

placed before the Legislative Council of N.S.W. by the Labor Government in the form submitted by the said Government without any amendment, alteration, or addition, unless such amendment, alteration, or addition shall be accepted by the Government.

Talk about a house of review! If it is to uphold the responsibilities of this Parliament that we are so interested in enlarging upon the Government could easily during the current session do some of the things that I have mentioned. Hon. members on this side will not object if the Government brings down a measure to abolish compulsory unionism, or to give the country people an opportunity to vote without the risk of drowning in the attempt. If such measures are introduced by the Government, hon. members on this side will not complain that they were not included in His Excellency's speech. I hope that all hon. members will enter this new century of parliamentary government with a constructive mind, and that we shall free ourselves from the shackles with which we have fettered ourselves. This encroachment on our prerogatives and privileges would not have occurred unless we had allowed it. It is not too late to act, but it is necessary for the Labor party to alter its platform and opinions. If it does so the Government will get all the support possible to build up this Parliament and save this country from unification.

Australia cannot be governed from Canberra. A bureaucracy has been established there that will choke us. Why does the Government not free the people of this country? Look at what has happened in the United States of America and in Australia. Victoria had only a handful of people, and the State of Queensland began with 7½d. in its Treasury. It was criticised and lampooned for beginning in that way. To-day anybody would like to buy Queensland for 7½d. Let us profit from the past. Let us make this country a federation. I, myself, have not much more time, but that would give all the younger men in this House an opportunity of being members of a true government. If action is not taken, hon. members will not have that opportunity. Let us get rid of the shackles of the last century. Let us think of the good example
Lt.-Colonel Bruzner.]

set by the great men who made this country what it is to-day.

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT.

Motion (by Mr. Heffron) agreed to:

That this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next at 2.30 o'clock, p.m.

House adjourned at 5.27 p.m.

Legislative Council.

Thursday, 24 May, 1956.

Leave of Absence—Governor's Speech: Address-in-Reply
(Third Day's Debate).

The ACTING PRESIDENT took the chair at 4.30 p.m.

The opening Prayer was read.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

The ACTING PRESIDENT reported the receipt of a communication from His Excellency the Governor intimating that leave of absence had been granted to the Hon. A. E. Armstrong for two months from 23rd May, 1956, for the purpose of visiting Eastern countries.

GOVERNOR'S SPEECH: ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

THIRD DAY'S DEBATE.

Debate resumed (from 23rd May, *vide* page 51) on motion by the Hon. R. R. Downing:

That the following Address be presented by the whole House to the Governor, in reply to the Speech which His Excellency had been pleased to make to both Houses of Parliament, viz.:—

To His Excellency Sir JOHN NORTHCOTT, Knight Commander of the Most Distinguished Order of Saint Michael and Saint George, Knight Commander of the Royal Victorian Order, Companion of the Most Honourable Order of the Bath, Lieutenant-General on the Retired List of the Australian Military Forces, Governor of the State of New South Wales and its Dependencies in the Commonwealth of Australia.

May it please Your Excellency,—

We, Her Majesty's loyal and dutiful subjects, the Members of the Legislative Council of

New South Wales, in Parliament assembled, express our thanks for Your Excellency's Speech.

2. We are greatly honoured to receive the Message from Her Majesty on the occasion of our celebration of the Centenary of Responsible Government in New South Wales and we ask that Your Excellency convey to Her Majesty our deepest appreciation of her warm congratulations.

3. We ask also that Your Excellency convey to Her Majesty an assurance of our unfeigned attachment to Her Majesty's Throne and Person and inform Her Majesty that the people of New South Wales cherish warmly the recollection of the occasion in 1954 when Her Majesty visited this State and graciously opened a Session of the Parliament.

4. We join Your Excellency in the hope that, under the guidance of Divine Providence, our labours may be so directed as to promote the highest welfare of the people of New South Wales.

The Hon. H. D. AHERN [4.37]: Before expressing appreciation of the message that His Excellency the Governor conveyed to hon. members from Her Most Gracious Majesty Queen Elizabeth II on the occasion of the Centenary of Responsible Government in New South Wales, I shall place several appropriate matters of interest before the House. I congratulate the Hon. E. E. Warren on his maiden speech. The hon. member's achievements are an inspiration to me, and his contribution to the Australian coal industry has been recognised by Her Majesty's bestowal upon him in the last New Year's Honours of the Companion of the Order of St. Michael and St. George. I am not unmindful of the Hon. R. A. King's observations on the Hon. E. E. Warren's speech. Adhering to the established practices of the House, the Hon. R. A. King heard the Hon. E. E. Warren's maiden speech in silence, although he disagreed with him, and I respect his action. If there were a difference of opinion about what the hon. member said, or if his remarks contained any shortcomings, the Hon. G. H. Neilly would surely have been competent to deal with them. I look forward to further contributions of an authoritative and important nature from the Hon. E. E. Warren, and I am sure that his remarks will not lack forthrightness.

