

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, July 29, 1959.

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

### QUESTIONS.

#### PRICE AND GRADING OF MEAT.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Has the Premier received a report from the Prices Commissioner regarding the price of meat? I understand that investigations were recently conducted by him and I wonder whether the matter of grading was mentioned in the report.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have not received a further report from the Prices Commissioner since the matter was last mentioned in the House. Information given then related to a survey that had been made by the Prices Branch up to, I think, the middle of July. The Prices Commissioner is making further investigations and I will in due course inform the honourable member on the matter. The last survey of 63 shops and the average prices charged showed that the margins had been considerably increased over margins under price control. Some considerable time ago the Government desired the grading of meat to be undertaken and offered to provide £7,000 to the Abattoirs to permit the grading and strip branding of meat. Mr. Rice, who was then general manager of the Produce Department, was asked to implement the arrangement, but, as I have said previously, it met with much opposition from the industry concerned and it did not appear to meet with any support on the consumers' side. Finally Mr. Rice advised that under the circumstances he could not recommend the Government to proceed with the proposal because it did not have the co-operation of the industry and the persons concerned. The matter lapsed because we did not get any co-operation on the matter. I do not think the report of the Prices Commissioner has previously dealt with grading. I will let the honourable member have further details as soon as they come to hand.

#### AUSTRALIAN PRODUCTIVITY COUNCIL.

Mr. COUMBE—In today's *Advertiser* there is mention of the formation of the Australian Productivity Council. As this has been formed with representatives of the Chambers of Manufactures and Commerce, and leaders of the trade union movement, seeking the co-operation of various sections of the community in increasing productivity, will the Premier bring the matter before the Depart-

ment of Industry and Labour seeking its co-operation and assistance in the furtherance of the council's desires?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Department of Industry has always given assistance to industry in problems associated with productivity and safety of personnel in factories, which is a big factor and one not usually realized in productivity. In some instances the number of man-hours lost annually through accidents is alarming. I will follow up the question and see whether we can give any useful assistance to the new council.

#### SHEPHERDS HILL ROAD DRAINAGE.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Will the Minister of Works obtain a report on drainage problems that occur in my electorate? Water diverted from the Shepherds Hill Road down Sturt Road is taken under the South Road into the continuance of the Sturt Creek. I believe there is merit in taking water along the southern side of South Road into Sturt Creek rather than into Sturt Road itself. It warrants consideration on account of the building activity by the Housing Trust and the desirability of giving people reasonable access to their homes. If the water cannot be taken along the southern side of South Road the Highways Department should be responsible for placing in position the necessary pipe along the Sturt Road to deal with the matter.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I will refer the matter to my colleague, the Minister of Roads.

#### POLIO VACCINE CAMPAIGN.

Mr. HUGHES—Recently Dr. Meyers, Director of the New South Wales Poliomyelitis Vaccine Campaign, is reported to have said that outbreaks of polio like those now sweeping the United States of America could occur in Australia this summer. Can the Premier inform the House whether the response by parents and young adults to the official campaign in this State has been satisfactory?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I will ask the Minister of Health for the information and I will get it as quickly as possible. So far as I know, the campaign in South Australia has been successful and I believe the public have co-operated in every way. We have had no difficulty because of lack of public co-operation. I will check the position and inform the honourable member in due course.

# **DANGEROUS CORNER AT GAWLER.**

Mr. HAMBOUR—Early this session I asked the Minister of Works if he would find out whether it would be possible to move a post a little further out at the turn off from the North of the River Road into Gawler in order to give cars a little more room. Has the Minister a reply to that question?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—Yes, I have received from the Minister of Roads the following report by the Commissioner of Highways:—

Traffic islands were constructed to assist the motorists to safely negotiate this intersection by defining and limiting the points at which opposing lines of traffic meet. Some difficulty is apparently being experienced, however, by drivers who approach this intersection at excessive speeds. "Junction" signs are erected at the approaches, warning motorists of the intersection. It is proposed, however, to substitute "Traffic Island" signs for the "Junction" signs. In addition, portions of the islands have now been painted with a reflectorised paint, which is visible at night some distance from the intersection. It is not considered that any difficulties could be overcome by moving the posts on the lefthand side back, and so increasing the width of the turn-left lane. This would tend to increase the speed of vehicles entering the intersection to a dangerous figure. In addition, a wider lane would encourage vehicles to overtake within the intersection, and so create a highly dangerous state which it is wished to avoid.

# **GAS PRICE IN PORT PIRIE.**

Mr. MCKEE—Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked last week concerning the high cost of gas in Port Pirie?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Regarding the cost of coal at Port Pirie all coal is now landed at Port Adelaide and railed to Port Pirie; consequently, in addition to the Port Adelaide landed charges there are railway freight and trans-shipment charges from the railway to the works at Port Pirie. This means that the Port Pirie price of coal, which has a big bearing upon the price of gas, is 50 per cent higher than the landed price at Port Adelaide. No coal has been landed at Port Pirie since there was a co-operative handling authority there.

# **NORTHFIELD INFANT SCHOOL.**

Mr. JENNINGS—I have had a request from the committee of the Northfield School about the long delay in the erection of a permanent infant school building at Northfield. About 600 children attend that school; they are being housed in peculiar little places, and they think they should have a completely separate school.

Approaches to the department have not borne very much fruit, although I am not expecting that any approach should make a school available immediately. The committee has not been able to get a definite reply. Will the Minister of Education take the matter up with his department and inform me of the exact position so that I can advise the committee?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I shall be pleased to comply with the honourable member's request. I doubt whether I shall be able to indicate the exact position because there are such heavy demands on the department in the building of so many schools, secondary, primary and infant, but I will consider the matter and advise the honourable member as soon as possible.

# **TUG PENS AT BIRKENHEAD.**

Mr. TAPPING—Can the Minister of Marine inform me whether it is proposed to construct the tug pens at Birkenhead this financial year?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—This project has been considered on several occasions, but as yet no Cabinet decision has been made to construct the pens. I have not recently considered whether the matter could come within the purview of this year's work. The cost is considerable and the return from revenue very slight, therefore this matter has been deferred from time to time. However, I will examine the matter again and let the honourable member have further information when I obtain it.

# **RAIL STANDARDIZATION.**

Mr. FRED WALSH—A report in the *News* of July 14 is as follows:—

Because essential information has not been supplied yet from South Australia, Federal Cabinet is still unable to decide whether to provide the first instalment of funds for South Australian rail standardization. If the money for South Australian rail standardization is to be provided under the Budget in the normal way, the required information will have to be sent to Canberra very soon. The information is to come from the South Australian Railways Commissioner, Mr. Fargher, and the Commonwealth Railways Commissioner, Mr. Hanna-berry.

Can the Premier say whether the report is correct, whether the South Australian Railways Commissioner is the cause of the delay, and if so, why?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—It is not correct to say that the work has been held up because the Railways Commissioner has not the necessary estimates prepared. The Railways Commissioner has already prepared estimates and supplied them to the Commonwealth

Government. Those estimates are on the same basis as those supplied to the Commonwealth prior to undertaking the broadening of the gauge in the South-East and, according to my information, are much more complete than the estimates upon which the Commonwealth authorized the construction of the railway line between Albury and Melbourne. We have complete estimates of the cost of a considerable portion of the line, because the line covers the present route in those places. There is no difficulty about the estimates at all, and for large sections of the line we have complete estimates that could enable the work to proceed tomorrow. In fact, we would be anxious to start tomorrow if permission were given for the work to proceed. However, there are one or two deviations which the Commonwealth has suggested and for which the full survey figures could not be known. No railway job in the world has ever been completely surveyed before the work has started. I say emphatically that we are prepared and anxious to start the work immediately, and our detailed estimates are sufficiently advanced to enable the work to be done. I took up with the Prime Minister the report mentioned by the honourable member, and the Prime Minister wired back that he had no information that the Commonwealth had said that South Australia was holding up the estimates. That was the official reply I received, but whether some other Minister gave that information without the Prime Minister's knowing is another matter.

Mr. Fred Walsh—It was Senator Paltridge.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—It does not actually quote him, although I believe that he did make this statement. Similar statements have emanated from two or three sources and I have been told that Senator Paltridge has made them. The Prime Minister's official reply was that he had no knowledge that these statements had been circulated. The real questions to be considered at this time are:—Is the Commonwealth prepared to go on with the agreement which has been ratified by Parliament, and which we are prepared to carry out in the fullest sense? Does the Commonwealth seek an alteration of it or does it repudiate it?

Mr. O'HALLORAN—In reply to the member for West Torrens, the Premier stated that some deviations are proposed if and when the railway line from Cockburn to Port Pirie is brought to uniform gauge. I understand from previous references that these deviations will be between Paratoo and Ucolta and between

Yongala and Jamestown. Will the Premier state whether the deviations will result in the by-passing of existing sidings in those two sections of the line? If so, by how many miles will they be by-passed, and will Parliament have an opportunity to consider the deviations in the interests of the local people before they are finally agreed to?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—As I said in reply to the previous question the Commonwealth has suggested, quite apart from the two minor deviations the Leader mentioned, substantial deviations—in fact, a new proposal. One deals with the line between Radium Hill and Broken Hill, and the other with deciding whether to take the new gauge into Port Pirie or to divert it before reaching Port Pirie, cutting across the narrow strip between the two lines, one coming in from the west and the other running south; Nurom is the name of the place, I think, I assure the Leader that I will consult him before any deviations affecting his district are acquiesced in.

#### MOLASSES SUPPLY.

Mr. QUIRKE—Has the Minister of Agriculture anything further to report on my question of last week about the supply of molasses?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—I have a report stating:—

Supplies of local molasses in 20 drum lots are available to each of 10 local firms about once a month. These cater for the local demand from feed manufacturers and stock agents. Generally molasses is disposed of all the time and no stocks accumulate. When excessive demands occur as at present, small lots of 50 to 100 drums (44gall.) are imported from Queensland by feed manufacturers for incorporation in such stock foods as "sheep nuts" but not for re-sale.

Transport costs are about £3 a drum from Queensland. Molasses is quoted at about £4 a drum (44gall.) f.o.b. Brisbane. No difficulty has been experienced by South Australian importers in getting 50 drum consignments from Queensland. The imported product is regarded as being considerably superior to the local product which has a much lower specific gravity. The feed value of imported molasses could be up to 50 per cent better than the local product. Demand has been accentuated for spraying pastures with molasses-urea mixtures but this demand is likely to ease.

