thankful that the Labor Party came to its assistance. The Government took over a paying concern. It is true that it was not extending power into the country areas, but that was because it lacked the capital to do so. However, the shareholders lost nothing; indeed, they gained an extra share and their investments became virtually gilt-edged because all the shares, both preference and ordinary, were turned into debentures, and they are receiving more now than they would have received on their original investment. According to the reply to the last question I asked on this subject over £2,000,000 has been paid to the shareholders by way of interest and, in effect, the charges have had to be maintained in order to pay those interest commitments. I am not denying the shareholders their rights, but according to the Governor's speech sales of electricity are now at the record annual rate of 1,000,000,000 units, producing an income of over £10,000,000. Consumers have increased by 11,000, making a total of 226,000. As I have said, it was a profitable undertaking before the Government took it over, but I am of the opinion that when big concerns of this nature are run as Government departments

they lose their identity as a service to the community. We find that the Leigh Creek coalfield, which has become associated with the Electricity Trust, according to the Governor's speech is "a sound enterprise making a financial surplus each year." Notwithstanding that these two undertakings are on a profitable basis with an expanding revenue we are asked from time to time to vote further money for them. Despite this the unit cost of electricity has not been reduced but has been increased from time to time ever since the take-over, and I want to know what the Government proposes to do about it. Simply because the trust has been given the imprimatur of Government control are the people expected to be lulled into a sense of security and accept these charges which do not come under the purview of price control?

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—Don't you think Government undertakings are usually more expensively run than those of private enterprise?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—Some are.

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—It cannot be avoided.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—It can. Admittedly, there is not always the urge to make a Government department a profitable undertaking because of the knowledge that the money will be supplied by the Government, win, lose or draw, but that does not apply to everything. I have already instanced T.A.A. which is paying well in competition with private air lines, and the Commonwealth line of steamers before they were sold is another instance. All things under Government auspices could be made to pay in competition with private enterprise.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe—The honourable member cannot name one electricity undertaking in Australia that is run more efficiently than the South Australian Electricity Trust.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I am not casting any aspersions upon the integrity of the trust, but merely asking the Government to answer the question I have raised. I pay the highest compliment to those who run the trust upon their integrity and efficiency.

I now come to schools. I have always advocated free education and still do, but I have always asserted that those private schools that carry on a great functional part of education that would otherwise devolve upon the Government have become Cinderellas of our educational system. I have made it my business to make inquiries and I find that, taking private schools of all denominations, the over-

all capital expenditure on school buildings, without any aid from the State, runs into many millions of pounds. I have in my possession a pamphlet issued by the Minister of Education with regard to Education Week, where it is stated that the total expenditure by the Government for the year ended June 30, 1957, in all departments under the control of the Minister and for grants to educational institutions paid to the Education Department was £10,000,000. The various items of expenditure are set out, including £120,000 for the Kindergarten Union. I mention this item specifically because it should bring private schools into the same category. I have the greatest admiration for those who formed themselves into the union and the work they perform, but many of the children attending kindergartens are eligible to go to primary schools, and should be going there. Private schools find it most difficult to borrow money for building extensions, although I have been successful on three occasions in getting funds for them, once from a private bank and twice from the State Bank, to whom I pay a compliment. However, as Sir Arthur Rymill said yesterday banks' funds are tied up. The development of the building programmes of private schools should be carried out on long term loans on a pound for pound basis to make it easier for them. I can name two denominations which are unable to extend and provide the necessary amenities because they cannot borrow from private institutions. If the Kindergarten Union can receive £120,000 from the Government, about which I do not cavil, the same consideration and support should be given to private schools.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—They have been doing this work for the last 50 years and receive no consideration from the Government.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I agree. The Government provides funds on a pound for pound basis to the Parents and Friends associations attached to the State schools to enable them to provide amenities. I am not suggesting that this support should be taken away, but where private schools are acting similarly there would be no harm if the Government extended the same facilities to these other people who are saving the State £10 a year per head of the population in educating children.

I now come to the question of housing and pay a tribute to the State Bank, the Savings Bank, the Superannuation Fund and all those other lending organizations which make it possible for £1,750 to be advanced to a person who desires to erect a home. One of the greatest barriers

which could be raised against Communism and all the other "isms" which attempt to eat into the body politic is to make the people contented, provide them with homes and give them an equity for which they can work. It is a well-known axiom that an Englishman's home is his castle, and we should apply the same principle in Australia to make it easy for those who desire a home to have one, instead of their being faced with the financial stringency of having to find about £1,000 before they can think of purchasing one. This condition has been brought about by the policy pursued by the Menzies Government. I might be charged with talking politics if I quote from the publication I have before me.

The Hon. C. R. Story—Not another one of those capitalistic things?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—It is, and I would advise my honourable friend to study it, because it would remove from his eyes that cobweb of Conservatism resulting from such Liberal propaganda. I might be challenged by some honourable members if I say that the Commonwealth Bank was brought into existence by Labor, but it was. Since the Chifley Government was defeated in 1949 Mr. Menzies has reconstituted the Commonwealth Bank Board, and the policy that was being pursued by the Chifley regime is contrary to that now being pursued by the Menzies regime.

The Hon. E. Anthony—The same director.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I am coming to that. Sir Arthur Rymill referred to the private banks yesterday, and his statement was one of fact. They can lend only on certain investments with the liquid assets available. The *National Bank of Australia Digest* has this to say:—

During the year the Central Bank called up the net amount of £80,000,000 in special accounts and by June, 1957, the ratio of those funds to the profits of the eight major trading banks had risen to 21 per cent as compared with 18 per cent 12 months earlier. During 1955-56 this ratio has shown very little change. In other words, in 1956 it was only 18 per cent, whereas in 1957, in order to clamp down and create financial stringency, the Commonwealth Bank drew in 21 per cent.

The Hon. E. Anthony—It will halt inflation.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—Not at all. This is the aftermath of the "Little Budget" as a result of eight economists sitting in Canberra and making an economic survey of the position. Their report was accepted by the Menzies Government. Professor Karmel, of the Adelaide University, was one who sup-

ported the proposal that there should be a steeper grade of taxation in order to skim off the surplus earnings of the community's income. We have been told from time to time that ever since the financial agreement was entered into in 1924 the smaller States, such as South Australia, Tasmania and Western Australia, have become mendicant States.

