
ADDRESS IN REPLY.

SPEECH BY MR. E. J. CRAIGIE, M.P.

(MEMBER FOR FLINDERS.)

Land Rent the Natural Revenue. Proportional
Representation Defended. Evil of Single
Electorates Exposed.

Delivered in the House of Assembly, 16th June, 1936.

[Reprinted from *Hansard*.]

REPORT OF SPEECH BY MR. E. J. CRAIGIE, M.P.

Mr. CRAIGIE (Flinders)—I am sure we have all listened with great pleasure to the interesting discourse by the honourable member for Adelaide in reviewing the political situation. The Governor's Speech provides a very wide opportunity for members to deal with matters which vitally affect the wellbeing of Australia. This afternoon I propose to offer a few words of comment regarding certain clauses in the Governor's Speech and then I shall proceed to make an effort to reply to the statements made by Mr. Hamilton and probably shall finish off by offering a few words along the lines which I believe to be in the best interests of the State. The Attorney-General laughs when I say that, because he realises that if he does acquire something economically sound, something which will stand a very searching investigation, then this is the quarter of the House to which he has to look to get that reliable information.

Clause 6 of the Governor's Speech refers to the amount of money saved in regard to payments for unemployment relief. Every member is pleased to know that the number of persons in receipt of relief has been reduced from 31,400 to 23,300, and that the expenditure on relief has been reduced from £7,600 to £6,200 per week, but when we realise that the latter sum approximates £300,000 per annum we must agree that in any young country such as South Australia, with its wonderful natural resources, it is a standing disgrace to the Parliaments of the past to think that the legislation of this country has produced such a lamentable state of affairs.

The Hon. S. W. Jeffries—Do you blame it all to legislation?

Mr. CRAIGIE—I am coming to the allocation of the blame in due course and will not overlook the Minister's share. In dealing with the outlook for primary industries an optimistic note is struck in clause 8 of the Governor's Speech. We are told that with the excellent rains and reasonable prices there is little doubt that our primary industries will ultimately regain much of their former prosperity. I do not think that there is much in the way of optimism for our primary industries. Undoubtedly these industries have suffered considerably because of climatic conditions being unfavour-

able and the low prices ruling for primary products, but my opinion is that, notwithstanding the adverse climatic conditions and the low prices for products, the main reason for the unfortunate position of the primary producers is because of legislation which has increased their cost of production and by a system of legalised robbery appropriated the earnings of their labour. It is surprising that in dealing with the outlook for primary industries neither the Governor's Speech nor the speeches of the mover or seconder of the motion indicate that there was anything to be done in bringing about the much needed reduction in the cost of production. We cannot get away from the fact that to-day the farmer is in the unfortunate position of being compelled to sell the product of his labour overseas in an open market, but he is forced to buy all his requirements in a closed market and pay artificial, high prices for them. Because of that he is suffering a considerable handicap, and it cannot be gainsaid that those engaged in primary industries to-day are taxed for the benefit of the manufacturing industries of this State. We also find that those overseas markets which our primary producers have looked to in the past are closing to us one by one on account of the policy of the Commonwealth Government. That policy endeavours to make one way traffic in trade. The Commonwealth Government thinks that the people of Australia can export their surplus products and sell them overseas but is not prepared to allow those countries which desire to buy our products to have the opportunity of sending us goods in return. So we are faced with a high tariff policy, a policy of quotas and restrictions which is bringing disaster upon those industries upon which the national well-being of the State depends. It is the duty of this Government, irrespective of the fact that it is linked with the national Government responsible for this policy, seeing that it claims to represent the producing interest of the State, to enter a definite protest against the continuance of such an unjust policy.

In Clause 11 of the Governor's Speech we are told that this session we may expect the report of the Royal Commission on Lotteries.

My own opinion is that we did not want this Commission. If it was necessary to find out what was transpiring in the other States in regard to this phase of gambling it could have been discovered by the expenditure of a few twopenny stamps. It is certainly striking a low moral note when the Government of a country expects to finance the healing of the sick by revenue obtained by gambling methods. For that reason I shall look with a considerable amount of interest to the evidence gathered, and to what the intentions of the Government will be when this great national question is handled this session.

We are told that the Government, following the lead of Russia, is adopting a five-year plan. It seems that five-year plans are somewhat contagious. This five-year road plan may be good, or it may not. Throughout the country districts, particularly, there is the need for a great expenditure of money on roads, and when this plan is put into operation I hope that the Anzac Highway will not be the first to be reconstructed and the country roads left until the end of the five years. As Anzac Highway is sufficient to serve the needs of the aristocrats who use it for a long while yet, any roads expenditure should be on country roads that are in a deplorable state. Country people pay a considerable amount of the motor taxation, which was intended to provide good roads, and they have just as much right to consideration as city people.

Mr. Hamilton—Who are the aristocrats you speak of?

Mr. CRAIGIE—The honourable member for East Torrens is one. I could mention others, but time will not permit me to deal with the smaller things of life this afternoon. Paragraph 18 of the Governor's Speech forecasts an improved Milk Supply Bill. Of course, the Speech gives no indication of the lines it is likely to follow, but I presume it will be along the same monopolistic lines as that previously before us. It will be interesting to see whether this Bill will provide for the squeezing out of the small milk dealers in the interests of the big interests in the industry. I shall look forward with great interest to this measure, and expect to have a few words to say when it is introduced.

A balanced budget is one of those things which make an appeal to every individual, and much political capital has been made out of the balanced budget and the small surplus

we had last financial year. Every member, of course, approves of the budget being balanced, but there is another side to the picture that is not emphasised. Although there is a tendency to think that prosperity is already with us in South Australia—that we have very definitely turned that financial corner of which we have heard so much in and out of season—what is carefully concealed is the fact that every penny of taxation wrung from the wealth producers of this State during the last financial year was about one and a quarter million pounds short of the sum needed to pay the interest on the South Australian debt for the same year. In view of the amount we received in grants from the Commonwealth for disabilities we suffer I do not think we have much reason to be pleased about the balancing of the budget.

Mr. Hamilton—The other States have done nothing.

Mr. CRAIGIE—One State at a time is quite enough for an ordinary individual. Supermen, such as the honourable member for East Torrens, may be able to handle three States at a time.

The Hon. R. L. Butler—Surely the honourable member does not suggest that we should pay the whole of our interest bill out of taxation?