I support the Hon. Richard Thompson's comments regarding the failure of the office of Leader of the Opposition to be suitably

recognised at the State Reception on 22nd May. The Premier in his speech at that function referred to Parliament as a whole, and to the people who make Parliament possible. Responsible government envisages that the representatives of all the people will be recognised on State occasions. Parliament receives its power from the people; its members are elected to represent all points of view and, it is important for the prestige of Parliament that Her Majesty's Opposition should be adequately represented on occasions such as we are now celebrating. The omission was probably due to an oversight on the part of officers of the Premier's Department and I should be failing in my responsibility as a member if I did not say so. It was unfortunate, because of physical circumstances, that visiting parliamentary guests, Federal and State, were not accommodated on the floor of the Chamber, during the opening ceremony. I am not aware of protocol on such occasions, and far from criticising anyone I record my appreciation of the general arrangements that were made at all such functions. However, it would have been appropriate that representatives of other parliaments should have taken their place on the floor of the Chamber with us. I speak as a member of a parliament of a Federal system in which all parliaments are equal.

Having made those observations I express my appreciation of Her Majesty's gracious message which was conveyed in His Excellency the Governor's speech. I have read the speech with interest and congratulate Sir John Northcott on his contribution to responsible government in New South Wales. Also, I listened with interest to the Minister's statement about Parliament over the past 100 years. I listened, too, and learned from the Hon. Sir Henry Manning's analysis of the origin of our constitution, and I record my appreciation of the contribution of those hon. members. Each hon. member is entitled to form an opinion of the extent to which New South Wales has enjoyed responsible government; history alone will be the judge of the degree to which the people of New South Wales have enjoyed

it. Instead of looking backward, I propose to look forward and to see where parliamentary government, as I understand it, is likely to lead us. That brings me to two comments. First I shall speak briefly about Federal-State relationships under the Federal system of the Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act, and secondly, about the division of responsibility between the Legislature, the Executive, the Judiciary, and the Administration, in what I term the trend towards the managerial society, in which the responsibility of parliament becomes *de facto* and will shortly become *de jure*.

Referring first to the Federal-State relationship, I appreciate the motion of the House of Representatives and the Senate recording their recognition of the Centenary of Responsible Government in New South Wales. That is as it should be. It is too often forgotten that the Federal system is the product of the State Parliament and we, the Parliament of New South Wales, are a part of a seven-government system. Frequently I listen to Federal Cabinet Ministers who seem to take upon themselves an omnipotence for which our constitution does not provide. I find, when I turn to the Constitution—which I probably do more regularly than some hon. members—that Chapter I, Part I, Clause 1 reads “The legislative power of the Commonwealth shall be vested in a Federal Parliament, which shall consist of the Queen, a Senate and a House of Representatives, which is called ‘The Parliament’ or ‘The Parliament of the Commonwealth’”. I have mentioned that particular clause of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Australia, to call attention to the frequent reference to the Federal Parliament as the National Parliament of Australia. Speaking with restraint, I say that this is probably caused by Canberra’s isolation and a tendency there towards inbreeding. When considering the problem of Federal and State relationships hon. members must recognise the importance of the taxing powers of the respective governments of Australia. To claim that there can be taxation without responsibility by those who spend it is unreal. To-day one

is confronted with one central taxing authority and seven spending authorities without responsibility to the people. Recently this subject has been canvassed in other places. One Federal Cabinet Minister observed that one reason why the Federal Government cannot solve the problem is that the Australian Labor party’s representatives at Canberra have decided that they will not support a return of taxing powers to the States. My only comment is that the Liberal party’s representatives in Canberra may well be accused of adopting the same attitude. The Federal authorities should advance a more appropriate reason for their reticence in returning the taxing powers to the States.

One sees a ray of hope in Victoria, where the Premier, the Hon. Henry Bolte, is taking what appears to be appropriate action. He is referring the question of the taxing rights of that State to the High Court of Australia, and, if necessary, to the Privy Council. I am in full agreement with his action, and I hope that he will be successful. Those who believe in a return of responsible government to all Australian parliaments should support the Hon. H. E. Bolte. My second point concerns the relationship between the Legislature, the Executive, the Judiciary and the Administration—the four limbs of responsible government in a democracy. The Legislature consists of men like ourselves, members of Parliament, the Executive of the Minister and his colleagues, the Judiciary of the Judges who are appointed by Parliament, and the Administration that has its authority from the Executive. Hon. members might well view in prospect the change in the relationship between these four limbs of parliamentary government at the opening of this second century of responsible government. To-day one observes a managerial society—I use this term rather than “bureaucracy” and “the civil service” because I am not unmindful of the fact that over the years in a managerial society one must include not only the senior civil service but also the leaders of commerce and industry. Experts in industry and senior public servants, have caused problems for the legislators. Some hon. members have

The Hon. H. D. Ahern.]

different views about the importance of this matter; some have their ideas on the way the problem should be handled, and at this stage I do not canvass the question of the desirability or wisdom of their approach. I merely state the problem. It is more apparent in the relationship that exists between the administration and the judiciary.