The Hon. E. Anthony—They always were.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—Not until 1924, because they had the right to determine their economic survival until then, but now it is determined by an outside authority that is only partially responsible to this State by the number of representatives it sends to the House of Representatives in Canberra. An interesting article appeared in the January-March issue of the *Review of the Institute of Public Affairs*. This publication—not by choice—in many ways advocates Labor policies and expresses Labor's views, particularly with regard to the "Horror Budget" introduced by the Menzies Government. The article sets out:—

Professor Karmel made two other points, neither of which comes to grips with the main criticisms raised against a programme of increased taxes. He disputed the idea that higher taxation is inflationary because it raises prices and costs. He argued that an increase in indirect taxes which resulted in a once and for all rise in the price level would serve to mop up excess purchasing power.

I think every member agrees that we have "had" economists. We "had" them in the depression, during the war and since. They are like some poor relations, they are always with us. In contrast to what they have told us, we should look at the position in West Germany as set out in another publication of the *Institute of Public Affairs*. After the Nazi regime was abolished, the Americans assisted Western Europe, but the Germans found themselves in a difficult position because manufacturers were unable to sell their goods. They were bartering manufactured goods for old clothes and other things. Professor Wallich's views are set out in this journal as follows:—

Professor Wallich, of the Yale University points out the anomalous fact that Germany, the one Western nation with a thoroughgoing experience of peace-time planning under the Nazis in the early 1930's was the first to turn her back on controls.

We have controls in this country, but only on certain things, and while we have those controls wages have been pegged, yet costs have risen because of the rapaciousness of some

manufacturers, not because of increased wages. This article sets out how Germany got out of the difficulty; it states:—

In Wallich's view the outstanding feature of Erhard's policy lay in the wide range of incentives to increased productivity. The natural urge of every German to rapidly improve his personal position was reinforced by tax concessions favouring the enterprising and hard working; "Whoever made money was allowed to keep most of it under a system that forgave taxes to those who saved and invested." Labour was encouraged by making overtime earnings exempt from tax.

Contrast that with the position in Australia, which has a working population of about 3,870,000, who are all taxed right up to the hilt irrespective of whether they are employed in heavy or light industry. Manufacturers are taxed and are not permitted to receive any amelioration for reconditioning or rehabilitating their machinery. The articles they produce are also taxed. Although the economists who brought about the "Horror Budget" said taxation should be increased, war-devastated Germany, which was in a parlous condition during the Nazi regime, is now the third exporting country of the world.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—There is no 40-hour week there, either.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—The honourable member always has some catchery. Germany did not bring this about at the expense of the worker because, as I mentioned, the tax on their overtime earnings is rebateable and they get a fair share of the goods they produce. The quicker we get down to hard fundamental facts the better it will be for this country. We should not be advised by these people who are attempting to hold themselves up as economic doctors.

I now come to housing. I do not intend to malign the Housing Trust because I think it is carrying out an excellent function, but members of my Party have always advocated setting up a Ministry of Housing. We have gone further in advocating a building commission under which all the technical knowledge of the building trade, from the architects down to the artisans, could be used to gear up and provide the necessary drive for the carrying out of home building. However, we find that the trust is being used by this Government as a stalking horse. There is no Minister in charge of this body, although all questions relating to it are put to the Premier. The Governor said in his speech that we have virtually caught up with the housing

situation, but the following table indicates the true position:—

Year.	Applicants.	Units built.
1952-53	7,904	4,126
1953-54	9,807	3,555
1954-55	10,806	3,238
1955-56	17,751	3,238

These figures clearly indicate that we are gradually slipping back in housing, and the only solution is that advocated by members of my Party—the marshalling, as in war-time of all building resources so that we can at least attempt to overcome this problem.

In conclusion, I wish to say that the problems confronting the Australian people today is one which should be placed fairly and squarely before them. All these attempts to malign the Labor Party, and the taking out of the context statements made by Federal and State Leaders, will achieve nothing. If we can all pull together during a crisis, let us all pull together in peace-time when we should attempt to enjoy some of the fruits of supporting Labor's policy, having come through the purging fire of war. Our economic problems cannot be solved by branding Labor as Communistic and un-Australian, but by marching forward as one Australian people.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Central No. 1)—I support the motion. I join with others in congratulating the mover and seconder, and although I do not necessarily agree with everything they said they expressed their points of view and made excellent speeches. I am pleased that the Government has extended the term of office of His Excellency the Governor. I might be pardoned for saying that His Excellency and Lady George came to South Australia with a terrific job in front of them, following as they did such a popular and able couple as Sir Willoughby (now Lord) and Lady Norrie, who did such a magnificent job in South Australia. It took the public quite a time to become accustomed to the present Governor's ways, but the more one meets him and Lady George the more one is satisfied that they have endeared themselves to the people and are carrying out their duties on just the same high level as their predecessors.

I associate myself with the expressions of sympathy at the death of Mr. Larry Heath and Sir George Jenkins. I had not met Mr. Heath until he became a member of this Parliament, but I heard a lot about him and much of what I heard, I am pleased to say, proved to be correct. I formed a very high opinion of him, and found that he went about his work and his associations in a quiet and unassuming

manner. In his short time in this Parliament he enjoyed the affection of all members. I knew Sir George Jenkins some years ago when he was Minister of Agriculture and I was a member of the House of Assembly. I did not come in contact with him very much, but he always impressed me as being a good friend and one who would always help a person when necessary. While we may differ violently on politics, the fact that we can endure one another and create some bonds of friendship makes this walk of life worth-while. To the relatives of those gentlemen I extend my personal sympathy in their irreparable loss.

On hearing the Governor's Speech one could be pardoned for thinking that we were being told that everything in this good country of ours was above reproach, that nobody had any worries, and that we had the best Government in the world which cared for everybody. That is not entirely correct, and I will endeavour to prove that it is not correct. We should be prepared to put the exact position to the public and not gloss over everything that appears quite right and forget about the unfortunate people who are not doing so well. In paragraph 3 of his speech His Excellency said:—

My advisers are gratified to observe a continuance of the prosperity which South Australia has enjoyed in recent years. The rapid growth of our population is being matched by the development of natural resources, progress in Government undertakings and housing, and increase in production and commerce. During the last five years, while the natural increase in the population of this State has been a little above the Australian average, the rate of increase from migration has been almost twice the Australian figure. The strong attraction of South Australia for migrants is a reflection of our favourable living conditions and sound economic position.