Mr. CRAIGIE—I will make my suggestions in due course, and the Premier will probably benefit therefrom. Clause 22 indicates that we are to have a uniform Income Tax Assessment Bill, and the draft of that Bill was circulated at the end of last session. No doubt uniformity, if we are to retain the income tax, is very desirable. Instead of introducing a Bill for a uniform system, however, we should introduce one to abolish that tax altogether, because it is undoubtedly one of the worst systems of raising revenue ever designed by the mind of man, as it works injuriously on every member of society in the exact proportion that he contributes to production. The harder a man works and the more he contributes to production, the more is he regarded as an enemy to society, and fined because of his industry. There are one or two other items in the Governor's Speech with which I shall deal later, but at this stage I propose to deal with some of the points raised by Mr. Hamilton. The honourable member opened by saying that it was loss of confidence that brought about the depression, and that this could not be disputed. He also stressed the fact that during his travels abroad

as soon as he set foot on foreign soil the newspaper reporters, apparently knowing that a distinguished visitor was in the district, approached him and asked where he came from. When they learned that he was from South Australia they said, "Oh, that is the State that has balanced its budget." It is pleasing to know that South Australia is so well advertised in foreign countries, and that all those foreigners recognised Mr. Hamilton on sight. However, it would have been more interesting had the honourable member, when speaking of that surplus of about £30,000, said that but for the heavy windfall which came to the Treasury from the betting tax, instead of a surplus we would have had a deficit. I think, therefore, that he has nothing to feel pleased about on that phase of the question. He went on to deal with the evergreen question of unemployment, and perhaps he is at his best when dealing with a question of that nature, although I certainly disagree with his contentions. He said, "What is wanted is a general idea among the population to provide service and the goods and things which people want." It is quite all right to provide goods and services, but if there is an economic system which has the effect of denying to hundreds of thousands of people the right to produce either goods or services to exchange for those things which Mr. Hamilton thinks should be produced, how can unemployment be dealt with along those lines? He said, "It is safe and wise then to spend money," but I think he is sufficiently acquainted with the question of production to know that money is not usually handed out to individuals unless they have engaged in production, and as long as we have 300,000 people in Australia who are denied the right of earning their livelihood they will not have money to spend and there will not be that demand for goods and services which there would be under a true economic system. He also said "It is utterly impossible to cure this problem." I would not like to be of such a pessimistic nature. He claimed to be a student of economic doctrines. As one who understands the fundamental principles of political economy, surely he does not think that the natural order of society is that some people shall be constantly unemployed and dependent upon charity for a right to gain their livelihood? If that is the brand of economics he subscribes to he has my deepest sympathy.

Mr. Hamilton—You are only stating the problem without one word as to its solution, the same as you always do.

Mr. CRAIGIE—Of course the honourable member is in the happy position of being able to state a problem and its solution in one breath. I have not yet reached that high standard of oratory, but if the honourable member will be patient for a little while I will endeavour to give the solution. We know that this problem of unemployment is not one that has just arisen. It has been with us for a long time and before giving my ideas as to how it should be dealt with may I go back, for the benefit of the honourable member, to the ancient history of this State, and tell him what transpired then in regard to unemployment.

Mr. Hamilton—I can remember it, and men were employed at 4s. 6d. a day.

Mr. CRAIGIE—Four shillings and sixpence a day then was worth more than the basic rate to-day, because legislators at that time did not tax the food and clothing of the people in the same unfair manner that they do now. In a paragraph in the "Advertiser" headed "Fifty Years Ago" I noticed that the problem of unemployment was present then, so I took the trouble to look up the newspapers of that period to see what happened. I find that an unemployment meeting was held in the Adelaide Town Hall on May 12, 1886. The Mayor of Adelaide presided. Mr. Clements moved:—

That a vigorous public works policy is immediately necessary to raise the colony out of its present difficulty, and to meet our deficit and the land tax be increased.

I am sure that that will meet with Mr. Hamilton's approbation. Mr. Clements said:—

The main question was the land tax which was still badly understood, although it was hundreds of years old. . . . This colony was suffering from the fact that hundreds of thousands went into the pockets of the landholders who did not live here. Under the present laws many men would make fortunes out of the present depression by buying land cheaply and holding it in their possession until they could sell it at a high price.

The motion was seconded by Mr. J. Kean.

Mr. G. S. Fowler said that he was thoroughly with them in the removal of all taxation from food and the necessaries of life. He was thoroughly with them in making up the deficiency of revenue by increasing the land tax. There was a Liberal of the right type who had the courage to express an opinion.

Mr. J. S. Sanders advocated a progressive land tax, that there should be no taxation without representation, and that customs should be perfectly free. Protection was all very well for the manufacturers and others interested in the property of the colony, he said, but the labouring class did not come in that category, and had to go where it best suited them. The Hon. W. K. Simms, M.L.C., said that they wanted a land tax and more taxpayers. He had voted for the land tax in the House and he would vote for it again when he got the chance. He did not believe in a property tax, because it only injuriously affected the thrift of the country, and would lead people to keep their money in their pockets instead of spending it on improvements on the land. Henry George had pointed this out clearly, and his writings throughout contained a great deal of commonsense. The motion was carried.

What would we imagine to-day if we found members of another place speaking at a meeting of unemployed people at the Adelaide Town Hall and suggesting that revenue should be raised by the taxation of land values? It would be hard to imagine such real, sound, democratic statements being made by one of those representatives. Another meeting was held at the Adelaide Town Hall on March 25, 1886, the Hon. Dr. Campbell, M.L.C., being in the chair. Mr. J. Clements, of the Working Men's Political movement, moved:—

That in the opinion of this meeting it is absolutely necessary that Parliament be at once called together to deal with the commercial depression now existing and for the purpose of initiating works of a seasonal and reproductive character, and that it is desirable that the duties on the necessaries of life be abolished, and in lieu thereof an increase in the land tax.

He said that they professed to go in for protection to assist the working man. It was not protection at all that they advocated. The tariff had been prepared at the instigation of interested parties as a set-off to the land tax. They must insist upon the land tax being increased and the duties being taken off the articles of food. Mr. J. Forster seconded the motion. Mr. S. D. Glyde, M.P., another good Liberal, in the days when the Party was liberal in policy as well as in name, said:—

With regard to the removal of duties from the necessaries of life, he had fought consistently against the imposition of duties on food. He favoured the imposition of duties on such things as they could manufacture in the colony. . . . The finances of the colony

had got into such a dreadful muddle that everything it was possible to tax would have to be taxed, and the land would have to bear a very much greater portion than in the past.

The Reverend A. Turnbull supported the motion. Mr. Archibald said:—

It was time the working men were considered. There was not any other part of the world where any statesman would tax the people's food. . . . The tax on food should not be allowed to last for another hour. Any Treasurer could get revenue by increasing the land tax. Whatever industry was pinched in this community the loafing landowners would not suffer. An increased land tax would destroy monopoly. It would throw the land into the market and keep the price down. The cause of all the mischief in the English speaking world was land monopolies.