I am cognisant that I may tread on ground over which there is room for difference of opinion; nevertheless, it is of importance. The growing tendency of the Administration to influence the judiciary is of importance. This was adverted to, hon. members may remember, by Lord Hewitt in his now famous book, *The New Despotism*, and later by other well-known writers, including C. K. Allen. The continual establishment of new courts, taxation boards of review, the introduction of complicated legislation to control prices, and administrative tribunals, all point to the ascendancy of the administration over the judiciary. There is growing evidence and interest that we should start a second century of government in New South Wales with an exhaustive investigation by competent, impartial, and informed investigators into the relationship of the Legislature, the Executive, the Judiciary and the Administration to ensure that democratic parliamentary government is given to the community. Finally, I suggest that this inquiry, which might well be made by an all-party committee of this House, should also cover the widening fields of government activity, since less government would mean less taxation and a better standard of living for everyone.

The Hon. G. H. NEILLY [4.51]: I support the remarks made by His Excellency the Governor in his opening speech. Also, I congratulate the Hon. E. E. Warren on his contribution to this debate. He is well versed in the affairs of the coal industry in which he undoubtedly represents certain interests, just as I represent others. Those he represents, as general manager, if not as managing director, are J. & A. Brown and Abermain Seaham Collieries Ltd., the biggest coal producers in this State. As a Minister of the House

has said, in the preceding three years this company has made £1,800,000 profit. The Hon. E. E. Warren naturally is most interested in an industry that provides such profit for him. From notes I have made, the profits of that company approximate £2,250,000, and its reserves are considerable. Naturally the hon. member would wish to protect the company's interests; and to that end he has made approaches to this Government. It is remarkable that he should have approached this Government rather than the Commonwealth Government, which has responsibilities to the nation as a whole. The hon. member has visited the United States of America on many occasions, has investigated the coal industry there, and has studied the approach of Congress to its problems. This has been found to be totally inconsistent with that of the Federal Government in Australia.

The Hon. H. D. AIERN: The hon. member appreciates that the United States of America has a different constitution?

The Hon. G. H. NEILLY: And a different approach! Congress set up a committee to investigate the industry and to report on the problems confronting it. Much useful government legislation has resulted from this report and more is being prepared for introduction to Congress. Because of this positive approach to a solution of its problems the coal industry in the United States of America is expanding and last year production rose from 290,000,000 to 405,000,000 tons. To-day the rate of production is about 10,000,000 tons a week, or 500,000,000 tons a year. I heard one hon. member, when referring to the competition between coal and oil, say "King Coal is dead". He is very much alive, but the Commonwealth Government has the responsibility of ensuring that he remains so.

My discussions with consumer interests in the gas industry in the southern States of the Commonwealth reveal that they do not want to enter into firm contracts with the oil companies for the supply of residual oil. They realise that once they begin a conversion to oil of their existing plants and the installation of new oil plants they will thenceforth be in the clutches of the oil monopolies. Oil interests, unlike the

coal industry, spend about £1,000,000 sterling a year on research. The Hon. E. E. Warren said that the coal industry here has decided in the past few years on some research, but that is obviously not enough to meet the threat of competition from oil. Oil research in the United States of America resulted in the discovery of alternative uses for residual oil and the price has now risen from 1 dollar 40 cents to 1 dollar 85 cents a barrel. The gas industry is no longer the only buyer on the market, and it is now returning to the use of coal as being a more economical proposition.

What is the Federal Government doing about the problem in this country? The oil combines are well aware that the known oil resources of the United States of America will be exhausted within the next twenty-five years. Hon. members need not accept my word for that; they can read the February edition of *The Coal Age*. Much has been said about electrification. In the United States of America the first coal-burning gas locomotive is being put on the road, and undoubted proof exists that, as a result of research, this locomotive will replace the diesel type. At a recent conference I accused the Federal Government of having no definite plan for the coal industry. I still believe that to be so, and in these circumstances no industry of national importance could be expected to progress. It has been suggested that the Federal Government should establish itself in the steel industry because at present Australia cannot provide enough steel for its own requirements. It has been suggested, also, that rather than build new plant the plants controlled by Australian Iron and Steel Limited and Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited should be developed.

The Hon. H. D. AHERN: The hon. member does not understand that, under the Constitution, the Federal Government cannot take over the steelworks.