Paragraph 4 reads as follows:—

The recent restrictions of credit did not halt the upward trend, though the rate of expansion in secondary industries slowed down a little. The basic wage in South Australia in terms of real purchasing power is still the greatest in Australia, while the C series index reveals that since June, 1953, price rises in this State have been the lowest. The standard of living is higher than ever, and our citizens are animated by a lively spirit of enterprise and optimism.

One might ask who have been enjoying the prosperity, and where has the real purchasing power been so magnificent in South Australia. Since basic wage adjustments were abandoned in September, 1953, the workers of South Australia have at various times been on the wrong side in terms of purchasing power by as much as 19s. a week. The Government, like a drown-

ing man clutching at a straw because they were on the right side of the ledger for one quarter during the preceding four years, decided that this was a golden opportunity to tell the people that because of the Government and price control the purchasing power here was better than anywhere else in Australia. With their statement that that was so for 13 weeks I have no quarrel, but what the Government's advisers did not know or anticipate was that in the last quarter the figure rose by 4s. a week, and if it were not the highest it was at least the second highest increase in any State. Since the first pay period of this quarter the male workers are 3s. a week worse off than they would have been if cost of living adjustments had continued. The abolition of those adjustments, according to figures which have been prepared and which I believe to be correct, has meant that each male worker has lost £78 11s. over a period of less than four years, and the female workers have each lost £58 18s.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe—Employees in other States have lost more than that amount through industrial disputes.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD—That may or may not be so, but that is only dragging a red herring across the trail. The Government told the people that for one quarter we had 1s. a week better purchasing power over the C series index, but when that index shows an increase over the basic wage it means that the workers are losing in purchasing power and the real living standard. The question of strikes has been raised. The people who are responsible for healing industrial disputes do not get any help from the Government or any credit for what they do, and I happen to know what I am talking about.

According to the *South Australian Statesman's Pocket Year Book* for 1956 the number of male employees in South Australia is 183,000 and therefore these workers have lost £14,374,650 since the abolition of quarterly adjustments. The 63,700 females, assumed to be all adults, have lost £3,751,930, giving a total loss in wages to all adult employees since September, 1953, of £18,126,580. If I understand aright the meaning of prosperity this Government has nothing to be proud of. That in a short space of less than 3½ years the employees of this State, through the policy of the Federal Government, supported by this Government, have had their purchasing power reduced by over £18,000,000 is not very creditable to anyone, but the position is even worse than that. Since the first pay period of this month it will have been further aggravated to the extent that

males will have lost a further 3s. a week, or a total of £27,450, and the females 2s. 3d. a week or a total of £7,166 5s., a total of £34,616 5s. I do not know where the prosperity is for those people. The position would be bad enough if it stopped there, but there is another very sorry side to the situation, and, so as not to be accused of misrepresentation, I quote something said by an honourable member here last week with reference to unemployment. Apparently a lot of people who walk in better circles than the majority of employees are not acquainted with the actual position in their own State. I refer to Mr. Anthony's speech as reported in *Hansard*:—

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—Statements made by captains of industry, leaders of thought, and trade gazettes, and the balance sheets of various business firms, all point to great prosperity in this country. It is very heartening to realize that Australia has gone through such a period of prosperity, and the future appears particularly bright.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan—Then how do you account for the increasing amount of unemployment?

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—The honourable member had better get his facts right. I understand that there is no increase in unemployment.

The Hon. A. J. Shard—It has doubled in the last 12 months.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—According to figures supplied recently by the Government Statistician, the incidence of unemployment is completely static.

The Hon. A. J. Shard—It has increased by 100 per cent in the last 12 months, and I can produce figures to prove it.

Number of persons registered for employment at Commonwealth Employment Services:—

	Males.	Females.	Total.	Increase. Per cent.
For Commonwealth—				
June, 1956	20,659	10,858	31,517	
June, 1957	36,194	16,031	52,225	65.7
For South Australia—				
June, 1956	1,319	629	1,948	
June, 1957	2,261	1,102	3,363	72.6

The position is becoming worse daily and it is also of interest of note that they are the highest unemployment figures registered since the end of the war. They are higher now than in what was known as the 1952-3 recession. They have not found a name for this one yet, but to me it is plain, cold-blooded unemployment. The following figures tell the

The Hon. C. D. Rowe—Less in this State than in any other.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD—So is everything else less. Although it has not increased by 100 per cent it is astonishing how much it has increased in the last 12 months, and the figures cannot be disputed.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe—On a State basis the position is better here than anywhere else.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD—It has increased by over 60 per cent.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe—But it is better in this State than any other.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD—On a population basis it may not be as good as the Minister might imagine. I quote from the Department of Labour and National Service News Release which gives the true picture of the employment position throughout Australia. It is published in the name of Mr. H. E. Holt, who is not a member of our Party, but I believe that the department is very zealous in the compilation of these figures and I think they can be taken as correct.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan—Certainly not overstated.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD—That is so, and there are reasons for that which I will endeavour to give. Although I want to stick mainly to South Australia it is interesting to have a look at the Commonwealth position, because we are apt to forget what is happening in other States. These are the figures:—

real tragic story. These are the people who are unfortunate to be in Australia and receiving unemployment social benefits, and I would like the Minister to tell me whether South Australia is better off in this regard than any other State, because on the Commonwealth basis that is not proved.

Persons in receipt of unemployment benefits:—

	Males.	Females.	Total.	Increase. Per cent.
Commonwealth—				
June 30, 1956	5,393	1,608	7,003	
June 30, 1957	14,324	3,747	18,071	158
South Australia—				
June 30, 1956	210	109	319	
June 30, 1957	730	324	1,058	230

The Hon. C. D. Rowe—Approximately one-twentieth of the whole for Australia whereas our percentage population is about nine per cent.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD—The figures I have given are indisputable, showing the percentage on a Commonwealth basis as 158 whereas it is 230 per cent in South Australia and still increasing.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—In this year of alleged prosperity.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD—When everything is painted so beautifully with gold trimmings. The facts are undeniable and the Minister can work out the percentages in any way he likes. Those figures are compiled by a department under the direction of a Government supported by this Government. It astonishes me to think that there is at least one member of this Chamber who did not know the unemployment position, so I think we should have it on record so that everybody can read it. The following appeared in the *Mail* of August 17 in a message from Canberra from Frank Chamberlain, and I think no-one will call him a friend of the Labor Party. Under the heading "Worry about Workers" the following appeared:—

In studying Budget papers this week there has been a hint of worry in a large section of the Ministry about the rising unemployment figures. The Minister of Labor (Mr. Holt) has been quick to insist that by the end of September the unusually large and rather menacing figure of 50,000 registered for work will fall quickly.