The Hon. G. W. Cotton, M.L.C., advocated a progressive land tax as the fairest mode of raising revenue. The motion was carried unanimously, and a deputation was appointed to present it to the Premier, the Hon. J. W. Downer. At that time, when the unemployment question was receiving serious consideration at the hands of members of both Houses, it was not suggested that the means of finding relief should be by placing further burdens upon those who were already carrying too heavy a share, but that the revenue should be taken from its natural source—the values which people had created.

Mr. Robinson—There were more single taxers in those days than is the case now.

Mr. CRAIGIE—There were a number of people at that time who had strong sympathy with the movement and were not afraid to express it. We have a number to-day who, in public life, are in sympathy with it, but have not the courage that the men had in those times. We were told by Mr. Hamilton that we had shown the Americans and other people a plan on the fundamental principles of political economy. He said that when he was asked about it he replied that everybody was asked to make sacrifices; and those people overseas then said that they wished they had adopted this policy also. They were interested to know that during the depression all people in Australia had made sacrifices. I would strongly urge the honourable member to make a very careful investigation of the balance-sheets and returns of the Glass Manufacturing Company, the Cement Companies, the Sugar Company, and many others, and then he would be in a position to say

whether there had been equality of sacrifice, or whether the sacrifice was not mainly on the one side—on those who could ill afford it, and who were expected to make sacrifices, while recipients of privileges endeavoured, during the years of the depression, to entrench themselves more firmly in the privileges they enjoyed. As one who believes in the fundamental principles of political economy, Mr. Hamilton went on to quote Professor Giblin as saying that as soon as confidence was in a fair way to being restored money would flow along its natural course. He proceeded to show that the restoration of confidence had occurred in Australia because, first of all, there had been a payment of a bonus of £1 an ounce on gold production. I think that the less the honourable member has to say about the bonus on gold the better it will be for him as a representative of East Torrens. We know that the money used for the payment of a bounty on the production of gold was taken mainly by the Federal Government out of the £40,000,000 taxation which was levied on the necessities of the people of this country. It is a fundamental principle of political economy not to levy heavy and unjust taxation upon the necessities of life to give a bonus for the production of gold. He went on to say that we were indebted to the professor for that exposition on the principles of political economy. My experience is that the orthodox professor of political economy presents his matter in such a manner that by the time you get to the end of it you do not remember what was in the front part of it, and you get into such a hopeless tangle that you do not understand what he means; and he certainly does not understand what he means himself, if you judge him by his writings.

Mr. Hamilton—According to you no economists are of any value except yourself and your adherents.

Mr. CRAIGIE—I am glad that the honourable member has recognised that truth. If he recognises that much there is still hope for him. I am hoping that, as the days go by, with the constant drip of economic truths I will impose on him from time to time he will at last come out and be as valiant a champion of economic principles as he was in days gone by. He said that he did not want to stir me upon what he calls the fundamental principles of political economy. Whether he wants to stir me up or not, I propose to give some facts which, I think, will be much appreciated by him. I tender him

a very sincere vote of thanks for providing me with the jumping-off ground with regard to the speech I am delivering.

I now come to what is the strong point with Mr. Hamilton. In regard to the last election for East Torrens, the Leader of the Opposition said that Mr. Hamilton's party did not record a majority, to which Mr. Hamilton replied, "Of course we did." I have studied statistics a little, and in my study of the returns for the last election I have never been able to understand exactly how the statement of the honourable member that his party secured a majority could stand logical investigation. In looking through the figures I found that of the total number of people who were entitled to vote 59.45 per cent. went to the poll, and of that percentage the Liberal and Country Party candidates secured 34 per cent. It will be seen that it cannot, by any stretch of imagination, be logically claimed that that party secured a majority.

The Hon. G. F. Jenkins—It had a majority of those who voted.

Mr. CRAIGIE—No. Of the total of 173,758 votes cast, the Liberal and Country League secured 60,159—roughly a trifle more than one-third. In the East Torrens district we find that the Liberal and Country Party secured 9,137 votes and the Labor Party 11,225. Of course, in dealing with this question, I am not overlooking the fact that the honourable member said, "But, what is the process of reasoning which an elector goes through when he is prepared to vote under the preferential system?" I think that the honourable member is wise enough to know that under this preferential hybrid system we have in operation to-day it is not any use of a voter attempting to go through a reasoning process. He really has to undergo a principle of compulsion. When he goes to the polling booth he reasons as follows: "Such and such an individual is the man I desire to represent my interests and I do not want any other." But because the element of compulsion is introduced in the voting system that man is compelled to cast his vote for an opposing legislator, with whom, to use a common phrase, he would not wish to be found dead in the same paddock.

The Hon. G. F. Jenkins—Does the honourable member suggest that he wants to be found dead in a paddock?

Mr. CRAIGIE—I am not anxious to be found dead anywhere, but I am anxious to see a just system of voting established at the earliest

opportunity; and I would welcome the honourable member's assistance, knowing that he is one of those who stand strictly for principles of justice and morality. For that reason, I feel sure that when the Bill dealing with the question comes before us he will not be found in the camp of those who desire to disfranchise a great number of people under the single electorate system, but will come under the banner of proportional representation, which is the only true democratic system. Being a democrat of the first water, I rely with confidence upon his vote.

The Hon. G. F. Jenkins—And under that system there will be no compulsory preference.

Mr. CRAIGIE—There will be no compulsory preference under proportional voting. We will allow a person his choice and allow him to stop when he feels he has had sufficient. Mr. Hamilton was good enough to say that the Labor Party did not know exactly what was going to happen in regard to proportional representation. He said something about Polly putting the kettle on and Sukey taking it off again. He did stress the fact that the Labor Party was conspicuous for putting the policy on at some time or another. At least we can say that it did not try to have two opposite things in its policy at the one time, as did the Liberal and Country League in 1913 when it had single electorates and effective voting on the one platform. If the Party had that knowledge which it is supposed to possess it must have known that the policy of single electorates was the natural antithesis of effective voting. Yet, we are faced with the picture of a great political organisation coming out with a printed policy referring to single electorates and effective voting! The honourable member should first put his own house in order instead of finding fault with the other Party. Mr. Hamilton said I had endeavoured, with more or less success, to prove to some of my constituents at least that proportional representation is a doctrine that will cure all the ills of the body politic. I have convinced them to the extent that there is a big section in my district sufficiently democratic to recognise that, although there are members of society in that area who hold political opinions different from their own, they will be permitted to express those views under proportional representation. They do not think that they possess all the political virtues and that they alone should be allowed to express their views on the floor of this House. That is the virtue of pro-

portional representation. It gives to the other fellow the same right of having his views reflected in Parliament as he claims for himself. It is the only system that has been discovered up to the present that will produce that effect.