Summary.—Sufficient stocks of molasses exist to cope with the usual demand. The extra demand is not sufficient to induce agents to import small lots at about double the local price.

When I was in Brisbane recently I spoke to the Queensland Minister of Agriculture who informed me that Queensland would like to sell molasses, which is a by-product of the sugar

industry, but it did not produce larger quantities than it could see sales for. What the industry wanted was a regular annual demand, in which event, he had little doubt, supplies would be available, but rush demands in odd seasons are not attractive to the industry. If any regular supply is required he suggested that interested persons communicate with the Australian Sugar Producers Association, whose secretary is Mr. E. T. S. Pearce, Primary Building, Fleet Street, Brisbane. He thought useful arrangements might result from that.

#### COCKCHAFER BEETLE.

Mr. SHANNON—I have been approached by people in my electorate concerning a cockchafer beetle infestation which is a menace to pasture. Apparently some landowners are spraying to get rid of the beetle but their neighbours are not taking the necessary precautions, apparently assuming that it is a passing infestation, whereas those who are worried believe that the beetle is increasing and the menace becoming greater. This is not a purely local problem as I understand there have been large infestations in the South-East, and possibly a recurrence this year. Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether his department will examine the most appropriate steps to be taken to deal with this menace and if necessary make it compulsory for landowners to treat their pastures on some approved basis? If necessary, the Government could provide the material. Something should be done to counter this menace to pastures in our highly developed rainfall areas.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—I will carefully consider the whole matter. The implications of compulsory spraying are fairly wide and I would rather give the matter full consideration before replying.

#### QUARRY BLASTING AT MURRAY BRIDGE.

Mr. BYWATERS—Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked last week concerning quarry blasting at Murray Bridge?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yes. The Director of Mines reports:—

Following complaints from residents at Murray Bridge investigations were made into the blasting at the quarry across the river in the district council of Mobilong. Tests were made with a Cambridge vibrograph to determine whether the ground vibration from blasting was sufficient to damage houses. At no stage did the measurements made with the instrument indicate a vibration capable of damaging houses. The tests are being continued.

#### WOOLLEN AND SYNTHETIC GARMENTS.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Last week I asked the Minister of Agriculture a question regarding money that would be available for the advancement of wool sales from regulated sales by J.O. Has the Minister anything to add to the reply he gave then?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—Up to the present I have no official knowledge of how that money will be spent. I understand, from press reports, that it will be spent on research only and, if so, I do not know yet whether my department will have any of it to spend. The department's functions in relation to the wool industry are in the field of extensions and, to some extent, research. Wool selling is not one of its functions but comes strictly under the Wool Bureau's duties over which I have no direct control. When I learn whether we shall get any money for research I will inform the honourable member.

#### MOUNT GAMBIER SEWERAGE.

Mr. RALSTON—In last year's Loan Estimates £20,000 was provided to make a survey of the Mount Gambier area with a view to installing sewerage in accordance with the Medical Advisory Committee's report on priorities for country sewerage schemes, which recommended that Mount Gambier should follow immediately after Naracoorte and Port Lincoln. Can the Minister state whether this amount was so expended and, if so, is the report on the survey available?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I cannot say off-hand whether the precise sum of £20,000 provided for the survey has been expended. This sum was provided to enable survey work to be carried on during the year with a view to developing a scheme for Mount Gambier sewerage as soon as it was possible to commence actual construction. The department has been actively concerned in survey work, at least of a preliminary and general nature, to attempt to gather information to enable a decision to be made on such matters as the discharge of effluent, the method of disposal, and the point of discharge. Much work of that nature could be done without its being apparent to the people of the district. I have not discussed the matter in detail with the Engineer for Sewerage in recent weeks, but I will discuss it with him and see whether I can inform the honourable member in general terms about what is being done. I am not sure that a precise report has been furnished.

## STUART MURDER CASE.

Mr. STOTT—My question concerns the controversial Stuart murder case. As the decision of the Privy Council has now been given, I understand the matter is not now *sub judice*.

The SPEAKER—Order! I have to rule that any question on the matter of capital punishment is out of order while the prisoner Stuart is under sentence. While our Standing Orders do not make any specific references to a case like this, we are guided by the House of Commons practice, and to satisfy members on my ruling I shall quote Erskine May, a well-known authority on the procedure and practice of the House of Commons, which under our Standing Order No. 1 we are obliged to follow. May, at page 358, states:—

A question with regard to the exercise of the prerogative of mercy in connection with persons sentenced to capital punishment is not in order. A capital sentence cannot be raised in a question while the sentence is pending.

I point out to the honourable member that while the sentence is pending the matter of capital punishment cannot be raised in this Chamber.

Mr. STOTT—With great respect, Sir, I did not intend to raise the question of capital punishment as such and I suggest that you allow me to proceed with my question and then decide whether it is out of order. As the eminent Privy Council judges have made their decision and stated in rejecting the petition that the matter of new evidence was now one for the Executive authorities, will the Premier state whether the Government is prepared to consider the new evidence?

The SPEAKER—I rule that question out of order because it relates to the prerogative of mercy that can be exercised by Executive Council.

## PIPING FOR ELECTRIC CABLES.

Mr. DUNSTAN—Is the Premier aware that the Master Plumbers' Association of South Australia has taken up with the Electricity Trust the laying of underground electric cables in galvanized water piping and in copper-encased tubing, and that these two materials are entirely similar in appearance to galvanized and copper water piping used by plumbers? The Association has asked the Wiring Rules Sub-Committee to investigate this matter, but so far no decision has been obtained from the trust, and the association has expressed concern because dangerous electric cable is placed underground in such circumstances that a plumber cannot readily distinguish it from something he might presume to be carrying

water. Will the Premier have this matter investigated to see whether adequate differentiation can be made between underground electric cable and piping that normally carries water so that no danger is likely to arise to plumbers in altering water mains?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Some time ago I had occasion to consider this matter, and found that the trust's regulations regarding lines carrying any considerable voltage underground were very complete. They appeared to me to be entirely satisfactory, but in view of the honourable member's question I will have further investigations made to satisfy myself, and I hope the honourable member, that the procedure followed is safe. If I find there is any necessity for alteration I will advise him and the House accordingly. In the case I investigated the procedure followed was most satisfactory, even taking into account that it was a permanent location line; it had to be set out permanently so that nobody could blunder into it by misadventure.

## EXECUTIVE COUNCIL CONSIDERATION OF DEATH SENTENCES.

Mr. BOCKELBERG.—Where appeals in court cases are dismissed by superior courts, can the Premier say whether it is the policy of the Executive Council to permit the law to follow its course if a verdict of "guilty" has already been reached?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The general procedure is that the Executive Council examines all aspects of the crime, and we invariably do so. It would obviously be wrong if some new factor arose not known to the Executive Council at the time it made its decision. A decision might then be made on wrong premises. On the other hand, Executive Council would have to satisfy itself that the new premises were real premises, warranting examination. That is the general answer to the question. I am not prepared to go into detail because I think it would be out of order.

## CLOVER PASTURE.

Mr. JENKINS—My attention has been drawn recently to the failure of clover pasture in my area. The land was some of the first treated with superphosphate for clover-growing and farmers are endeavouring to overcome the deficiency, if there is one, by giving applications of top dressing, but silver grass and other grasses are taking over from the clover. Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether the department would be interested in

analysing the soil in order, if possible, to learn whether there is a deficiency?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—I shall be pleased to get full details from the honourable member and submit them to the departmental experts for comment. I do not know now whether they know the answer, but I will have an examination made.

#### SICK AND AGED PERSONS AT PORT PIRIE.

Mr. McKEE—Has the Premier received any information, following on a question I asked last week, about the care of aged and sick persons at Port Pirie?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I took up the matter with the Chief Secretary and he has reported that investigations are proceeding. I have not got a final report. I will let the honourable member have it as soon as it is available.

#### WATER RATING.

Mr. HAMBOUR—Yesterday I was informed that some people along the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline are paying the same rate as people along the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline. Can the Minister of Works say whether certain consumers along the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline pay a higher rate than consumers of water in and near the metropolitan area?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—Several factors govern this matter. One is the arrangement made with landholders through whose property the main pipeline passes. Some people in that category did not desire a supply of water and the pipeline came through their property, not at their request, but to meet the convenience of the department. Similar cases existed in connection with the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline where it passed through pastoral land and at the time the lessees did not want a supply of water, but later were permitted to have it and be charged by measure. In the absence of a specific case in the honourable member's question I believe that is why some people on the Adelaide-Mannum pipeline may be paying a higher price—a payment by measure. A case came to my notice a week or two ago. If the honourable member has a specific request from a constituent in this matter I shall be pleased to examine it.

#### SUNDAY NIGHT TRANSPORT SERVICES.

Mr. JENNINGS—Has the Minister of Works received a reply to the question I asked last week about the proposed curtailment of transport facilities in my area on Sunday nights?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I have received the following report hereon from the general manager of the Municipal Tramways Trust:—

As from Sunday, August 2, 1959, arrangements have been made to bring back the departure time of last trams and buses from 11 p.m. to approximately 10.30 p.m. on Sunday nights only. Both the trust and its licensed operators (who are also adopting the new time) have very light loadings on Sunday evenings. It is expected if the experience of other cities is indicative that the advent of TV in Adelaide will still further reduce evening patronage, particularly on Sundays. Larger Australian cities conduct restricted all-night services (at considerable loss), but in Brisbane and Hobart the departure time of last vehicles on Sunday night approximates that now planned for Adelaide.

#### ABORIGINES' COTTAGES NEAR WELLINGTON.

Mr. BYWATERS—Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked last week about aborigines' cottages near Tailem Bend and Wellington?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I have discussed this matter with the secretary of the Aborigines Protection Board and the information I have bears out what I suggested in my reply to the first question. The cottages are not suitable for dismantling and re-erection and I doubt whether the district council would be willing to accept that type of cottage adjacent to the town. The board's policy is to provide housing accommodation for aborigines adjacent to towns if they are at a stage of development that justifies that, and where it is felt that the aborigines would utilize satisfactorily the housing provided for them. I suggest to the honourable member that if application were made on behalf of these people for that type of housing it would be considered. Provided the district council was willing to agree and the department was able to provide it, these people would be considered for housing, as is done in many other cases in country towns.

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.  
(Continued from July 28. Page 205.)