It is remarkable that the Labor Party are not the only ones with a difference of opinion. We have the Graziers Association on the one hand and the Chamber of Manufactures on the other blaming each other, and refusing to take blame for the growth of unemployment in Australia. In the *Advertiser* of Monday, under the heading "Unemployed Not Result of Treaty" appeared the following:—

Current unemployment could not be blamed on Australia's trade agreement with Japan, the president of the Graziers' Federal Council (Mr. G. W. Mellroy) said yesterday.

He said manufacturers were trying to use the treaty to force a fundamental change in Australia's tariff policy to give them almost absolute protection from competition.

Unemployment had been increasing for the past 12 months—a trend which could not possibly be blamed on the treaty.

"Manufacturers are exploiting the situation in an attempt to rouse a public outcry against ratification of the agreement," he said.

Then we have the *News* of the same date with a leader on trade with Japan and it states:—

Chamber of Manufactures spokesmen have been increasingly vocal in their condemnation of the trade pact recently concluded with Japan by the Minister for Trade and Customs, Mr. McEwen.

They claim that it has already caused unemployment; that it has been gravely detrimental to local industries, and that safeguards to protect these industries do not exist.

As the pact was signed only last month and as unemployment has been growing for the past 12 months towards the current figure of 52,000, it is difficult to reconcile the manufacturers' claim with those facts.

And in the same edition of the *News* under the heading "Jobless tell of battle to live," appears the following:—

More than 200 people filled the Commonwealth Employment Office in Currie Street this morning seeking jobs. But many were without skill or qualification, and some were too old for labouring.

Vacancies for them were very few. There are vacancies for skilled workmen.

One man, aged 62, said he had had no work for a year. Another had not worked for seven months.

Latest figures showed 2,261 males and 1,102 females were seeking employment in South Australia at the end of June. This figure was believed to have increased slightly.

The Hon. C. R. Story—Are they all employable?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD—Yes. The unemployment position has been developing for a long time. I still spend much of my time at the Trades Hall, and when there less than a month ago I met Mr. Kussadias, who is a leader in the Greek community and does a magnificent job for migrants, and thereby a good job for Australia. He meets the migrants and teaches them to speak our language and attempts to look after their wants. He had with him that morning about 25 able-bodied young Greeks and said he was looking for work for them, and mentioned that the position was getting out of hand. He said he had 100 men—strangers in a strange land—who were seeking employment. They are prepared to do labouring work. I went to the Trades Hall last Monday and from 9.30 a.m. to 12.30 p.m. there were endless inquiries at the office, not only by migrants, but by Australians, looking for work, and yet we are told that everything in South Australia is rosy. In this morning's *Advertiser* appeared the following:—

"More Out of Work in July." Canberra, August 20. Unemployed benefit recipients rose from 18,071 at June 28 to 20,291 at July 26, according to figures released tonight by the Minister for Labor (Mr. Holt).

In South Australia, including the Northern Territory, 1,345 recipients were registered, a rise of 291 for July. Most, 1,302, were in the Adelaide area.

Reductions of employment occurred in fertilizer, fruits processing—both seasonal—and electrical firms, and on some public works jobs. More work was available in motor vehicle and component firms.

Vacancies registered with the Commonwealth Employment Service fell by 64 to 1,020, and persons registered increased by 236 to 3,599.

I received the following letter yesterday from a person at Medindie under date August 19:—

I appreciate the fact that you are a busy man, but wondered whether you could assist my husband to secure a position. We recently sold a small mixed business as the hours were too strenuous for so poor a return. Mr. . . . has tried unceasingly to get a job for nine weeks, but has not been successful. He is 40 years of age and the position advertised calls for clerks between 25 and 35 years.

I would be grateful if you could use your influence to get a job. He is incapacitated in one leg, but enjoys good health, has an excellent hand for writing and figures, and would carry out his duties to the best of his ability.

Although as a clerk he could do a good job, this man had been unable to find a job. The unemployment position has been developing over the last 10 years or more. Previously, there had been, from an employment point of view, only one black spot in each 12 months—from about mid-June to mid-July. That period still exists to some extent, but with the advent of annual leave there has developed a second bad unemployment period—from the end of the second week in December until the end of January, when business activities, from an employment point of view, are dead. This has been brought about by annual leave and public holidays and because employers have decided to close their factories for three weeks. Actually, the leave period runs into almost four weeks. That might be very good from a business point of view, but not for employees. I predict that automation will become more and more part and parcel of industry within a decade, and with a general shortening of the working week and with three weeks' leave instead of two, for the good of the State employers must consider whether industry can afford to close down for the Christmas period. Migrants who come to Australia in mid-June have a rough spin in finding employment, and this also applies from mid-December until early February. So, we have to look at the position in the interests of the State, and not that of any particular employer. If we can keep the wheels of industry turning for the 52 weeks of the year, we will do something to stem the tide of unemployment. I will leave the position there, but hope that the facts and figures I have given will have dismissed any com-

placency any honourable members may have about there being an era of prosperity in this State, because I can assure them most sincerely that there is not.

Last year I suggested that it was time to overhaul the Industrial Code to bring it up to date, or at least that it should be consolidated and all the amendments and regulations incorporated. This year the Trades and Labor Council had another good look at the Code and appointed a committee to act in conjunction with executive officers of the council to see what amendments were necessary. That committee met on a number of occasions, and although it did not go half way through the Code, it had a list of 33 suggested amendments, the majority of which I think would be agreed to by people of modern thought, as none of them are really reactionary. I ask the Minister to consider appointing a Select Committee to hear evidence from employers and employees and to bring the Industrial Code up to modern day trends.

The relationship between employers and employees in this State is very good, something about which I am a little egotistical because I played some small part in it. When Mr. Dennis Winterbottom was secretary of the Chamber of Manufactures, he urged me to suggest a Select Committee. He said that he would fall into line, and there are very few people in this State who know industry better than he. If the Government appointed such a committee it would be doing a service for the State generally, not only for the Chamber of Manufactures and employees, and the amended Code would be a model to the rest of Australia. After all, are we not here in the interests of the people as a whole, and should we not do our best to improve the employment machinery? If the Minister cannot agree to this, I repeat my request that at least the Code could be consolidated and contain all amendments and regulations. I was told recently by the secretary of a union that he could not purchase a copy of the Code, amendments and regulations. I asked a messenger here to obtain a copy for me, and he told me that the Government Printer had no copies, and had told him that they were not available. I do not know who is responsible for that, but it is a sad state of affairs when it is not possible to obtain a copy of the rules relating to employment in this State.