Mr. Hamilton—What about New South Wales?

Mr. CRAIGIE—I have spoken about proportional representation previously in this House, and my speeches can be found in "Hansard." Later I will show that proportional representation was removed from the Statute Book of New South Wales by Mr. Hamilton's political friend, the Hon. J. T. Lang.

Mr. Hamilton—It was removed by agreement between both parties.

Mr. CRAIGIE—It was not. As a matter of fact, when the vote was taken 43 votes were cast in favour of having single electorates and 37 votes were cast by the National Party for the retention of proportional representation.

The Hon. G. F. Jenkins—Are you sure that it was not a protest against the proposed scheme of proportional representation?

Mr. CRAIGIE—No. Mr. Bavin, the Leader of the Nationalist Party at the time, said:—

Before the Bill finally leaves this House I desire to say that it represents a direct effort on the part of the Government to prevent the people from being represented according to majority. It represents an effort on the part of the Government to twist the electoral machinery to its own interests. Any Government which to secure any political interest seeks to alter the electoral machinery of the country to prevent electors from recording the true position is a traitor to every democratic principle.

Mr. Hamilton—What did Sir George Fuller say? I quoted it last time and you carefully ignored it.

Mr. CRAIGIE—You will find that I dealt with the statement of Sir George Fuller, which was taken by you from two pamphlets prepared by Mr. Archdale Parkhill. You did not tell the House on that occasion that the National Party lost the election under proportional representation and that Mr. Archdale Parkhill prepared a pamphlet exposing what he considered to be the evils of proportional representation. At the next election, when the National Party went in under proportional representation, no pamphlet was issued. At the following election when the National Party lost again, Mr. Archdale Parkhill came out with another pamphlet. It was only when the Nationalists had a rebuff at the polls that a pamphlet

was issued. I know as much about the New South Wales position as the honourable member does.

Mr. Hamilton—But you do not know any more.

Mr. CRAIGIE—I am quite prepared to admit that I do not know any more, but I do claim credit for expressing it in the way the thing was put, and not taking the opposite view.

Mr. Hamilton—The fact remains that both parties agreed to its abolition and you know that very well.

Mr. CRAIGIE—The honourable member says that both parties agreed to the abolition. If so, why were 43 votes cast in one direction and 37 in another?

Mr. Hamilton—There was a variation in the question.

Mr. CRAIGIE—That is something which you cannot get over.

Mr. Hamilton—Under any circumstances, it went.

Mr. CRAIGIE—My honourable friend should be pleased to be in the company of the Hon. J. T. Lang, and of people who refuse to have democratic representation.

Mr. Hamilton—That does not matter. The system you advocate was tried over three elections and it was subsequently discarded.

Mr. CRAIGIE—It is true that it was tried and was put down simply because it took the power out of the hands of the underground engineers in the Party and put it into the hands of the electors, who always should have it. Mr. Hamilton also spoke about the Proportional Representation Group, established in this State, "comprising single taxers, Douglas Crediters, members of the W.C.T.U., inflation and deflation societies, &c." We have a number of respectable organisations associated with the Proportional Representation Group. The Douglas Crediters have not yet joined, neither have inflation or deflation parties. It is not a question of how many parties are associated. It is a question of whether or not the principle is right. Before I finish I shall, no doubt, convince at least some members that the principle is right. Mr. Hamilton asserted that I have not been known to change my opinions under any circumstances, and whether right or wrong I consistently stick to them. He also indicated that he thought there would soon be a "No-party" Party established in the House. No doubt he sees the writing on the wall. I can

understand his fears regarding the advent of an independent party. I sympathise with him in his belief that before long he may be relegated to political obscurity. Nevertheless, he must not be downhearted. He said he was wondering whether I should be Treasurer to this new "No-party" Party Government. He felt that he could not put me in that responsible position as it would never do to have me as Treasurer, because I would immediately apply the principles of single tax and sweep away all our water rates, income tax, railway rates and many other things, and the result would be that I would not get enough revenue for State purposes. If I know anything about the minds of the general public they certainly will welcome the time when income tax and all other taxes will be swept into oblivion. I am afraid the time has not arrived for that to happen, but when the honourable member suggests that if we were to perform an act of economic justice and remove the burden of taxation it would not be sufficient to meet the case, let me quote an excellent authority. When speaking on the Land Act Amendment Bill on October 11, 1928, Mr. Hamilton, who was then a member of the Victorian Parliament said:—

In this colony, had we never parted with our lands, we could do absolutely without any taxation whatever, because the rent of land that would be received from the lands in the towns, boroughs, and country districts would be sufficient to provide for all the necessities of the State without placing any burden on the community at all.

In a later speech on the Bill, he demonstrated that he knew there was a fundamental difference between land and the products of labour. Here are his words:—

Land was different from any other form of industry. Land was what the people must all live on and all use at some time or other of their lives. If they ran short of boots, they could put on more men, more machines, open new factories, and produce as many boots as they required, in a short space of time; but if they ran short of land, through some persons monopolising great quantities of it, they could not produce any more land. . . . If a land tax were imposed in this colony it would do more than the compulsory purchase clauses of this Bill, and do it in a natural and automatic manner. It would open up, not a few small areas, but practically the whole country.

Mr. Hamilton—What is wrong with that?

Mr. CRAIGIE—They are statesmanlike utterances. I am pleased to note that at some time during his political life Mr. Hamilton

has realised that there is a just means of collecting revenue. My one regret is that he has so far fallen from grace that during 1936 he is no longer publicly advocating the great principle which he expounded at that time. Mr. Hamilton's speech on the Victorian Budget on August 29, 1899, was a much better effort. On that occasion he said:—

I doubt if the Government have ever fully recognised the true economic value of the tax on unimproved land values. Now, sir, I want to say that the land tax is indeed a revenue producing machine, but it is not only that. It differs from all other taxes in the respect that, while other taxes have the one effect of taking money from the people and making them poorer thereby, the great majority of people are benefited by its imposition. They are benefited, first, because it tends to open up a great quantity of land which is closed for purposes of production; and, secondly, because it takes burdens off a large number of the people and enables the amount so released to be used in commerce, whereas other taxes take money and use it for the purpose of government.

That was an excellent statement and I congratulate him for having at that period seen clearly and not through dark glasses as apparently he is doing to-day.

Mr. Hamilton—It is like a glass of good wine.

