

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, August 4, 1959.

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

QUESTIONS.**STUART MURDER CASE.**

Mr. O'HALLORAN—My question relates to the terms of reference of a Royal Commission recently appointed. Last Thursday the Premier, in the House, undertook to appoint a Royal Commission to go into all aspects of the case of Rupert Max Stuart. I am advised by senior counsel that neither the terms of reference subsequently announced nor the Premier's further statement yesterday carry out that undertaking. Can the Premier say whether the Government will forthwith widen the terms of reference to include all matters relevant to the guilt or innocence of Rupert Max Stuart?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I want to make it quite clear that I gave no undertaking to the House last week. I said that there was no need to move a motion to consider the matter in this House as the Government had already taken action to suspend sentence for one month and to go into the fullest possible implications of the question that had arisen. Subsequently I saw in the press that one member of the Opposition had stated that we had induced the Opposition to withdraw its motion. There was no inducement of the Opposition to withdraw its motion.

Mr. Dunstan—What nonsense!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Leader of the Opposition advised me only two or three minutes before the House met that he proposed to take action. I then stated that I believed a debate on the matter would be highly improper at that stage and that I would oppose it, which I subsequently did. The Leader, after the statement I made in opposing his move, withdrew the matter from discussion by the House.

Mr. O'Halloran—After you said that all aspects of the case would be considered.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I come now to the Leader's question. The Government is most anxious that every matter relevant to the guilt of Mr. Stuart, or some other person, should be thoroughly investigated. Members can accept the Government's assurance—which I give—that it has always tried to administer the laws of the land in a proper

manner, but it is not going to be stampeded into taking some improper action. I instructed the Assistant Crown Solicitor last Thursday morning, after Cabinet had considered this matter, to draw up terms of reference to cover all the matters at issue in the case. He drew up the terms of reference, submitted them to me, and assured me that they covered all those matters. I subsequently asked the Chief Justice whether they did cover all the matters at issue and he gave me the assurance, which I have since conveyed to Miss Devaney in a letter, that the Commission was empowered to consider all matters it felt to be relevant. He stated further that the terms were very much wider than could possibly have been granted for reconsideration by the Full Court. I informed Sir Mellis Napier, who is chairman of the Commission, that at any time he considered any additional terms necessary I would immediately place them before Executive Council. I assure the Leader of the Opposition that the Government will see that every matter connected with this case is sifted to the ground.

Mr. Clark—That is an undertaking?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—That is an undertaking. I personally believe that some objections raised to the terms of reference are not that they are too narrow, but some of the terms, in my belief, are too wide, and that is causing some anxiety, I believe, in certain quarters.

Mr. O'Halloran—That is not the case with the Opposition.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I do not for one moment suggest that it is. There are laws governing this matter. Mr. Dunstan raised two questions that he considered should be in the terms of reference. If my memory serves me right one was, why was the Protector of Aborigines not present at the time of the questioning?

Mr. Dunstan—I did not say that.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—That was reported, but if the honourable member did not say that, I take it back. Another question attributed to the honourable member was whether the confession should be examined. The Chief Justice categorically informed me that the terms of reference would enable him, if he considered it desirable, to deal with the confession. I do not know the senior counsel from whom the honourable member obtained the opinion he mentioned, but the Government has commissioned Mr. J. F. Brazel, Q.C., who is completely

outside the Crown Law Office, and has appointed as his junior another solicitor, Mr. Legoe, who also is outside the Crown Law Office. The Government has also appointed the three judges available at present to undertake the investigation.

Mr. Stott—What instructions have been given to Mr. Brazel and Mr. Legoe?

The Hon Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—To assist the Commission. I presume that Mr. Brazel will take his instructions from the chairman of the Commission. He will get no instructions from the Government. The Government, as in every other case where severe penalties are involved, has no other desire than to see that the law is carried out properly and adequately.

I could go on, but think it would be improper to do so. I think honourable members opposite realize it would be highly improper to discuss the relative merits of the case. I have not discussed them, but I have seen many statements in the press that are completely false and misleading. I have not discussed the case because I felt that the issues at stake are whether the courts are to be allowed to carry out, by proper procedure, the functions of the courts. The matter is only referred to a Royal Commission when in point of fact there has been additional evidence which it is claimed would give a complete alibi to the accused person. If that alibi is available, the prisoner should not have his sentence commuted to life imprisonment, as the petitioners ask, but should be given complete freedom. If the Commission is satisfied with the alibi no subsequent trial will be necessary but if it does not stand the test we shall know the reason when the Commission has thoroughly investigated the matter.

I do not think we should discuss the eventualities that could occur, but I shall be willing to discuss them at a later stage. I, as acting Attorney-General, have told the chairman of the Commission that if he wants any alteration in the terms of reference, any extension of them or any other matter, the Government will make it freely available. That is all the assurance I can give the House. If Sir Mellis Napier asks for the terms of reference to be altered—I was nearly going to say, “If the solicitor who is trying to advance the case for Stuart could put up a case for them to be altered”—the Government would consider the request; but merely saying that they are not wide enough is not putting up a case for their alteration. I would say the

terms of reference cover the movements of the accused on the day and the reasons why this information has not been available before, which obviously brings in the confession. If the police have sat on a confession and have not looked for information, that would immediately become obvious under the terms of reference. The terms also include the alibi claimed to have been established and, further, the method by which this further evidence has been obtained. If the Commission finds itself in any way hamstrung in conducting a full and complete investigation, all it need do is ask and the terms of reference will be amended accordingly.

I want to make it quite clear that this is not intended to be a retrial of Stuart: I do not believe a Royal Commission should retry a man. If an alibi is established by the investigation I, as acting Attorney-General, will deal with it accordingly. If an alibi is not established the matter will be examined in all its aspects. An application for a retrial was made by Miss Devaney who was told that it would be deferred pending the decision of the Royal Commission. After the decision is given it will be considered and, if necessary, I will discuss it with Miss Devaney or Mr. O’Sullivan.

Mr. Riches—Are the terms wide enough to include the removal of any stigma that may rest on the police?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I think and hope so.

Mr. Lawn—Then why not widen it and include all terms?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Once we bring in the question of why this information was not brought forward before, we immediately include every question relating to the police, which enables the police to give a complete reply and it has to report on that particular matter. I say definitely that it covers that matter. I do not want in any way to decry the work Mr. O’Sullivan has done in trying to defend the case entrusted to him, but on a number of occasions we have gone out of our way to do a certain amount of work in connection with the appeals that have been made because we have realized the tremendous strain placed on a relatively small office by the bulk of work involved in the trial. Far from trying to stop the case being considered, the Government has given every assistance.

Mr. STOTT—Mr. Speaker, last week when I asked a question regarding the Stuart case

you ruled it out of order on the ground of precedent mentioned by Erskine May. Subsequently I asked another question to clarify the matter of raising in the House a matter which had been discussed in the press, and again you ruled it out of order. This afternoon we had a discussion on the matter without any contravention of the Standing Orders. Where are we going in this matter? Why was I out of order in asking my questions, and is the Leader of the Opposition in order in asking his?

The SPEAKER—The honourable member was out of order in asking the question last week and I gave a certain ruling. If there was objection to that ruling the objection should have been taken then. The question by the Leader of the Opposition today was directed to the widening of the terms of reference in connection with a certain matter and I allowed it.

Mr. Stott—It is still the same case.

The SPEAKER—The Leader's question was directed to the widening of certain terms of reference, and I did not object to it. In any further questions regarding this matter the merits cannot be debated or embodied in a question.

Mr. DUNSTAN—In the letter the Premier sent to Miss Devaney he said that if the Chief Justice should find that, through something unforeseen, the terms of reference should be widened, he could make representations to the Government and the Government would then widen the terms of reference. Arising out of his reply today, I ask the Premier, should counsel for Stuart seek to raise any matter before the Commission concerned with the matter, language, or the obtaining of the confession of Stuart, and it is found by the Commission that its terms of reference do not extend so far, will the Government extend the terms of reference accordingly?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I am not quite sure what is covered by the question and I do not desire to answer it when I am not sure of its content. If Miss Devaney or Mr. O'Sullivan finds there is some matter they desire to place before the Commission that is relevant to the innocence of Stuart, undoubtedly I shall receive an application for an extension of the terms to enable counsel to put such a matter before the Commission. I do not know whether that covers the point raised by the honourable member. I suggest that he put the question on notice and then I will give him a reply tomorrow.

ZONING OF LEAVING HONOURS STUDENTS.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—My question relates to the establishment of new Leaving Honours classes at certain metropolitan high schools. A recent edition of the *News* contained the following report:—

Leaving Honours classes for 80 students would be established at Enfield High School at the beginning of next year, the Education Minister, Mr. Pattinson, said today.

The report goes on to tell of plans for zoning students, and concludes:—

For example, Leaving students now attending Brighton or Marion high schools would be required to enrol at Brighton High School.

Has the Minister of Education considered the possibility of students who now attend the Marion High School from local residential areas and from places as far afield as Port Noarlunga and Christies Beach and who have no direct transport to Brighton High School being given the opportunity of attending a central place such as the Adelaide Boys High School or Adelaide Girls High School with a view to completing their Leaving Honours rather than forcing them to attend the school to which they have been zoned?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I should be pleased to reconsider the matter as requested by the honourable member or to reconsider any proposal on this or any other educational matter, but the hard core of the problem is that we are short of highly qualified specialist teachers. In order to establish a Leaving Honours class, it is considered that at least six of such teachers are required. As much as I should like to establish a Leaving Honours class at Marion, for example, I am advised that the teachers are not available. It is necessary to spread the Leaving Honours scholars amongst the high schools where those classes and the teachers are available.

It may be overloading the Adelaide Boys and Adelaide Girls High Schools to comply with the honourable member's request, but they certainly cannot go to Marion because there will not be a Leaving Honours class there next year. I understand that by "a central place" the honourable member means Adelaide?

Mr. Frank Walsh—I mean Adelaide or any school for which public transport can be provided.

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I will have the matter reconsidered to see how many scholars are available, but all sorts of

difficulties will arise. For example, we shall be obliged to zone scholars from the Gawler, Salisbury and Elizabeth High Schools to Enfield. That will cause many disappointments and inconveniences, but we are endeavouring to establish a service to the best of our capabilities with the limited number of these highly qualified specialist teachers available. I am disappointed that we cannot establish them at various country centres, but it is not possible at present.

TEACHING OF HANDICAPPED CHILDREN.

Mrs. STEELE—Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked last week regarding the training of special teachers for opportunity classes and classes for handicapped children?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—The studentships in psychology, for which applications were called in the July *Education Gazette* and which were announced recently in the press, are for students at the Teachers Colleges or at the University of Adelaide who have satisfactorily completed at least Psychology I at a recognized university. During their studentships they will be assigned to the Adelaide Teachers College and will be expected to work as required in the Psychology Branch of the Education Department and to continue their studies with special emphasis on psychology. Applications were also invited from teachers who had completed at least Psychology I for secondment to the Psychology Branch. They will be expected to continue their studies in psychology and to perform other duties as required. On satisfactory completion of their studentships or secondments they will be appointed as teacher/psychologists. The work of these teacher/psychologists will materially help in the work of the Psychology Branch but will not directly help in the training of special teachers for opportunity classes or for classes for handicapped children. The training of teachers for opportunity classes is provided for by the holding of courses of training each year by the Senior Psychologist and his staff.

Bearing this in mind, the answers to the questions asked by the honourable member are:—

(a) The duration of the studentships in psychology and the duration of the secondments of teachers for work and training in the Psychology Branch before the appointment of either group as teacher/psychologists will depend on the progress which the students or

seconded teachers make and also on the qualifications they already possess before beginning the training. The duration could not be less than 12 months and might require two or three years.

(b) This training will not in any way take the place of the training of teachers of the deaf at Kew, Victoria. It is hoped to continue the practice of sending one or more teachers each year for training in Victoria.

(c) As stated above, these students and seconded teachers will be appointed to the Psychology Branch and will not directly relieve the shortage of teachers of opportunity classes and classes for other handicapped children. However, the appointment of teacher/psychologists will of course enable the Senior Psychologist and his staff to devote more time and effort to the training of teachers for opportunity classes.

In addition, they will enable the many children on the waiting list who have been referred to the Psychology Branch for testing or for treatment to receive attention.

POLIOMYELITIS VACCINE.

Mr. JENKINS—I draw the attention of the Minister representing the Minister of Health to an article in the staff journal of the Adelaide Children's Hospital entitled "Forceps." It deals with poliomyelitis vaccine and refers to the development of an attenuated live virus for polio immunization. It states:—

There seems to be little doubt that the live poliomyelitis vaccine is safe and vastly more effective than the Salk vaccine, and it is given by mouth, not by injection.

The article also states that one dose will provide for lifelong immunization; and at only about one-tenth the cost of Salk vaccine. Will the Treasurer draw the attention of the Minister of Health to this article to see whether this method of immunization can be adopted in South Australia?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I will get a report for the honourable member.

Mr. HUGHES—Has the Premier a reply to a question I asked last week concerning the response by parents and young adults towards the poliomyelitis vaccine campaign in this State?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have obtained the following report from Dr. Woodruff, Director-General of Public Health:—

The public acceptance of poliomyelitis immunization injections in South Australia

has been most satisfactory in all eligible age groups. Up to July 24, 1959, approximately 95 per cent of pre-school children and 90 per cent of school children had started their course of injections. Many of these children have completed the course. These age groups have been eligible since July, 1956. The age group 15 to 45 years did not become eligible until the beginning of last year. Already, at the half-way stage of the adult campaign, 40 per cent of this age group have started their poliomyelitis immunization. Facilities are still available for eligible people who have not yet sought immunization. They should apply to a mobile unit as soon as possible.

DANGER TO SMALL BOATS.

Mr. BYWATERS—An article accompanying a photograph in this morning's *Advertiser* states:—

This picture of what pounding waves and rocks can do to a helpless small boat might save a life in the future, shipping authorities at Port Adelaide and Outer Harbour said yesterday. They said it would warn owners of small boats of what could happen without emergency gear . . . They said legislation to control small boats was urgently needed. In the meantime, they appealed to boat owners to observe safety rules.

I previously asked a question regarding the control of these small craft, the matter having been brought to my notice by the Murray Bridge Corporation, and I received a reply from the Premier. Can the Premier, in the light of this morning's announcement, say whether it would be possible to review the suggestion I previously made for the appointment of a committee of responsible people who would know what is necessary to control these small craft?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—When the honourable member raised this matter earlier, the decision not to take any action was arrived at not because of any lack of sympathy with his suggestion but because all attempts to take action in other cases had proved abortive. It would be difficult to police the loading of small craft without a much larger police force than we could provide, and therefore the suggestion did not appear to be practicable. However, I will make a further investigation for the honourable member. I think I can give him a copy of the earlier report which sets out the measures that had been tried and found to be insufficient.

NARRUNG AND MENINGIE DAIRIES.

Mr. NANKIVELL—Can the Minister of Agriculture tell me whether it is possible that dairies in the Narrung and Meningie areas will be issued with city milk licences, and, if so, when that is likely to be put into effect?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—Yes, it is possible. The area is constantly kept under review. The Metropolitan Milk Board is at present considering the extension of the area in that direction which can supply milk during the autumn. However, whatever the outcome, nothing can be done immediately, because in order to give dairy farmers time to get their premises in order to justify the licences some period would have to be allowed. That is about as far as I can take it at present, but the matter is definitely under consideration.

BUSH FIRE RELIEF FUND.

Mr. RALSTON—I understand that all applications for relief under the Bush Fire Relief Fund from those who suffered loss in the Kongorong fire have been considered and checked and that the amounts approved by the committee have been posted to the applicants. Can the Premier say whether the committee has submitted a report to the Government on the disbursement of the fund and, if not, can he indicate when the report can be expected and whether it will be tabled for the information of members and the public? I emphasize that I do not know the position regarding other parts of the State.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have not had a formal report from Judge Paine in connection with the administration of the fund. He consulted me on two or three issues at various times when distribution of relief was being considered. I do not think we should issue a report that reveals, for instance, the individual amounts applicants received.

Mr. Ralston—I would not want that.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—That would be highly undesirable. The fund was adequate to cover all applications and a small balance has been carried forward. Every year small amounts are carried forward in that fund to meet urgent applications for relief. We were not able to get the full amount of £50,000 from the Commonwealth because of the conditions under which it made the grant. I can get a report but I do not think it would be advisable for it to be made available to the public. I do not think it is necessary to table it, but it could be available to members.

SHEEP STEALING.