On two or three occasions last year I asked the Minister of Industry about the appointment of a deputy president of the State Industrial Court. In my opinion the man appointed was

a very good choice. When I was a member of the Board of Industry I heard a case presented by him, and I have appeared as an advocate when he has represented the other party. He put his case very ably, fairly and kindly, and if he carries these characteristics with him in his new office, I can foresee that South Australia may in the future provide another Federal Arbitration Court Judge.

Everyone who takes an interest in public affairs must be concerned at certain happenings in road traffic matters since the Address in Reply debate last year. I agree with most of the views mentioned by Sir Arthur Rymill. I agree with him that there has been an improvement in driving ability and courtesy by most motorists. It has been most noticeable with taxi drivers, who to my mind are the most maligned of all motorists. The person responsible for the construction of the Emerson crossing traffic lights is to be commended. I have travelled a great deal, and like Sir Arthur Rymill I have never seen a better set of lights than at this crossing. Traffic lights have done more to bring about a decrease in the accident rate than anything else, and they could be used in many other places. I am not concerned about their cost, because money will have to be found for them to reduce the number of accidents. In my district are two corners where they should be erected. The first of these is the intersection of Main North Road and the Irish Harp Road; I do not know any corner that has a greater volume of traffic. The other is the intersection of the Main North Road and Grand Junction Road, where traffic lights are essential.

Last week Mr. Anthoney spoke about accidents. I am afraid I was rather vicious last week, because I do not like the people I represent to be attacked, and I think it is most unkind for any member to attack any section of the community by making incorrect statements. Mr. Anthoney said that all road accidents were caused by employees driving employers' vehicles in regard to which accidents they are not responsible for insurance.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—I said nothing of the sort.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD—Then you have to convince many in this Chamber that you did not. I think you should be very thankful we have a *Hansard* staff.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—You are disagreeing with what *Hansard* reported, are you?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD—No, and I think you should forever be grateful that they report the facts. For my own enlightenment, I

tried to find out how many accidents were caused by employees driving their employers' vehicles. Anyone who reads the papers will know that the vast majority of accidents are in the early morning, late evening, at week-ends, and on public holidays, and others are caused by drunken drivers. During all the times I have mentioned, the number of vehicles driven by employees would be very small. I tried to obtain figures, and my first approach was made to Mr. Kay, Registrar of Motor Vehicles, but he told me that his department does not keep a separate registrar of business vehicles. I then telephoned a friend who is manager of an insurance company, but he told me that he did not think the figures were available. He told me to ring the Fire and Accident Underwriters' Association because, if anybody would have them, they would. I got in touch with that association, but they had no record relating to this. I also rang Mr. Wilson at the National Safety Council who informed me that he had no such record as suggested by my friend. I then rang Mr. Connolly of the Police Department, and he told me that no record of accidents under that heading has ever been tabulated. I wondered why the statement was ever made.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—It never was made.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD—According to *Hansard* that is what was said. I came to the conclusion that it was nothing but an unwarranted, malicious attack upon employees.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—Mr. Acting President, I object to that statement and I ask the honourable member to withdraw it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. L. H. Densley)—I ask the honourable member to withdraw.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD—I withdraw the word "malicious." It was an unnecessary and unwarranted attack. It is a pity that some honourable members will attack any section of the community unnecessarily.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—The honourable member is doing that now.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD—I am not. I made all possible inquiries to find some justification for the attack, but was unsuccessful.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—There was no attack. The honourable member is now saying things out of his inner conscience.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—On a point of order, Mr. President, is the honourable member in order in interjecting from another member's seat?

The PRESIDENT—He is not in order in interjecting from any seat, but he has the right to sit anywhere as long as the occupant of that seat does not object.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD—If ever I attack any section of the community I have just and reasonable cause for doing so. During last session I referred to the movement of buses in and around the City. Without wishing to claim any kudos I did suggest the removal of Glenelg buses from their old route to the present route, which I think is more in the interests of the community. I also referred to the movement of the buses which go to the northern suburbs. I do not know whether the powers that be have to wait until some serious accident or tragedy occurs before something will be done in this matter. It would be quite simple to overcome and avoid the U turn just below the safety zone in King William Road. These buses come from the northern end of the City, make the U turn, and then return in that direction. It would be simple, without interference or annoyance to the public, to run those buses down Montefiore Hill, around the back of the Adelaide Oval, over the Overway Bridge, into Hindley Street and then into King William Street. That would avoid the congestion which is occurring daily in King William Road. I have seen buses hold up north and south bound trams as well as other road traffic, but I think that could be easily avoided. I hope that somebody takes notice of these suggestions and does something, but sometimes I have very serious doubts whether they do. There is another bad practice within our City which should be avoided, and that is the making of U turns. The City Council has banned right-hand turns in King William Street at certain times. Yet we find taxis and other vehicles making those U turns in King William Street between North Terrace and Rundle Street. The making of these U turns, at least during peak hours, should be prohibited between intersections.

Mr. Bevan recently stated that the road between Alice Springs and Darwin is deteriorating. I was fortunate in being able to make a trip by road to Darwin last April, and I can say that the road is in as good a condition as the Anzac Highway, a tremendous amount of repair work having been done. I had been under the impression that the road was not in very good condition, but we did not have to make one deviation nor did we experience very much rough road. We travelled for two hours at a time and we invariably covered over 100 miles in that time. The total

distance was a little over 1,000 miles. The only bad part of the road from Adelaide is that under the care of our own Government. The section from Port Augusta to Woomera is corrugated but not very badly. The worst part of the road to Kingoonya is a section of between seven and nine miles around Lake Hart. I suggest to the Attorney-General that his colleague, the Minister of Roads, should investigate this matter. That section could be repaired at not very great expense, and then the road would be a good one for its entire length.

Like other members I have taken an active interest in education, and whenever possible visit schools and attend school functions. I was agreeably surprised during Education Week at the speeches I heard and read which, for quite a change, gave Parliament some credit for what is being done for education. It was refreshing to hear the speakers refer to the work of the Education Department as sponsored by Parliament, instead of the old cry of "My Government has done so and so." I think we all agree that education is a subject which should be above Party politics. I pay a tribute to school teachers. With one or two exceptions, they do a magnificent job and are really fitted for their occupation; in many cases they love their work, otherwise they would not do it.