Mr. CRAIGIE—Yes, it is most refreshing. I hope we shall see a conversion take place here which will be advantageous to Mr. Hamilton and the community generally. Continuing his speech on the Victorian budget, Mr. Hamilton said:—

The tax on unimproved land values has one redeeming feature, if it has no other, that the landlord cannot transfer it on to the tenant.

In past discussions in the House when I suggested those principles put forward by Mr. Hamilton years ago, it was stated it would not benefit the great mass, because if revenue were collected from those sources it would ultimately be transferred. He quoted John Stuart Mill on that occasion and his words should be written in letters of gold and placed in his Party's room for all time. In proof of his assertion he added this further testimony to a most convincing and logical speech:—

Instead of being an unjust tax, the land tax shines pre-eminently above all other taxes that were ever conceived by the mind of man, as the most just of all.

That is an excellent statement.

Mr. Hamilton—That is not single tax.

Mr. CRAIGIE—I should like to know exactly what it is. We must presume when Mr. Hamilton to-day supports other forms of taxation that it must be taxation he knows is unjust. Members, if they will recall the day when tears were shed in this House because it was proposed to remove a farthing land tax to give relief to the small struggling outback farmers, will remember I pointed out that those poor struggling farmers, with £1,000 of unimproved land value, would make a magnificent saving of £1 0s. 10d. a year. I pointed out, too, that if we took the King William Street farmer, with one acre, they would make a saving of £373. It appears that the saving is not for the primary producer who has everything to gain, but who instead is being mulet in taxation.

Mr. Hamilton referred to the friendly debate the Commissioner of Public Works and I had at Willunga. He said he was bound to confess that, as an impartial judge, Mr. Craigie left the hall "without a single-tax feather to fly with," but that did not alter his opinion. The impartiality of Mr. Hamilton can be judged by the fact that he occupied a front seat in the hall, and when the Minister evidently quoted wrongly from his notes he was able to prompt him and put him right. Some people said that it was an indication of collusion in the preparation of the notes, but any person who views it with an uncritical mind must say there was no impartiality.

Reverting to proportional representation Mr. Hamilton said he would now deal with the more serious aspect of it. He said it was great only because of the magnitude attached to it by interested persons, and that really it was a very small and miserable thing, not worth all the discussion it caused. If it is a small and miserable thing it is a wonder that the honourable member wasted his time and that of members in dealing with it. He would have members believe that no person of any particular standing would have anything to do with the question. He was very good, when a member of the Victorian Parliament, in quoting John Stuart Mill as an authority who could be looked up to with considerable respect. I pay him the compliment of quoting John Stuart Mill in regard to the principle of proportional representation. This is what Mill said:—

I saw in this great practical and philosophical idea the greatest improvement of which the system of representative government is susceptible; an improvement which, in the most

felicitous manner, exactly meets and cures the grand, and what before seemed the inherent defect of the representative system; that of giving to a numerical majority all power, instead of only a power proportional to its numbers, and enabling the strongest party to exclude all weaker parties from making their opinions heard in the assembly of the nation, except through such opportunity as may be given to them by the accidentally unequal distribution of opinions in different localities. To these great evils nothing more than very imperfect palliatives had seemed possible; but Mr. Hare's system affords a radical cure. This great discovery, for it no less, in the political art, inspired me, as I believe it has inspired all thoughtful persons who have adopted it, with new and more sanguine hopes respecting the prospects of human society: by freeing the form of political institutions towards which the whole civilised world is manifestly and irresistibly tending, from the chief part of what seemed to qualify, or render doubtful, its ultimate benefits. Minorities, so long as they remain minorities, are, and ought to be, outvoted; but under arrangements which enable any assemblage of voters, amounting to a certain number, to place in the legislature a representative of its own choice, minorities cannot be suppressed. Independent opinions will force their way into the councils of the nation, and make themselves heard there, a thing which often cannot happen in the existing forms of representative democracy; and the legislature, instead of being weeded of individual peculiarities and entirely made up of men who simply represent the creed of great political or religious parties, will comprise a large proportion of the most eminent individual minds of the country, placed there, without reference to party, by voters who appreciate their individual eminence. I can understand that persons, otherwise intelligent, should for want of sufficient examination, be repelled from Mr. Hare's plan by what they think the complex nature of its machinery. But any one who does not feel the want which the scheme is intended to supply; anyone who throws it over as a mere theoretical subtlety or croquet, tending to no valuable purpose, and unworthy of the attention of practical men, may be pronounced an incompetent statesman, unequal to the politics of the future.

That is a statement by the man Mr. Hamilton selected as his authority when dealing with the land values question. I give him the same authority to show that any person who does not approve of the principle of proportional representation may be pronounced an incompetent statesman, unequal to the politics of the future. Another man the equal of Mr. Hamilton in political life was the late Mr. H. H. Asquith, later known as the Earl of Oxford. He said:—

I press upon the men and women of all parties that the first and most urgent of all our political reform is the abandonment of the

misleading system, or lack of system, from which we are at present suffering, and the substitution for it of proportional representation. Proportional representation is an experiment . . . which we are bound to make, because it supplies the only direct means of escape from the breakdown and even the bankruptcy of the electoral machine.

That statement by the great Liberal Leader of England, when proportional representation was debated in that country, referred to the single electorate methods adopted in Great Britain as the lack of system which should not be supported.

Mr. Hamilton—Do you know what the Liberals told me when I was in England?

Mr. CRAIGIE—No, and I advise the honourable member to keep it to himself. He can give it to the House when he is speaking. I have another quotation by Mr. H. G. Wells. It appeared in the "Westminster Gazette". Mr. Wells has produced many books equal to anything produced by Mr. Hamilton. He is an author and thinker well known for his "Outline of History" and other important works, and although gentlemen like the honourable member for East Torrens might endeavour to discredit him he stands to-day as one of the greatest leaders of thought in the world. Wells said:—

Except . . . where they have proportional representation and an approach of political sanity, all the elections of the English-speaking democracies are profoundly silly affairs. The common voter hasn't a dog's chance of expressing his real opinion of things. Some organisation or other put up a couple of candidates for his constituency, and he votes for the one associated with political leaders he dislikes and distrusts least. . . . The voter is generally in the case of a man who wants to go shooting, and is confronted with the choice of taking the family Bible and some cartridges or a boiled fowl and a gun. The only civilized method of democracy is proportional representation in large constituencies returning many members; there is no other method which gives the individual voter a reasonable opportunity of expressing his real preference. It is the right way, and all other ways are wrong and bad.

I could multiply the number of great leaders of thought in various countries who have stood behind this particular system. They point out that it is the only one which will give purely democratic representation.

Mr. Anthony—We can quote just as many against that.

Mr. CRAIGIE—If you can it is a wonder they have not been produced.