The Hon. G. H. NEILLY: I appreciate that it cannot do that any more than it can take over the coalmines, but it can take definite action to encourage the building of additional steelworks to meet the

requirements of this State. That would result in the greater use of coal. The legislators in the United States of America, unlike the Commonwealth Government, are not silent on this matter. Positive action has been taken and recommendations have been made on the importation of residual oil into the United States of America. Already the quantity of residual oil imported into that country has been considerably reduced, though not by legislation. The National Coal Association of the United States of America is prepared to fight against the excessive importation of residual oil. In this country it would be entirely wrong, in view of our defence requirements, to allow the residue of imported fuel to replace a national commodity. Residual oil imported into the United States of America is being used in the production of bitumen and asphalt. Is there no scope for the use of these commodities in this country? Could not the Federal Government assist New South Wales by making bigger grants to the States for road development? Could not waste commodity be used in this way if the Federal Government were prepared to assist? If the Commonwealth Government were to make a constructive approach to the use of residual oils, especially to provide bitumen for extensive road-making programmes, the present problems of the coal industry in Australia would readily be solved. There is no good reason why such action cannot be taken.

It might well be asked "What part are the mine workers themselves playing in meeting the threat to the coal industry?" I shall answer that question by quoting, not from a workers' publication, but from a publication of shipping and coal interests in this country, the words of the Federal Minister for National Development, Senator the Hon. W. H. Spooner, who is not a member of a Labor government. In *The Harbour* the Federal Minister gives these figures on coal production and prices:

In June, 1953, the average pit top price of New South Wales coal was 64s. 6d. a ton. At 30th June, 1955, the average price was down to 59s. 3d. a ton. Output for a man-shift increased from 2.94 tons in 1949-50 to 3.3 tons in 1954-55. Between 1953 and 1955 output for a man-shift increased by 10 per cent.

That is, by everyone's standards, a good production record and it is continuing. Though the man-shift output in the coal industry continues to increase, what are the men in the industry receiving in return? What sympathy are they getting? The fact is that they are living from day to day in the expectation that at any time they will be given notice of the termination of their employment in the industry. The only reason for this situation is the Commonwealth Government's failure to accept its responsibility to plan for the benefit of the coal industry in such a manner as to enable it to continue its vital work in the interests of the people generally and for the defence of this nation.

The report of the Joint Coal Board for 1955 gives some illuminating figures about State-owned collieries in comparison with those owned by the company of which the Hon. E. E. Warren is managing director. The Joint Coal Board mines had in 1955 a man-shift output of 5.96 tons, and the price of the coal produced in them was 51s. 9d. a ton free on rail. The New South Wales State Coal Mines, which work at a profit, are selling their coal at much lower prices than those charged by the collieries owned by the hon. member's company. In the State Coal Mines the output a man-shift in 1955 was 3.61 tons and the price 62s. 1d. a ton free on rail. The output in collieries owned by J. & A. Brown and Abermain Seaham Collieries Ltd. in the same year was 2.56 tons a man-shift—one of the lowest production rates in the Commonwealth—and the price was 69s. 7d. a ton—one of the highest in the Commonwealth.

The Hon. E. E. Warren asserts that the industry has to help itself, and I have shown that the men working in it are playing their part. Unquestionably the coal industry has problems, but the trend on world markets reveals clearly that with correct planning and a constructive approach to the solution of those problems, "Old King Coal" can be made to reign again. When his reign is restored the men in the industry will have security of employment and the interests of this State particularly, and of the Commonwealth

generally, will be protected. If an industry achieves these objects, no more can be asked of it. However, the main problem of the industry is not the attitude of this Government to a proposed plan to improve shipping services at Newcastle, about which I know something. The plan and the plant were a brain child of the Joint Coal Board, which is a government instrumentality. I have no objection to the scheme, but because of its possible advantages to the major coal companies they were quick to want to take control of it.

The Hon. H. D. AHERN: That is a little unfair.

The Hon. G. H. NEILLY: It is not unfair, having regard to the companies' profits, the figures of which I should be pleased to show to hon. members. The plan entails only the diverting of certain profits, having regard to taxation, which can be easily achieved having in mind the number of companies associated with the coal industry.

The Hon. H. D. AHERN: I appreciate that; but profits help wages.

The Hon. G. H. NEILLY: It is interesting to see that in the United States of America, when coal consumption fell, the coal owners were happy that the miners should get a 2-dollar increase. They did not approach the problem by attacking the men's wages; they did not react as did the management of Bellbird colliery, which said to the men, "If you accept twenty-four worse conditions we shall save £5,000 a week". The industry's problems should not be tackled in that way, and I am sure that the Hon. H. D. Ahern would not say that they should be. A suitable approach and correct planning are needed, bearing in mind the results of overseas research into the coal industry. Little research has taken place in Australia, but proprietors in the United States of America are deeply concerned about the South African position, where much money has been spent developing oil and other by-products from coal, having in mind the limitations of their own country. The coal industry's problem is most difficult, but if the Federal Government

is willing to do something constructive on the basis of what is being done in America in the way of limiting the use of residual oil or diverting it to benefit the States and the people by the building of roads, the problem can be solved. I believe that my colleague, the Minister for Labour and Industry, agrees with me.