Last week I visited a girls technical school, and the improvement in the work displayed, and the fittings and materials provided for them to do the work, was most noticeable. Parliament cannot take all the credit for that, and I pay a tribute to parents associations, mothers clubs and all the other kindred bodies who between them raised about £156,000 last year. These organizations deserve great credit for what they are doing. I have heard it said that some departmental heads think the Government is being too generous in giving pound for pound, but I feel that that is too little and it could easily give one and a half times what is being raised by these organizations.

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—Don't forget that the Government is giving £10,000,000.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD—If the parents did not do anything it would cost the Government a lot more. I sound that warning because I am fearful that if departmental heads suggest that the payments should be cut the Government will accede to their requests. Mr. Wilson has already heard me say that the subsidy of a pound for pound in connection with new community hospitals is not sufficient.

They are doing a magnificent job, and the one with which I am connected cannot complain about the treatment received from the Chief Secretary. However, I feel that the Government could have done a little better, because at the moment we are really in difficulties.

The educational system at Darwin is under the control of our State and I pay a particular tribute to the school teachers there. I inspected a primary school and found it to be in very good surroundings with well-equipped buildings, and the teachers are doing a magnificent job. A dental clinic is provided, staffed with a full-time dentist and nurse, and I give full credit to whoever is responsible for that service.

The Hon. C. R. Story—That would be the Menzies Government, wouldn't it?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD—I should say someone in the South Australian Education Department. You cannot give that one to "Uncle Bob." At Bagots Compound there is a headmaster and an assistant, and the classes are all aboriginal children whose families live in the compound. The children have a bath each morning before school and change into fresh clothes as distinct from those in which they leave their camp. They are provided with a meal at lunchtime and after completing their lessons in the afternoon they change into their own clothes to go home. That is a daily routine and something to be commended. I asked how many aborigines were successful scholars. I may have been a little unkind to them, but I was surprised to learn that the figure was better than eight out of 10, which reflects great credit on the teachers.

I have always taken a keen interest in apprentices and make a point of attending their annual functions. I attended one last year. The items were very good and a credit to those who arranged the programme. I heard an eloquent and excellent address from Mr. O. E. Nilsson, President of the Apprenticeship Commission of Victoria, who has given his life to apprentices and technical education. It was a pleasure to hear him, but unfortunately he was followed by an eminent citizen of South Australia, who, after making due apologies to members of Parliament present, went out of his way to attack what he called the Socialistic policy of the Labor Party. I thought that this was in very bad taste and totally uncalled for, and if we are to be invited to functions to hear eminent citizens make attacks upon the policy of either Party the sooner such

functions are not held the better. This particular gentleman should have known better than to have said one word one way or the other on politics. His attack was so direct that a member of this Council said to me, "After hearing that, Bert, are you going to join the Liberal Party?" If such functions are to be used as forums for politics for either Party it is a retrograde step and the powers that be should see that such a thing does not recur.

I conclude my remarks with some comments about this Legislative Council. I knew before I came here that the standing of the Legislative Council in the eyes of some people was not very high, but I had not realized that the Government itself would do so much to bring its standard down. I have never suffered such inconsiderate treatment by the Government, or seen a body of men treated so inconsiderately as we were in the February special session.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—The honourable member is not doing much to improve the standard this afternoon.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD—That may be the honourable member's opinion, but I will justify my opinion wherever I go. Unless members talk about these things the recognition we get will become less and less. In the February session the Council was adjourned until the ringing of the bells awaiting a message from another place. If my memory is correct, after waiting an hour or an hour and three-quarters we were called together only to hear the Minister tell us that the other place had adjourned and had forgotten to send us a message.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe—That happened once in 20 years.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD—It was done and it was not the only occasion, and someone has to say something in a case like that. In connection with the centenary of responsible government the notice given members to allow them to make their private arrangements was very short. I was as anxious as anybody to attend those ceremonies, but I also wanted to make arrangements for a holiday, not necessarily all pleasure, but at my doctor's wish. I waited and waited for something definite to be done until at last I gave it away in disgust and made my arrangements, to find ultimately that on such an important occasion only one month's notice was given to members. I think that for such an important occasion members should have been given longer notice.

Again, in connection with the meeting of this Council last week another unfortunate incident occurred. We had decided to resume on that date, but another place decided to adjourn that week because of Education Week. My colleagues and I had invitations to attend certain functions on that day. One of them was a physical culture display by youths, and I am very interested in the work of juniors in this respect. However, we agreed to cancel our appointment and attend Parliament, but I regret to say that all members did not do likewise. This is not the first occasion that I have refused an invitation to attend a function only to find on coming here that other members have accepted and attended. It is apparent that I will have to look at it from my own point of view in future.

I have seen the opening of Parliament in most States and in one or two other countries, but never until last week did I see a sitting commenced without a Minister of the Crown in his place. I do not think that that is anything to add to our prestige. Then in last Sunday's *Mail*—and this is of weekly occurrence—we read that the State Government had decided to grant £360,000 for new buildings for the Adelaide University and Waite Research Institute—with the addendum—"Provided Parliament approves." I do not know of any member, with the exception of Cabinet Ministers, who had heard of that until they saw it in print, and it is not adding to the prestige of Parliament for members to learn from the press about the Government's intentions.

The Hon. L. H. Densley—I had the privilege of being on a deputation to the Government about it and I knew.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD—The honourable member was fortunate. I think that was the first intimation that any other member got of the proposal. I am not criticizing the amount; possibly I agree with it, but I think that such a proposal could have been included in the Governor's Speech. I support the motion.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Attorney-General)—I join with other members in their expressions of congratulation to His Excellency, Sir Robert George and Lady George, on their reappointment. I know that they will carry out their duties during their extended term in the same highly satisfactory way that they have done previously. I congratulate the mover, Mr. Wilson, on his comprehensive coverage of the matters relating to the development of this State. He stated that the

Chief Secretary in his trip overseas on Government business was endeavouring to secure further information with regard particularly to the departments which he administers, and I know that members will be pleased to learn that, on reports that I have received, he arrived in England in the pink of condition and has been able to pursue his work without interruption. Already it is evident from what I have heard that the State will benefit very considerably from his knowledge when he returns a little later in the year.