Mr. Hamilton would have us believe that the adoption of proportional representation in Germany was responsible for many political parties. At the elections held in 1935 under the system of single electorates 18 different political parties sought the suffrage of the people, so that he has not anything to satirise with regard to proportional representation when the scheme is responsible for producing 18 different parties, as it did in that case. There have been many parties in Germany since the first election for the Reichstag in 1871. There were 21 parties in the last Reichstag previous to the war, and only 10 parties in the first Reichstag of the German Republic. The German system of voting differed from the true proportional method. There were only 35 constituencies for the whole of Germany, the average size being 5,200 square miles. The elector could only vote for a party as such, and not for an individual. The elector voted for, say, List 1, or for some other list; and for each 60,000 votes recorded for a list, candidates were declared elected in the order in which they appeared on the list. It will thus be seen that the choice of the voter was very restricted. The charge against the system in Germany is that no one party ever obtained a majority of seats, but that is likewise true under the single electorate system from 1871 to 1914. It should also be placed on record that in no general election in Germany did Hitler's party, the National Socialists, poll an absolute majority of votes. Even in the election of March 5, 1933, when there was no freedom of speech except for the Hitlerites and their allies, when the newspapers and political organisations of the opposition parties were suppressed, the National Socialists polled only 44 per cent. of the votes.

In Germany, the Reichstag could escape from the responsibility of forming a Government, and did so. The responsibility could be transferred to the President, who had large powers under the constitution. The failure of the parties in the Reichstag to provide a government led to the creation of governments based on the authority of the President, and thereby facilitated the revolution. It was because the Reichstag would not stand up to its obligations and transferred that power to the President that there is the present dictatorship. It is not because of the restricted system of proportional representation in operation.

Mr. Hamilton—They could not get a strong Executive.

Mr. CRAIGIE—They could have provided a government had they made the attempt, but as the constitution gave them power to transfer responsibility to the President they did so. Poland is another country with a restricted system of proportional representation. The members of the Diet can only be nominated by electoral committees, composed of representatives of local authorities, and of various commercial, industrial, agricultural, professional, and labour organisations. The Senate is composed of one-third members appointed by the President, and the remaining two-thirds chosen by electoral colleges elected by a restricted franchise. It is not right for Mr. Hamilton to come here and endeavour to show that proportional representation is responsible for the dictatorship. The honourable member referred to Italy as being another country which has suffered as a result of proportional representation. The List system of proportional representation was adopted and used in two elections in Italy in 1919 and 1921, but as it did not suit the purposes of dictatorship it was abolished by Mussolini in 1924. His programme required a system that would enable him to elect a majority to parliament whether he got the majority or not. The new election law in Italy, applied for the first time in April, 1924, provides that two-thirds of the seats shall fall to the largest party, if that party had polled not less than 25 per cent. of the votes. The purpose of the law is to ensure that some one party (or combination of parties) shall have a majority of seats in parliament, even if it does not have a majority in the country. It is desirable that this principle shall find a permanent place in the laws governing the election of parliament? The Rome correspondent of the "Morning Post", April 7, 1924, said:—"It is a dangerous law, rendered innocuous for the moment only by the certainty of the Fascist victory at the elections." It is dangerous because of the power it places in the hands of the minority, and of the temptation it holds out for the formation of unreal combinations in order to grasp that power. It offers no help where liberty prevails and, therefore, affords no guidance of value to English speaking peoples, whilst in Italy itself it is regarded even among Fascists as but a temporary expedient. Mr. Hamilton contended that in a district a minority has no right to representation, and should go out and endeavour to obtain a majority. How could a minority under the

then his vote would be cast against proportional representation which is truly a democratic measure.

The Hon. R. L. Butler—The result should be analysed in countries where the system has been tried.

Mr. CRAIGIE—I made a fairly complete analysis this afternoon and have also analysed it in previous speeches. The Premier has analysed it also and he was so satisfied that he made an excellent speech worthy of reproduction by the Proportional Representation Group.

The Hon. R. L. Butler—Unfortunately, wherever it was put into practical application I was proved wrong.

Mr. CRAIGIE—Everything is against the Premier there. The Premier apparently is not conversant with all the facts. The following is the result of the Victorian elections held on March 2, 1935:—In Allandale district, Parkin (United Australia Party) polled 3,135 votes and was elected, although 6,820 votes were cast against him. In Hampden district, Cumming (United Australia Party) was elected with 3,439 votes, and 7,019 voters were disfranchised. In Karakarra and Borung, Cameron (Country Party) polled 2,867 votes and was elected, and 7,524 voters were left without representation. In Stawell and Ararat, McDonald (Country Party) secured 4,160 votes, and was elected, and 7,087 voters were disfranchised. The returns showed that in each of those districts men with minority votes secured representation and the majority were disfranchised.

Mr. Shannon—Had your researches gone a little further—

Mr. CRAIGIE—In that case I should have been able to produce more damning evidence of the single electorate system than I am producing now. If we take Victoria as a whole, we find that at the last election 474,353 voters, or 57.24 per cent. of the voters, secured 53 seats in the contested districts and 354,779 voters, or 42.76 per cent. did not get a single representative. It is a shocking state of voting which permits 354,779 voters, or 42.76 per cent. of the electors not to have any representative on the floor of the House to express their views.

Mr. Shannon—You object to majority rule?

Mr. CRAIGIE—If the honourable member understood the principles of proportional representation he would know that it makes for majority rule, but also provides for the representation of minorities, which are disfranchised under every other system. At the elections in Great Britain on November 14, 1935, 11,792,332 voters supporting the Government parties secured 405 seats in the contested districts, and 10,209,505 voters in the opposing parties secured only 170 seats. In the 11 southern counties the Government parties, with 2,000,000 votes, secured 77 seats out of 79, the 300,000 opposition Liberals elected two members, whilst 800,000 Labor voters did not get a single representative.

Mr. Hamilton submitted on Thursday quotations relating to voting systems from a book called "The Way of Dictators." I will give a few quotations from the same book which he overlooked. Referring to the voting system in England it says:—

We were in the past made uneasily conscious of the absurdities and anomalies of our present electoral arrangements. We were forced to admit that on the face of it it is not equitable that one set of voters numbering five millions should return 70 per cent. or even 80 per cent. to the House of Commons, and another set of voters numbering four millions should return 20 per cent. or 30 per cent., while a third set of voters numbering three millions should secure only 10 per cent. of the representation. . . . We have had our examples of minority government. We have had a Socialist Ministry kept precariously in office by Liberal support. We have seen the spectacle of Liberal leaders performing wonderful evolutions in the political circus—justifying the support of measures today which they had condemned at the election yesterday, testifying to the possession of marvellously adaptable political consciences, and to the possession of inimitable talents in casuistry. Politics were diverting in those days, but not edifying. The democratic system on the British Parliamentary model will only function effectively when one of the parties is assured of a decisive majority in the House of Commons. Our electoral system promotes that end by reason of the very anomalies which advocates of proportional representation deplore. Our system accentuates the swing of the pendulum, gives to the winning party at the elections representation in the House of Commons in excess of what is proportionately due on the results of the poll.