Mr. LAUCKE (Barossa)—When I obtained leave to continue my remarks yesterday I was briefly referring to the invaluable service rendered by primary industries and the Department of Agriculture. Increased costs of production are becoming a matter for concern. There are increases in practically everything the primary producer uses. He cannot avoid

using many of these secondary industry products in his business, yet the prices for his products either remain static or are declining. Under these conditions, and as we depend on primary produce to give us overseas credits, the functions of the department assume an importance greater than ever before. I wish to emphasize these functions because they are not merely terms of reference but are discharged most effectively. Those functions are to provide, in the first instance, an advisory service to rural producers; to apply scientific principles and findings to agricultural and livestock practices through the media of research centres; to protect the State, through quarantine, against the ingress and spread of noxious weeds, diseases and pests affecting plants and animals; research, advisory and inspectorial services; to administer legislation in regard to registration of livestock brands; and to administer grants made by the Commonwealth Government to the State for the improvement of primary production.

It is not generally realized, at least away from country areas where the value of the activities of the department are really appreciated and acknowledged, just what an asset the research centres of the department are to primary production and what the State-wide dissemination of the findings of these centres means to farmers in keeping them up to date in their farming techniques. The research and advisory officers of the department, through the medium of the Agricultural Bureau of South Australia, and direct personal contact with farmers, discussing problems peculiar to a given line of production on the spot with the farmer, are meeting a real need in maintaining our rural economy in a condition to meet the competitive demands of overseas markets.

I also commend the department and the Minister who administers it for the unflinching campaign to ensure that the greatest possible scourge of our fruit industry—the Mediterranean and Queensland fruit fly—does not take hold in this State. Last year £302,086 was spent on eradication measures and compensation, and the total cost in this campaign to the end of June last was £1,608,284. That is a lot of money, but it is an essential investment for the future when one considers that an industry of an annual value of £10,000,000 is at stake.

In most of our primary products we note the decreased returns in overseas markets, arising mainly from keen competition in these markets. At present that competition is hav-

ing a depressing effect, particularly in the wheat industry. Wheat is our most important cereal and this is therefore a serious matter. The farmers have for years been exhorted to increase efficiency and to produce more cheaply, and wherever possible the farmers have striven to achieve greater efficiency. It surprises me, then, that when a system of handling wheat more efficiently and more cheaply to the individual is introduced, when it is in accordance with overseas buyer preference, when it is approved by the Minister and Parliament and implemented to the satisfaction of most growers, we should hear the condemnatory remarks of the member for Onkaparinga last week on the operations of South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. I like to give credit where credit is due and I am prepared to criticize where I feel criticism is justified. I note that although this company has not as yet operated for four years, it has erected 25 receival centres, including three main terminals, that 10 flour millers have installed facilities for bulk handling at their mill (giving a total number of 35 receival centres to date), and that the system has spread to every railway division in the State. In the Wallaroo division there are nine storages, including the terminal, with a designed capacity of 5,133,000 bushels.

The last nine years' average deliveries in the division have been 5,284,416 bushels. The member for Onkaparinga is wrong in stating that the provision of storage in the Wallaroo division is in excess of production. Since October 1 last year the Wallaroo installation has had shipped through it a total of 5,925,000 bushels. In the Port Pirie division there are four storages with a capacity of 1,750,000 bushels. In the Port Lincoln division there are five storages, including the Lincoln terminal, with a capacity of 2,500,000 bushels. In the Port Adelaide division there are six C.B.H. storages of a designed capacity of 2,730,000 bushels, and at Thevenard there is one installation with a capacity of 300,000 bushels.

These storages provide for a total of 12,413,000 bushels, and, together with privately constructed mill storages, give a total storage of about 12,880,000 bushels, which is roughly half of the State's average production of wheat over the last nine years. This is not a bad effort in less than four years. With the membership at 15,400 farmers, representing 92 per cent of the State's growers and contributing over £1,000,000 in tolls and charges to date, it seems from these figures that the wheatgrowers' satisfaction with C.B.H. is well

and truly indicated. Time is money equally as much in the language of the farmer as it is to the manufacturer. The speed with which a crop can be taken off and delivered in bulk as against the slow and laborious handling in bags has to be experienced to be fully appreciated. From my brief experience of bulk handling of wheat as a manufacturer, it is indeed a boon. Wheat handling is now a press button job. I recall that at the luncheon following the opening of the Wallaroo terminal the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. O'Halloran) said that man was born to better things than to carry wheat on his back, and I heartily concur for it is mighty hard work. I have had experience of it, and I know how hard it was to lump wheat all day before the advent of elevators.

From the economies point of view some very revealing facts emerge when one compares the comparative costs to the farmer in delivering wheat in bags as against bulk. The cost of bags is a very obvious one. It costs £3 a 100 for the sewing of bags, which is 7.2d. per bag. The cost of a good quality hemp twine to sew the bags is about .8d. Then there is lumping on to and off the lorry, and the time taken in both operations. This makes the 6d. toll of C.B.H. a winner for the farmer. Let us closely examine the differing costs in handling wheat in bulk as compared with wheat in bags. For this consideration I accept the cost of sewing bags at £3 a hundred or 7.2d. a bag or 2.4d. a bushel. Twine is .8d. a bag or .3d. a bushel. The extra cost to the farmer in purchasing bags is, according to my calculations, 8.75d.—a total of 11.4d. in unavoidable costs and charges.

To arrive at the figure of 8.75d. a bushel for bagged wheat I used the ruling cost of bags at the last harvest at pool 22, £40 a bale or 32s. a dozen cash before delivery *ex store* Port Adelaide or for credit sale (that is for bags which would be taken against future wheat deliveries and which would be deducted from Wheat Board payments to the farmer, when he claimed for wheat) £40 12s. 6d. a bale or 32s. 6d. a dozen, which equals 2s. 8½d. a bag. That is about 11d. a bushel. Wheat at 14s. 6d. a bushel is slightly less than 3d. a lb. A jute bag weighs 2½ lb. and when the farmer delivers wheat in bags he is paid for that weight of jute in terms of wheat at 3d. a lb. This returns the farmer 6.75d. for his bag or 2.25d. a bushel. Therefore, being credited with 2.25d. and spending 11d. a bushel for the bag, the farmer is 8.75d. down on the bag transaction.

Offset against that unavoidable cost of 11.4d. total is the fact that the deliverer in bulk receives about 8d. a bushel less than the farmer who delivers in bags. I based this on the average from pool 20 for the 1956-57 season. The final realization to the farmer who delivered in bags was 13s. 1.875d., whereas the farmer who delivered in bulk realized 12s. 6.125d., a difference of about 7.7d. In the 1957-58 season, from pool 21 the final realizations were 13s. 8.16d. and 12s. 11.93d. respectively. Last season from pool 22 the deduction on first payment to the grower was the usual 4d., but one can regard 8d. as the final anticipated deduction from the total realization to the farmer. By taking this from the 11.4d. there is a balance of 3.4d. a bushel in favour of bulk deliveries. That represents a considerable saving to the farmer if a bulk system operates in his area, bearing in mind also the additional labour costs involved in bagging wheat.

Mr. STOTT—What about shipping costs? They result in a saving over bagged wheat.

Mr. LAUCKE—Yes, the quick turn round of ships effects a major saving to the industry that is reflected in the final returns to farmers. South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited is no more than a receiving agent for wheat, the same as any other licensed receiver. It receives wheat of a given standard determined by the board and is personally responsible, and is liable for any losses that may occur if the wheat when opened is not of the required standard. It is the receiver's liability and I cannot imagine any person, firm or authority risking funds by accepting inferior wheat. The board can make a direct claim on a receiver if the wheat does not meet the requirements of the set standard. The system of payment to farmers is a clerical arrangement. The farmer fills in a claim for compensation which is honoured by the Wheat Board when it verifies through the licensed receiver the correctness of the receipts. I cannot see how any licensed receiver would withhold that document for any ulterior purpose. The general acceptance of C.B.H. by the farmers of this State indicates the high esteem in which that authority is held and the trust reposed in it and I doubt whether there would be grounds for claiming that it capriciously withheld payments.

In the last couple of years we have benefited materially through segregating wheat into two types—soft and semi-hard. This has enabled us to supply given overseas markets with their requirements and has assisted our



local millers who use about 6,500,000 bushels of the local crop annually. It has been a major forward step in the interests of the wheat industry. After the first few horizontal type silos were erected by C.B.H. there has been a complete changeover to vertical type silos which has proved the best system. There can be an interchange between cells in moving wheat if need be after a given lie. In view of our climatic conditions this is the best type of silo.

I do not favour price control because it has dangers inherent in it which, if let loose, could play havoc with our commercial structure. In some hands price control can be fair and beneficial—as it is generally in this State—but in other hands it can be malevolent. It is a dangerous weapon that must be handled with the utmost care, particularly as it concerns manufacturing industry where there are factors perhaps unknown and not appreciated by a single authority that could not be expected to have a clear knowledge of requirements for the obsolescence of plant and equipment and for replacing capital assets in the event of a fire or similar occurrence. I appreciate that where supply and demand cannot operate—for example through Government policy in import restrictions—there must be a power to be invoked to preserve justice should it be seen that freedom becomes licence. I believe the meat retail trade has done the cause of decontrol generally the greatest possible disservice in permitting retail prices to diverge unreasonably from current market values of stock. I presume that when meat control was abolished the trade would have given an assurance that it would abide by a reasonable profit margin and that the price of meat would reflect the fluctuation of markets, bearing in mind the varying values of grades of meat. Obviously, under present market values of stock, in many instances retail prices are excessive. This renders no service to the grower as it tends to decrease the consumption of meat. It has a major impact on set incomes, causing hardships in homes, and as a cost of living item has repercussions on the wage level, thus affecting the whole economy. I have no sympathy for those who have abused the trust and if control is reimposed the trade will have only itself to blame.

I am most concerned that in this era of rapid development of the metropolitan area provision is not being made to preserve, while there is yet time, broad acres to ensure to posterity a participation in healthful outdoor sports. One of our greatest prides is the

park lands provided by Colonel Light when he planned Adelaide. Although I admit he did not pay for them and I have a clear appreciation of the cost involved in providing open spaces now, I feel that it will not be any cheaper at any future time to provide them, and I hope we will approach this matter in a more purposeful manner than we have thus far done. In England, where land is at a terrific premium, one of the things that impressed me most forcibly was the areas set aside for parklands and recreational purposes. Here we are flying into development with, I feel, insufficient consideration—and I say this with the utmost respect for those in authority—of the need for providing open spaces for this generation and those that will follow.