Mr. HAMBOUR—One of my constituents, who has a rather small holding of 256 acres of outside country and 250 acres of inside country, lost 107 sheep, obviously through theft. The police have not been able to trace the thief or

help in any way. Will the Minister of Agriculture consider requesting stock agents to keep a record of brands and earmarks of stock passing through their hands?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—I regret the experience being suffered in the honourable member's district at present. Under present laws there are many provisions designed to check sheep stealing. I will get a report and see what can be done by way of special vigilance.

WHYALLA SWIMMING POOL.

Mr. LOVEDAY—In plans for the extension of Whyalla, submitted to the Whyalla Town Commission a few days ago, no provision was made for a swimming pool site. As the Whyalla Swimming Association is anxious to secure a suitable site and has already put forward a proposition in that regard, endorsed by the Whyalla Town Commission, will the Minister of Lands have the matter re-examined to see whether a suitable site can be allotted on the plan?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—Yes.

GLEN OSMOND PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Some weeks ago I made representations to the Minister of Education about the purchase of additional land contiguous to the Glen Osmond Primary School that would give it a frontage to Glen Osmond Road. Can the Minister say whether any decision has been made, and, if so, what it is?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—Yes. Cabinet approval has been given for the purchase, and necessary plans that are now being prepared will be referred to the Crown Solicitor for settlement in the next few days.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT.

Mr. McKEE—Can the Premier intimate whether a Bill to amend the Local Government Act will be introduced in time for councils to take advantage of it this year?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Cabinet yesterday authorised the Minister of Local Government to bring up to date the amendments introduced into the House last year. Since then we have received a number of requests from councils that require consideration. Notice has been given for the Bill to be introduced in another place, and I hope it will be expeditiously considered. The honourable member has not been in the House when a local government Bill has been considered, but I assure him that there are more experts on

this legislation than on any other. When members have two or three councils for whom they must speak during the debate, even with the best of luck it takes a long time to get a Bill through. It is a marathon problem, but this year we hope we shall accomplish it.

AUSTRALIAN PRODUCTIVITY COUNCIL.

Mr. CUMBE—Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked last week about whether the Department of Industry and Labour would co-operate in the formation of the Australian Productivity Council and assist in furthering its desires?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have a report from the department that it is prepared to co-operate with the council should any information or assistance be requested.

FREE SCHOOL BOOKS.

Mr. RICHES—My question relates to book allowances for secondary school students. Before the last State elections I understood that an undertaking was given by the Premier that all children in secondary schools would receive an increased book allowance. A statement as follows by the Premier appeared in the *Advertiser* three days after the elections:—An increased allowance for school books for all secondary school pupils, including those attending private schools, will cost nearly £200,000 a year.

I should like to know why the Education Department, in gazetting the necessary regulations, precluded scholars who had failed in one year from obtaining the book allowance. This question was raised earlier this session by the member for Gawler, Mr. Clark, but no reason was given by the department for what seems to me to be an extraordinary position and one that is a breach of faith to the public.

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—It places me in a somewhat invidious position. The honourable member directs a question to me concerning a statement made by the Premier and also refers to a question raised by Mr. Clark. I thought I had discussed the matter in some detail and I wrote in considerable detail to the Leader of the Opposition, who said he was satisfied.

Mr. O'Halloran—Not altogether satisfied, but it was a big improvement.

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I am prepared to give Mr. Riches or the House a considered statement, but I do not propose to be drawn

into a discussion regarding some alleged statement by the Premier. If the honourable member is not satisfied with what his Leader has received and should like to ask me a direct question, I should be pleased to answer it in detail.

COUNTRY ELECTRICITY CHARGES.

Mr. LAUCKE—My question concerns a possible simplification of the existing system for metering power and light on farms. At present separate meters are required for general lighting and commercial power, involving a duplication of meters when light and power are distributed to various farm outbuildings. Often I find that farmers are reluctant to link up all outbuildings because of the expense involved in the multiplicity of meters. A solution of the problem is a commercial all-purpose tariff for farms similar to the system operating for private homes under the single meter system. Could an investigation be made into the possibility of introducing such an all-purpose tariff for farmers?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I will refer the question to the Chairman of the Electricity Trust. There is no more complex question than that of metering electricity requirements, because every consumer has a different proportion of use for particular purposes. I doubt whether it would be possible to get much of a solution. The trust has gone a long way in its endeavour to iron out anomalies. We have different tariffs for different purposes, and that is necessary because the trust must secure from users sufficient to cover its operations.

FIRE PROTECTION IN OSBORNE-TAPEROO AREA.

Mr. TAPPING—Three years ago a deputation waited on the Premier following upon serious fires in temporary homes, one of which caused the death of two children. The Premier referred the matter to the Fire Brigades Board, but so far no improvements have been made. The nearest fire alarm to the Taperoo area is about one mile distant at Magery Terrace, Largs North. There is only one public telephone booth among 400 temporary homes, and only four public phones between Largs North and Outer Harbour. Because of the approach of summer, when a greater fire hazard exists, will the Premier obtain a report from the Fire Brigades Board regarding this vital matter?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yes.

TANTANOOLA HOUSING.

Mr. CORCORAN—Has the Premier a reply to my recent question regarding the extension of the Housing Trust's operations at Tantanoola?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—During the next two weeks the trust will call tenders for a number of houses to be erected at Tantanoola. They will be built of Mount Gambier stone.

CAR DEALERS' FINANCES.

Mr. LAWN—Has the Premier a reply to a question I asked on July 21 relating to car dealers' finances?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Registrar of Companies states:—

Neither car dealers nor any other traders are required to file returns with the Registrar of Companies. Only a public limited company is required to file copies of the profit and loss account and balance-sheet with the Registrar of Companies.

ADVERTISING BY STORES.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Recently I asked the Premier whether it was the responsibility of any department to check and proceed against traders advertising goods at prices lower than those at which they could be obtained at the store. I have good reason to believe that it is not the responsibility of any department. If I supply copies of advertisements and a letter showing that attempts were made to secure advertised goods that were not available on inquiry, will the Premier refer the matter to a Government department for investigation?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yes.

TRANSPORT CONTROL BOARD LEVY.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Has the Premier obtained a reply to a question I asked recently on whether, to assist the finances of the Transport Control Board, a levy is imposed on passengers using tourist buses for tours of the Flinders Range?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yes, the report of the Board is as follows:—

The board applies a fee to all licences issued including those granted tourist companies to conduct all road tourist trips from Adelaide to the Flinders Ranges. The companies licensed operate different tours but on an adult fare of £20 10s. for a six days' tour the proportion of such fare payable to the board would average 4.57 per cent. The proportion would be lower in the case of children's fares.

SOOT AND SMOKE NUISANCE AT EDWARDSTOWN.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Has the Premier obtained a report from the Department of Industry and Labour concerning the soot and smoke nuisance affecting the residential area near the Wunderlich tile factory at Edwardstown?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Following a complaint made by the honourable member some time ago the Chief Inspector of Factories (Mr. F. E. Roberts) and one of the steam boiler inspectors of the department made an investigation into the alleged smoke nuisance at Wunderlich Ltd. The problem which that firm faces is to provide proper combustion conditions so that the smoke emitted from the kiln is reduced to a minimum. Much research has been carried out by this firm in recent years in an attempt to adapt all of its kilns to burn in the most efficient manner. To this end one kiln was fully converted to oil firing and the combustion chambers of a second kiln have been reconstructed in an effort to burn coal more effectively, with the assistance of a high draught fan.

The economics of various fuels are being studied by engineers at the head office of Wunderlich Ltd., who are making various changes in combustion techniques in the light of new information from overseas and in collaboration with technical advisers of the Coal Research Association of New South Wales. Resulting from the reconstruction of one kiln alterations of a permanent nature in the way of fan connections and inlet and outlet duct work for the products of combustion have been made. Up to the present any smoke from this process has been discharged at low level and this will now be directed into the main chimney stack by the new ducting. The management of Wunderlich Limited is making a sincere effort to combat the smoke problem and the Chief Inspector of Factories is continuing to give all the assistance he can to minimize the problem that exists here.

GILLES PLAINS SCHOOL TOILET FACILITIES.

Mr. JENNINGS—Last week I asked the Minister of Education a question regarding the inadequate toilet facilities at the new Gilles Plains Primary School and requested him to take up this matter urgently with the Architect-in-Chief. Has the Minister heard anything further about it?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I am pleased to give the honourable member a progress report that the Architect-in-Chief has been

requested as a very urgent matter to provide the additional toilets as follows—two for boys, five for girls, one for male teachers, and one for female teachers.

THIRD PARTY INSURANCE.

Mr. TAPPING—Has the Premier a reply to my recent question relating to "No claim" bonuses for third party insurance?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have obtained the following reply from Sir Edgar Bean:—

On the information available it does not seem likely that a satisfactory scheme of no claim discount could be devised for compulsory third party insurance. I am informed by Mr. S. H. Leech, who represents the Fire and Accident Underwriters' Association on the Premiums Committee, that about 2 per cent of the insured vehicles have accidents in each year leading to third party claims. It follows that under a system of no claim discounts 98 per cent of the insured vehicle owners would be entitled to the discount. The discount, of course, would cause a loss of income to the insurance companies which would have to be made good in some way because the third party premium income, which is controlled by the Premiums Committee, is only sufficient to enable third party insurance to be carried on at a small profit. Some companies make losses on it. There are various ways in which the lost income could be made up. One is by a general increase in premium. If such an increase were made those who received the discount would pay for 98 per cent of it. Alternatively, the discount might be provided for by increasing the premium payable by those who had the accidents. In this case 2 per cent of the vehicle owners would find the money for all the discounts. This would result in an enormous increase of premiums to the owners. For example, the £6 5s. 0d. premium on private cars would, it is estimated, have to be raised to £24, and other premiums in proportion, in order to pay a five per cent discount. No doubt there are other intermediate types of schemes but in all of them it would be necessary to increase premiums to allow the discount. Another fact is that a discount would not have much effect unless it were substantial. A five per cent discount on the private car premium of £6 5s. 0d. is only 6s. 3d., and this would not have much effect on the habits of the average motorist. The question of no-claim discounts was carefully considered at an Interstate conference called by the Victorian Government some years ago. This conference was attended by insurance and actuarial experts and its conclusion was that a no-claim discount system would not work successfully in third party insurance. The third party premiums in the ordinary course of events will not come up for review until the end of next year. I am quite willing to refer the matter to the Committee for consideration when it next reviews the premiums but I would not like to hold out much hope that a satisfactory scheme can be devised.

LOXTON AND WAIKERIE HIGH SCHOOLS.

Mr. STOTT—Can the Minister of Education inform me whether the plans for the official openings of the high schools at Loxton and Waikerie are ready?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—No; I am still waiting for communications from the high school councils in these cases. I had discussions with them when I visited there many months ago, and I have had some correspondence. I have been ready, willing and anxious to proceed with the openings, but in each case the high school council has asked me to delay it until it has made its final arrangements. I shall be pleased to discuss the details with the honourable member at any time if he so desires.

DAMAGE TO RED GUMS BY LERP INSECTS.

Mr. LAUCKE—Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I asked recently about damage done to red gums by the lerp insect?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—A reply to the question has been furnished by the entomologist at the Waite Institute. It begins:—

Little can be added to the statement of the honourable Minister as reported by *Hansard* of July 23, 1959.

The report goes on to give fairly technical detail about the insect and the type of spray that can be used. I ask leave to have this report inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

DAMAGE TO RED GUMS BY LERP INSECTS.

During the past summer and autumn large numbers of these insects have appeared on various kinds of gum trees, particularly the pink, red, and blue gums. There are many kinds of lerps, each tending to prefer a particular kind of tree, and several forms live on red gum for instance. They are always to be found on the trees in small numbers, but usually pass unnoticed. Their large numbers, and heavy damage to foliage in recent months, are considered to result from the long period of mild warm weather, during which additional generations of lerps have occurred at a time when they are usually inactivated by lower temperatures. The dry conditions prevailing during the same period have retarded leaf growth, and death of infested leaves has been accelerated by moisture stress.

Lerps are native insects, which have evolved in association with the eucalypts over long periods of time, so that both plants and insects live in close adjustment. It is probable that periodical increases in lerp activity have occurred for a long time; they have been noted in Australia on various occasions in the past fifty years. They are controlled by

a variety of natural enemies, and it is presumed that cyclical increases result from the effects of weather and other environmental factors on the trees, the lerps, and on their parasites and predators. Dr. F. D. Morgan, who was recently appointed forest entomologist, has made some observations on the situation during the past summer and autumn, and has noted a considerable variation in the activity of parasites, which at some times and places may destroy high percentages of the lerps. In view of the persistence of gum tree leaves, those damaged earlier, and no longer infested, contribute to the poor appearance of trees which later produce a new cover of healthy foliage.

Since the insects are native to Australia and do not occur elsewhere, it is unlikely that any improvement could result from seeking possible predators from other sources. No insecticidal procedure on a wide scale can be imagined that would not be costly and temporary in its effects. It is considered that eucalypts are in general, well adapted to tolerate lerp infestations, and that they suffer little permanent damage. Some eucalypts do however, reach the end of their life-span every year, and die from natural causes; in some of these cases moribund trees may finally die if submitted to a temporary heavy infestation by lerps.

It is suggested therefore that active control should be considered only for trees which require protection for some special reason. In these cases they may be sprayed with a standard white oil/malathion formulation (white oil 1:60 in water, with malathion added at the rate prescribed by the maker). The spray should be applied in the spring or early summer before damage is severe, and before temperatures exceed 90°F.

There are indications that most reasonably healthy red gums can withstand fairly severe defoliation for two to three years before death of major parts may result, and it seems likely that most lerp populations are brought under control by their predators within that time.

The problem of lerp infestation of eucalypts is receiving some attention at present from C.S.I.R.O. Division of Entomology at Canberra, and observations are being made in South Australia as opportunity permits, although Dr. Morgan's programme relates chiefly to *Pinus radiata*. It is expected, however, that a clearer picture of the causes and management of outbreak, on the course they run, and on their effect on the trees, will emerge over the next few years, as part of the general programme on forest entomology now being undertaken at the Waite Institute.

SLAUGHTERING CHARGES.

Mr. STOTT—Has the Minister of Agriculture any information about slaughtering charges, which he promised he would investigate?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—Again, I have a rather lengthy reply for the honourable member. The brief outline is that slaughtering charges for sheep are 2.37d. per pound local, and 3½d. per pound export. I have a

schedule of the whole charges. Also, I was asked why the yard fees were higher in South Australia than in other States. I have a statement on that but, as it goes to two pages, I again ask leave to have it inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

ABATTOIRS BOARD STATEMENT.

In connection with yard fees the Board's present charges per head of stock in comparison to those in operation at the Metropolitan Meat Industry Board, Homebush, N.S.W., the Queensland Meat Industry Board, Cannon Hill, Qld., and the Melbourne City Abattoir and Cattle Markets, Newmarket, Vic., are as under:—

Type	S.A.		N.S.W.		Qld.		Vic.	
	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.
Cattle	3	0	1	2	1	0	2	6 (Ox and cow).
							3	6 (Bull).
Sheep	0	4	0	2½	0	2	0	3
Pigs—								
Fat	1	6	1	2	0	7	Not applicable.	
Store	1	2	—	—	—	—	Not applicable.	
Calves	1	6	1	2	0	2½	Not applicable.	

In the case of Cannon Hill, it is known that these charges are being reviewed due to cost increases.

With regard to the Board's charges as compared with those applying in other States there are amongst other things additional services and charges included in the fees which are not provided or allowed for at the other instrumentalities.

These services and charges are:—

1. *Handling of Dead Stock and Cripples.*—The expense involved in the above work is included in the Board's yard fees but at the other establishments mentioned a separate contractor carries out the work at the expense of the agent or purchaser whoever is concerned.

2. *Check of Stock Purchase.*—The Board takes over the control of all stock at the time of branding after sale and is responsible for checking out, against owners' orders, numbers taken away from the market; also numbers held for slaughter. At the other utilities mentioned, with the exception of the Melbourne City Abattoir, the check of all stock is the responsibility of the buyer.

3. *Interest Charges and Sinking Fund repayments.*—These charges are included in the Board's fees as is the case at both Homebush and Newmarket. The markets at Cannon Hill are freehold.

4. *Method of Selling.*—At the three interstate instrumentalities mentioned cattle sales are conducted under the pen system as compared with the sale ring method adopted at the Board's markets, the latter method necessitating a greatly increased amount of labour.

5. *Administrative Charges.*—The Board apportions certain of its Head Office administrative charges to markets expenditure but with the exception of Melbourne City Abattoir, where a nominal amount is included, these charges are not applied elsewhere.