There is an author that Mr. Hamilton was fond of quoting regarding the single electorates that he is such a strong advocate of, but like Nelson he put his blind eye to the telescope when he came to the portion I have just read.

I shall now deal with the 1935 elections in Alberta, where a composite system of voting was in operation. The following are particulars in connection with the elections for the Alberta Legislative Assembly:—

Party.	First Choice Votes.	Members in Proportion to	
		Elected.	Votes.
Social Credit . . .	123,545	50	28.7
Liberal	47,052	1	10.9
United Farmers of Alberta	30,576	0	7.1
Conservative	8,644	0	2
Labor	2,073	0	.5
Others	7,771	0	1.8
	<hr/>		
	219,661	51	51

Under this single electorate system in the rural areas of Alberta 123,545 electors secured 50 representatives, whereas 96,116 electors who recorded votes for other people only got one representative. This is the system we are told should be accepted as an ideal one in connection with electoral reform in this State. Contrast the position in connection with single electorates with proportional representation in the city of Calgary, the particulars for which are as follows:—

Party.	First Choice Votes.	Members in Proportion to	
		Elected.	Votes.
Social Credit . . .	24,079	4	3.5
Liberal	8,000	1	1.2
Conservative	5,505	1	.8
Labor	2,073	0	.3
Independent - and Communist	1,740	0	.2
	<hr/>		
	41,193	6	6

The details in connection with the city of Edmonton elections are:—

Party.	First Choice Votes.	Members in Proportion to	
		Elected.	Votes.
Liberals	14,033	3	2.3
Social Credit	13,853	2	2.2
Conservative	4,820	1	.8
United Farmers . . .	2,092	—	.3
Labor	1,373	—	.2
Communist	1,096	—	.2
	<hr/>		
	37,267	6	6

It will be seen that in these two cities where the proportional representation system was in operation the nearest approach to correct representation of the people was obtained. After

referring to this system, let me come back to Australia and give figures concerning the Queensland elections on May 11, 1935. In the Bundaberg district McLean (Labor) was elected with 4,738 votes, and 4,308 voters were left without any representation. In the Warwick district Healy (Labor) was elected with 4,247 votes, and 5,334 electors did not get any representation. In the Dalby district Morgan (Country Progressive Nationalist) was elected with 4,373 votes, and 4,061 other voters were disfranchised. Taking the State as a whole, Labor polled 216,627 votes, and gained 46 seats, an average of 4,709 votes a seat. The Country Progressive Nationalists polled 133,263 votes, and gained 16 seats, an average of 8,329 votes a seat. The Independents polled 13,177 votes, Douglas Credit 27,659, Communists 5,909, Women's Political Association 2,460, and Independent Labor 2,086, a total of 51,291 votes; yet these voters were without representation. It does not make any difference which State elections we consider, the system of single electorates has always been responsible for disfranchising a considerable number of people. Regarding the elections in New South Wales on May 11, 1935, in the Arncliffe district J. J. Cahill (State Labor) polled 8,438 votes and was elected, notwithstanding that 9,860 votes were cast against him. In Granville district W. F. Ely (State Labor) received 8,489 votes and was elected, and 10,983 electors who voted against him were disfranchised. In Tamworth district F. A. Chappey (United Australia Party) secured 5,879 votes and was elected, whereas 7,388 voters cast their votes against him. In Petersham E. S. Solomon (United Australia Party) polled 8,701 votes and was elected despite the 8,830 votes cast against him. An analysis of the votes cast throughout the State shows that the United Australia Party polled 422,983 votes and secured 33 seats, the average votes a seat being 12,817. The United Country Party polled 160,190 votes and secured 19 seats, the average votes a seat being 8,431. The State Labor Party polled 518,372 votes and secured 27 seats, the average votes a seat being 19,199. The Federal Labor Party polled 63,377 votes, Independents 51,731 votes, and Communists 20,126 votes, a total of 135,234 votes, and obtained no representation.

The details in connection with the New Zealand elections on November 27, 1935, are:—

Name of Party.	Votes Polled.	Seats Obtained.	Seats According to Strength.
Labor	392,317	53	38
National	285,819	19	27
Democrat	66,688	0	7
Country	21,048	2	2
Independent	67,257	4	2
Ratana	8,569	2	
Communist	600	0	2
Others	10,257	0	
	<hr/> 852,555	<hr/> 80	<hr/> 80

In 35 constituencies members were elected on a minority vote. In those 35 districts 157,095 voters secured the 35 seats, whereas 206,451 voters were left without any representation.

Any person who claims single electorates as a measure of electoral reform in the interests of the people cannot find any evidence from the practical operation of the system in other States to support that bold assertion. The Premier intimated that the system of proportional representation had not worked out satisfactorily in any country. I ask him to study the figures in connection with the 1933 elections in the Irish Free State. The particulars are:—

Parties.	Votes Polled.	Seats Obtained.	Votes Per Seat.
Fianna Fail and Labour	770,968	85	9,070
Cumann na nGaedheal, Centre, and Independents	615,358	68	9,049

That is about as accurate a representation as you can get. "The Irish Press," Mr. deValera's paper, and one of the most popular dailies, in its issue of January 24, 1933, the day of the poll, said:—

The English press correspondents sympathise with us in having to work so complicated a system as proportional representation. It is wasted sympathy, for the system is simple to understand and easy to carry out. . . . It is based on an excellent idea—that we have greater preference for some candidates than others. . . . Under proportional representation the voter not only has the pleasure of voting first for the candidate he likes most of all, but he also can vote for all the others in the order in which he likes them.

The number of informal papers in the whole of Ireland was just one per cent. In some counties the record was exceptionally good, being a little more than half of one per cent.

Mr. W. T. Cosgrave, the Leader of the Cumann na nGaedheal, speaking in regard to proportional representation, said:—

The system of proportional representation aims at affording representation to every point of view in proportion to the extent to which that point of view exists among the electorate. Broadly speaking it achieves that object. . . . It makes manipulation of the electorate difficult, if not impossible. It tends to prevent sudden landslides in favour of any particular party.