I appreciate the subsidies granted to district councils to assist in the purchase of open spaces for recreational purposes, and also appreciate and approve the necessary qualifications of valuation of that land, but I feel that to approach effectively this urgent need for playing fields and recreational areas in districts not developed by the Housing Trust as complete towns (where the Government is making ample provision) in rapidly developing areas such as Teatree Gully, where there is no Housing Trust attention to the general structure of housing, consideration must be given to preserving more land, as was done at West Beach and Elizabeth. Every possible avenue for implementing an effective scheme should be explored. In this I ask that the Government inquire into methods adopted in the Eastern States and in Western Australia to provide the necessary finance with a view to applying them here so as to give us open spaces from moneys raised in a manner similar, perhaps, to that used in other States, which are proceeding to get open spaces for the benefit of the present and future generations.

Mr. Hambour referred to two matters and I heartily endorse his remarks. He said that hospital rates in respect of Wychunga and Pinkerton Wards of the Mudla Wirra District Council should go to the Hamley Bridge Hospital which is the logical hospital for them. They are now subscribing to the Hutchinson Hospital at Gawler, which is many miles away. Wychunga and Pinkerton border on the township of Hamley Bridge, yet none of the rating raised goes to Hamley Bridge. The total assessment of the two wards is £19,670, and £165 is paid to this distant hospital. I warmly support Mr. Hambour—

The ACTING SPEAKER—Order! The honourable member keeps on saying “Mr. Hambour.” He should refer to him as “the honourable member for Light.”

Mr. LAUCKE—Mr. Acting Speaker, I tender my apologies to the House and the member concerned for my incorrectness. I also support the contentions of the member for Light that consideration be given to a greater part of the Broken Hill milk trade to producers in the more northerly area. As the suppliers of milk in the metropolitan area receive the benefits of an expanding metropolitan area that now embraces Elizabeth, I feel that producers of the Lower North, which embraces a number of my constituents and those of the member for Light, should be given better access in greater volume to northern markets, including Broken Hill. A very active organization in my district known as Golden North Dairies, which has a subsidiary or an organization working in conjunction with it called the Barossa Dairymen's Co-operative Society, supplies milk to Port Pirie, Whyalla, Woomera, Port Augusta and other places. Having in mind the increased markets opening to metropolitan suppliers, in the interests of dairymen in the Lower North areas I suggest that these firms be given an increased interest in the Broken Hill trade. This would mean not their pressing forward into the city, but looking to the north for more openings. I have pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. LOVEDAY (Whyalla)—Firstly, I congratulate the Speaker and you, Mr. Acting Speaker, on your respective appointments; I also extend my congratulations to the member for Burnside for her valuable contribution in moving this motion. Her speech was of considerable interest to the House: in fact, seeing that it came from the first woman to sit in this House and that she spoke with such feeling on price control, it was, to borrow the phrase used by the member for Barossa, like a breath of fresh air. I also congratulate the member for Gouger on seconding the motion, and the new members for Port Adelaide, Port Pirie and Albert, all of whom made valuable contributions and got over what is, to new members, a difficult hurdle.

In a recent announcement it was stated that Whyalla, where the new steelworks will be established, will probably have a population of 40,000. When I think how this steelworks has become a matter of fact, I cannot help thinking back over the years of work that have been necessary in this House to bring it to fruition. I have in mind that the matter

of establishing a steelworks at Whyalla was first raised about 30 years ago by Mr. Fitzgerald, the then member for Port Pirie, who put forward the idea of utilizing the enormous, rich deposits in the Middleback Ranges for the benefit of this State. We owe a tremendous debt to a former Director of Mines, Mr. Dickinson, who provided all the detailed and expert information that was used to such good effect, particularly by members on this side in pressing the case for a steelworks. I feel sure that the member for Mitcham will agree with me in this. Very little has been said about the work that had so much to do with securing a South Australian steelworks that will be so important in the further development of this State. We on this side can be very proud of the efforts we have made throughout the years to obtain this particularly valuable adjunct to our economic welfare.

The suggested population of 40,000 will probably result in a fully integrated steelworks, a suggestion that was rather pooh-poohed on occasions by some members opposite, who regarded it as quite beyond the realms of practicability. Nevertheless the experiments conducted for some time by the Broken Hill Proprietary Company regarding the economic use of low-grade ores available in such tremendous quantities in the Middleback Range are, I believe, being brought to a successful conclusion, and there is not the slightest doubt that the long-term prospects of the steel industry in South Australia rest on the economic and successful use of these deposits.

I have been amazed to find that, although Whyalla will be the largest city outside Adelaide if this development proceeds as planned, the planning is not to be submitted to the Town Planner. I believe the reason is that as most of the land to be developed is Crown land it does not have to be referred under the Town Planning Act to the Town Planner. This is amazing in view of the tremendous planning that will be necessary in a place whose population will expand from 10,000 to 40,000. I doubt very much if it was ever intended that the Act should be interpreted this way. In April, 1958, the Whyalla Town Commission made it clear to the departmental authorities associated with the preparation of the plan for the extension of the town that it wished to see a draft plan before any plan became even tentative. From time to time there was correspondence on this subject largely because many applications had been made for industrial and residential sites; and these

applications could not be satisfied also because the local governing body wished to express its views on the question of planning. Unfortunately, it was not until recently that any sort of plan arrived. In May of this year the Whyalla Town Commission made it a special point in the letter to the Lands Department that the draft plan should be available to the commission in order that it could make suggestions before any final plan was decided on. Assurances were given that there would be plenty of opportunity to discuss the draft plan. Unfortunately it did not arrive until a few days ago. The members of the commission were able to get together and discuss it briefly for an hour, but as a body they had no opportunity to meet the representatives of the Lands Department, Housing Trust and Surveyor-General when they arrived at Whyalla to examine the new area. In fact the inspection was not made with the chairman of the commission. This is regretted and although members of the commission had a number of suggestions they thought should be considered for altering the plan they received attention only at a conference that was subsequently held by the departmental heads and the chairman of the commission. Members of the commission concluded that they were being presented with an accomplished fact and not a draft plan. Irrespective of the merits of the plan, this is certainly not in the interests of good planning or an encouragement to people who have taken great interest in local government affairs over many years to continue with that same interest. The local government body has a sound knowledge of local requirements and peculiarities, but if it is treated in this way it feels that its ideas are being wiped off. I hope that some notice will be taken even now of the suggestions made, some of which contain great merit, and are in some ways superior to those adopted by the authorities concerned.

I now draw the attention of the Minister of Works to water rating at Whyalla. One or two aspects need consideration. When the Select Committee took evidence on the question of the establishment of steelworks at Whyalla a witness for the Engineering and Water Supply Department assured the committee that there would be little or no change in the amount that the people would pay under the rating system, but when the matter is examined in the light of the assessments made it seems that there will be in the aggregate a considerable increase in revenue from the town in respect of water used, and a number of

anomalies will arise. In addition, there is every prospect of more water being used because of the new method of water rating. Whether or not that is desirable is open to question.

Regarding anomalies, as usual under a rating system business houses are rated very highly for water they do not use and naturally the extra charges are probably passed on to customers in prices. In addition, there is the case of the widow whose husband built a good house. It is now assessed highly and the widow finds it difficult to meet the rates imposed and cannot use the water covered by the rates. There is the feeling that if one has to pay high rates, despite not having much of a garden, the water must be used. As a consequence, there will be an increased load on the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline. This is a matter of paramount importance in the matter of development and it should be carefully watched to see whether we should not revert to the system of paying for water as it is used; that is have a fixed charge for each thousand gallons, which would be a fairer method of charging for water. The present rating system is based on the premises that if a person has a good house he should be charged more for the water he uses because he can afford to pay more. In many instances that is a false premise.

There is another matter of great urgency in connection with water supplied at Whyalla. On July 1 the Broken Hill Proprietary Company ceased attending to the work of laying on and controlling water in the town. At the time there was a team of men busily engaged in laying on the water to new trust homes being built in the western part of the town at the rate of 300 to 400 a year. Since the company ceased control the Engineering and Water Supply Department has moved in and one man has commenced operation on behalf of the department. We are now close to the end of this month and so far as I know no other man has been busy continuing the work of connecting houses with water. It would be a pity if development were in any way delayed through houses being finished and not connected with water. It is understood that the additional work force are being delayed because no houses are available for them to live in. The foundations are just being poured. The Minister should examine the question because any delay in connecting houses with water must be serious.

I pass now to a problem of considerable difficulty and one with which members of this

House have little opportunity to acquaint themselves personally. I refer to aborigines in my electorate, particularly those at Coober Pedy, Andamooka and the North-West Reserve. The Governor's Speech states that the Aborigines Protection Board intends to continue its policy in developing aborigines to the standard where they can be accepted as part of the general community. If that is so, and I believe the Minister is doing his best in this respect, surely some attention needs to be given to the position of aborigines in the areas mentioned. I will first deal with aborigines in the North-West Reserve in the Musgrave Ranges. Earlier this session I asked the Premier a question about the setting up of an observatory at Mount Woodroffe, and he said the setting up of the observatory would not in any way impair the rights of the aborigines or their freedom, but in fact would probably result in certain advantages to them. He said the Rocket Range authorities were moving across the reserve, that a mining company had been operating there for some years, and that Commonwealth and West Australian officers were exploring the area for mining possibilities.

I cannot agree with the Premier in his supposition. The intrusion of white men into native reserves has always resulted in a breaking down of the native tribal life and usually the destruction of the native culture without adequate replacement by a satisfactory substitute. The conditions laid down by the Aborigines Board are stringent. They are set out in the report of the Board last year. The entrance of persons into the North-West Reserve will bring about considerable changes in the way of life of the aborigine. That is, of course, dependent on the number of people who move into the reserve. Surely none of us has any delusions about this matter. If any profits can be made by the white man in going into the reserve he will not refrain from going in. There is no evidence that he will not go in.

Mr. O'Halloran—All the evidence is to the contrary.