6. *Number of Operators.*—A comparison of the approximate numbers of wholesale butchers and master butchers buying stock in the various markets is:—

S.A.	N.S.W.	Qld.	Vic.
400	100	120	200

As the Board caters for a greater number of operators, additional expense is necessarily incurred both by way of labour and administrative costs.

RAILWAYS DEPARTMENT PROMOTIONS.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (on notice)—

1. What method is adopted by the Commissioner of Railways in the promotion of clerical staff?

2. Does it provide for seniority of service, or is service in a particular clerical division only considered?

3. Is any provision made for an officer in one clerical division to be promoted to another clerical division?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The Railways Commissioner reports:—

1. The vacant position for promotion is advertised in the *Weekly Notice*. Recommendation of appointment is made by the head of branch and considered by the Staff Board. Recommendation of the Staff Board is submitted to the Commissioner for decision. Appeals against the appointment are considered by the Appointments Appeal Board. The recommendation of the Appointments Appeal Board is submitted to the Commissioner for final decision.

2. Appointments are made in accordance with Award provisions. These provide *inter alia* that consideration be given to the relative ability, suitability, record, experience and seniority. Relative seniority is determined by status.

3. Yes.

BEDFORD PARK SANATORIUM.

Mr. BYWATERS (on notice)—

1. What is the capacity number of beds at the Bedford Park Sanatorium?

2. What number of these beds is occupied?

3. What is the number of tuberculosis cases awaiting treatment?

4. Is it intended to close Bedford Park Sanatorium?

5. If so, how is it intended to provide for these people?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The replies are:—

1. 90.
2. 40.
3. Nil.

4. and 5. Consideration will be given to accommodating all in-patients in the Morris Hospital and Kalyra Sanatorium when there is a sufficient safety margin.

RENT FIXATION.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice)—How many rental fixations pursuant to section 21 of the Landlord and Tenant (Control of Rents) Act have been made since the 1957 amendment thereto in respect of the following premises:—
(a) houses; (b) flats; (c) caravans (d) shops with dwellings?

The Hon. SIR THOMAS PLAYFORD—The replies are:—

- (a) 3,197.
- (b) 398.

(c) Caravan rents are not fixed pursuant to Section 21.

- (d) 88.

RAILWAY OFFICER'S LEAVE PAYMENT.

Mr. BYWATERS (on notice)—

1. Has any high salaried officer of the South Australian Railways retired since July 29, 1958, and received payment in lieu of annual leave exceeding 48 days?

2. If so, who was the officer concerned and what amount of money did he receive in lieu of accumulated leave?

3. Will any other officers with accumulated leave be allowed to receive monetary payment in lieu thereof upon retirement?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The Railways Commissioner reports:—

1. Yes.

2. Mr. F. B. Harvey—£2,407 13s. 1d.

3. Yes. It is expected that a limited number of officers will be unable to take out all their accumulated leave before retirement, and will be allowed monetary payment in lieu thereof for the remaining balance. The accumulation of leave started during the war, when the railways were working at very high pressure and manpower instructions placed a limit on leave, and continued subsequently thereto, when there was a serious shortage of officers qualified in train operations. With the idea of minimizing the accumulation of leave, cash payment in lieu thereof was introduced in 1942, and continued until June 30, 1957, since when it has been stopped. Present cash payments are restricted to leave which had been accumulated prior to July, 1957.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 30. Page 278.)

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Edwardstown)—I refer to the following passage from His Excellency's speech:—

The South Australian Housing Trust expects to build about 3,012 houses during the current financial year, making the total number of completed dwellings to date approximately 36,700.

I am particularly concerned about the number of homes to be erected by the Housing Trust for rental in the metropolitan area, where people have a reasonable chance of being housed and finding work rather than, as is the position today, living in the Elizabeth area where there is a lack of industry and chances of employment. The matter of rental homes is important. Why does the Housing Trust demand a cash payment of £5 from the occupant of a trust rental home? I have said previously that often the trust says that because of some damage to the house there can be no refund of the £5. However, if it is necessary to collect the £5 the occupant should get interest on it, and later an inspection should be made to see if the £5 can be refunded. The Treasurer will recall that last January I wrote him asking for Government policy on the galvanized iron ex-Air Force huts at Springbank that had been converted to emergency homes. It was not until after the last State election that I got some information on the matter, and it came from the press. It was to the effect that the huts would be demolished. Then I asked the Treasurer for a reply and when it came it confirmed only what I already knew. This session I asked a question about temporary homes in the portion of the Marion district I represent and the portion represented by the Minister of Education, and the Treasurer said that the trust did not intend to demolish the homes. I do not suggest demolition, but suggest their removal to other areas. I believe we have the necessary equipment to do that. There is still a great demand for rental homes. More should be built for people in the metropolitan area and for migrants. The building programme needs to be stepped up to meet the increased demands.

I now refer to Commonwealth legislation that affects aged people. The Aged Persons Homes Act (1954-57) provides, amongst other things, that the Director-General of Social Services may, on behalf of the Commonwealth, make grants to eligible organizations towards

the capital cost of approved homes for aged people. Its purpose is to encourage and assist the provision of suitable homes so that aged persons may reside in conditions approaching as nearly as possible ordinary domestic life. In the case of married people, proper regard is to be had to the companionship of husband and wife. The legislation says that church organizations and other organizations, the principal objects of which are charitable or benevolent, may be eligible to receive a grant. In broad terms the legislation makes a fairly reasonable coverage of the position. In connection with a grant to be made under the legislation, when a home has been approved the Director-General may, in his discretion, and on behalf of the Commonwealth Government, make a grant to assist towards meeting its capital cost. The grant is made on the basis of two-thirds of the capital cost of the home, as determined by the Director-General.

One of the approved organizations is the Carrum Downs Settlement in Victoria. I have some information that was prepared by a sub-committee of the board of management of the Mount Gambier Old Folks' Home, Incorporated. It said that Carrum Downs statistics kept over 20 years showed that the average of entry to the community was 70 years, the average duration of stay 14 years, and the average length of the last illness only a few days. The report said, also, that the hospital cared for those who could not care for themselves, and the sick or injured, and that it was Father Tucker's theory that when a person was sick or bedridden for any time he should not remain at Carrum Downs, but should be removed to a Government institution or hospital.

Under Commonwealth legislation, if an approved organization (which can be a religious organization) applies to build certain accommodation, the application must be approved before assistance on a 2 to 1 basis is granted. Such applications today mostly concern either single or double unit flats. I know of a non-religious organization which today is able to satisfy the Commonwealth Government in this matter. These flats are of a very reasonable standard, and some that I have inspected provide a very high standard of accommodation. They are becoming available for persons who, if they are aged or invalid, may qualify for them at the discretion of the director or the Minister of that particular department. These people can purchase the flats, generally at £750, and they can live

rent free for the remainder of their lives. However, in some houses no provision is made for them when they are sick. Another religious organization is told by the Government how it should care for the aged, although it has cared for them for the past 70 years. One provision states that there shall be no more than four in any sick bay. When a religious organization with a limited number of acres starts to build single and double unit flats, it must spread rapidly over its area.

I commend the people responsible for the establishment of Felixstowe Home, which I have inspected. Although at one time it was considered that a home could be converted for the care of the aged by the provision of dormitories and an infirmary, Felixstowe has the original residence and the authorities did build additional cubicle accommodation and single and double unit cottages and flats, in some cases for sale to tenants. The authorities there are also providing hospitalization for the aged, who must be cared for there because of the lack of accommodation existing at the Northfield wards. I understand that the Felixstowe authorities made an application for the erection of an infirmary block, for which it was necessary to raise the sum of £25,000. The Commonwealth Government provided another £50,000 because it was known as an infirmary block, and I understand the State Government provided another £25,000. Although I do not complain about the £25,000, I believe something better could have been done.

The Little Sisters of the Poor at Glen Osmond has attempted to keep within the limits of the 2 to 1 Commonwealth assistance for the erection of suitable accommodation. It has almost completed accommodation for a further 12 couples at Glen Osmond, but the cost has risen to £20,000, excluding furniture. That organization has been told that there is to be no more accommodation of the infirmary type. New South Wales does not hesitate in this matter, and a letter I have indicates that substantial grants have been made to homes to enable them to extend accommodation for the aged. It states:—

With reference to your communication of the 24th ultimo in relation to the St. Joseph's Home at Sandgate, I have to advise that in addition to the grant made to this institution, grants have been made through the Hospitals Commission to other ecclesiastical hospitals to enable them to extend the accommodation available for aged, chronic and terminal patients, namely The Home of Peace (£322,254) and the Lottie Stewart Hospital at Dundas (£258,030).

I understand that the latter home works on a similar basis of authority to the Felixstowe Home. There the New South Wales Government subsidizes hospitalization for the aged.

I also have a list of the South Australian public hospitals which, under section 82 of the National Health Act, 1953-58, come within the category of those that would receive subsidies for hospitalization, providing the inmates were not over 65 years of age. Some organizations, particularly religious organizations, provide single and double unit homes for aged people for £750 and they live in them rent free for the remainder of their lives, but these organizations are unable to provide infirmiry accommodation. The Government is unable to provide sufficient hospital accommodation for age and invalid pensioners who could not possibly afford to pay the normal hospital charges of £15 15s. or £16 16s. a week, but where private organizations are prepared to accommodate and care for them the least the Government could do would be to erect their infirmaries. These organizations should not be compelled to beg financial assistance from the general public. According to the Premier, we are no longer a baby State, and he should measure up to the Government's obligations and assist in providing infirmiry accommodation for the aged.

In His Excellency's Speech the following statement appears:—

During the year the Director of Education spent several months abroad in Great Britain and America, giving particular attention to secondary school courses. My Government is now considering his report and recommendations and it is expected that many improvements in our secondary schools will result.

If I accept the Minister's reply to a question I asked on this subject I can only suggest that the Director's approach to the problems of secondary education is a poor effort. Our primary schools have been denuded of recognized teachers to provide for secondary schools, but we have not enough teachers for Leaving Honours classes. The Government should encourage more people to enter the teaching profession and should also investigate the desirability of not accepting children into schools prior to their reaching the compulsory attendance age of six years, particularly while we have a dire shortage of teachers.

In New South Wales a committee, under the chairmanship of Dr. H. S. Wyndham, was appointed to survey secondary education. In its report the following statement appears:—

It seems clear that before further progress

can be made, both the examination structure and the constitution of the authorities concerned must be reviewed on the basis of a frank re-assessment of the task which schools must undertake to meet the needs of the very diverse adolescent school population now enrolled.

This committee received written evidence from over 100 persons and oral evidence from over 120 persons. We will be confronted with problems similar to those that are facing the New South Wales educational authorities. The "Wyndham Report," as it is called, opened the eyes of the New South Wales authorities and I have no doubt had some effect on South Australians who read it.

At present there are three secondary schools in my electorate—two technical high schools and the Marion high school—and with the ever-increasing population it will not be long before another one or two are needed: consequently, I am vitally interested in secondary education. Students in South Australia have two choices for their secondary education: they can either attend a high school or a technical high school. The high school student, at the end of his third year, takes the Intermediate examination arranged by the Public Examinations Board, but the technical high school student submits to an internal examination. The technical high school student may receive a certificate for passes, and perhaps credits, in as many subjects as the high school student, but if he applies for a clerical position in the Public Service he is advised that he cannot be accepted. The position is different for fourth year students. In a letter I received from the Secretary of the Minister of Education the following paragraph appears:—

In every technical high school, fourth year students may elect to be prepared for the Leaving examination of the Public Examinations Board, and thus are in a position to matriculate for courses at the University of Adelaide.

Ample provision is thus made for fourth year students irrespective of whether they attend high schools or technical high schools. I think it is agreed that the Intermediate certificate is the measuring rod for employment purposes, but a technical high school student should be permitted to compete equally with high school students for positions in industry. Either the Public Examinations Board sets the subjects or they are set by the department. The facts are that this Parliament will be asked to pass the necessary finance to enable the department to function, and it will also provide certain funds for the University. The

Wyndham report contained the following paragraph:—

Such a common curriculum, in our opinion, could be defined in terms of the following subject fields:—

1. English.
2. Social studies—history and geography.
3. Science—should embrace some biological study.
4. Mathematics—arithmetic, algebra, geometry.
5. Music.
6. Art.
7. Crafts.
8. Physical and health education.
9. Religious education.

We are still waiting for recommendations from our Director of Education, who went overseas to inquire into an improvement in the standard of our educational system. Public examinations are to be held in the near future. About 8,000 students entered for the Intermediate examination last year and honourable members are aware of the controversy concerning inadequate provisions at the Wayville Show-ground, where children were herded into the motor pavilion and other such accommodation. Will the department have a sufficiently big hall available this year to accommodate 8,000 children, will it suggest that the examinations be held in various high schools, or will the teaching staff have to travel from one school to another? Long before this the Government should have disclosed the department's intentions concerning this important matter. I consider that the department has some competent officers who should be able to set the standard for Intermediate examinations. Why should we have members of the Public Service decrying the merits of the technical high school student who has a three-year certificate when such students are accepted in the Railways Department as apprentices. This department sets its own internal examination prior to a lad being accepted as an apprentice. The Public Service demands the Leaving certificate for clerical positions. Some of the Commonwealth Departments have their own internal examinations, so it does not make much difference whether an internal or external examination is at the Intermediate standard. Although five Leaving subject passes are accepted by the Public Examinations Board for matriculation to the University, experience shows that a year in Leaving Honours is most desirable for students before starting at the University. The letter to me from the Minister of Education included the following:—

A report has been received from the Director of Education concerning your suggestion, and it appears that it is unnecessary to make such

a statement at the present time. However, the Director's report includes the following statements:—

- (1) The Intermediate technical certificate is acceptable to, and is in fact accepted by, employers in industry as a suitable qualification for employment. In certain cases, indeed, it is preferred as an entrance qualification to apprenticeship and even to some clerical positions in some large organizations.
- (2) A recent survey shows that the Intermediate technical certificate enjoys equal status with the Intermediate examination conducted by the Public Examinations Board in the eyes of many other employers.

In effect the Public Service Commissioner says to prospective employees, "I do not accept the technical high school Intermediate certificate. If you want to join the Public Service in a clerical position you must attend a high school and pass the examination set by the Public Examinations Board." I should like to know where the future examinations are to be held and whether the department has in view a building big enough for the purpose. Already this session we have been told that Intermediate results will be published earlier, and yet the House is told this afternoon that the department has insufficient teachers to tutor the children, territories have to be zoned, and some children have to attend a school for which no transport is available. Let the Director of Education in his spare time examine some of the high schools where zoning operates. I suggest that he visit the corner of Marion Road and Sweetman's Road any school day and notice the number of push cycles that are ridden from Glenelg by students on their way to the Mitchell Park Boys Technical School, the Vermont Girls Technical School or the Marion High School. I am expected to swallow my pride in the interests of those who send their children to the Marion High School but those children cannot undertake the Leaving Honours course there. They must go to the Brighton High School, where no public transport is available to them. When parents send their children to a secondary school at least these children should have a chance to compete in industry by having their three-year Intermediate certificate recognized as providing a satisfactory standard of education. I support the motion.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide)—As usual, contrary to other honourable members, I oppose the motion and for the usual reasons—briefly, that this Government has not won the confidence of the people and should not be occupying the Treasury benches, and in fact should

not have presented the Governor's Speech. Before the general elections in March the Parties held their pre-selection ballots. I have a high regard for the Parliamentary institution and I know of no other system that would be better than a democratically elected Parliament. However, it is not in the best interests of this institution that we should have what happened in the Liberal pre-selection ballot for Burnside. Had something similar happened at an Australian Labor Party ballot the press would have referred to it in large type on its front pages for weeks afterwards. I know that in past years when the Australian Labor Party had ballots that did not stand up to public decency, or any other kind of decency for that matter, and they were not fair and above board, the press never missed an opportunity to let the public know. I shall now tell the House what happened in the district of Burnside. Why is the press shielding the Liberal Party? We know there are arguments in that Party, but the public never hears about them through the press, yet if we have any dissension in our Party the press never lets up in splashing it in the largest possible type.

Mr. Hambour—That is your fault. You wash your dirty linen publicly.

Mr. LAWN—Last year the honourable member criticized the Labor Party over the expulsion of Mr. Chambers. The Liberal and Country League never misses an opportunity to attack my Party if any dirty linen is being washed. Mr. Chambers accepted what happened, agreed that he had broken the rules of his Party and that he should be expelled. When he next spoke in the House of Representatives the Government benches were fully occupied because Government members expected him to criticize his Party. However, they were bitterly disappointed to find that, as usual, he supported Labor policy, and ultimately sought re-admission to the Party. We have never conducted pre-selection ballots in the way the ballot was conducted in Burnside. Every member opposite knows that I often attack Government policy and Government members on political matters, but I never pursue my arguments outside this House or raise personal matters in this House.