The Hon. F. W. SPICER [5.14]: The occasion that hon. members have had the honour and privilege of celebrating this week will live in the history of this country. Australians have freedom and all the other benefits of democracy. If any proof of that statement were needed, it has been supplied by the speech of the Hon. G. H. Neilly. Yesterday in this Chamber a captain of industry, the Hon. E. E. Warren, put his point of view, and hon. members have just heard the Hon. G. H. Neilly put the argument from the other side. It shows that this is a great system under which we live. All points of view can be placed before this Assembly. I feel that that should strengthen our resolve to ensure that these rights of free assembly and democracy are handed on unsullied to generations yet unborn. Nothing worth achieving is achieved easily, whether by persons or governments. Many things can be fully appreciated only if they are gained in the hard way. The citizens of this country fought for a long time for the right of self-government and, after it was won, other parts of what is now the Commonwealth fought for the right of self-government, and they did not obtain it very easily from the Parliament of New South Wales.

The time is ripe for a revision of the Commonwealth constitution. On this all parties are agreed, though maybe they are not agreed on the extent of the alteration that is necessary. Not only should the Commonwealth constitution be reviewed. In addition State boundaries could very well be reviewed and possibly new States created. In 1933-34 the late Mr. Justice Nicholas presented a report to the Government in which he showed how various new States could be established. I commend to hon. members a study of that report, from which much can be learned. About three years

ago an unofficial referendum conducted during municipal elections in the north of this State showed an overwhelming majority in favour of the establishment of a new State. We read that the people of North Queensland have for a long time been agitating for the establishment of a new State in North Queensland. Hon. members who have visited North Queensland know what a huge territory it is and how great are its potentialities. Australian governments could well look into the matter of constitutional reform, and, at the same time, examine the present boundaries and the creation of new States.

The Hon. G. H. Neilly has given an excellent address, from his point of view, on the problems of the coal industry, but he did not give the reason for one colliery's producing coal at a higher cost than others. I do not profess to know anything of the coal industry, but I know that coal produced from old collieries, under different conditions, may be more costly than that produced in newer and more mechanised mines. If I am incorrect in what I am about to say I would appreciate correction, but my understanding is that the State coal mines supply the New South Wales Department of Railways with coal at a much higher price than that charged by private enterprise.

The Hon. H. D. AHERN: The hon. member is quite correct.

The Hon. J. M. CONCANNON: The hon. member is not quite correct. The hon. member who interjected should not say that the Hon. F. W. Spicer is quite correct. I question his statement.

The Hon. F. W. SPICER: My belief is that what I said is correct. However, if I am incorrect I am quite willing to listen later to what the Hon. J. M. Concannon has to say. I followed the Hon. G. H. Neilly attentively, and I feel that he should have given hon. members further reasons for the higher costs of production at some collieries. I am sure that everyone knows that the darg is applied in different ways at different collieries. No doubt this has an adverse effect on the price of coal. This is an appropriate occasion for hon. members to resolve to protect as far as possible

all forms of government—Commonwealth, State, or local. As one who has had an active association with local government for more than thirty years I assert that the powers of local government are being slowly and surely whittled away by this State Government. By delegating authority to the Electricity Commission the Government proceeds merrily on its way to the creation of county councils. One that comes readily to mind, the Central West County Council, is in an area of the State in which my home town is situated. It is now proposed by the Electricity Commission to incorporate a number of other areas, including Forbes, Grenfell, Condobolin, and Lake Cargelligo, into the area of control of the Central West County Council. This is undermining local government because the local people through their councillors will no longer be able to control the instrumentalities which they had so much pride in creating. This is a part of the scheme of socialism.

The reticulation of electricity has become an undertaking of such magnitude nowadays that no layman can afford the time to study the problems and attend council meetings to vote with intelligence on many matters that come up for discussion. It will be no time before paid commissions have to be appointed to administer this sphere of local government if this proposed amalgamation of areas is effected. When this is done local government, which has thrived and prospered on the voluntary efforts of public spirited men over many years, will be killed. The creation of county councils serves no good purpose. No doubt one or two gentlemen on the opposite side of this Chamber will disagree with that statement. Now is the time to resolve on calling a halt to these continued amalgamations. Ultimately the incentive of people who have worked on a voluntary basis over the years will be destroyed.