In the "Irish Times" of November 27, 1933, there appeared a remarkable letter from a dignitary of the Church of Ireland, the Reverend Canon Luce, Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin, and an acute observer of the political life of the country. The following extracts are of interest:—

Proportional representation has been tried here for a number of years and has worked well. . . . It has been the stabilising factor in our public life, the secret strength of our Governments. Our deputies, whether in office or in opposition, have felt, and have in fact been, really representative; for they have drawn their mandate from the widest possible area of consent. It is the people's will that majority opinion should prevail. It is equally the people's will that the majority opinion should be considered. . . . The familiar proportional representation voting paper suits the situation of the voter. . . . It gives him the biggest return for the trouble of voting. On it he can record not only his one choice, but also his several preferences. In fact he can put on paper a big piece of his political mind, giving effective expression of his wish, will, desire, and consent. . . . Under the English system of voting, political landslides occur often. At such a time many of the outgoing Ministers and members are swept, not only from office, but from public life. Could we, in a cool hour, desire such an event here? We have not the men to spare. We want more debaters, not fewer, more men of public spirit and experience, versed in public affairs, whatever their party politics. . . . To bring back here the English system of voting would be a retrograde, reactionary, and undemocratic step—one that would, I fear, be a step towards a dictatorship of a party or a person. Those who desire to abolish proportional representation convict themselves of desiring disproportionate representation—that is, grasping at power without the authority of consent.

I think that is a very striking testimony to the efficacy and justice of proportional representation. It shows that the system has been in operation in the Irish Free State since 1923 for both Houses of the Dail. It has also been used for local government elections and has proved so successful that it has been embodied

in the Constitution. Yet, it is a system we are told we should not approve of. The evidence I have given—and I shall give more when the Bill is before the House—is sufficient commendation of the proposed single electorate system as being one that will not give proper representation to the people.

I am pleased to see the member for Adelaide, Mr. Bardolph, in his seat for once, because I propose to pay him some attention on matters he brought before the House. On September 11 Mr. Bardolph moved a motion in this Chamber asking Parliament to protest to the Commonwealth Government against the proposed extension of the sugar embargo. Members know with what impassioned eloquence he moved the House when he spoke of the iniquity of the great sugar combine. He said if we could camouflage the issue and blind the eyes of the people we were supposed to be assisting we were just as guilty as the Colonial Sugar Refining Company which for years had been robbing the people right and left. He stated that Mr. Nixon, an accountant, discovered enough to know that the company held the whole sugar trade of Australia in the hollow of its hand, and he felt it his duty to oppose, in every possible way, the ruthless exploitation of the Australian consumer at the hands of this monopoly. I remember how our friend's soul was torn by anger when he uttered those words against the iniquity of a company which was bringing disaster to the people's homes and sugar pots. Not content with that appeal, in the great organ of democracy, the "South Australian Worker," dated October 11, 1935, we find an article with the following big black headings, "Union Leader exposes Colonial Sugar Refining Company. Sugar Combine Racket Routs Black Bogey Schemers. Workers Fleeced Under Sugar Agreement. Wages and Conditions Operating are Appalling." It went on, "The following article was written for the 'South Australian Worker' by Mr. A. J. Newman, Federal Secretary of Australian Meat Industry Employees Union. Mr. Newman spent 10 years in Townsville as organiser for the meat industry employees, and should be thoroughly fitted to discuss the sugar industry in all its details." That was the grave statement made by Mr. Bardolph. We find later that advertisements in favour of the sugar interests' exploitation of the people appeared in the "South Australian Worker," in seven consecutive issues. They were six-inch two column advertisements. On May 8 we were

charmed with nearly a whole page report in this same workers' paper, supposed to be given by Mr. Muir, of Prince Alfred Old Collegians' Association, beautifully set out in nice type extolling the virtues of this exploiting company. I do not say it was an advertisement in the same way as the other was marked "Advertisement," but I know that the sugar interests have ways of getting into papers matter which appears to be an expression of opinion from other people, apart from themselves. Actually, however, they are advertisements in the same way as the real advertisements. In 1930, when we were fighting the fight, and a report appeared in a Victorian paper called the "Labor Call" one of the members of the Henry George League forwarded a letter criticising it. He received the following reply from the editor of that paper:—

We have to inform you that the articles appearing in the "Labor Call" on the sugar industry are paid for at advertisement rates.

As recently as November 15, the New South Wales "Truth" had similar matter in its columns. One of our friends, anxious to put the other side of the case, wrote a letter in opposition.

Mr. Davies—To the "South Australian Worker?"

Mr. CRAIGIE—No. I would not send anything there as I have some regard for my press matter.

Mr. Bardolph—The editor refused to accept it on account of its editorial comments.

Mr. CRAIGIE—My friend received the following answer to his letter:—

Replying to your letter on this subject, I think that you are under a misapprehension when you accept the matter appearing in "Truth" with regard to the sugar industry as being an expression of opinion of this newspaper. This matter is advertising and is inserted by the Queensland Sugar Growers' Association and appears in all newspapers throughout the Commonwealth. However, we appreciate your letter on the subject.

It appears that much matter appears in various newspapers which is not the expression of the editor, but that of the sugar interests concealed in a different guise. I do not assert that that is what happened in regard to the "South Australian Worker," but I suggest that Mr. Bardolph, who was so moved in his passions for the down-trodden working man, anxious to prevent that exploitation of \$7,000,000 a year in sugar

should, as the editor, have written a footnote explaining for the benefit of the workers that it was not the views of the paper, but of the sugar combine. If I were editor of a paper or connected with one in which that statement appeared as an advertisement or otherwise I should certainly have done so. Unfortunately, Mr. Bardolph, who was keen to make himself heard on the sugar business in this House apparently had his right hand paralysed at the time the article appeared and so nothing to the contrary was said. He allowed his readers to believe that the sugar combine was not such a bad concern as had been painted. This Parliamentarian—the member who on Thursday last, broadcast from Station 5 KA the doings of Parliament, although he was not in Parliament himself to know exactly what occurred and said that it rose at 6 p.m., whereas actually it

adjourned at 4.45 p.m.—in his broadcast over the air to-night, although not in this august Chamber to hear my speech on proportional representation was good enough to say "That the long speech made by Mr. Craigie in reply to Mr. Hamilton on the question fell very flat indeed." It is very nice to know we have a man in this Chamber who is blessed with second sight, and, although not within the sacred precincts, can say over the microphone things with which he is not conversant. I suggest that Station 5 KA, or the British Broadcasting Commission, when they are looking for some great man to take over control, should not overlook the wonderful knowledge and capabilities possessed by Mr. Bardolph. I give him a cordial invitation when broadcasting from 5 KA to-morrow night to put over my remarks on the sugar question.