In the three previous Parliaments the previous member for Burnside and I had no time for each other politically inside the House, and he was very bitter about my reference to him and his master and the Liberal Party members and their master, but I have never said one word about him outside. That

is not my business. I represent 21,500 people in this alleged democracy. They expect me to speak on their behalf and to criticize the Government and Government members when the occasion demands, but they do not expect me either in the pre-selection ballot or in this House to besmirch any member of any political Party publicly, semi-publicly, or under the lap. It is a shame that the first woman member in this Chamber should enter under circumstances not in the best interests of Parliament. During the pre-selection ballot she and a few of her friends canvassed the female members—and there are some hundreds of them—of the Liberal Party in Burnside to vote for her instead of Mr. Geoffrey Clarke because he had recently remarried not long after the unfortunate death of his first wife.

Members interjecting.

Mr. LAWN—Government members know it, we all know it, and I shall not canvass that matter further.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman—I should think not.

Mr. LAWN—It is just as distasteful to me to have to mention it as it is to members opposite: that a member of their Party should conduct herself as she did. We all know that after a pre-selection ballot we can make a statement to the press. The member for Burnside is reported in the *Advertiser* of February 23 as saying—

Mr. Hambour—Aren't you letting yourself down a bit?

Mr. LAWN—Well—

Mr. Hambour—I would hesitate if I were you.

Mr. LAWN—I said it was distasteful to me to have to mention that a member of another Party would use the Parliamentary machine against another candidate of the same Party on a pre-selection ballot in the circumstances mentioned. This is what the honourable member said:—

Burnside has benefited from the stability which results from the well-planned economy. Its population has grown with the result of increases in home-building activity, new schools have been established and existing ones expanded, and roads and transport have been improved to meet modern demands.

From that and the rest of the statement it is apparent that Burnside has everything it wants. If so it is the only district that has, with the possible exception of Mitcham, yet I have heard even the member for Mitcham asking the Government for something for his district. These things do not just happen, as we all know. The things that a district obtains result

from the work of the member representing it, not from the work of the Government. Schools, roads, transport and so on do not just happen; they are obtained only because members in their multifarious mediations with Ministers ask, apply, agitate, appeal, implore, importune impassionately, seek, solicit sweetly, intervene, interpose, interview, exhort, explode, wheedle, wrangle, coax and cajole courteously.

Mr. Clark—Have you tried all these methods?

Mr. LAWN—No, but I suggest that the previous member for Burnside tried some of them to get the things for the district that the present member for the district said it had. We know that Mr. Geoffrey Clarke was the Government Whip and a “yes” man for his master, that he never said a word that he thought would displease the master, that he was being groomed for the Ministry and that he had the ear of Ministers outside the Chamber and within. I do not say Burnside has everything it wants, but that can be inferred from what the present member said to the press. If it is true that Burnside wants for nothing, however, it is due to the work done by those who represented the district over the years, among whom was Mr. Geoffrey Clarke.

We now have a woman member in this House and it is not the fault of the Labour Party that we have not had women members before. We have endeavoured to give an adult franchise to all people irrespective of sex because we believe the female is equal politically to the male. When we have endeavoured over the years to give equal voting rights to females the Liberal Party, through the Government, has always said that the man of the house knows best what is good for the woman of the house. I have a wife and two daughters over 21, and in my case the Government says that although they have a right to vote for this House, I know what is best. The Liberal Party still puts a brake on women's voting strength by restricting the vote from my household to one, as the Legislative Council has an equal right with this House in vetoing legislation. Although all females over 21 have a vote for this House they are still prevented from enjoying the full adult franchise.

The member for Burnside will carry on the embarrassment she caused members opposite during the preselection ballot. I hope she will embarrass them in a different direction, however, when later during this Parliament we introduce a Bill to alter the Constitution and give women the same right to vote for the

Legislative Council as we have. When moving the adoption of the Address in Reply the honourable member said:—

My thoughts then were of the generations of women who had striven tirelessly and unceasingly—undaunted by any opposition which they encountered—to secure for women the right to vote.

Her thoughts were with women of the past who have given her an opportunity to occupy a seat in this House. When elections were first introduced women were not given the right to vote. Male negroes in America had the right to vote before white women had. It is all very well to speak about the fight by women in the past to give the present generation of women a right to occupy a place in this House, but surely the honourable member will not drop the fight now.

Mr. Jennings—She has all she wants.

Mr. LAWN—She used women in the preselection ballot at Burnside to get women in this House. Surely she will not drop off now and say, “Unless you own property in your own right the male in your house knows what is best for you, so we will let the franchise remain as it is.” I look forward confidently to her support to a Bill to be introduced to give all womenfolk of this country equal rights with males in voting for both Houses. For years my Party has advocated equal pay for the sexes. The honourable member could not oppose it: she is receiving the same pay in this House as male members. In other words, she is receiving the male rate for the work she does here. In factories, offices and workshops where a female is doing similar work to a male why should she not receive the same money? The member for Burnside could not refuse to grant to her sisters the same rights and privileges as she is enjoying. During the preselection ballot the press played up the fact that we might have a few women in the next Parliament. We had some women candidates ourselves. The press suggested that they would represent the women and children of this country.

When we introduce our Bill on workmen's compensation to give the womenfolk of this State an insurance cover on their husbands when going to and from employment, the honourable member for Burnside (Mrs. Steele) cannot refuse to vote with us. In all the Australian States, except Western Australia and South Australia, and even in South Australia in the case of Commonwealth employees, men going to and from employment are covered so that, if they are killed, their widows receive some monetary compensation, which of course

does not fully compensate them. The honourable member for Burnside, being a housewife, cannot say to other mothers and wives in this State, "You are not entitled to any workmen's compensation cover while your husband goes to and from employment" if she is truly representing the women and children of South Australia. It is obvious that Government members feel they might be embarrassed during this Parliament because the master has gone to the honourable member for Burnside, as he has to everyone else in his Party, saying "Do what you are told in this House or you will be out. There are ways and means of turning you out in three years' time if you do not." That happened in the Torrens electorate. If it happens this time I hope—I am still not without hope, for life would not be worth living without it, especially with the gerrymander in this State—that the first woman member of this Parliament will stand up to her master and vote to give the women of this State an insurance cover that women in other States already have.

I have had many ups and downs in my life but, when down, I have never been without faith and hope. If it were not for that, I would give the whole show away. I know that Government members are doubtful whether or not the honourable member for Burnside will embarrass them. Only history will show, but I hope she does. Some people play merry while the opportunity presents itself, but I hope it will be history that for at least three years, from 1959 to 1962, it was the woman member of the House of Assembly whose influence accomplished the following:—full adult franchise for women in South Australia, equal rights with men in voting for Parliament, equal pay for the sexes at long last, women and children having some workmen's compensation cover while their husbands and fathers were going to and from employment; and women going to and from employment being covered by workmen's compensation. I hope that after 1962, even if the present member for Burnside is not still a member, at least it can be said that during the first three years of the first woman member of our Parliament, these things were achieved, which could not be achieved during the previous 100 odd years in which Parliament existed under a dictatorship.

If it were not so serious it would be humorous. I can see the humour in practically anything. For years I have been reading press statements about South Australia being the most progressive State; that South Australia's

factories have increased; and that this State has made greater industrial progress than any other in the Commonwealth—all that purported to have happened since 1938 when the Premier first took office.

I have often thought, "What is the press saying in the other States?" In January of this year a magazine entitled "Commerce," an industrial and mining review, was posted to my home. On page 14 appeared an article from the Western Australian Chamber of Commerce. It is not a "Red" article; and it did not come from the A.L.P. That organization is not affiliated with the Trades Hall Council in Western Australia, either. It is one of those august bodies with which the Liberal Party likes to be associated. It had commissioned a Mr. A. C. Gray, who was the Victorian Division Research Officer of the Bank of New South Wales, a highly respected body which means something to members opposite, to inquire into the industrial growth of Western Australia and tell the people of that state what he thought about it. He made his research and got all his statistics and I should like to read one part of the article. Mr. Gray referred to certain influences bearing on the matter:—

That they have not prevented rapid growth in the economy indicates they are not insuperable. In fact, the growth and development of Western Australia in the past 20 years has been extremely rapid and, in secondary industry, more rapid in rate than the other Australian States taken together.

So, whilst the press in South Australia says that the master, the dictator of South Australia, Sir Thomas Playford, is the man responsible for our industrial growth and that we have a greater expansion rate than any other Australian State, the Chamber of Commerce in Western Australia, with the assistance of an officer of the Bank of New South Wales, is attempting to prove that Western Australia has made greater industrial development than any other State.

I thought I would look at this question myself to see whether I could not obtain from the Commonwealth Statistician figures and information to enable me to see which State has made the greatest industrial progress during the past 20 years. In the Commonwealth Year Book a comparison is set out of the years 1938-39 and 1956-57. I have prepared four drafts which, with the permission of the House, I should like to have incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

AUSTRALIAN MANUFACTURING INDUSTRIES

Statistics, June 1958, No. 232 Issued by Commonwealth Statistician 1938-39

Particulars	New South Wales	Victoria	Queensland	South Australia	West Australia	Tasmania	Australia
1. Factories.....	9,464	9,250	3,087	2,067	2,129	944	26,941
Per Centage of Australian total	35.1	34.3	11.4	7.6	7.9	3.5	100
2. Persons employed average whole year.....	228,781	201,831	54,110	43,371	23,211	13,802	565,106
Per Centage of Australian total	40.4	35.7	9.5	7.6	4.1	2.4	100
3. Salaries, wages paid, £1,000, excluding amounts drawn by working proprietors.....	44,606	36,027	10,887	8,169	4,574	2,480	106,743
Per Centage of Australian total	41.7	33.7	10.1	7.6	4.2	2.3	100
4. Value of fuel, etc., used £1,000.....	7,652	4,000	1,423	1,018	1,169	438	15,700
Per Centage of Australian total	48.7	25.4	9.0	6.4	7.4	2.7	100
5. Value of materials used £1,000.....	120,502	82,971	42,596	20,309	9,604	5,321	281,303
Per Centage of Australian total	42.8	29.4	15.1	7.2	3.4	1.8	100
6. Value of production £'000 equals figures in line 7 less totals of figures in lines 4 and 5.....	90,266	65,996	19,302	13,678	8,776	5,399	203,417
Per Centage of Australian total	44.3	32.4	9.4	6.7	4.3	2.6	100
7. Value of output £'000.....	218,420	152,967	63,321	35,005	19,549	11,158	500,420
Per Centage of Australian total	43.0	30.5	12.6	6.9	3.9	2.2	100
8. Value of land and buildings £'000.....	57,354	42,026	12,299	8,711	6,814	3,717	130,921
Per Centage of Australian total	43.8	32.1	9.3	6.6	5.2	2.8	100
9. Value of plant and machinery £'000.....	62,693	38,627	18,095	9,750	8,095	6,402	143,662
Per Centage of Australian total	43.6	26.8	12.5	6.7	5.6	4.4	100
10. Population 31/12/39 Official Year Book No. 33—1940.....	2,770,348	1,887,278	1,015,927	597,045	465,916	241,576	6,978,090
Per Centage of Australian total	39.7	27.0	14.5	8.5	6.6	3.4	100

Statistics, June 1958, No. 232 Issued by Commonwealth Statistician 1956-57

Particulars	New South Wales	Victoria	Queensland	South Australia	West Australia	Tasmania	Australia
1. Factories.....	21,838	16,232	5,537	4,063	3,935	1,595	53,200
Per Centage of Australian total	41.0	30.5	10.4	7.6	7.3	2.9	100
2. Persons employed—Average whole year.....	435,998	355,204	103,426	91,981	48,748	27,670	1,063,027
Per Centage of Australian total	41.0	33.4	9.7	8.6	4.5	2.6	100
3. Salaries, wages paid £'000, excluding amounts drawn by working proprietors.....	377,976	296,608	77,780	77,818	36,916	23,636	890,734
Per Centage of Australian total	42.4	33.2	8.5	8.5	4.1	2.6	100
4. Value of fuel, etc., used £'000.....	71,445	40,381	13,130	14,130	9,225	4,699	153,110
Per Centage of Australian total	46.6	26.3	8.5	9.2	6.0	3.1	100
5. Value of materials used £'000.....	946,573	707,729	244,974	184,209	104,969	56,909	2,245,363
Per Centage of Australian total	42.1	31.5	10.8	8.2	4.6	2.5	100
6. Value of production £'000 equals figures in line 7 less totals of figures in lines 4 and 5.....	707,379	527,646	138,400	126,766	73,442	48,682	1,622,315
Per Centage of Australian total	43.6	32.5	8.5	7.8	4.5	3.0	100
7. Value of output £'000.....	1,725,397	1,275,756	396,504	325,105	187,636	110,390	4,020,788
Per Centage of Australian total	42.9	31.7	9.8	8.0	4.6	2.7	100
8. Value of land and buildings £'000.....	303,981	252,024	58,654	55,343	35,520	56,473	761,995
Per Centage of Australian total	39.8	33.0	7.6	7.2	4.6	7.4	100
Value of plant and machinery £'000.....	363,310	290,785	89,904	71,847	63,272	44,836	923,954
Per Centage of Australian total	39.3	31.4	9.7	7.7	6.8	4.8	100
10. Population 31/12/57. Quarterly summary of Australian statistics September 1958 No. 233.....	3,660,497	2,700,635	1,401,427	886,203	700,214	340,866	9,689,842
Per Centage of Australian total	37.7	27.8	14.4	9.1	7.2	3.5	100

VARIATIONS BETWEEN 1938-39 AND 1956-57.

Particulars.	New South Wales.	Victoria.	Queensland.	South Australia.	Western Australia.	Tasmania.
				No variation		
1. Factories	+ 5.9	- 3.8	- 1.0		- 0.6	- 0.6
2. Persons employed	+ 0.6	- 2.3	+ 0.2	+ 1.0	+ 0.4	+ 0.2
3. Salaries, wages paid . .	+ 0.7	- 0.5	- 1.6	+ 0.9	- 0.1	+ 0.3
4. Value of fuel, etc., used	- 2.1	+ 0.9	- 0.5	+ 2.8	- 1.4	+ 0.4
5. Value of materials used	- 0.7	+ 2.1	- 4.3	+ 1.0	+ 1.2	+ 0.7
6. Value of production . .	- 0.7	+ 0.1	- 0.9	+ 1.1	+ 0.2	+ 0.4
7. Value of output	- 0.7	+ 1.2	- 2.8	+ 1.1	+ 0.7	+ 0.5
8. Value of land and buildings	- 4.0	+ 0.9	- 1.7	- 0.6	- 0.6	+ 4.6
9. Value of plant and machinery	- 4.3	+ 4.6	- 2.8	+ 1.0	+ 1.2	+ 0.4
10. Population	- 2.0	+ 0.8	- 0.1	+ 0.6	+ 0.6	+ 0.1

+ Increase of percentage of Australian total.

- Decrease of percentage of Australian total.

NO. OF FACTORIES.

State.	1938-39.	1956-57.	Increase.	Per Cent Increase.
N.S.W.	9,464	21,838	12,374	130.74
Victoria	9,250	16,232	6,982	75.48
Queensland	3,087	5,537	2,450	79.36
Sth. Aust.	2,067	4,063	1,996	96.56
West Aust.	2,129	3,935	1,806	84.82
Tasmania	944	1,595	651	68.96
Total	26,941	53,200	26,259	99.10

POPULATION INCREASE.

State.	1938-39.	1956-57.	Increase.	Per Cent Increase.
N.S.W.	2,770,348	3,660,497	890,149	32.13
Victoria	1,887,278	2,700,635	813,357	43.09
Queensland	1,015,927	1,401,427	385,500	37.94
Sth. Aust.	597,045	886,203	289,158	48.43
West Aust.	465,916	700,214	234,298	50.28
Tasmania	241,576	340,866	99,290	41.10
Total	6,978,090	9,689,842	2,711,752	—

Mr. LAWN—Besides these figures taken from the Commonwealth Statistician's books, there are workings of my own that can be checked. The first table shows the particulars of factories, persons employed, salaries and wages paid, value of fuel used, value of materials used, value of production, value of output, value of land and buildings, value of plant and machinery, and population in the six Australian States. I have worked out the percentage of each State of the Australian total. That is for the year 1938-39.