The Hon. A. A. ALAM [5.25]: Previous speakers have covered most ably the subject of this debate, but I should like to make this observation upon our democracy—that all of us take pride in being members of this Chamber. I have been fortunate enough to travel the world six

or seven times and it has been my hobby to visit legislatures. I have done so at every point of the compass, from Norway and Sweden to the United States of America. My heart is full of pride that I was born into the great Australian Labor party. I should like the mover of the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply—the Hon. the Attorney-General—to convey to the Premier and his Ministers my belief that the Premier leads the greatest political party that the world has ever known. All the social benefits that the world has received have come from this Chamber. This is a sweeping but factual statement. I instance compulsory education, maternity wings to hospitals, free hospital accommodation; the Hon. J. M. Concannon was privileged and proud to vote for widows' pensions, child endowment, and the finest scheme of workers' compensation the world has ever known. Long-service leave, the Moratorium Act and much similar legislation emanated from this Chamber.

The Labor party of New South Wales is the party in Australia, though I must give some credit to the party in Queensland for its help through the years. This Chamber gave the lead to Australia; all the social legislation in the world came from New South Wales, Australia. This is a factual statement. I do not want to disparage hon. members opposite, but from the earliest time they have represented here as in other parts of the world the negative, reactionary party that must oppose every innovation. The Australian Labor party, the positive party, has from its inception been fighting for improved social conditions. I was born at Wallsend and have heard stories of victimisation of my father's and grandfather's mates, when John Brown would force them into the mines at 30s. or 35s. a week—sometimes for only two or three days' work a week. I have watched the flags half-way up to see whether dad or uncle was going to work that day. If hon. members opposite had known those conditions they would appreciate the iron in the soul of the miner, and would know why the Labor party has struggled over the years. That despite money, vested interests, radio and the press, the Labor party has,

election after election, gained control of the Treasury benches is a miracle. If I can be contradicted I shall be only too happy to listen to any hon. member opposite who can refute what I have said.

When in America in 1926 I spoke at a Kiwanis Club at Long Island. The system of arbitration and conciliation was then beginning in Australia, and I suggested that the Americans should come to Australia to see its operation. Present on that occasion were representatives of great capitalist interests in the United States. At that time many of them would not allow a unionist in their plant. I said then that the day would come when the collective strength of trade unionism would bring Henry Ford, the United States Steel Corporation, General Motors, and the other great institutions in the country, to their knees. The great Atlantic and Pacific organisation is typical of the enormous size and strength of these institutions in the United States. Its annual turnover runs into not hundreds of millions of dollars but thousands of millions. It is too large for complete centralisation and each of the forty-eight branches—one in each State—operates as an entity, submitting bi-annual balance-sheets to head office. Years ago that great organisation, which conducts huge markets through which one may drive and buy anything from a needle to an anchor, would not employ one unionist. To-day, it works hand in glove with the trade unions, even collecting union dues. The same thing has happened in the great Ford motor corporation under the control of Henry Ford III. Although his great-grandfather was bitterly opposed to unions, to-day Henry Ford works in co-operation with them, and he even guarantees a minimum employment of twelve months for new employees.

It would be foolish to suggest that the hon. members opposite are any less kind and considerate to the underdog than are Government supporters. I recall such fine men as the Hon. James Ashton and the Hon. Sir Joseph Carruthers, whom I always admired for their sincerity. To-day any hon. member, no matter on which side of the House he sits, would dip into his pocket to help a worthy cause or a man down

on his luck. But I shall never forget the satanic, sadistic look on the faces of the Opposition in this House when, years ago, they voted for the hanging of a lad about 17 years of age who had been convicted of rape in the notorious Henty case. They must oppose Labor at all costs and on that occasion, notwithstanding their individual feelings, they voted against Labor. Individually, hon. members opposite may be human, but collectively, they are always the same—negative, reactionary, cruel sadists. Hon. members opposite said that widows' pensions and child endowment, introduced by a Labor government, would ruin the country. There was a similar cry when the Hon. James McGowen brought down legislation in 1910 to provide for free hospital treatment. Labor also was responsible for the introduction of compulsory education, which made the people of this country literary giants compared with those of some other countries. Australians were the greatest soldiers in World War I not only because they were strong but also because they were intellectual. They were superior to other troops, and every man was a potential officer.

I was only a young man at college when my father and grandfather fought for free hospital treatment and the addition of a maternity wing to every hospital. There was immediately a howl of protest, and it was said that it would ruin the country. Hon. members opposite did not care if the workers' wives lost their lives during confinement. There was not another Labor government until the year 1920, when the Hon. John Storey was Premier. Later the Lang Government controlled the affairs of this State. The Hon. J. M. Concannon was then the Leader of the Government in this House. If hon. members lived for another thousand years they would not see measures introduced to equal the humanitarian legislation brought down by the Lang Government. Because of the excellent hospital attention now given to expectant mothers hardly one baby is lost. The wives of the workers are given the best attention.