Mr. LOVEDAY—Yes. We should not kid ourselves that the conditions laid down by the Aborigines Protection Board will be sufficient. It is comparatively easy to control the movements and the actions of a few specialists who go in and make preliminary investigations, but when it comes to allowing possibly hundreds or more employees—men of all shades, types and characters from all over the place—to do work that will be profitable I feel that

this sort of supervision can no longer be carried out effectively and must have a tremendous impact on the life of the aborigines there. If members dismiss this as of no consequence, I draw attention to the fact that if these people are to live in a near tribal state and have their mode of culture broken down in the area they can only come down to the state of the people who are now living on the outskirts of the opal fields at Coober Pedy and Andamooka. If the tribal life of these people is interfered with the State will have on its hands a problem far greater than it has today. That is to be expected. There is no doubt that we are not meeting the problem of the natives at Coober Pedy and Andamooka.

I come now to the question of the conditions of the aborigines living at those places. First of all I will deal with the position at Coober Pedy. It is probably the most urgent matter connected with the opal field. I have approached the Minister on the matter and it is receiving consideration but I propose to refer to it now because I want members to be acquainted with the situation, seeing that this is a remote area and one that members cannot visit without great difficulty. At Coober Pedy the water supply consists of a 500,000 gallon underground tank. The water comes off the catchment area which is unfenced, and obviously there is a risk of the water becoming fouled. Dr. Deland of the Department of Public Health is very much concerned with the condition of the water in this underground tank, which at present has an approximate three months' supply on the present rate of consumption. That tank has been down since 1921 and may have been cleaned out once or twice, but it now has much sediment in the bottom.

The people living throughout the opal field in the scattered areas, perhaps eight or as much as 14 miles away from the tank, have to cart water in 40-gallon drums. Considerable wastage occurs owing to the rather primitive mode of pumping and the fact that natives have access and get their water in one-gallon or four-gallon tins in a very unsatisfactory manner. It is not as though the opal field were in any way static. The population of whites and natives has increased considerably over the last two or three years, and there are now 150 to 170 whites and 150 to 200 natives using this one supply. In addition, the tourist traffic through Coober Pedy on its way to Alice Springs and northwards has been increasing rapidly, as evidenced by the greatly increased sales of petrol in the

last few years. "Pioneer" buses now go through, and there will be as many as 29 people staying at Coober Pedy on two nights a week. I mention these points because it shows that the demand for water in this area is growing steadily, and many people will be going through the area and seeing the conditions under which these people live.

The question of dealing with this field adequately and of doing something for the aborigines in this area depends very largely upon improving the water supply. It is basic to the whole question. When speaking on this matter last year, it was the Premier, I think, who remarked that we had to remember that opal fields provide very little return in public moneys. In case members are thinking along those lines, I will deal with that matter later on. Firstly, let us remember that the question of a better water supply is basic to these other questions.

Another matter that needs attention is that of a school. During last session the Minister of Education promised that he would have inquiries made on this matter. I believe some inquiries have been made, but, if anything is to be done, particularly for the aborigines, then a school is essential, because it is with the children that we have the most chance of making progress in the development of the aborigine. At present there are about seven white children of school-going age whose parents are anxious to have a school established, and there would be anything up to 40 native children, none of whom has ever been to school. Their parents want education for their children. The argument has been advanced that it is extremely difficult to get teachers to go to places of this character, and we have an incentive allowance in South Australia for teachers who go to schools in such places. That incentive is the magnificent sum of £39 a year for teachers who may go to places like Wocalla, Kingoonya, Tarcoola or Cook on the East-West line. For a teacher who goes to the Andamooka opal field the payment is £39 a year, but the teacher who goes to Alice Springs receives an incentive allowance of £200 a year from the Commonwealth Government.

Which of these places would any member prefer to go to if he had to go to an outback school as a teacher? I do not think there is any need for me to answer that question. Getting teachers to go to these places is simply a question of offering the right incentive. What is more, if we erected decent accommodation for a married man I

believe there would be married men teachers, probably with wives also capable of teaching, who would be happy to go to these places provided they were given the incentive to do a job that is so badly needed. Let there be no mistake about this question of natives wishing their children to be educated. I have talked to some and there is no question about this matter. It has been said that they go on walk-about from the opal field. True, they move from the field, but if a school were opened there much of that would cease and they would stay there in order to have their children educated.

I draw the attention of the House to a statement recently made by the president of the Coober Pedy Progress Association. He emphasized the need for a school and a new water supply. He also said a police officer was needed on the field. He said these matters were very essential, and he pleaded with the State Government to act instead of passing the buck to a mission. The Aborigines Department has an arrangement whereby a missionary is on the field, but there is no education of the children as a result of that arrangement and consequently it does not fill the bill. His views were supported by a half-caste, leading motor mechanic and leader in the aboriginal community, who pointed out that he had six children at Port Augusta and that (for reasons which it is not necessary to enlarge on here) he had to leave his children there in order to get any education for them. Both sides of the community are concerned about this question of education.

On June 29 and June 30 this year two articles by Ted Smith appeared in the *News*. One was headed "The whites want to keep us down," and the other was headed "£2,000 squandered in a two-day splurge." I do not know whether members read those two articles, but I expect many did. As one who has personally observed the condition there and thoroughly inquired into the matters referred to in these articles, I say that the articles are essentially accurate and do not exaggerate the position. The correspondent said, in relation to the native people at Coober Pedy—

There is an atmosphere of apathy and hopelessness in these humpy camps. The atmosphere you could expect of people lost somewhere between the old way of life behind them and the new alien white one like a mirage ahead.

With regard to water, the correspondent said:

The choice was between washing and drinking. A man could live longer and more comfortably without a wash than without a drink, so nobody washed.

True, nobody washes for those very reasons, but this is not solely a matter of choice. It has been said that these people do not want to wash, but I disagree with that entirely. Too many excuses are put up as to why nothing has been done regarding these problems, excuses which are, in the main, an attempt to push the problem away and also, of course, to provide a reason for nothing being done so that the aborigines can continue to be exploited. In fact, one of the natives interviewed said:—

We've got bad black men and you've got bad white men. But why do the white men always judge all of us by the bad ones?

He went on to say:—

They treat us like children, and they want things to stay that way. If we all became like white men they wouldn't have jobs any longer. The other white men, the sheep station owners and the opal gougers, don't want us to grow up, either. It is better for them this way. They gang together and keep us from the best parts of the fields. The buyers just offer us what they want because we're only black men and haven't got any rights. The station owners get cheap workers.

If any members would like copies of these articles I would be only too happy to supply them, and I hope they will be accepted as essentially accurate because so many people feel that this sort of thing is an exaggeration, but that is not so in this particular case. I noticed when the Vice-President of the Aborigines Advancement League had a look at Coober Pedy recently he said that he was appalled at the shocking conditions there, that the aborigines were extremely primitive, that they had had little or no education in the past, and that their living conditions would most surely be the worst in the world.

The report by the Aborigines Protection Board last year stated that, apart from housing, the board was satisfied that the aborigines in this State were well cared for. I agree that in the last two or three years considerable improvement has been made and considerably more money expended on aborigines than in the past. I admit that it is a most difficult question, but I wish to emphasize the condition of these people because the words in that report are certainly not true regarding the two opal fields, and in fact the conditions there are a blot as far as South Australia is concerned.

Members may recall that last session I asked one or two questions regarding the sale of an opal that was subsequently sent to the United States. I directed questions to the Minister of Works and, during his absence from the Chamber, to the Premier who on

November 12 went to some trouble to explain that the opal that had been valued at £84,000 overseas was not the opal I had referred to. Mr. Sherman, a buyer, visited the Premier and told him that the matrix, the subject of the transaction, was not opal and had been purchased by him for £80 and lent to an American who wanted to exhibit it. The Premier said:—

It will be coming back to Australia, it has very little commercial value, and it was purchased more as a museum specimen than as a commercial transaction. The report that it is worth £84,000 is nonsense: anyone who wishes can buy it very cheaply indeed when it is sent back to Sydney in a few days.

It is interesting to trace what has happened to the piece of opal that was allegedly worth £84,000 but which the Premier claims is worthless. On January 27 it was reported that the opal was on display, was worth £83,034 and had been obtained from aborigines for £1,306. On February 28, Mr. Elliott Glasser—who exhibited the opal in New York—claimed on television to have three pieces of opal in his possession worth two million dollars. This was apparently the same piece of opal. In the *Advertiser* of April 30 a report stated:—

An Australian opal jammed the sidewalks in New York's famous Union Square yesterday. The opal, a 136 lb. piece from the Andamooka Field in South Australia, was sliced twice in a shop window . . . The stone contains a streak of rare black opal, worth about 200 dollars a carat in polished form . . . Mr. Glasser bought three pieces of opal from a dealer in Sydney who paid the aborigines who found them £1,632.

The report mentioned that the Premier had described as "all bunk" the valuation of £84,000. In the *Advertiser* of June 20, under the heading "Andamooka—Striking Changes," the following appeared:—

Ted Egan, 75-year-old "king" of Andamooka's 300-odd acre transient native gougers, complained bitterly today that he and two other natives had been paid only £50 about a year ago for an opal matrix. This matrix which weighed more than 1 cwt. has since been reported to have been sold overseas for a huge sum. Egan said, "When we sold the big matrix the buyer told me and two other full-bloods that he would send us more money if the matrix brought a good price, but we haven't heard from him since and have only received the original £50 which we shared equally among the three of us."

Somebody has not told the truth in relation to this matter and I suggest that the valuation of £84,000 is not "all bunk." After all, the value of an article is what people are prepared to pay for it and there seems to be no doubt in this instance that people were prepared to pay a high price indeed. I mention

this because it reveals the tremendous exploitation of our aborigines. Incidentally, some of the opal buyers have nick-names. One is called "two-bob" because that is his standard offer for opal irrespective of quality. In June Mr. John Warwick, an American, claimed to have a matrix that he hoped would be worth up to £1,500,000. I do not suggest that it would be worth that because one buyer has told me that that valuation is sheer exaggeration and was designed to induce people to go digging on the field so that it would be better for the buyers. If people are attracted to the field through this publicity the Government will be faced with the serious responsibility of trying to provide water for them. The water supplies on both fields are down to the bare minimum, although the situation is certainly better at Andamooka than at Coober Pedy.

If the natives were assisted in securing a reasonable price for their opals people might be astonished at what they could then do for themselves, particularly if they were taught to use their money intelligently. The Aborigines Protection Board has an arrangement with the Mission and has erected a building for the missionary, who is doing some work for the natives. However, I must inform the Minister that the natives have little or no confidence in what is being done for them under this arrangement. If one wishes the co-operation of the natives it is essential to secure their confidence. I will not say more on this matter now, but I may communicate with the Minister later because I am quite certain that this aspect needs investigation.