The second table gives similar information for the year 1956-57. My last two tables give examples of what the first two tables disclose. The third table is headed "Variations which have taken place between 1938-39 and 1956-57." We find that, of the factories in Australia, New South Wales had 35.1 per cent in 1938 and during that 18-year period it increased its percentage by 5.9. South

Australia had no variation; we maintained our position. In 1956-57 our percentage of the factories in Australia was no different from what it was in 1938-39. That means that, while factories have been increasing in South Australia during that period, so they have in other States, and the position now is that we have made no gain, whereas New South Wales has gained 5.9 per cent. In regard to persons employed during that period, New South Wales had to find employment for an additional 890,149 people, whereas South Australia had only to find employment for 289,158 extra persons.

The position as regards salaries and wages paid is interesting. It shows that in South Australia salaries and wages paid increased by 0.9 per cent; in New South Wales by 0.7 per cent. It looks as though our wages paid increased more than New South Wales', but that is not the true position. In 1937 the

Commonwealth Arbitration Court awarded a prosperity loading of 6s. to the Eastern States and 4s. to South Australia, Western Australia and Tasmania. However, in South Australia, where general industry's employees were receiving a prosperity loading of 4s., our railwaymen enjoyed a prosperity loading of only 3s. In New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland they were getting 6s., so we had a leeway to catch up.

In 1950, that leeway had been made up because I think it was in that year that the court gave the £1 a week increase in the basic wage, removing all the disparity in regard to prosperity loadings. The States were not all equal. During this 18-year period, so South Australia only made up the amount by which we had lagged behind the other States. That is why the Statistician's figures disclose a 0.9 per cent increase as against 0.7 per cent by New South Wales.

The position with land and buildings is interesting. During this period Victoria increased its value of land and buildings by 0.9 per cent and South Australia by 0.6 per cent, so we have not taken a winner yet. In the value of plant and machinery, Victoria increased by 4.6 per cent and South Australia by 1 per cent. In population, New South Wales decreased in variations by 2 per cent, Victoria increased by 0.8 per cent, Queensland decreased by 0.1 per cent, South Australia increased by 0.6 per cent, Western Australia by 0.6 per cent and Tasmania by 0.1 per cent. Over the 18 years the Victorian population increased more than that of any other State. The number of factories in New South Wales in the period increased by 130.74 per cent and the population by 32.13 per cent. South Australia's population increased by 48.43 per cent and the number of factories by 96.56 per cent. New South Wales has made the greatest industrial progress over the 18 years and there is a doubt whether South Australian runs second or third.

Mr. Hambour—That's not a bad performance.

Mr. LAWN—Even if South Australia is third, she is only in the middle of the road, but I have a sheaf of claims made at the last election about the progress made in this State. It is marvellous how people opposite pledge their support for the Playford Government. No mention is made of a Liberal Country League Government. There is an attempt to create a myth, and it is assisted greatly by the press; that South Australia has made the greatest industrial progress. When it is proved that

that is not so and that South Australia runs only second or third, some people say it is not a bad effort. Last year our Premier went overseas and, as far as I know, came back with nothing. Whilst he was away the Premier of New South Wales and the Deputy Premier of Western Australia were also overseas. Since their return new industries have been established in their States with the capital investments amounting to millions of pounds. Recently the Premier of Victoria went overseas and following on his return industries worth millions of pounds have been established in his State. On June 9 the member for Stirling asked whether the Premier intended to make an overseas visit in order to put the advantages of South Australia before other countries, and the Premier said:—

Only last week I was told by a company in New York that it had decided to come to South Australia, that it had taken up 20 acres of land at Elizabeth and that it would immediately occupy it to establish premises. In this case there had been some preliminary discussion and there was a definite mission to be undertaken.

Several days later we read in the press the name of the firm concerned, Yankus, which had come from America and had taken 20 acres of land at Elizabeth to establish a chicken farm. The Premier said that there would be no industrial legislation to affect his industry, that factory conditions, workmen's compensation legislation and award rates of pay would not apply, and that after seven years Mr. Yankus would have to give only an extra week's pay to employees with continuous service.

I have always understood that if a voter at election time makes a mistake on his ballot paper he can get another. I live in the electorate of Edwardstown and on election morning last March before I had left home a lady called at my place. She said that she and her husband had been to the Soldiers Memorial Hall to vote but she had made a mistake and on asking for another ballot paper had been told that she could not get one and that it would be all right if she voted again on the same paper just outside the squares she had used previously. I mentioned earlier that on the day of the Wallaroo by-election I went to the Kulpura polling booth. It was at the local school and I opened the door and sang out to the presiding officer and his assistant that I would be standing at the front of the school giving out cards on behalf of the Australian Labor Party candidate. I was invited to go in and to put my cards on the school desks.

I could not really understand what was wanted and then I saw a blue Liberal Country League card on each desk. I had to sit in one of the seats to read how the card told me to vote for the Liberal Country League candidate. I wondered what would be the position when the returning officer got the ballot paper on which two votes had been cast, with one crossed out. It is time the Government instituted an overhaul of our electoral laws. The position would be improved if an Opposition suggestion were adopted. We believe that there should be one roll for both Council and Assembly voters, with each voter being given two ballot papers. Sometimes the presiding officer will see if the elector is on the Legislative Council roll, but that does not always apply.

The SPEAKER—Order! I notice in the Speaker's Gallery a distinguished visitor, Mr. B. F. Perera, His Excellency the High Commissioner for Ceylon in Australia, and his wife. I invite His Excellency to occupy a seat on the floor of the House.

Mr. Perera was escorted by the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition to a seat on the floor of the House.

Mr. LAWN—How unlucky can you be? It is a pity that His Excellency did not arrive about three-quarters of an hour earlier to hear my opening remarks. He would have learned of the dictatorship we have in South Australia and something not in accordance with a democracy. I have another important matter to mention. The Government has set up a dictatorship in the Metropolitan Tramways Trust. If members ask questions about trust matters the Premier or one of the Ministers answers that he will ask for a reply. If the trust gives one everything is all right, but if it does not want to reply the Government cannot make it do so. Councils have approached the trust on various matters but the approaches are always rejected. The Adelaide City Council has made many approaches to the trust but they are always rejected. When the trust makes a request to the city council it is invariably granted. The Municipal Association has complained of the way approaches to the trust are brushed off.

The trust controls a bus service that runs through Southwark, a portion of my electorate. The streets through which this service runs are narrow and the buses are wide. Bunney Brothers run a private bus service down the Port Road and straight through George Street to Taylors Road. Large buses operated by the trust run down the Port Road and then turn off into narrow streets. No two buses can enter or

leave the Port Road at the same time; one has to wait, and the driver of the bus coming on to the Port Road has his view obscured from traffic by the trust's bus which is waiting to enter the side street. The passengers on these buses using the side streets have complained, and so have the residents. The kerbing and the footpaths have had to be altered by the Thebarton council to permit these big buses to make their winding turns. The local residents have compiled a petition asking that the tramways bus service run down George Street to Taylor's Road instead of through these little side streets, and that Bunney's bus service run down the side streets as its buses are smaller.

When the matter went before the Thebarton Council originally, the council by a small majority agreed to the present route, and that is why the alterations to the kerbing were made. However, the council is by no means unanimous or happy about the position, nor are the residents who are compiling the petition and asking me to present it to this House or to the Trust. I suggested that because my approach to the Trust had been rejected it would be useless going back again, and that therefore the approach should be made to the Premier. The Hindmarsh Council has also forwarded me a letter, dated July 22, advising that it had heard of this petition and the approach to be made, and asking that it be joined in this protest. That council has asked me to collaborate with the member for Hindmarsh. I also received a letter from the Tramway Employees' Association, saying that it had been advised of the petition. That association pointed out that the matter had been discussed by its executive, and that the association supported the petition and trusted that our efforts would be successful.

Mr. Hutchens—Did you hear from Woodville?

Mr. LAWN—No. I was advised that the Woodville Council had also agreed to fall into line, but I have not received any communication from it. I point out that it was not the member for Hindmarsh but someone else who told me that Woodville would fall into line. The letter I received from the Hindmarsh Council was not solicited by me; it was sent to me out of the blue, as was this letter from the Tramway Employees' Association, and as this letter from the Woodville Council will be, if I receive it. The only direct approach by anyone was from the people who were going from house to house getting up this petition. If I receive the

letter from the Woodville Council I intend to ask the Premier to meet a deputation from the people I have referred to. The Premier may ask how it would affect the people in Woodville. My answer is that people will not travel on the M.T.T. bus from Woodville to the city because of these many winding turns in Thebarton and Southwark. They claim that they are afraid, or that it makes them sick in the stomach, therefore they either walk to catch the M.T.T. service from Port Adelaide (and so overload that route) or walk through to the train. I hope that the petition will obtain some results.

A recent press controversy concerns the actions of the Government in the appointment of a Royal Commission. I do not intend to refer in any way to the court proceedings, but will merely discuss the motion that was before the House and the statements in the press regarding this Royal Commission. The Premier today denied that he gave the House any assurance last week, but according to *Hansard* the Premier, in his reply to a question last week, said:—

I ask the House to oppose the motion. Knowing what the Leader has in mind, I can assure him and the House that steps already taken will ensure that there is a thorough inquiry into all aspects of the case he desires to ventilate before any sentence is carried out.

Mr. Stott—You realize you are discussing something that happened when the Standing Orders of this House were suspended.

Mr. LAWN—I cannot quite follow the honourable member's interjection. The Premier denied today that he made that statement last week, and tomorrow he may deny the statement he made today. We cannot get away from the statement that is recorded in *Hansard*; we all knew what was said, and so did the press. Letters have been written to the press and statements made by professors from the university. Sir John Latham—not a political friend of mine, because during his political career he was always a member of the Liberal Party and at one time Attorney-General of a Liberal Government—has written to the Premier regarding this matter. It has always been a principle, as far as I know, that justice shall not only be done but that it must appear to be done. Press headings say that the eyes of the world are on South Australia regarding this Royal Commission. My opinion is that the terms of reference of the Commission should be as wide as possible and that the personnel of that Commission should come from outside the State. I would also like to see the appointment to that Com-

mission of Judge Kriewaldt, of the Northern Territory, who knows and understands aborigines. We could then say to the world, "Watch us, we have nothing to be afraid of," and justice would not only be done, but would appear to be done. No-one could then point the finger at South Australia and say that the odds were stacked against Stuart.

Two of the judges on that Royal Commission may well be embarrassed because they have participated in the previous trials, and they should not be placed in that position. The world should be told that the Parliament of South Australia wishes to see justice done, that it is going to make the terms of reference of this Royal Commission as wide as possible and that it is going outside the State to select the personnel of that Commission. If that were done, no finger could be pointed at South Australia. However, for some reason or another the Government does not want to do that, and I condemn it and voice my protest at the mishandling of the appointment of the Royal Commission.

The member for Barossa referred to General Motors-Holdens. When speaking on this matter last year (at page 1584 of *Hansard*) I referred to last year's profit of General Motors-Holdens of between £11,000,000 and £12,000,000, and said that the firm wanted a profit of £15,000,000 in the coming year.

Mr. Ryan—You were right.

Mr. LAWN—I have made quite a few correct prophecies in this House. In fact, I remember saying last year that there was a pact between the Liberal Party and the Democratic Labor Party, that in the Federal elections the D.L.P. was going to use a card with a yellow background and the Liberal Party a card with a blue background, and that they were going to swap for the State campaign. That prophecy proved so correct, right up to the State campaign, that those Parties thought it better not to make the swap and altered their agreement just to prove me wrong. While the member for Barossa was referring to G.M.-H., some questions were asked as to the original capital of that company. The original capital provided by the G.M.-H. was £1,750,000. That was the ordinary share capital, the whole of which, I believe, was subscribed by G.M.-H. If that ordinary share capital was not all subscribed by G.M.-H., then the original ordinary share capital was £1,750,000. I believe the preference shares are wholly Australian-owned, and total £561,600. Since the capital was subscribed, G.M.-H. has taken millions

from the employees and the consuming public of Australia. I know it has ploughed back many millions of pounds into the working operations of the company, but that has been done merely because under the Commonwealth law the company is limited in the amount it can take out of the country.

Mr. Ryan—The profits are still excessive.

Mr. LAWN—Yes, that profit is excessive for any company. I know the company is efficient—probably as efficient as any firm in Australia.

Mr. Hambour—That must be why it sacked you.

Mr. LAWN—Possibly, but it was always prepared to take me back. Every time I was sacked by certain personnel down there, which this Government is prepared to use, it was because of my agitation either in the Commonwealth Arbitration Court (in the first instance), or within the factory.

Mr. Fred Walsh—In other words, you were victimized?

Mr. LAWN—Yes. However, due to the generosity and fairness of Mr. McFarlane, the then industrial officer, I was re-employed every time. Although he had the task of managing the industrial affairs of the company he permitted employees the right to freely speak their minds in the factory and to go to the Arbitration Court. The profits of the company increased from £11,000,000 to £15,000,000 in one year and it is interesting to study the balance-sheets to see where the money went. In 1957, 55.2 per cent went to suppliers of materials, parts, components, services, etc., compared with 54.4 per cent in 1958. The percentage decreased because the company's employees produced more components than in the previous year. In 1957 employees received 19.8 per cent, but, notwithstanding their increased production, in 1958 they received 18.7 per cent, a drop of 1.1 per cent.

Mr. Laucke—A larger sum was provided for wages.

Mr. LAWN—Yes, but according to the report the staff increased by 1,262 and wages were increased during the period by virtue of wage adjustments. I must be fair and admit that the company recognized the truth of what I have said and has attempted to make adjustments by recently agreeing to increase the amount employees will receive in the next 12 months. I hope they get back the 1.1 per cent, but even if they do they will not have got anything for their increased production in 1958.

The company has consistently argued before the Commonwealth Arbitration Court that it believes in uniformity. If a series of stoppages occurred in New South Wales it would go to the court and secure a variation of the award to inflict penalties on the New South Wales employees. Then it would ask that the variation be wide enough to cover its Commonwealth operations and, consequently, the penalties were put into the award to operate on a uniform basis irrespective of State or union. When the Victorian Parliament passed its Long Service Leave Act in 1953 the Vehicle Builders Union went to the company and referred to its belief in uniformity, which the company admitted. We pointed out that the company would be obliged to provide long service leave in Victoria and probably New South Wales and Queensland, and asked, whether in view of its belief in uniformity, it would be consistent and apply the long service leave provisions of the Victorian Act to its employees in South Australia, Western Australia and Tasmania. The company asked for time to consider the proposal and subsequently agreed, and the agreement it signed is generally in accordance with the Victorian legislation that was made retrospective to 1933.

The company delayed the final implementation of that agreement pending appeals to the High Court and Privy Council, but assured the employees that it would abide by the Privy Council decision and it has honoured that undertaking. The company was recently approached and advised that in all States except Western Australia and South Australia it was compelled to take out workmen's compensation cover to cover its employees travelling to and from work and it was asked whether it would provide similar compensation for its employees in Western Australia and South Australia, but it has refused to do so. Unfortunately, this company is like many others and will only do what pleases it. It believes in consistency and uniformity when it suits it. I regret that that is the company's attitude on workmen's compensation because I had confidence that it would be consistent, particularly as it had accepted uniformity on long service leave. I do not know whether pressure has been applied from other sources to persuade the company to reject the proposal.

According to the balance-sheets, in 1957, 10.2 per cent went to the Government for customs, duties, taxes, etc., and in 1958, 10.9 per cent. In 1957, 6.1 per cent was retained for use in the business and in 1958, 6.7 per cent. In 1957 shareholders received 5.8 per

cent compared with 6.4 per cent in 1958, and the amounts allowed for depreciation of plant and equipment were 2.9 per cent in both years. I did not intend to refer to the company's balance sheets, but after hearing the member for Barossa I thought I should clarify the position concerning its original ordinary shareholding and point out that the employees had received less from the operations in 1958 than they did in 1957.

I hope the Government will see the wisdom of our request concerning the Royal Commission and that it will widen the terms of reference and appoint personnel from other States. I am interested to see whether the Government will be embarrassed by the member for Burnside, Mrs. Steele, supporting humane and just legislation which will be introduced by the Labor Party in the next three years.

Mr. STOTT (Ridley)—I congratulate the member for Burnside on her excellent maiden speech, which created a favourable impression. Obviously she has the courage necessary in a member of Parliament who wishes to properly represent an electorate. She disagreed with some people who live in high places in her electorate and who would strongly advocate the removal of price control. She is to be commended for not being swayed by that opinion and for standing up to her convictions. She also expressed opinions quite contrary to Government policy and it is obvious she will not be afraid to disagree with Ministerial policy. I look forward to her standing steadfastly to her convictions—a stand that in the past has generally been the exception rather than the rule. Unfortunately I was unable to hear all that the member for Gouger, Mr. Hall, said, but I subsequently read his speech. He made an excellent debut and we look forward to many valuable contributions from him.