In 1926, shortly after the Labor government had introduced workers' compensation and widows' pension legislation, I addressed

The Hon. A. A. Alam.]

a meeting of 300 workers at Newcastle-on-Tyne. Not one man in fifty at that meeting was wearing a decent suit of clothes. They were all wearing dungaree trousers, denim jackets and blucher boots. In 1950, twenty-four years later, I was asked to address a similar gathering. In the meantime England had had only two Labour governments, the MacDonald and Attlee governments, but forty-nine out of every fifty men in the audience were as well dressed as any Labor audience of this country. That is an indication of the improved conditions brought about by two Labour governments in England. I remember standing on a verandah at Wallsend with the Hon. G. H. Neilly's father and speaking to English, Scotch and Welsh miners. Those men, in their time, had seen girls compelled to work in the mines at the age of 10, and they worked from daylight to dark. In those awful days a pregnant woman was allowed only seven days off work for her confinement. If she was not back after that time she lost her job and her family starved.

The Hon. C. A. DALTON: Shame on them!

The Hon. A. A. ALAM: The hon. member knows the struggle of Labor to improve the conditions of working people. I was with him in 1921 when squatters threatened to drive us from their properties with double-barrel shotguns! Responsible government as it obtains in Australia and the democratic way of life in this country have been patterns for the rest of the world. The Australian Labor party has brought down legislation that has been a beacon to other countries, including Britain and the United States of America. The statute books of the world all bear the imprint of the legislation of Labor governments in Australia. The Australian Labor party crossed the "t's" and dotted the "i's" of industrial legislation and Labor governments have made the Statute Book of New South Wales an inspiring document. Widows' pensions, child endowment, compulsory education, free hospital treatment and many other benefits have been the product of Labor governments. I was about to claim for a New South Wales Labor government credit for being first to grant

votes to women, but I recall that New Zealand conferred the vote on women about three years before this State did. Perhaps that was due to the influence of Australians who went over there, though I do not wish to decry in the least what Labor governments have done in our sister dominion.

Labour governments everywhere in the British world have achieved splendid reforms, but in New South Wales their record is unparalleled. It is a pity that those old stalwarts of Labor with whom I associated as a boy have gone to their reward. They were the direct sufferers from victimisation and oppression, and they were the leaders of the fight for the improvement of the conditions of working men and women. They worked for Labor in its pioneering days and we present members of the Labor party are proud to carry on their traditions. I attend many social functions that are patronised by persons who look down their noses at the Australian Labor party. They consider that there is some sort of stigma in being associated with it, but I am proud to belong to the greatest political party the world has ever known.

The Australian Labor party was conceived in the womb of the people and has the blessing of the Divinity. The Hon. C. A. Begg laughs, but what other explanation can there be for its profound success in the face of virulent opposition from powerful material interests? From 1896 to 1956 Labor governments have been returned to office in both Commonwealth and New South Wales parliaments. There is no word in the English vocabulary that could adequately describe the depth to which Labor's opponents descended in the recent election campaign, but the Hon. J. J. Cahill was returned in sweeping fashion at the head of a Labor government. A sewer would be crystal clear in comparison with the foul campaign of opponents of Labor. The decent people of this country were not swayed by the tactics of anti-Labor forces, and they returned Labor and its leaders to office. The Divinity was responsible for Labor's success. The anti-Labor forces spent £100 on election propaganda for every £1 that the Labor

party spent in campaign expenses, but their materialism was defeated. The recent elections in Western Australia and Queensland prove that when the Australian Labor party presents a solid front it is insuperable. The spirit of Labor has gripped the Australian people, and it will be defeated only if it defeats itself, as it did in Victoria. The Opposition parties have had their last opportunity to win an election in this State, and never again will they come as close to gaining office as they did last February.

I pay tribute to the Hon. Richard Thompson and the Hon. H. D. Ahern. Courtesy begets courtesy, and whenever an hon. member opposite expresses kindness and courtesy, no effort is made by hon. members on this side to embarrass him. On matters of policy no two hon. members will hit harder than those to whom I refer, but in all their expressions in this House they exhibit culture, kindness and courtesy. However, hon. members opposite should not assume that because at various times they have most of the say in a debate and hon. members on this side are silent, Government supporters have not the ability or the intellect to retaliate. After thirty-one years in Parliament and ten years before that working for the Australian Labor party, I know that Labor will continue to govern because of the ability of its members. They do not gain office because of wealth and position or because of whom they know; under the Australian Labor party system those who represent Labor in the legislative halls of Australia must gain their position by ability and merit. None but citizens of the highest integrity and ability are chosen to represent the workers of this country and to fight for them. The late Hon. Alan McNamara was perhaps one of the most skilled in repartee in this House. Once, referring to Colonel the Hon. H. J. R. Clayton and Colonel the Hon. A. E. Colvin, he said, "I have to pull my punches". In a sentence, that describes the feelings of us all. Courtesy and kindness beget similar characteristics. We on this side listen attentively to hon. members opposite when they deal with questions of policy, and reserve the right to criticise

The Hon. A. A. Alam.]

them. And the harder they kick, the better we like it. But if personalities are indulged in, look out for fight; the Opposition will get more than it expects, and we shall be the victors.