During the last three years I have advocated the appointment of special officers to assist the aborigines in obtaining fair prices for their opals, education for their children, assistance in buying and selling—and there is great opportunity for co-operatives on both fields—and guidance on the question of cleanliness. When schools are put in these areas provision should be made for showers and change rooms. The question of cleanliness could then be effectively handled as it is in some other places where this problem has been dealt with by other Governments.

To reveal what little confidence some of the natives have in the white man's attitude to them I need only cite the case of a half-caste at Coober Pedy. This man had a white father and a full-blood mother. His mother died when he was three years old and he was brought up by his father. He never went to school but speaks good English and is an intelligent man with a good brain. He is

the leading motor mechanic at Coober Pedy. On one occasion he set out from Coober Pedy for Port Augusta in an "old bomb," but on the way his distributor cap broke. He sat down by the road and fashioned a new one out of wood with a pen knife. How many skilled motor mechanics could do that? Recently he accepted full-blood brotherhood of the tribe and said that he found the attitude of the full-blood native more sympathetic to him as a half-caste than the attitude of the white man. He said, "I belong to nobody. I have to belong to somebody, so I became a full-blood brother of the tribe." That does not say much for our attitude and for what we are doing for the natives in that area.

I have heard it suggested that during the recent influenza outbreak at Coober Pedy the natives did nothing for themselves. I could produce a witness who would categorically deny that. When help first arrived during the epidemic all the natives, except two or three, were so prostrate that they could not possibly help themselves, but when they improved they immediately helped the others. Why are these stories circulated? Is it just to give them a bad name or simply because so many people are interested in keeping them where they are?

It is interesting to refer to the value of opal mined in South Australia. During the year ended December 30, 1957, opals mined at Andamooka were valued at £75,982 and at Coober Pedy at £105,417 — a total of £182,399. For the year ended December 30, 1958, the values were—at Andamooka £85,554; Coober Pedy £103,012 and Mintabie £1,250—a total of £189,816. These figures were supplied from voluntary returns made by 11 of the biggest buyers from the Mines Department list of about 30 buyers. I suggest that there are many more than 30 buyers and I think we can safely say that if 11 buyers admit a value of almost £190,000, the actual value would be at least £400,000.

Mr. Quirke—They did not include the value of the big one?

Mr. LOVEDAY—No. In 1956-57 the value of direct exports of opal from South Australia was £37,629, including £24,618 to the United States. The balance from Melbourne and Sydney went mainly to the United States. In 1957 the value of opals mined in the other States, according to official statistics, was for Queensland £1,050, New South Wales £1,500 and Victoria, nil. The value of opal exports in 1956-57 was, for New South Wales, £188,472;

Victoria, £26,173; Queensland, £65, South Australia £37,629 and Western Australia £218—a grand total of £252,557. I draw attention to the fact that although South Australia is the biggest producer of opal in Australia, and only £182,000 worth of opals was mined in 1957, £252,000 worth was exported.

Mr. Quirke—Would cutting and finishing have much to do with that?

Mr. LOVEDAY—Possibly, but obviously the discrepancy is too great. In 1957-58, the value of opal exported rose to £297,852. People who know something about this trade say that a tremendous amount of opal is simply smuggled out of the country; in other words, there is no accurate record of what is produced or exported. As the State is expected to do something in relation to these places, surely some inquiry is called for, because obviously here is a source of dollars that has not been fully tapped. We have heard about the value of goats exported from Port Lincoln; if that is worth talking about, surely at least £500,000 worth of opals produced in South Australia should be considered. Obviously no record is being kept of this business, but the dollars it would earn if properly controlled should be worked out. I have been told that registration of buyers would necessitate Commonwealth legislation, but if this were done royalties could be imposed. However, if they were imposed, would the fields get any benefit in view of the Premier's attitude on iron ore royalties?

I have gone into this matter, firstly because it is difficult for members to get information, and secondly, because it needs attention. As I have said before, the conditions of the natives on these fields is a blot on our society. Conditions at Andamooka are superior to those at Coober Pedy because Andamooka has a school, and it is apparent that native children who have a school are superior to those who have not. The natives at this field mix freely with the white children attending school—there is no sense of discrimination where children are concerned—and they are quite well dressed. When the hall there was opened I attended the function and saw that the native children were well dressed and well behaved; in fact, the behaviour of all the children who attended was exemplary and far better than one would expect at many gatherings of that type attended only by whites.

It is time we stopped condemning these people for not using their money as we think they should. After all, their culture is one in which they have to share everything; that

is their law of survival, and they could not survive unless they shared all the food they got. We should not expect them to change their habits over night. After all, is the way we handle our money entirely free from criticism? I could point to many white people who handle their money just as foolishly as did the native who got £2,000 for a piece of opal. No doubt much criticism arises because people are anxious that the conditions of natives shall not be improved, as they wish to continue exploiting them. This exploitation is not confined entirely to the sale of opals.

As an example I will cite one instance in which two men had a truck which they wished to sell for £300 and which two full blooded aborigines were prepared to buy. They offered opals for the truck, and the offer was acceptable; they brought along a packet of opals that I was reliably informed was worth at least £500, but the two men selling the truck said that it was not enough and that they wanted another bag like the first before closing the deal. The aborigines brought along another bag of equal value, but unfortunately they still have not got the truck and they are not likely to get it. They have no remedy because, firstly, they do not know how to go about it and have no-one to help them, and secondly, they have firmly in their minds that if they take any action the white men's word would be believed rather than theirs. That is the type of exploitation that goes on, and there is also exploitation regarding the supply of liquor. One man who has spent 20 years in the pastoral industry in this area recently said to me "Of course, many of the pastoralists are opposed to what you are saying and doing because they still want to exploit the natives in my area." I do not say many of them do not treat the natives fairly; many do, but some do not, and it is only by assistance and guidance that the natives will ever get out of the rut they are in. They have little confidence in the arrangements they now have at Coober Pedy.

It was said earlier, in relation to carrying wheat, that "man is born to better things than to carry wheat on his back." As far as I am concerned, "man" means every man, and I believe that man is born to better things than to be deprived of everything that mattered in his culture and to have little or no opportunity of achieving access to, and acceptance in, another way of life. At the end of reports of the Aborigines Protection Board always appears this line: "The cost of aborigines to the South Australian Government for



the 12 months ended ——— is (so many thousand pounds).” It would be appropriate if we had another line under that stating: “and the cost to the aborigines of the South Australians is so much.” I venture to say that cost could not be assessed. We took their land from them without compensation, and only lately have we begun to consider some more intelligent approach to the problem. If we believed in half the things we say about the humanitarian approach, these problems I have mentioned would get the closest attention of the Government and there would be the keenest support for the reforms I have suggested. I support the motion.

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River)—In supporting this motion I firstly congratulate the mover, the member for Burnside. I think we all agree that she did a splendid job, and even we mere males have to admit that she put her case lucidly and plainly and was not afraid to say what she thought. That does not mean that I agree entirely with her subject matter, but on this side we are free to say what we think. I do not support her remarks about price control, and my kindly criticism is that she could have given credit to the Playford Government for the fact that in this State people are buying commodities more cheaply than those in other States, particularly as half the prices quoted by her are not subject to price control and are lower than the prices of similar commodities in other States. It is obvious that we should congratulate the Government. I also congratulate the seconder, the member for Gouger, a young man who, we hope, has many years of service before him. He put his case, which was quite original, logically, and spoke on matters that affect his electorate. I believe Gouger will be well represented by him.

I also congratulate the member for Port Adelaide on his contribution to the debate. He put his case very clearly and we as a Parliament owe him our thanks for delving into the many figures he produced. This must have taken some time, and as a result he brought before us and the public the huge savings the Government is making in handling cargoes at Port Adelaide. I believe the Government is more or less hiding its light under a bushel. We are indebted to the honourable member for making known the huge savings, not only in money but in man hours, brought about by the use of mechanized equipment at Port Adelaide and other ports. These man hours, unprofitably employed before, will now be profitably employed elsewhere in production.

The fact that the price of superphosphate, the cargo he mentioned particularly, has not been reduced to primary producers does not mean a thing; what is important is that the savings made in the transport of phosphate rock have enabled its price not to be raised. Although there has been an increase in freights, in the cost of phosphate rock, and in the basic wage, because of the savings that have been brought about we are still buying superphosphate as cheaply as we did three years ago. I commend the honourable member for giving the House that information.

We have not heard mention of “the member for Albert” for many years, because the previous member for that district was a Minister. I believe the new member for Albert will represent his district very well, and it will be to the advantage of his constituents to have direct representation in Parliament. The last maiden speech made was that of the member for Port Pirie; I congratulate him on the way he spoke, dealing with matters concerning Port Pirie and his electorate. To you, Mr. Speaker and to the member for Unley (Chairman of Committees), I also offer my congratulations.

His Excellency's Speech contained some important subjects. It was pleasing to me, and I think important to the State, that the first seven paragraphs were confined entirely to primary production. We cannot do without primary production. It is the most important production in this State now and it will be for many years to come. Secondary industries are important, but a balance between primary and secondary production is necessary. The State Government has done a good job in this matter. We would not have got through the drought the year before last but for secondary industries; primary producers should realize that fact and also that their best markets are the home markets, and in this connection secondary industries will help them to a great extent. The only way to increase our population is to have more secondary industries. Both forms of production play an important part in the economy of the State.

Earlier I intended to confine my remarks in this debate to matters affecting my district, but since then an attack has been made on one of Australia's major industries, on a member, and on people outside who have no opportunity to defend themselves. Mr. Shannon attacked Mr. Stott and South Australian Bulk Handling Co-operative Limited. He wilfully tried to degrade the good name of our wheat industry.

I will not say much about the attack on Mr. Stott for he can defend himself, but I want to speak on behalf of people who are not in this place to defend themselves. Mr. Stott has nothing to do with the bulk handling company. He is not a director or secretary of it. He is secretary of the Wheat and Wool Growers Association and he has nothing to do with the control of the bulk handling company.

Mr. Shannon—On whose authority do you say that? Mr. Stott will say there is some connection.