I congratulate the Minister of Railways on making alterations to the train schedule from Alawoona to Paringa for the benefit of people in the area who have been fighting for this for a long time. They are looking forward to further alterations. I am glad that the department saw the wisdom of altering the schedule.

My speech today becomes necessary in order to reply to the vicious personal attack on me by the member for Onkaparinga, Mr. Shannon, and his despicable attack on members of South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd., some of whom I have been associated with for more than 30 years. I hope I shall be able to convince the House that there is no truth in any of Mr. Shannon's statements.

I had delayed making this speech deliberately so that I should be absolutely accurate in everything I had to say in relation to the company, and could not be challenged. It will go down on record for ever so that this company will never in future be able to be attacked as it has been in this Chamber. The claim by the honourable member that the company had built storages in the Wallaroo division in excess of the requirements of the division is not correct. The designed capacity of the nine silos erected in the division is 5,133,000 bushels and the capacity of the terminal storage does not exceed the capacity recommended by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works in May, 1956. In relation to the Wallaroo division, the following recommendation appeared in the committee's report:—

That it is advisable to construct horizontal storage for 1,500,000 bushels of wheat and vertical storage for 100,000 bushels of wheat on section 266 and adjoining sections at Wallaroo.

The last nine-year average delivery in the Wallaroo division has been 5,284,416 bushels. The company received in the season 1958-59 a total of 5,417,296 bushels of bulk wheat in this division. Although the Harbors Board shipping conveyor belt loading system was not completed and in operation until October 1958, the company shipped from its terminal 5,925,042 bushels during the period from October 3, 1958 to July 24, 1959 (10 months). During this time approximately 100,000 tons (3,705,011 bushels) has been railed from the company's bulk grain installations to the Wallaroo terminal.

This is what the honourable member for Onkaparinga said—

With regard to the cost of the installation at the port—first of all there is a much more costly site to secure, upon which to construct the facilities; secondly, there is the disability of having to congregate more than is required. In this matter the committee made many investigations. We suggested 1,000,000 bushels for a transit facility at Wallaroo and the company provided 1,510,000 bushels for Wallaroo.

In illustrating this point, just previous to this statement, the honourable member said—

I point out this factor in looking at the costs of a bulk handling installation, the more expensive the port facilities are in the way of storage capacity, the greater will be the over all cost for any particular division.

On the question of the capacity of a silo at Wallaroo, the honourable member is deliberately misleading the House and the outside public. The House would expect that, as

Chairman of the Public Works Committee, Mr. Shannon would approach the question from an unbiased point of view and make an unbiased and truthful report upon it; and that any subsequent statement made in this House by him would be truthful, accurate and not at all misleading.

Mr. Fred Walsh—I want you to be fair. When he attacked you, he was speaking as the member for Onkaparinga.

Mr. STOTT—That is so, but he was dealing with the report of the Public Works Committee. The facts are that the Public Works Committee itself recommended building storage capacity at Wallaroo for 1,500,000 bushels. Yet, in his previous statement the honourable member condemned the company for building a 1,500,000 bushels silo at Wallaroo. He conveyed the impression to honourable members that the company had acted contrary to the committee's finding. The report was signed by the honourable member himself. Dealing further with the question of the terrific overhead costs, which the honourable member seemed to be worried about, he stated:—

It secured an inalienable right to any grower of wheat, who delivered it to any specific siding near to his farm, that if at least 30,000 bushels or more were the average deliveries to that particular siding, he would get a bulk installation.

This investigation that we conducted and concluded in 1954 was not the only one dealing with this particular problem. The problem of harnessing our country areas for the handling of wheat in bulk was looked at back in the 1930's by a former investigation into bulk handling. We could not see any valid reason why we should not adopt its findings.

In fact we thought it was a sound basis for deciding where these facilities throughout the country should be placed. We adopted the 30,000 bushels as the minimum standard for testing whether or not there should be a bulk installation.

Members will see that the basis of this statement on the finding of the Public Works Committee was, firstly, that it was prepared to take 1930 as a basis for building the present bulk installations, and as the Committee recommended the building of silos of 1,500,000 bushels capacity at Wallaroo and that every siding producing an average of 30,000 bushels or more should be equipped with a bulk installation—that is exactly what the honourable member said—yet, in the next breath, if he ever paused to get breath, he said the company had now established the following silos and facilities in the Wallaroo division—he mentioned Balaklava, Blyth, Brinkworth,

Bute, Hoyleton, Nantawarra, Paskeville, Snowtown, and the Wallaroo terminal, making a total of 5,320,000 bushels.

He stated the average receivals at all points in the division of Wallaroo for many years had been 4,500,000 bushels. He went on to say that that total capacity of 5,320,000 bushels gave some 800,000 bushels in excess of the average receivals in this division. If the company proposed to erect installations at various other sidings, it will have a storage capacity in the Wallaroo division far in excess of what it will ever need, and then the question is, "Who carried the overhead?" The honourable member stated, "If it is possible for the company to erect installations on such an extravagant basis, obviously money is no object." Members, on reflection, will see that he casts aspersions and throws malicious insinuations against the company's intentions; yet this is the very thing that he recommended himself. Where do we get with statements like that?

Of course, Mr. Speaker, the truth (which the honourable member handles so carelessly) is that for the last nine years the average receivals in the Wallaroo division were 5,284,416 bushels. The company's silo capacity in the Wallaroo division aggregates 5,133,000, not 4,500,000. There is, therefore, no surplus storage in the Wallaroo division whatsoever at present. The future needs of the division will be considered when the company's stated policy of bulk facilities for as many growers as possible, spread to give maximum cover throughout the State, and built as quickly as possible, to function as efficiently as possible, has been completely implemented.

Mr. Shannon stated—

If the company has not had time to provide all the facilities, how long shall we give it? The company is not working at Wallaroo today, but is spending money in various other parts of the State. Why should it do only half the job at Wallaroo? If it intended keeping faith with the agreement, why should it install a 540,000 bushel facility at a siding that receives less than half that quantity?

The next day the honourable member said:—

The South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. has broken faith with this Parliament after a charter had been given it in connection with providing country facilities for bulk handling. The company has also broken faith with the farmers.

He went on to say:—

I have been approached by some wheat-growers complaining that they have no bulk handling facilities at sidings near them where they had expected to get these facilities.

The honourable member cannot have it both ways. In one breath he complains that the company should have stayed in the Wallaroo division and in the next he complains because the company is not building silos in other parts of the State. The truth of the matter, of course, is that the company has not broken faith with the farmers in its endeavours to give a service of bulk handling equipment and build some bulk receival depots in all divisions as speedily as it possibly can in order to keep faith with all its members all over the State. It would have been a suicidal and stupid policy to complete one division first and leave all the other parts of the State waiting, but that is the type of policy the honourable member advocates. I question very much whether he advocates it, or whether it is just because of his anger and his contempt of the company and the hate he holds for it that he is just saying these things in an attempt to discredit the company. It will already be seen that in his hate and venom for this company he would say anything whatever to damage it and do anything to create doubts in the minds of the members of the company and this Parliament as to the *bona fide* intentions of the company itself.

It will be clear to the House that in his haste to condemn the company the honourable member has lost all sense of logic, reason and commonsense and, in addition, he has lost all sense of decency and fair play. He said:—

If the company is not going to break its charter it will break the bank, it will have an excess capacity in every division, such as at Bordertown, and I could name others. In every instance where a bulk facility has been provided its capacity is in excess of the average receivals.

This statement is not factual. The company, in its anxiety to provide facilities to minimize the distance farmers would have to cart to their respective bulk receival depots, has gone to a great deal of trouble to build these silos in the respective focal points.

The honourable member suggested that growers must carry bulk wheat long distances in the Wallaroo division because the company has not provided facilities in certain places as promised. The distances between silos is as follows:—Snowtown to Bute, 16 miles; Nantawarra to Balaklava, 16; Hoyleton to Blyth, 16; Brinkworth to Blyth, 13; Balaklava to Owen, 12; Redhill to Snowtown, 17; and in other divisions, Gulnare to Gladstone, 13; and Mallala to Owen, 16. As these silos are well spaced through the mid-North the average carrying distance for growers delivering to

those silos is half the mileages above—that is, not greater than six to eight miles, which, with modern transport, is no problem.

Before building the silo at Nantawarra, the company approached all the farmers who would deliver wheat to the silo at that point. We said "If we build a silo at Nantawarra will you all deliver your wheat to it or will you by-pass it and deliver to the Ardrossan silo?" Every farmer agreed that they would deliver to Nantawarra silo. Subsequently, however, the carriers and carters of wheat on Yorke Peninsula, in order to secure business, canvassed the farmers in Nantawarra, reduced their prices for cartage, and picked up their bulk wheat in their paddocks, by-passed Nantawarra and delivered it to Ardrossan, which meant a considerable saving per bushel to the farmers at Nantawarra because of the differential freight rate from Nantawarra as against the terminal point differential at Ardrossan, which is nil. The freight rate at Nantawarra is 8.724d. and that is for a distance of 46 miles. The honourable member said:—

There are bulk handling facilities at Nantawarra and Hoyleton. In the years 1949 to 1954, prior to bulk handling, the annual average delivery of wheat at Kybunga was 282,957 bushels, in Nantawarra 146,691, Hoyleton 157,531 and Moonta 476,166 bushels. Nantawarra and Hoyleton have bulk handling facilities, but not Kybunga and Moonta.

The fact is that the company gave the fullest consideration to the building of the silo at Hoyleton, and before any decision is made as to where the silos will be built the company holds conferences with the Australian Wheat Board, which is vitally concerned because of trade with the flour mills, and with the South Australian Railways, which is also vitally concerned, and honourable members would know that one of the Government directors on the Board is Comptroller of railway accounts. All these factors caused the decision to build at Hoyleton.

Dealing with the honourable member's attack that the company has not built a silo at Moonta, the House would understand that the honourable member attacks the company for not building the silo at Moonta which has a receival of 476,166 bushels (his own figures). I venture to state that if the company did build a silo at Moonta it would not receive 30,000 bushels of wheat in it. The point here, which the honourable member does not understand (and I really think he should) is that there is a differential of 4½d. per bushel between Moonta and Wallaroo, the distance from Moonta to Wallaroo is 10 miles, and it is quite obvious

(and this has been tested out by many farmers at Moonta) that the farmers would by-pass the silo at Moonta and cart to Wallaroo to save the 4½d. per bushel, exactly the same thing as happened at Nantawarra.

The member for Onkaparinga went to great lengths to attack the company for breaking faith with the farmers, saying it should have built silos at the 30,000 bushel points. He gave the impression that it has to do this under the Act. The report of the Public Works Committee on the Wallaroo bulk bin quoted evidence given by Messrs. Rosevear and Dean, the Government representatives on the board, who both said that their approach to the problem of zonal country storage was influenced by three conflicting considerations that they thought could be satisfactorily met by the application of the principle of storage at alternate sidings. The first was advice given to them by the late Minister of Agriculture (who introduced the Bill into this House) that although it was not obligatory on South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited to erect a bin at every siding with an average receipt of 30,000 bushels or more the company would be expected to provide sufficient to meet the convenience of farmers. It is not obligatory on the company to build at points receiving 30,000 bushels or more. The member for Onkaparinga quoted the Act, and said he did not understand why the section was there, but members who have been in this Chamber for any length of time, and even new members, appreciate what it means. Section 14 provides:—

(1) The company shall, with all practicable speed, erect adequate bulk handling facilities—

(a) at each terminal port; and

(b) at a sufficient number of railway stations, railway sidings and depots, to receive the wheat which is to be taken to the terminal ports.

(2) The company shall not be obliged to erect bulk handling facilities at any railway station or railway siding unless the average annual amount of wheat received thereat during a period of five consecutive years after the first day of September, 1949, has been 30,000 bushels or more.

Mr. Quirke—That is an obligatory point?

Mr. STOTT—No, it is not. Section 15 provides:—

Subject to section 7 of this Act the order of priority of the erection of bulk handling facilities shall be determined by the company. In determining such order the company shall take into account the following matters:—

(a) The urgency of the needs of growers and the amount of wheat produced in the various parts of the State:

(b) The urgency of the needs of persons shipping wheat in bulk from the respective terminal ports and the quantity of wheat in bulk which may reasonably be expected to be handled at each port;

(c) The amount of finance available to the company;

(d) The quantity of materials and labour available to the company at the respective places at which bulk handling facilities are to be erected.

The member for Onkaparinga said that the company had broken faith with its members, but section 18 is the safeguarding part that allows Parliament to dictate to the company, and we were careful to see that it went into the Act. It provides:—

Whenever, in the opinion of the Minister any bulk handling facilities provided by the company are inadequate for the needs of the district which they serve, or are defective, or ought to be enlarged so as to meet the requirements of a larger district, the Minister may, by notice in writing, direct the company to make such alterations or additions to those facilities as the Minister deems necessary, and the company shall obey such direction.

Mr. Quirke—Have those directions been given?

Mr. STOTT—It was not necessary for them to be given because the company has not completed its building programme. It can be seen from the Act that it is not obligatory on it to tell the Minister where it is going to put a silo. Plans and specifications have to be approved by the Minister, but not the sites. However, at every place where it intended to build a silo the company informed the Minister accordingly and told him the progress made.

Mr. Shannon—What is the position in the Wallaroo division? Is it completed?

Mr. STOTT—Unfortunately the honourable member was not here when I dealt with it.

Mr. Shannon—You were not here at all when I spoke.

Mr. STOTT—The honourable member will be sorry he raised that.

Mr. Shannon—I do not think so.

Mr. STOTT—Yes, he will, because on the day when the vital report of the Public Works Committee was to be tabled in this Chamber he was not here to sign it as chairman of the committee.

Mr. Shannon—You will agree it was presented?

Mr. STOTT—That is not the point. Of course it was presented but it had to be signed by the temporary chairman to get it here. The honourable member was not in his place.

Mr. Shannon—Do you think that is the only occasion on which such an occurrence has taken place?

Mr. STOTT—The honourable member is raising the point.

Mr. Shannon—I did not raise it; I am only raising the point about your not being here.

Mr. STOTT—I am here.

Mr. Shannon—That is about the only time.

Mr. STOTT—When I am here I do speak the truth, and that is better than never being absent. Anyhow, I think the honourable member will be sorry that he raised that point.

Mr. Shannon—Not a bit. The point you take is quite inappropriate because I do not sign all the reports. That is physically impossible. There have been times when I have been overseas. Who signs the reports then?

Mr. STOTT—There was no objection raised that day, as everybody knows. The point is that if the honourable member wants to pursue it, I will pursue it.

Mr. Shannon—No.

Mr. STOTT—Honourable members will remember that we had a special session of Parliament to enable the Bill to pass because they wanted to get the thing under way so that a silo could be built near Ardrossan to remove the bottleneck there. Under the Public Works Standing Committee Act, there are limitations on what Parliament can do without receiving a report from the committee. This matter was referred to the committee for report to the House. The House had met for a couple of days, but a report had not come forward, and we waited till the next Tuesday. When we met on that Tuesday I expected it to be laid on the table of the House, and the chairman of the committee was expected to be here to sign it, but he was not here.

Mr. Shannon—That is not the point, because any member of my committee could have signed it.

Mr. STOTT—If the honourable member was away and not carrying out the duty that he was appointed by Parliament to do, there is no point in his remarks. What he is saying is absolute rubbish.

Mr. Shannon—The honourable member does not attend to his business here.

Mr. STOTT—The honourable member was not attending to this either. Do not let us go into that.

Mr. Shannon—I will not. We can look at the attendance book.

Mr. STOTT—That has nothing to do with the duties that this Parliament laid down for the chairman of the committee. The proposed

silo was not built at Moonta because the company realizing what was likely to happen took a very cautious and conservative approach in deciding where to build silos in future. The same thing applies at Kadina. The company would be foolish to build a silo at Kadina to equal the total previous receipts there because, with the latest up-to-date bulk bins and machinery for handling wheat in bulk from the harvester to the siding, it enables a farmer to run longer distances and by-pass his usual silo where he previously delivered in bags, and thus save 4½d. and up to 6d. per bushel. It is beyond the realms of commonsense to expect the farmers to do otherwise. The honourable member for Barossa, Mr. Laucke, who is a flour miller and has some knowledge of this matter, interjected when the honourable member for Onkaparinga was speaking, and made a valiant attempt to put the honourable member on the right track in this regard. He interjected and said, "Because it was economic to do so!" There is a natural trend for the movement of wheat over longer distances to a bulk centre.