I now come to a serious aspect of the Cumberland County Council scheme and should like the Hon. J. J. Maloney to listen carefully. With 120,000 to 150,000 immigrants arriving in this country each year, and more of our own boys and girls reaching adulthood, the housing shortage is reaching the stage at which it will become a national menace. Immigrants cannot find accommodation in Bondi, Coogee, or Manly, and must look as far afield as Liverpool, or towards St. Mary's. It is almost impossible to buy land in Bankstown, Marrickville or many other suburbs. With Government members I voted for the master plan; we must not develop higgledy piggledy as did Pittsburgh and Boston. I was sincere when I congratulated the Hon. W. J. McKell, upon bringing in the Cumberland County Council scheme, but it needs modification and it is not too late now to remove some of its drawbacks. No lending authorities will advance a single penny for land purchase unless a certificate is first provided under the appropriate legislation. I know Fairfield quite well, and, if I had a diagram, I could show hon. members what I mean. In that suburb is a street beyond The Avenue, running towards Smithfield, which is a living area, where there are 50 acres that once were owned by a Chinese who, in his old age, returned to his homeland in conformity with tradition.

On that area, about 200 houses could be built but, despite petitions lodged by the Fairfield Municipal Council, the Cumberland County Council still zones it in the green belt, though it is about 3 miles from the boundary. That is an anomaly. Hon. members should not try to protect those who have land on the fringe of the green belt—I refer to the greedy subdividers who are ready to grab land and carve it up. They need no help from hon. members; for they are well able to look after themselves. That is only one of a dozen cases I can instance of ideal home sites being zoned in a green

belt. How long will this anomaly be allowed to continue? What is the Cumberland County Council doing to free land in green belt areas to enable many hundreds of thousands of people to build homes? How long must people wait to obtain this land? It would cause me no personal inconvenience if this land were never made available, but it would be grossly unfair to homeseekers. From a national standpoint this is a most serious problem, and the Minister in charge should refer my remarks to the Minister for Local Government so that he may make representations to the Cumberland County Council to free this land for home building, especially where local councils have recommended that land in green belt areas should be declared living areas.

Colonel the Hon. H. J. R. CLAYTON [5.56]: Having heard the description of myself by the Hon. A. A. Alam I feel that I should have an opportunity, between now and next Tuesday, to have myself psycho-analysed to determine whether I possess all the nasty inner thoughts of which I am accused. To enable me to do so I now move the adjournment of this debate.

Debate adjourned.

SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT.

Motion (by the Hon. R. R. Downing) agreed to:

That this House, at its rising to-day, do adjourn until Tuesday next.

House adjourned at 5.58 p.m.

Legislative Council.

Tuesday, 29 May, 1956.

Leave of Absence—Centenary of Responsible Government—Governor's Speech: Address-in-Reply (Fourth Day's Debate)—Adjournment (Centenary of Responsible Government: Public Inspection of Parliament House).

The ACTING PRESIDENT took the chair at 4.30 p.m.

The opening Prayer was read.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

The ACTING PRESIDENT reported the receipt of a communication from His Excellency the Governor intimating that leave of absence had been granted to the Hon. G. D. Bassett for one month from 1st May, 1956.

CENTENARY OF RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT.

CONGRATULATORY MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The ACTING PRESIDENT reported the receipt of the following letter from the President of the Senate:

My dear Premier,

When the Senate met yesterday I drew the attention of the Senate to the fact that the opening of the second session of the thirty-eighth Parliament of New South Wales marked the 100th anniversary of the first meeting of the Parliament and of the granting of responsible government to that State. The Leader of the Government in the Senate (Senator O'Sullivan) and the Leader of the Opposition (Senator McKenna) supported the sentiments I expressed, and all Senators joined with me in extending to the Government and the Parliament of New South Wales our congratulations and best wishes on this historic occasion, and in expressing the hope that the years that are to come will be marked by continued prosperity and progress.

Yours sincerely,

A. M. McMULLIN,

President of the Senate.

CONGRATULATORY MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL OF VICTORIA.

The ACTING PRESIDENT reported the receipt of the following telegram from the President of the Legislative Council of Victoria:

The President of the Legislative Council and the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly, Parliament House, Sydney.

Congratulations on completion of one hundred years Responsible Government and best wishes for the future of your State and Parliament.

CLIFDEN EAGER,

President of the
Legislative Council of Victoria.