Mr. HEASLIP—I do not say that there is no connection. I said that Mr. Stott has nothing to do with the control of the bulk handling company, and that he is not a director or the secretary. He is a liaison officer between the company and the Wheat and Wool Growers Association. Both organizations are primary producer organizations. That is the only connection Mr. Stott has with the bulk handling company. He has nothing to do with the selling of Australian wheat. Only one authority sells wheat in Australia—the Australian Wheat Board. The bulk handling company does not sell wheat. It is a licensed receiver and an agent of the Australian Wheat Board. It is paid to receive wheat for the board. I say this because I do not think everybody knows the set-up of the various organizations. The wilful attack—in fact, an attack containing untrue statements—and the bad publicity that has been given to our export wheat are the most important matters I want to discuss. Primary and secondary industries are concerned.

Mr. Lawn—Would not the inquiry sought by Mr. Shannon reveal that?

Mr. HEASLIP—If an inquiry is wanted one can be held. I should think that the board, the bulk handling company and all connected with the industry would be willing to have an inquiry. If accusations have to be made there are ways of making them. They should not be made in this place under Parliamentary privilege. Aspersions should not be cast here on people outside.

Mr. Shannon—How does one get an inquiry without disclosing the facts?

Mr. HEASLIP—I am giving the facts. This untrue criticism of our export wheat industry is a serious matter.

Mr. Lawn—Do you suggest that Mr. Shannon is a liar?

Mr. HEASLIP—He was definitely wrong in his statements. The bulk handling company in conjunction with and at the request of the

Australian Wheat Board introduced wheat separation in the 1957-58 season in this State and at present South Australia is the only State that segregates semi-hard wheat from soft wheat. Mr. Laucke dealt briefly with this separation from the manufacturing angle and said that millers appreciated the segregation made by the bulk handling company. There is no doubt that the millers and other purchasers of wheat appreciated it, and this was the first bulk handling company in Australia to segregate wheat. That was possible under the conventional orthodox type of silo. Mr. Shannon condemned the orthodox system, which is the vertical type of concrete silo that can be seen at many country sidings. The unorthodox system is the horizontal type made of wood and iron, which was first introduced in Western Australia. Mr. Shannon condemned the bulk handling company for introducing the orthodox system, but it was done at the same price as the unorthodox system would have cost, and it has made possible the segregation of semi-hard wheat from soft wheat. It has also made possible the turning of wheat in silos when necessary.

Mr. Shannon—Has wheat been turned?

Mr. HEASLIP—It has been turned in every instance where necessary.

Mr. Shannon—Is it being turned today at Balaklava?

Mr. HEASLIP—I am a wheatgrower and I represent a wheatgrowing area. I have carted wheat this year to the Gladstone bulk handling facility and I know something of the position.

Mr. Shannon—Is wheat being turned today at Balaklava?

Mr. HEASLIP—I am not representing the bulk handling company or the Australian Wheat Board. Mr. Shannon insinuates that we have bad wheat at Balaklava. We do not turn wheat unless it is going bad, and Mr. Shannon insinuates that at Balaklava we have bad wheat. I am informed that the Assistant General Manager of the Australian Wheat Board, Mr. L. H. Dorman, confirmed by telephone on July 23 that of all shipments of bulk wheat from terminals in this State since October last year (when Wallaroo became operative), the Wheat Board has received out-turn advices, including every vessel loaded during the period except the *Araluen*, which loaded at Port Lincoln towards the end of June, and that the quality of all cargoes was "good" to generally "very good," and that on the United Kingdom shipments no arbitration allowance was given

for any reason whatsoever. In other words, the people overseas are buying our wheat and there have been no complaints about the quality and no claims made in respect of it. Mr. Dorman also said that the *Karawoa*, which loaded at Port Lincoln immediately prior to the *Araluen* with wheat from almost the same cells, had been out-turned in New Zealand with a satisfactory report as to quality and condition. I think these were the two cargoes Mr. Shannon condemned.

Mr. Shannon—One would have thought that an inquiry would have been sought by these innocent people in order to clear themselves.

Mr. HEASLIP—They have not asked for one.

Mr. Shannon—Why don't they seek one?

Mr. HEASLIP—Because they are satisfied.

Mr. Shannon—They are satisfied?

Mr. HEASLIP—The New Zealand trade is important to South Australia. Every shipment to that country has gone with a Government certificate as to f.a.q. quality. If Mr. Shannon says that we have sent bad wheat to New Zealand he involves not only the bulk handling company and the Wheat Board, but also this State Government. A Government inspector has inspected every vessel that has taken wheat to New Zealand. The bulk handling company has never adopted the policy of encouraging growers to deliver wheat of inferior quality, and emphasis has been placed on the administrative instructions to inspectors, terminal officers and agents that on no account is wheat containing an excess of foreign matter or wheat of a quality below the current seasonal standard to be received in bulk. I believe the inspectors have carried out the instructions. The fact that the wheat has turned out all right proves that they must have done so. My information says that over 200,000 bushels of bagged wheat was delivered by growers to Port Lincoln last harvest. The C.B.H. terminal officer was of the opinion that much of this wheat contained a higher degree of moisture content than was safe for storage in the Port Lincoln terminal. Again, the member for Onkaparinga criticized and charged Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. with being after sixpences; but it refused 200,000 sixpences in this case because the moisture content of that wheat was too high to put into the silo, yet he condemns it. That wheat was opened up and never put into the terminal receiving bin because of the danger of weevil, which high moisture content will certainly bring about.

Mr. Stott—They did not pay any toll on that.

Mr. HEASLIP—It depends on what is meant by "tolls." The member pays 6d. if he puts wheat into the bulk bin. Every member appreciates that and wants it. Others who are members have agreed to 2d. a bushel on all bagged wheat they supply; although they are getting no benefit out of it they are willing to do that and want to do it. The bulk handling company was not after sixpences. Local deliveries last year were just over 500,000 bushels in bulk, and as the capacity is 1,250,000 bushels it will be readily appreciated that there was ample room to accommodate bagged wheat in the bulk storage in the event of its being of the required standard. Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. has exercised great care with the receipt of wheat for bulk storage, and has introduced for the first time in South Australia a system of checking every load of wheat delivered by the farmers. It uses a Marconi type T.F.933A moisture meter at every siding where there is a terminal, and every sample of wheat is subject to a test by this machine, which I think costs between £150 and £200. If the moisture content is found to be over a certain amount the farmer is turned away, and the wheat does not go into silos. In addition, a sample is taken, and if the wheat does not sieve through because of foreign matter in excess of what the regulations lay down, that wheat will not be received by the bulk handling authorities. When a truck goes up to the test—and every truck is tested—a long probe is shoved from the top to the bottom of the bin; holes are opened all the way down, and wheat runs in from the top to the bottom. That is the sample that is tested; it is not just from the top or the bottom or any other particular place. If the bulk handling operatives have any suspicion they will jab it in two or three times, in the back or the front or anywhere else. All precautions are taken.

In order to try to clear the good name of our South Australian wheat I will quote from a letter signed by the manager of the South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. (Mr. Sanders). I recall that when we gave the charter to Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. to handle wheat there was much speculation about who the manager would be, and when Mr. Sanders was appointed I heard no-one cast any aspersions on him, his ability, honesty, or capability of managing the company. Everyone gave him credit and regarded him as a

very desirable person to carry out the job. Even if some people doubt my word I think perhaps they will take notice of this person who is respected by everybody. The letter I received from him, dated July 24, 1959, is as follows:—

In response to your inquiry of even date, I have much pleasure in advising that since the commencement of bulk ship loading operations at Wallaroo on October 3 last year this company has shipped 46 cargoes of bulk wheat from our terminals of Wallaroo, Ardrossan, Port Lincoln, comprising 224,627 tons, the equivalent of 8,386,095 bushels, and that all of the wheat, in my opinion, has been shipped in good order and condition. This is confirmed by a telephone advice from the Assistant General Manager of the Australian Wheat Board head office in Melbourne, Mr. L. H. Dorman, this morning, when it was stated that an examination of reports for all vessels out turned to date was to the effect that the quality and condition of the wheat was "good" to generally "very good." You particularly inquired about the out turn of the first overseas vessel loaded at Port Lincoln—the *Karawoa*, and I am pleased to advise that Mr. Dorman has stated today that New Zealand was very pleased with this particular cargo and that the *Karawoa* is scheduled to load at Port Lincoln again next week.

I think that is sufficient proof that our South Australian wheat is still of the high standard that it has been in the past. I feel that great harm has already been done by the malicious remarks of the member for Onkaparinga. Those remarks have had widespread publicity, and I would say that his statement is now overseas and in the hands of the people that buy wheat from us. I hope that the information I have now produced will receive the same publicity.

Mr. Shannon—You would welcome an inquiry to prove that what you are saying is correct?

Mr. HEASLIP—Yes.

Mr. Shannon—You will ask for one?

Mr. Stott—It will be a sorry day for you, mate.

Mr. Shannon—I know someone who would be sorry.

The SPEAKER—Order!

Mr. HEASLIP—The attack went on to say that the Wallaroo installations were redundant.

Mr. Lawn—You said it was malicious.

The SPEAKER—Order! The member for Rocky River.

Mr. HEASLIP—The attack was directed entirely at this company, which is owned by the farmers, run by the farmers, and accepted by the farmers. The placing of bins in the Wallaroo area was attacked, and after refer-

ring to the redundancy of those bins the member for Onkaparinga went on to say:—

I point out to my friend who controls the Bulk Handling Ltd. . . .

I am entirely at a loss to know what that means, because quite frankly no one man controls the company or could ever hope to control it. That company is run by nine directors, two of whom are highly regarded Government officers appointed by the Government. There are seven others and the manager (Mr. Sanders), and it is these people that are responsible for running the company. Members will recall that it took us seven years to obtain a report from the Public Works Committee on bulk handling. I know of members other than myself, including the member for Ridley, who did everything possible to obtain a report on bulk handling, but for some reason it was seven years before we received it.

Mr. Shannon—How long after the present chairman was appointed did you get the report?

Mr. HEASLIP—Just what it meant to the farmer in extra costs in the intervening period and just what the farmer had to put up with under the old method of bag handling is nobody's business. It was terrific, and it was quite wrong that he should have had to put up with it. It is now five years since this company was granted the charter. I thought that everyone was happy with the position now, but evidently that is not so. I thought that this show was going along quite well and that we could forget about all that happened four or five years ago because it was gone and forgotten, but now, for some unknown reason, it has been brought forward.