The suggestion by my honourable friend that Ardrossan could handle this wheat would obviously deprive the South Australian Railways of this haulage of the 100,000 tons, and involve road transport from stations up to 70 miles from Ardrossan. The South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited has not been in operation four years yet but, with the strong support from almost every wheatgrower in the State, has collected from growers over £1,000,000 in tolls and provided storage for almost 13,000,000 bushels—half the average annual State delivery.

Membership of the company has doubled since the enactment of the Bulk Handling of Grain Act by the South Australian Parliament on July 7, 1955, and registered membership of C.B.H. now exceeds 15,400, representing a bushellage delivered of about 92 per cent of the annual State wheat delivery. The policy of the company has been to provide storage for the greatest number of growers at the earliest possible opportunity. This procedure has been pursued with vigor and, as a result, silos have been established in every division of the State, as follows:—Walleroo division, nine silos, designed capacity 5,133,000 bushels; Port Lincoln division, five silos, designed capacity 2,500,000 bushels; Port Adelaide division, six silos, designed capacity 2,730,000 bushels; Port Pirie division, four silos, designed capacity 1,750,000 bushels; Thevenard division, one silo, designed capacity 300,000

bushels. The three terminals at Wallaroo, Port Lincoln and Ardrossan provide first class bulk grain shipping facilities.

The South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited has stockpiled aggregate for the Thevenard terminal with the expectation that, in the event of the South Australian Harbors Board completing the installation of a full conveyor belt ship loading system at this port by the end of next year, the company may be able to provide shore terminal storage facilities of 750,000 bushels in 1961.

As a result of approaches by South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited to the State Government, advice has been received from the Minister of Agriculture that the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works has been requested to enquire into and report upon the establishment of port facilities at Port Pirie, capable of handling grain produced within that division, and maybe the honourable member, who is chairman of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, is not anxious for bulk handling to be established at Port Pirie, and is adopting the attitude that it may not be necessary to export wheat produced in this State, as it may be required for home consumption.

It is significant that the honourable member is a member of the board of directors of the S.A.F.U. They are the licensed receivers for wheat receivals at Port Pirie. The honourable member inferred that, with the population increase, wheat will be exhausted in the Port Adelaide division and will be drawn from the Wallaroo division, and will therefore make silos in the Wallaroo division redundant. As the State, in 1931-32, produced 48,000,000 bushels, and in 1932-33 produced 42,500,000 bushels, the last nine-year average was 26,000,000 bushels. Flour millers have only a limited capacity to handle wheat, according to the size of the concern. The country silos store this wheat and distribute it to the mills at a steady rate. The honourable member has overlooked, also, that the Wallaroo terminal will also be useful for storing and shipping barley as the opportunity permits. The honourable member then went on to say that South Australia would ultimately not be able to export any wheat. The answer to this is that in 1958, with a population of 900,000 people, the South Australian flour mills consumed 6,400,000 bushels, but only 3,700,000 bushels are required for consumption within this State. The rest is exported. The population has increased by 50 per cent over the last four years. The 1918 census showed that

South Australia's population was 457,552. On the impossible assumption of no increase in wheat production, in these circumstances it would take about 640 years for the population to consume the whole of South Australia's wheat production, by which time the honourable member will not have to worry about this problem.

One of the most despicable statements made by the honourable member was that low standard wheat had been accepted as f.a.q. by the company to induce growers to sign up as members. The company most emphatically denies this, as on no occasion was this done.

Mr. Shannon—That is a pity because I am getting more evidence of it every day.

Mr. STOTT—Let the honourable member listen to this one.

Mr. Shannon—I am listening with a great deal of interest.

Mr. STOTT—I point out that the company has a membership of 15,400, representing over 92 per cent of all wheat delivered. All membership is purely voluntary and wheat-growers are most ready to join a company which is advancing their interests so efficiently.

The honourable member went to the trouble to read a letter he had in his possession. He endeavoured to insinuate that this particular farmer had his wheat claim for compensation withheld until he was forced to join as a member of the company. This statement is most despicable and quite untrue. The facts are that the company has been able to trace the person concerned—I do not wish to disclose his name but am quite prepared to do so to any honourable member to prove the statement I am making. The facts are that the licensed receiver receiving wheat at the centre concerned is the South Australian Farmers' Union, of which Mr. Shannon is a director, and that the grower referred to joined the company on 23rd December, 1954. He willingly paid his tolls in 1955-56, in 1956-57 and in 1957-58, at the rate applicable to those seasons on bagged deliveries, i.e., 2d. per bushel, but then this farmer queried the payment of 6d. per bushel toll on his bulk delivery.

The point is, as honourable members will understand, that a member of the company pays 2d. when he delivers in bags, but when the bulk facilities are provided it jumps to 6d., and this farmer objected to paying the 6d. toll.

Mr. Shannon—So we apply a little pressure; that is what the correspondence discloses.

Mr. STOTT—No pressure. He willingly signed a form four years before this, so how was pressure applied?

Mr. Shannon—By the 6d.

Mr. STOTT—Rubbish!

Mr. Shannon—The honourable member does not even know what the application form is.

Mr. STOTT—No pressure at all because, when he originally joins the company and signs that form, he agrees to pay 2d. toll when he delivers in bags and, when the bulk installation goes in, he agrees to pay 6d. toll, so there is no pressure at all. There was no pressure on this member because he signed up four years previous to the 6d. being paid.

Mr. Shannon—Would you like the gentleman concerned to tender evidence?

Mr. STOTT—Yes.

Mr. Shannon—Very good; that would be good, too.

Mr. STOTT—That would be delightful.

Mr. Shannon—I only hope we get the opportunity.

Mr. STOTT—I could quote the name.

Mr. Shannon—Do not worry about it.

Mr. STOTT—He was quite willing to pay his 2d. but, when it jumped up to 6d., he kicked up a fuss and said he would not pay that.

Mr. Shannon—That is very true.

Mr. STOTT—We cannot be blamed for that. If we allowed this one member not to pay his 6d., how would we get it from anybody else?

Mr. Shannon—How did he know that he had to pay 6d.? I doubt if he did.

Mr. STOTT—How did he not know?

Mr. Shannon—The fact that he was a little reluctant to pay 6d. is some evidence that he did not know whether he had to pay 6d.

Mr. STOTT—It is no good asking the honourable member; he would not know.

Mr. Shannon—That is a good argument; proceed.

Mr. STOTT—If the farmer concerned wants to know how he has to pay 6d., he has only to read the document, discuss it with the person who does the sale and that will be explained to him. The honourable member cannot get away with that, tell me that the average farmer does not know that, when he signs, he agrees to pay 2d., and then use that as an argument in this Chamber that we put pressure on him to get the 6d. out of him.

Mr. Shannon—That is all I am proposing to prove. If you want that proof, bring that man into court and he will prove it for you.

Mr. STOTT—Rubbish!

Mr. Shannon—Call it rubbish if you will.

Mr. STOTT—How can he prove it when he originally signed the document that he would pay the 6d. when the bulk installation came in? The honourable member should have better sense in his old age.

Mr. Shannon—Even in your youth we might have listened to the man himself rather than to you.

Mr. STOTT—The honourable member is trying to make out now that we put pressure on the man who signed the document four years previously, paid his 2d. toll in the years that followed and then, when he had to pay 6d., suddenly wanted to withdraw from his contract.

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.]

Mr. STOTT—Mr. Shannon singled out a farmer whom he said had payment withheld until he became a member of the bulk handling company, but I explained that the farmer had signed an application to become a member about four years previously. Mr. Shannon tried, by interjection, to show that the company brought pressure to bear on this farmer, but that was not possible because the farmer was already a member. When a farmer makes a claim the local agent sets out in the required form the quantity of wheat delivered and the farmer signs it. At the bottom is an authorization to the Wheat Board to deduct the toll for payment to the board. That is what the honourable member is trying to slide away with, but it has no relation to pressure being brought to bear on a farmer to join the company before payment is made on his wheat certificate. It is typical of the honourable member. When he gets into a corner he tries to slide out, but this time he shall not do so. In the past I have been too generous with him. Over the years he has attacked me and I have let it go because I regarded it as his style, but now the time has come to nail things down.

As he progressed in his speech, the honourable member really got off the beam, and now I come to one of the most despicable and dastardly statements he made. He referred to the selection of the site for the establishment of the transit silo at Wallaroo. He stated:—

When the Public Works Committee inquired into the matter of the site the company bitterly opposed the site considered by the committee to be suitable. It went to no end of trouble to try to convince my committee that it was wrong in the choice of the site.

I would like to know what he means by "my committee." I thought it was a Parliamentary committee. He then went on to quote "the directors of the Wallaroo Clothing Company—Messrs. Bruce, Harvey, Sharpe and Ernest Walter Burr." The wicked thing about this allegation is that the honourable member said "We had before us," meaning that these two men had given evidence before the Public Works Committee, and he stated their conclusion, signed by Mr. Sharpe, as follows:—

If the silo is built on the proposed site opposite our factory, we shall have no alternative but to close the factory for the reasons enumerated hereunder and as expressed by the gentlemen who have supported me in this submission.

The honorable member continued:—

What was the outcome? I understand these two associated factories still operate, so how does it come about that the company was able to secure the acquiescence of these clothing factories to the establishment of their bulk facility on the site to which, at that stage, they were bitterly opposed? We can only draw our conclusions and everyone is entitled to do that! The company was anticipating quite a liberal income and it warranted the establishment on this particular site because it discovered that the northern site was not suitable. In my opinion it throws a little light on the methods this company has adopted to achieve its own ends.

That, Mr. Speaker, is a wicked statement, and I point out that this implies that the company engaged in nefarious practices with the two directors of this company to obtain the site opposite their clothing factory at Wallaroo. It means that the chairman of the Public Works Committee, who is in a position to receive evidence from these men of high repute, now sees fit in Parliament to cast aspersions on their integrity. He has also cast aspersions on every director of the bulk handling company and made wicked insinuations against their integrity. The directors of the company include the two Government representatives, Messrs. Rosevear and Dean. These two gentlemen are of the highest calibre, as honest as the day is long, and their integrity is above question. It is a wicked thing for this Parliament to condone that the chairman of the Public Works Committee should stoop so low as to make these insinuations about men that give evidence before his committee.

The truth is that the company intended to build the silo on what is known as the lowland site opposite the Wallaroo-Mount Lyell Company, and, in good faith, entered into

negotiations with the Wallaroo-Mount Lyell Company to purchase the land on the lowland site. I know all about it because I was responsible for it on behalf of the company. It was unquestionably, from the facility, road transport and railway points of view the best site. However, when the Mines Department put down test holes in this area it was found unsuitable. It would not carry the silos. The contractors indicated to the company that they would not take the risk of building a concrete vertical silo on that ground. This consequently threw the whole of the negotiations out of gear and in view of that statement the directors of the company would have been crazy to go ahead and build a silo on the lowland site. All our previous negotiations had to be cancelled and new negotiations entered into to build a silo on the highland site.

Mr. Heaslip—When you say "our negotiations," do you mean negotiations by the bulk handling company?

Mr. STOTT—Yes.

Mr. Heaslip—Not you?

Mr. STOTT—No. To show how careless the honourable member for Onkaparinga is (and one should be certain of facts before he casts such serious and wicked insinuations around this Chamber) he implied that the company had subsequently built the silo opposite the Wallaroo Clothing Company's factory, against which it had raised strong objections. The truth is, Mr. Speaker, that the company did not build the silo there, not in that exact spot.

Mr. Fred Walsh—In the same area?

Mr. STOTT—Yes, but some distance away. The Wallaroo Clothing Company was approached, plans were prepared and the silo was shifted much farther south than the original site proposed. This met with the approval of the Wallaroo Clothing Company and the approval of the corporation of the town of Wallaroo. I have in my possession copies of two letters, one dated October 1, 1956, signed by the town clerk of the corporation of Wallaroo, which states:—

Following on your visit to Wallaroo in connection with your company's proposal to erect a bulk grain terminal storage bin on the south-western end of section 1805, adjacent to the area known as Kohler Memorial Park, I advise that my council has discussed your proposal and has agreed to grant your company permission to occupy the said land for the purpose of erecting a bulk grain terminal, consisting of a vertical concrete storage bin and other necessary buildings. Section 1805 is

parklands, under the care, control and management of the council, and it will be necessary for you to ask the Minister for Lands to subdivide and resume the portion required for your company. My council will be pleased to co-operate with you in every way possible.

The following is a copy of a letter from the Wallaroo Clothing Factory, dated September 28, 1956, and I emphasize the paragraphs which prove this point:—

However, the new proposition, as discussed, as regards the new proposed type of construction, the method of handling of grain, and the new site, would appear to alter the position considerably as far as our objections are concerned. As far as we are concerned, we are anxious to co-operate in every way possible in order that this very necessary and important installation may be proceeded with as expeditiously as possible, as we fully appreciate the need for such a scheme in Wallaroo.

Mr. Fred Walsh—Didn't you object to the high ground in the first place?

Mr. STOTT—Yes, but this is another site. I am saying that Mr. Shannon indicated that there were nefarious practices. The letter continued:—

At the same time we greatly appreciate your action in consulting us on this matter and we would have no objection to the proposed installation provided that you are prepared to guarantee that:—

1. The site to be used to be kept as far to the south as possible and not closer to our premises than the position roughly determined on the spot and as shown on plan prepared.

That was when it was moved from the site referred to by Mr. Walsh to another site. The letter continued:—

2. Site preparation will be completed as expeditiously as possible and that dust nuisance from this cause will not be excessive.

3. The concrete vertical type silo will be used.

4. The company will install, maintain and efficiently operate sufficient dust extraction units in an endeavour to ensure that there is no dust nuisance from the silo to the Wallaroo Clothing Co. Ltd.

5. All road vehicles to and from the silo site will be routed from the diagonal road running to the seafont, i.e., entrance from Jetty Road.

6. All in and out handling of grain and movement of motor vehicles will be confined to the area on the seaward side of the installation.

7. Regular fumigation will be carried out at least every three months and if weevil or weevil moth are evident in the silo fumigation will be carried out by South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd.

This completely clears the Wallaroo Clothing Company and the Corporation of Wallaroo from any of the very vile insinuations made by the honourable member. I have made it clear in the press that the honourable member has

never liked the South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Company and, because of his hate for the company, I seriously question his right to continue as chairman of the Public Works Committee. It has been clearly demonstrated by the honourable member that he is biased against the company. He does not like the company, in fact, he hates it, and I submit, with the greatest respect to this Parliament, that a member of this Chamber who adopts that attitude and makes such serious insinuations against the directors of the company has rendered himself unworthy to continue as chairman of the Public Works Committee. It must be obvious to honourable members that it is unthinkable that this Parliament should condone such a state of affairs.

The honourable member, as chairman of the Public Works Committee, will continue to take evidence at Port Pirie and Thevenard, and on matters that will affect the future of this company very considerably. In view of his biased attitude towards the company, it is not right that he should be in such a high public position and hold the views he does.

Mr. King—You mention "we." Does that mean yourself or the bulk handling company?

Mr. STOTT—The bulk handling company. It is not right that Mr. Shannon should hold such a high office and be responsible for inquiring into matters affecting the company.

Mr. Jennings—He does not like you.

Mr. STOTT—That does not matter. The members of the House and the public outside could not care less what the honourable member thinks of me, and I should think they would care a darn sight less what I think about him, so it does not matter two hoots. The personalities in this case do not matter.

Mr. Hambour—Has the Chairman of the Public Works Committee, by his words or actions, done anything to jeopardize the future of bulk handling?

Mr. STOTT—I am not prepared to say that, but he has certainly said enough in this Chamber. In view of his biased attitude, he is not fit to be Chairman of the Public Works Committee, and he should not be allowed to continue to sit in judgment on the South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited's activities, let alone make a report and recommendation to Parliament accordingly. I have already proved that the statements made by the honourable member in this Chamber regarding the company are untrue. Members would have expected that any subsequent statements made by that member would be truthful and accurate, but I will prove

presently that that is not so. The honourable member has made the statement that the Wallaroo Silo is redundant and that we will not be exporting wheat from South Australia. This statement means, quite clearly, that in the view of the honourable member it would be crazy to build a terminal silo at Port Pirie. He would, therefore, naturally be biased if and when he takes evidence on Port Pirie.

It is clear the honourable member is not prepared to listen to evidence, sift out the facts and make an unbiased report, to Parliament accordingly. He has proved himself and condemned himself out of his own mouth as being unworthy to continue in office as Chairman of the Public Works Committee. He went on to make serious allegations against the company in receiving inferior wheat. He stated:—

One parcel went to New Zealand and another to the United Kingdom, but as it has not been unloaded, the necessity for asking whether there was quality or not has not arisen. The wheat that went to the United Kingdom not only had foreign matter in it that would have caused it to be docked at some 10d. per bushel, but also had live wheat.