I also compliment the seconder, Mr. Cowan, on a very thoughtful address. I understand that through circumstances which probably could not be foreseen he did not have quite as much notice as he would have wished for the preparation of his remarks and for that reason he is to be complimented very highly on his contribution to the debate.

I come now to some matters raised by Mr. Condon in one of his usual very good speeches on the Address in Reply, but there are one or two subjects on which we may take different points of view. Firstly, Mr. Condon implied that people in industry here are not as well off as they are in other States and, he having set the tune, we had a couple of choruses from Mr. Bardolph and Mr. Shard. Despite that, I think the true facts are that no Government in Australia can show a better record of industrial harmony and contentment and of better employment than ours. If there is one, I invite him to name it.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Is that not because of the co-operation of the trades union movement?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—No-one denies such co-operation, but the fact is that this Government by its efforts has been able to enlist the co-operation of all sections of industry, and has succeeded in doing so to an extent which outclasses anything else in the Commonwealth. That statement is true and cannot be contradicted.

Much has been said about the cost of living adjustments, and figures were quoted particularly by Mr. Shard by which he endeavoured to show that the workers have lost a very considerable amount because adjustments were not applied in this State during the last two or three years. Let me repeat what I have said previously, that during the whole of that period the trades union movement, if it had seen fit to do so, could have gone to the Industrial Court.

The Hon. A. J. Shard—The Government joined forces with the employers against them.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—They could have gone to the court and had a wage determined. The facts are that apparently they were perfectly satisfied that the position was best left as it is. In any event, even if the wages here have been kept at a lower level than in other States, that has been more than compensated for by the fact that the unemployment position has been, and now is in relation to the total number of workers employed, very much better than in any other State. I do not think any member opposite can contradict the statement that the percentage of unemployed here is less than half that of any other State. Whatever the position is here, I do not want honourable members to think that we are complacent about it. We will watch the position and do all we can to keep everyone employed. The point is that we have succeeded to a better degree than any other State in keeping our economic situation under control, and perhaps the best figures I can quote on that are in relation to the number of industrial disputes which occurred in industry. During the first nine months of the 1956 financial year there were 657 disputes in New South Wales involving 190,000 workers; 188 in Queensland involving 90,000; and 17 in South Australia involving 13,000. To reduce those figures to a percentage of the total number of workers employed the position is:—In New South Wales 6 per cent of the work force was involved in industrial disputes, 8 per cent in Queensland and 1.8 per cent in South Australia.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Give the figures for Western Australia and Tasmania.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—I have not those available, but the facts are that the position here is much better than in any other State. My view is that whatever the workers in the other States may have gained because of cost of living adjustments, they have actually lost more than was gained compared with South Australia because of industrial disputes and because industry could not afford to keep them all employed. I think there is ample evidence to show that in this State we have reached a more satisfactory solution of the problem than any other State.

Mr. Condon also mentioned the purchase by the Government of the Foy & Gibson building, and I believe his comment was that it was an unwise purchase and that the Government would have been better advised to build a new structure, presumably in Victoria Square.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—At the time it was recommended.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—The honourable member referred to the fact that a new building was recommended 20 years ago. I presume his suggestion is that we should have forgotten about our war effort and used our people to construct a building in Victoria Square rather than fight the war. Every member knows that for several years the nation was involved in a conflict which used all our materials and manpower, and since then we have been involved in the most difficult task of meeting urgent requirements for schools, hospitals and roads and providing the amenities required for our expanding economy. Because of that men, materials and money have not been available to build a Government office block, however much the Government might have desired to do so. The facts with regard to the purchase of the Foy & Gibson building are that it was bought for £452,500 and we have already spent £140,000 in additions and alterations and by the time they are completed another £39,000 will have been involved, making a total expenditure of £631,500. I have had an estimate made by an officer of the Architect-in-Chief's Department and he informs me that the cost the Government would incur today to erect a building to provide equal accommodation would be £1,145,000 to which must be added the cost of the land, which is valued at £255,000. So, if the Government wanted to provide an equivalent amount of accommodation by erecting a new building it would have to spend £1,400,000, which is more than twice the amount spent in this purchase.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—In my opinion that does not answer the criticism.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—In my opinion it does, because the Government has only a certain amount of money and must use it to the best advantage. Another point is that if the Government were to construct a new building at Victoria Square those occupying the present premises, which would have to be demolished, would have to be housed elsewhere.

In connection with the establishment of a shipbuilding industry at Port Adelaide, Mr. Condon said:—

We have heard talk of a British firm coming here to undertake ship building, when I claim there was never a suggestion or intention by a British company to come to South Australia. I say that was all hokey.

To which I interjected "I do not think the honourable member should make that statement," and he replied "I have made it and the Minister has the opportunity to contradict it." The facts are that Adelaide Ship

Construction Ltd., which was recently registered in Adelaide, had announced that before the end of 1957 a ship-building dock for the construction of tugs and small craft would be in full operation at a site next to Fletcher's Slip, Birkenhead. The parties interested in the project are Seawork Ltd., the principal United Kingdom licensees for the hydrochonic form of ship construction, and the Adelaide Steamship Company. The company will use the latest and most economical overseas methods of small ship construction.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—That project would employ only 100 men anyhow. What about the building of tankers?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—If the honourable member will possess his mind in patience for a month or two longer, this tanker proposal may come home to port satisfactorily and will prove further that his statement was not correct.

Mr. Bevan gave what in my view was a very thoughtful speech, a fine contribution to the debate. He mentioned many things, upon which I should like to comment. One was the cancellation of indentures by apprentices. I regret, as he does, that there seems to be a big increase in the number of those cancelling their indentures. He was unable, nor am I able, to suggest a remedy, but I suggest that students who enter into an apprenticeship would be well advised to consider the position carefully before they throw away the advantages of learning a trade for a momentary improvement in their wage. I join with the honourable member in bringing this matter to the notice of apprentices.

Mr. Bevan and Mr. Shard mentioned the consolidation of regulations under the Industrial Code. This question was raised in the Council last session, and I think also in the House of Assembly, and at that stage I said I would attend to the matter. When we came to study it, we found that one or two amendments were required. That was attended to and they are now lying on the table of this Chamber and when the period for disallowance expires at the end of a few more sitting days—

The Hon. A. J. Shard—Is it necessary for them to go before the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—I do not think so. When the period expires, almost immediately a complete consolidated copy of the regulations will be available, probably about the middle of September. That is the reason why some individual regulations are not available at present because obviously it is not

wise to print regulations and have stocks on hand when the consolidated edition comes out.