Mr. Dunnage—Has the company ever had any other complaints?

Mr. HEASLIP—There has not been a complaint regarding the quality of wheat it has exported.

Mr. Shannon—Has it ever had a complaint as to the non-compliance with the direction to place silos at certain sites?

Mr. HEASLIP—I do not know.

Mr. Shannon—It has.

Mr. HEASLIP—I know that of all the farmers in South Australia 92 per cent are members, so there are not many complaining.

Mr. Shannon—It is the members of the Bulk Handling Co-operative who are complaining that facilities have not been provided at sites where they thought they were going to get them.

Mr. HEASLIP—The member for Onkaparinga went on to say that these silos in the Wallaroo division are surplus and that the time would come when all the wheat produced in that division would be required to feed the population of South Australia. I point out that the yearly production of wheat in South Australia over the last nine years has been about 28,000,000 bushels. Our population of 900,000 consumes 6,500,000 bushels, which works out at about seven bushels per head of population. In 1942 we produced nearly twice as much as we are producing today, and we could do it again if we wished to. Assuming that we do not increase our production of wheat in the future, and working on the population increase in the last 40 years, in which time the population has doubled, we shall be able to feed 4,000,000 people in South Australia before we run out of wheat. In other words, it would take 320 years before exports would cease.

The member for Onkaparinga interjected a moment ago about 30,000 bushel silos. He also suggested that the Co-operative Bulk Handling Company had broken faith with this Parliament and with the farmers. He implied that it had not established receival bins for wheat wherever there were 30,000 bushel sidings. This company has been operating for only four years. Is it physically possible for it to provide sufficient bins to cover all the area in four years? He said that the company started in Wallaroo and is not working there any longer. Does the honourable member realize that members of this company come from all over the State?

Mr. Shannon—I am interested to know whether the company proposes to erect any more receival points in Wallaroo.

Mr. HEASLIP—I am replying to the honourable member's suggestion that the company had broken faith with the farmers and with the Parliament. Does he expect the company to say to some of its shareholders, "You can have everything you like and we will not supply our other shareholders with anything?" The company is spreading its activities all over the State to as many of its members as possible. In the last four years it has received bulk wheat and is now receiving half of the wheat grown in South Australia. Its membership is 15,400 or 92 per cent of the total number of growers. The honourable member blames it for breaking faith with the wheatgrowers.

Mr. Hambour—Doesn't it have an annual meeting?

Mr. HEASLIP—Every year.

Mr. Hambour—Can't the wheatgrowers air their grievances at those meetings?

Mr. HEASLIP—I have not heard any grievances. The honourable member made these insinuations and I have the right to reply to them.

Mr. Hambour—Do you think there should be an inquiry?

Mr. HEASLIP—The company is not afraid of even a full-scale inquiry because it has nothing to hide. I think Mr. Shannon's insinuations should be answered.

Mr. Shannon—A categorical denial is not a satisfactory answer.

Mr. HEASLIP—I can't help that. The honourable member said he could not obtain a balance-sheet and had to go to the Registrar of Companies to secure extracts from the reports that are necessarily tabled by the company with the Registrar. If the honourable member had approached either the Minister of Agriculture or the Attorney-General or gone to the head office of the company the balance-sheet would have been available to him. It was also printed in various country newspapers. All shareholders were supplied with copies. The honourable member complains because he had to pay two shillings to the Registrar of Companies for a copy of the balance-sheet. By interjection, I told him that if he had been a member of the company he would have got a copy of the balance-sheet, but he said:—

If it were private and confidential that is the only way I could have got one. I suggest it may have been private and confidential, and, having a look at some of the activities of this company, that might have been an instruction. That was absolutely despicable.

Mr. Quirke—Isn't a balance-sheet issued to every member of the company?

Mr. HEASLIP—Yes. Copies were issued to two Ministers of this Parliament and at least 200 were available at the head office.

Mr. Shannon—That is a little different from what I was told.

Mr. HEASLIP—The honourable member should make certain of his facts and not listen to what he is told.

Mr. Shannon—I am not going to argue about it. I only said what I was told.

Mr. Stott—You couldn't tell the truth if you tried.

Mr. SHANNON—On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I do not think the honourable member has the right to interject that I could not tell the truth if I tried.

The SPEAKER—I think the honourable member's language was a little intemperate and I am sure he did not mean that aspersion. Will he withdraw?

Mr. STOTT—In deference to you, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the remark.

Mr. HEASLIP—The member for Onkaparinga, after examining the balance-sheet, said he looked to see how the unfortunate farmers were going to be paid out and by interjection I asked him whether he was really worried about the farmers. He replied, "Yes, and I am going to give them some advice on finance." Farmers do not want advice from him. Over the years they have produced wheat at a lower cost than any other farmers in the world, and they are still doing it. They are capable of running their own affairs and managing their own businesses. They don't want advice from the honourable member and I am speaking on their behalf. When he referred to the repayment of tolls I stated, by interjection, that the Government guaranteed it. He said, "I do not think the Government had any finger in the pie. It was glad to wipe its hands of what looked like an unsavoury situation." That was a nasty insinuation. I might mention that so far as tolls are concerned this type of finance, which he claims cannot work, has worked for 30 years in Western Australia.

Mr. Quirke—It has worked longer than that in the wine industry.

Mr. HEASLIP—Yes. It is not new.

Mr. Shannon—I think the honourable member will recollect that I said that when they paid their 13th year's sixpence they would get their first year's sixpence back.

Mr. HEASLIP—That is not quite correct. If the honourable member went to the trouble of reading the company's Articles of Association—

Mr. Shannon—Is it anticipated that tolls will cease in the 12th year?

Mr. HEASLIP—The Articles do not say that, nor that the full contribution of the first year's toll will be repaid in the 13th year. The Articles state that one-twelfth of the first year's tolls will be repaid.

Mr. Shannon—On that basis it will be a long time before they get their tolls back.

Mr. HEASLIP—The farmers are quite happy about that. What is more, they were even prepared to give their money to get bulk handling. They are quite happy with the system of finance. On the question of toll repayments, Mr. Quirke having interjected "Does the total amount of

the tolls have to be paid in 12 years?", Mr. Shannon replied, "No, only the first year's toll."

As I have just pointed out, that is not quite correct. It is one-twelfth of the first year's toll, and in the first 13 years members will be progressively paid. The company hopes to repay the tolls even more quickly. There has been no suggestion that in 12 years the tolls will cease. It is not fair that a farmer should come in after the company has been operating for 12 years and get the service for nothing, for he should contribute. The company is required to ascertain the total amount standing to the credit of a member on the toll register and issue to him a certificate stating the amount thus due, and such amount shall be repaid by the company to the member in 12 equal annual instalments, the first instalment being payable on the date 12 months after the expiration of the said 12 years.

Up to the present £1,000,000 has been raised by toll. Mr. Shannon said that it could be assumed that it would amount to £240,000 each year. Actually, the company has only half the bin accommodation completed and has received the 6d. toll on half the total quantity of wheat. At the end of 12 years it will be receiving double the present total. Last year, instead of receiving £240,000 the company received more than £400,000 in tolls, and the amount will grow as time goes on. A total of 97½ per cent of the bulk wheat has been delivered by members and the balance by non-members. An examination would show that the non-members are mainly old farmers who do not expect to carry on for any length of time and therefore would rather pay for service and forget all about their payments rather than wait for 12 years for the repayment of the toll by becoming members.

I believe that Mr. Shannon has been only assuming in making his comments about the company. I have been a member of it since its inception and paid tolls since its inception, although I was able to deliver bulk wheat only last year. That also applies to thousands of others. If they had adopted the method suggested by Mr. Shannon to finance the scheme, there would be no bulk handling today, and the scheme would not be owned by the farmers themselves. They could not have found the necessary finance without the contributing tolls, which are so essential to enable silos to be built.

Mr. Shannon—What about the Government guarantee?

Mr. HEASLIP—It did make a guarantee. What is more, when a dry season was experienced the year before last the company did not get the quantity of wheat in the bins expected. The bulk handling authorities approached the Commonwealth Bank for £132,000 to enable it to carry on its plan and it did not hesitate to advance the extra money. The bank, as well as farmers and the Government have faith in the scheme. The company has stock-piled a quantity of wheat for the Thevenard terminal with the expectation that in the event of the Harbors Board building a conveyor loading system for this port by the end of next year the company may be able to provide terminal storage facilities for 750,000 bushels in 1961. As a result of approaches by the company to the State Government, advice has been received from the Minister of Agriculture that the Public Works Committee has been requested to inquire into and report upon the establishment at Port Pirie of port facilities capable of handling grain produced in the division. As honourable members know, Mr. Shannon is chairman of that committee. At Thevenard, the South Australian Farmers' Union is the receiving agent for the area and is also the licensed receiver for Port Pirie. Naturally, as the Co-operative Bulk Handling Company builds its silos, the Farmers' Union will lose its agencies. That is what bulk handling is here for. It is significant that Mr. Shannon is also a member of the South Australian Farmers' Union, the licensed receiver at both Port Pirie and Thevenard. Naturally that company does not appreciate the increased activities and progress of the South Australia Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd., because it is constructing silos at Booleroo Centre, Bordertown, Lameroo,

Lock and Poochera this year, and naturally will become the licensed receiver in every one of those centres where the Farmers' Union has been the receiver. If the co-operative is able to complete its 1960 building programme, the Farmers' Union will cease to operate at Pinnaroo, Ungarra, Meribah and Wudinna.

Mr. Shannon—Is the honourable member suggesting that this company has had any special benefit?

Mr. HEASLIP—No; I am only assuming this, but I know that last year the Farmers' Union was easily the biggest licensed receiver of bagged wheat, receiving more wheat than all the other merchants.

Mr. Shannon—The honourable member mentioned Thevenard. Was there any delay in the inquiry relating to Thevenard?

Mr. HEASLIP—No.

Mr. Shannon—I thought that was the inference.

Mr. HEASLIP—Definitely not. As soon as it is completed, South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. will become the licensed receivers in place of the Farmers' Union.

Mr. Shannon My committee has approved the Thevenard installation, but it has not heard from the Harbors Board with regard to Port Pirie.

Mr. HEASLIP—I am not disputing that.

Mr. Shannon—As long as my committee is not charged with any delay.

Mr. HEASLIP—I am not suggesting that. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.24 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, July 30, at 2 p.m.