Mr. Shard or Mr. Bardolph referred to decentralization of industry, and suggested that this Government has not succeeded in achieving anything along those lines. Reference was made, for some reason I cannot understand, to the township of Wallaroo. If a figure could be taken out, and if the volume of industries that have been established in country areas since this Government came into office could be arrived at, the total would approximate £200,000,000.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—The major portion would be at Whyalla.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—No, it would be scattered throughout the State. That is a record of decentralization of industry that I challenge any member to show has been equalled in any other State.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Then why has there been this drift from the country to the city?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—Whatever the drift has been, no Government could have done more than ours to achieve decentralization of industry. We hear much criticism from members of the Opposition, but I want to make it clear that if the Opposition has any tangible suggestion by which this can possibly be overcome, we are quite happy to listen to it. However, all I have ever heard is a spate of criticism all of which is up in the air, but none of which provides any real suggestions.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan—You could put abattoirs at Wallaroo.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—The facts in relation to that are that the Metropolitan Meat Company was interested, and the Government arranged finance to the extent of £200,000, of which £150,000 was to be by way of a long term loan and £50,000 by way of overdraft, which was the finance the company required. In addition, the company asked that it have the right to sell 50 per cent of its production in the metropolitan area, to which the Government agreed. It also agreed to every other request made by the company, but notwithstanding that, the company did not see fit to go on with the matter. On the question of establishing a Government abattoirs there, the Government has said quite clearly on a number of occasions that it is prepared to do so provided that producers in that area give a guarantee that they will deliver their

production to it. It is quite obviously economically unsound to build an abattoirs there if it is not going to be used by the people nearest to it. In the absence of that undertaking it was not logical for us to proceed.

With regard to the criticism made of the purchase of the power alcohol distillery, I think for £100,000, the facts are that the Government, through the Industries Development Committee, endeavoured to set up a company there for the manufacture of fire bricks and ceramics, and provided a guarantee of £30,000. It also made available the assistance of a very competent scientist, and gave every other assistance, but unfortunately the company was a failure and the Government had a fairly heavy loss. In addition, we have given to that area an adequate supply of water, and we supply electricity at a cheaper cost than is provided by any other Government in Australia to country towns. We have given an undertaking that if any industry wants to go there we will see that the necessary houses are provided. I cannot see what more can be done to assist the people in that area.

I do not want to deal further with the decentralization of industry except to say that since this Government came into power the Government forests in the South-East have been extended. They are now worth about £15,000,000 and are contributing about £240,000 a year to consolidated revenue. Apart from this, I feel that the development of Leigh Creek, soldier settlement on the river, in the South-East and on Eyre Peninsula, the development of Radium Hill and Whyalla, the establishment of a cement company at Angaston and the building of about 150 houses there, and the terrific extension of electricity mains throughout the whole of the State, is a record of which anybody should be quite proud.

Mr. Shard mentioned the appointment of Mr. Williams as Deputy President of the Industrial Court, and I thank him for his kindly remarks regarding the appointment. This matter exercised my mind very considerably, and it was very gratifying to me to hear Mr. Shard's eulogistic remarks and also the remarks made by the representative of the Trades and Labor Council in the court at the time when Mr. Deputy President Williams took his seat there. I feel it is a very important jurisdiction, and it is gratifying to know that Mr. Williams has the confidence of both sides of industry.

Mr. Densley gave what I think was one of many excellent speeches he has made in this

Chamber. It was an outstanding effort. He mentioned among other things making land available for development. I think he said that in the last few years the Government, under the powers it has, has partially developed land and has then made it available for allotment to various people. He thought that in view of the very great demand probably we should make land available without spending so much money on its development. The Government agrees with that contention, and in the very near future large areas will be made available in its natural state for development. Even before that can be done, however, certain work must be carried out; surveys must be completed, and access roads provided. In the South-East, of course, drainage problems must be surmounted. However, it will be the Government's policy to push ahead with the allotment of Crown lands as quickly as possible.

In that connection it may be interesting to know that recently an area of about 20,000 acres of partially developed land in the Hundred of Jeffries was made available. I think there were 13 blocks, for which there were 132 applicants, all of whom were satisfactory. This indicates that there is still a great demand for land in this State and we will do what we can to see that this demand is satisfied. I do not think, however, that he realizes what the Government has done in making Crown lands available for private settlement. In the 10 years up to June 30, 1956, an area of 13,401,512 acres has been allotted by the Crown to private people. Of that amount 3,580 allotments, covering 4,530,643 acres, were made available in farming and small grazing areas, and 46 allotments, covering 8,870,869 acres, were made available as pastoral holdings. In addition, 678,472 acres were made available under the Commonwealth soldier settlement scheme. Also, 140,000 acres has been made available through the A.M.P. Society in the South-East and up to the present 29 allotments have been made. I think members will appreciate the fact that land is being made available for all private development at a very much faster rate than they would ordinarily imagine.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill—Do these figures include pastoral leases?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—The Pastoral Board made 46 allotments, which would be pastoral leases.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill—Do the other figures contain pastoral leases?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—I am not sure, but I shall obtain the information. Sir Arthur

Rymill made one or two comments on various matters. I do not propose to deal at length with his comments relating to price control, because there will be another opportunity to do so later, but he raised the question of whether matters raised in debate in this Chamber are brought to the notice of responsible Ministers. The practice is for the secretary to each Minister to read through the complete record of *Hansard* in both Houses, and matters relating to particular portfolios are referred to the Minister concerned for his attention. That responsibility is taken quite seriously by Ministers, and we give careful consideration to the work done.

I do not wish to make any further comments at this stage about what I believe has been a very excellent debate, except to say that we are commencing the second hundred years of responsible Parliamentary Government in this State, and I think that if those people who sat in the first Parliament here 100 years ago could be here today they would feel that we

had made a worthwhile attempt to maintain the tradition of this important Parliamentary institution. I would think that the standard of this debate by all members of either Party would compare very favourably with any debates that have occurred over the century. I believe that this House and this Parliament enjoys the confidence, respect and esteem of people both inside and outside Parliament, that it has proved to be an instrument for the benefit of all citizens, of whatever rank or class they may be, and as time goes on I hope that that condition will be continued and that we in our turn will be able to carry the weight of Government and democratic responsibility the same as those who preceded us. I have pleasure in supporting the motion.

Motion for adoption of Address in Reply carried.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.15 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, August 27, at 2.15 p.m.