The honourable member then said:—

I am making a serious charge, one that could be investigated, and I am not making it lightly. I could be shot to ribbons if it were not true, but unfortunately it is true!

This statement is absolutely untrue! I would suggest that the honourable member start tearing himself to ribbons. The truth, of course, is that in all the handling of wheat, right down through the ages, wheat is subject to infestation of weevils, insects, flour beetles and so on.

As the honourable member for Rocky River illustrated the other day, there are some thousands of different types of insects that infest wheat, and the honourable member, as a director of the South Australian Farmers' Union, would be quite aware of this fact. Consequently, the wheat handling authority—whether they be merchants, co-operatives, or what have you—must keep a constant and vigorous supervision over any wheat for indication of insects at all times. With this in view, the Australian Wheat Board has appointed an officer—Mr. Anderson, the mayor of Glenelg—who is in control of weevil infestation. It is his job to fumigate silos where outbreaks occur, and consequently it can be truthfully stated that the South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd., in its silos, has kept a constant supervision in all silos for the outbreak of insects and weevils. They also occur in bagged stacks. As a matter of fact, at the present time,

there are indications of weevil infestation in stacks at Port Germein, Waddikee and Balumbah.

Mr. Quirke—It could happen anywhere where there is moisture on the outside.

Mr. STOTT—Exactly. These are stacks of wheat that are handled by licensed receivers who are wheat merchants similar to the South Australian Farmers' Union. These are the present indications and it is quite likely, though I sincerely hope not, that in the future, unless a constant alert is kept, there will be infestations of insects and weevils in some of the stacks of the South Australian Farmers' Union. However, the bulk wheat silos have been carefully and most meticulously fumigated and every possible step taken, not only to avoid infestations of weevils and insects, but to eliminate them where they have occurred. Proof of the pudding is in the eating and, in order to clear this matter up effectually and truthfully, I have a letter here from the Australian Wheat Board, dated July 30, 1959, signed by Mr. L. H. Dorman, Assistant General Manager, which reads as follows:—

The Board has noted the remarks of Mr. Shannon in the Assembly last week with respect to alleged export shipments of bulk wheat containing foreign matter, and one reported to have had 'live weevil.' Since the silos at Wallaroo and Port Lincoln commenced operations, seven cargoes of wheat have been shipped therefrom to the United Kingdom. Out-turn reports have been received with respect to five of these cargoes which have arrived in the United Kingdom, and in no case has there been any reclamation from the buyers with respect to the quality or condition of the wheat; in fact, these reports have been very favourable. Certainly there has been no indication of excessive foreign matter or of weevil infestation in these shipments.

Similarly, there have been no adverse reports from New Zealand, which has received substantial quantities of bulk wheat from South Australia. The shipment to that country, to which we believe Mr. Shannon refers, was commented upon most favourably by the buyers.

The honourable member for Rocky River was castigating very effectively the member for Onkaparinga for his allegations against the company in respect to inferior wheat. He interjected and said "Has the wheat been turned at Balaklava?"

The facts are, Mr. Speaker, that probably today or tomorrow at latest the whole of the wheat in the Balaklava silo will have been emptied and trucked away. Every possible step was taken to see that the wheat was in good condition before being trucked, and the member for Rocky River clearly demonstrated

that the weevil inspector of the Wheat Board (Mr. Anderson) had done his job most effectively. The point is that the South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. does the fumigation itself, and, for the honourable member's benefit, the wheat has been turned at the Balaklava silo not once but twice. That is a horizontal silo. Owing to the ingenuity of the South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd., there is a system in the horizontal silo whereby when a portion of the silo is empty the company's shovels at the back can lift the wheat up to the belt by an auger and change the wheat to the bottom end of the silo, and this has been done twice at Balaklava. Honourable members may have gathered the impression that wheat cannot be turned in a horizontal silo as it can in the concrete silo with cells, but the ingenuity of the company has proved that it can be done.

The House should not get the impression, however, that any grain handling authority can handle wheat so effectively as to prevent weevils or insects from entering the wheat. This is an absolute impossibility. The danger is always there but what must be done by both the licensed receivers, who are the wheat merchants, and the co-operative bulk handling companies, is to keep a continuous watch so that when it does occur they can effectively fumigate and handle the problem. Fortunately, today we have more modern chemical methods for dealing with this problem. As soon as the outbreak occurs we use phostoxin, which is a most effective deterrent and completely eliminates any live weevil or insects in the wheat. As a matter of fact, the authorities throughout the world have highly commended the Australian Wheat Board for the way in which it handles outbreaks of insects and weevils of any kind in their wheat in Australia. Mr. Anderson has been highly commended for his work, not only by the Wheat Board but by the overseas authorities who purchase Australia's wheat. He has also been commended by the exporters of wheat in Canada and the United States of America.

Before I finish this reply, there are two other points—one of minor importance, but the other is the most serious charge of all. The minor matter is that the honourable member condemned the company for not leaving one silo empty at the Wallaroo terminal so as to turn the wheat to prevent weevil. This statement, of course, is absurd. With the growing demand by the farmers to deliver their wheat in bulk, to keep one silo completely empty during the harvest delivery period

would have created terrific criticism by the members of the company itself because it would have prevented them from delivering wheat during the harvest period—the danger period when all farmers must get their wheat off the straw because of the danger of fire and storms. However, what is done is that the maximum amount of rail or shipping movement is arranged during harvest delivery, and if there was any danger during this period the company naturally would hold up deliveries and take immediate steps to fumigate any outbreak, but it is extremely unlikely that this outbreak would occur during the six or seven weeks of harvest delivery. Consequently, when the company is able to arrange shipping of wheat, it empties a cell and can then effectively turn the wheat into that empty cell when the ship has gone, if there is any danger of or suspicion that the wheat needs turning both from the point of view of high moisture content or insect infestation.

The statement of the honourable member that the company was not building silos and providing bulk facilities to members, and had broken faith with the farmers, is absurd. Also his statement that the company was greedy and wanted to get all the sixpences it could out of the farmers is equally untrue and without any foundation whatsoever. The facts are that the company had to have big stocks of wheat at Port Lincoln. All the farmers for many miles around were anxious to deliver bulk wheat at Port Lincoln and, on one occasion, because of the very cool harvesting weather, many farmers were told that unfortunately the company could not accept their wheat because it was too high in moisture content. They would have to wait until the wheat dried out, or alternatively deliver it in bags. This proves conclusively that the company was not anxious for the sixpences because, if the wheat was delivered in bags, the company would only receive 2d. The farmers in the Port Lincoln area contacted me, and I can only say that they were very irate at the company's refusal to receive the wheat with the high moisture content. I arranged a meeting of the farmers and the general manager of the company, at which the question of the difficulties of the moisture content was explained.

This question of moisture content in wheat is a very serious one, and I am quite satisfied, by the experience we have had, that we have got to re-orientate our thinking in regard to handling wheat of a high moisture content. In

this matter the Bulk Handling Company, in co-operation with the Wheat Research Committee and the S.A. Wheat and Woolgrowers' Association, initiated it, but the money is found by the Wheat Research Committee, and it has installed the most modern up-to-date equipment and is conducting experiments in the Wallaroo silo to help overcome this vexed question.

I now come to the most alarming, and at the same time the most ridiculous statement of all made by the member for Onkaparinga. He saw fit to attack the finances of the bulk handling company and went to a great deal of trouble to cast serious insinuations against the company, that their balance-sheet was confidential and could not bear public examination. This, of course, is absurd. The company printed the balance-sheet and posted a copy to every member of the company. It was also published in the *S.A. Wheatgrower*, where all members of that organization could read it. If the honourable member had not seen a copy, all he had to do was to ring and ask for a copy and it would have been posted to him with great pleasure.

However, the most ridiculous part of this statement is that the honourable member saw fit to attack the company's balance-sheet and made insinuations that the company would "break the bank" and would "never be able to repay the tolls of the company's members." In making this statement, of course, the honourable member attacked the integrity of all the directors of the company, including Mr. G. H. Rosevear, the Government representative on the board, who is the Comptroller of the Railways and handles, and is responsible for, all the railway accounts. It will be seen from this that he is an outstanding accountant and should know balance-sheets backwards, far in excess of the member for Onkaparinga. Mr. Rosevear signed the balance-sheet which the honourable member attacked. It will be quite apparent to the House that the member for Onkaparinga would be just a "babe in the wood" in his knowledge of balance-sheets compared with the Government representative on the board (Mr. Rosevear), and yet he has the audacity to attack the integrity of a man of Mr. Rosevear's ability! Recently, when examining the balance-sheet and finances of the company, Mr. Rosevear said:—

The conclusion I have come to after studying the accounts is that the company's affairs have been handled satisfactorily and efficiently throughout the year.

Last year, at the company's annual meeting, Mr. Rosevear went to much trouble in explaining the balance-sheet on a blackboard and I understand it is his intention to do the same at this year's annual meeting, which will be held on the Friday of show week, in September. If the honourable member wants a lesson on balance-sheets he should attend that meeting. The honourable member also made shocking and misleading statements to the House on the financial operations of the company, and I say that he did this deliberately in order to cast doubts on the company's ability to handle its finances and repay the tolls it has collected from farmers and, therefore, to carry out its obligations under its articles of association. This is a wicked statement: and what is worse, it is a wicked lie!

Mr. SHANNON—Mr. Speaker, I think that is straining it just a little—not much, but a little.

The SPEAKER—The member for Onkaparinga has taken exception to a statement and I ask the honourable member to withdraw it.

Mr. STOTT—I will withdraw those words and substitute "terminological inexactitude."

Mr. SHANNON—Mr. Speaker, if that does not mean what the honourable member has already said I do not know what it does mean.

The SPEAKER—The honourable member is in order in using the expression "terminological inexactitude."

Mr. STOTT—I am going to prove, to the astonishment of the House, and to the amazement of the honourable member himself, that he was in a position to know that the company was in a sound financial position. It was quite able, without any difficulty, to repay all the tolls collected.

Mr. Shannon—I think I will read the honourable member's evidence before my committee.

Mr. STOTT—The honourable member should have read it before, and he would not have made such a silly statement to this House. The truth of the matter is that the whole question of the finances of the company—how it would collect its tolls; how it would use the capital to build the silos; how it would borrow the £1,000,000 from the Commonwealth Bank; how it would repay the Commonwealth Bank, together with interest; and then, at the end of the 12 years, would be in such a sound financial position as to enable the company to repay the tolls it had collected from the members by the system of revolving finance—was made clear to the honourable member when I

gave evidence to the Public Works Committee. Members can read it for themselves on pages 8 to 14 of that evidence.

Mr. Shannon—The honourable member admits that the tolls will go on beyond the 12 years?

Mr. STOTT—Of course: that is revolving finance. I am going to prove that the honourable member didn't study that as he should have. He probably did not accept my statement, but he went to Wallaroo and took evidence from Mr. Cecil Chapman. I asked Mr. Chapman whether he gave evidence about financial arrangements, and I received a letter from him dated July 31, as follows:—

In response to your inquiry whether at any time I had intimated to the Public Works Committee the conditions and financial arrangements that have been entered into by the Australian Wheat Board with the various bulk handling authorities throughout Australia, the answer is "yes." Some time before 1954 I interviewed the committee at Parliament House to present some phase on bulk handling of wheat and in an informal chat with the chairman, the late Arthur Christian, and members present I did inform them of the facts as I knew them in the form of the 5 per cent interest paid on the capital involved yearly . . . I remember Mr. Shannon querying me whether I was sure of my facts as stated. My reply was that they could be verified by application to the Australian Wheat Board.

In 1954, just after my return from an overseas trip, I gave written evidence at an inquiry held by the Public Works Committee at Wallaroo on bulk handling of wheat. After my evidence had been read I was cross-examined by the chairman, Mr. Shannon, and members of the committee. During that examination I again mentioned the Australian Wheat Board's payments to the different bulk handling authorities in total amounts each year representing the percentage value on capital involved. I well remember this because of an incident in connection with my statement. Mr. Shannon said to me, "Mr. Chapman, if what you have stated is correct the problem of bulk handling in this State is solved," and further added that it should be published in the newspapers. My reply to that was, "Mr. Chairman, I would not do that if I were you." Mr. Shannon then said, "Why not?" I then replied, "If I were you I would never let the public of South Australia know that after all the years you have been inquiring into bulk handling of wheat you only found out this important information today."

However, following up that which I had said at Wallaroo, the chairman, Mr. Shannon, did get in touch with Sir John Teasdale, chairman of the Australian Wheat Board, and herewith find attached a copy of a letter that Sir John Teasdale had replied to Mr. Shannon as chairman of the Public Works Committee. A perusal of this will make it quite clear in regard to finance arrangements, which of course were available to any company that embarked upon bulk handling of wheat in South Australia,

upon the same conditions and terms as other States were being treated. As you are well aware by close personal contact with the South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Company, the actual financial reimbursements being received from the Australian Wheat Board are slightly better than that enumerated in Sir John Teasdale's letter.

That is signed "C. T. Chapman, S.A. growers' representative on the Australian Wheat Board." I have a copy of the letter addressed to the chairman of the Public Works Committee, Adelaide, dated August 24, 1954, which sets out clearly the contributions the Australian Wheat Board makes to bulk handling companies in other States. It clearly proves that the honourable member went to some trouble to find out how the finances of this company were managed and that when he attacked the balance-sheet of the company and said, in effect, that it would need an income of £240,000 from tolls, and that it would have to incur expenditure on the Ardrossan belt, on handling depreciation and other expenditure, and that the company would never be in a position to repay its tolls unless it borrowed from some financial institution, he was trying to convey the impression that the South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. was liable out of its own finances for all such expenditure, whereas the Australian Wheat Board paid every penny of it. He knew that all the time. How can the honourable member say he didn't know in the face of all that evidence? Of course he knew it!

The whole of the manner in which the scheme was to be conducted, as I have just related, had to be examined by the Commonwealth Bank, of course, before it would be prepared to make an advance of £1,000,000 to the company. The question of the collection of tolls, using the capital to build the silos, repaying the bank its £1,000,000 together with interest, and the repayment of the tolls at the end of the 12-year period, was all examined by the top ranking economists of the Commonwealth Bank of Australia, together with their accountants. The scheme was highly commended. It was pronounced perfectly sound to such an extent that the Commonwealth Bank was prepared to advance that £1,000,000 to the company to commence its operations. This, of course, was given on condition that the State Government would guarantee £500,000 of the Commonwealth Bank's loan to the company.

Mr. Riches—Do you honestly believe you will repay those tolls?

Mr. STOTT—Absolutely, and I will prove it in a moment.

Mr. Riches—You haven't proved anything.

Mr. STOTT—Just wait a moment. Does the honourable member suggest that the economists of the Commonwealth Bank did not tell the truth about this scheme?

Mr. Shannon—We accept your statement that the tolls will continue after the 12 years.

Mr. STOTT—What is wrong with that? The honourable member didn't say that! He said the company was unsound and would never repay the tolls. Before the State Government's guarantee was given, the Premier, quite rightly, wanted to ascertain all about the scheme: whether it was sound and whether it was right that the Government should give a guarantee of £500,000 to such a company. Consequently, he had his officers study the scheme and one of his officers had a conference with me on the matter. This man was a top-ranking economist. They were so satisfied with the scheme—that it was so sound—that there was no difficulty in getting the State Treasury to guarantee the £500,000 to the company: yet the honourable member has the audacity and the effrontery to attack these top-ranking economists of the Commonwealth Bank of Australia and the State Treasury Department, and say that all their reports are false; that they do not know what they are talking about; that the company is unsound and it will never repay its tolls. Could there ever be anything so ridiculous?

Right down through the ages—ever since Parliament was created in South Australia—I venture to say that with all the great oratory and eloquence that has rung through this Chamber—and I predict, never again in the future, when Members of Parliament should happen to have the honour and privilege of being members of the Chamber—have they heard or will they ever hear such ridiculous, stupid nonsense.

The facts are, of course, that it would be very generous, at the least, to say that the honourable member does not understand finance, particularly revolving finance. If this is true—and I want to be as generous as I can—that the honourable member fails to understand the expenditure side of the balance sheet he went out of his way to attack, and it shows a debit balance on maintenance, depreciation costs for the handling of wheat, including the costs of the belt at Ardrossan which is paid by the Broken Hill Proprietary Company, the poor honourable member does not understand that all these costs are paid to the South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. by the Australian Wheat Board. As the grain

handling authority of the silo at Ardrossan the Wheat Board pays all costs.

The honourable member made an accusation in dealing with the balance-sheet. He said he had been unable to get a balance-sheet, and "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." Mr. Heaslip interjected, "That is being nasty." Mr. Shannon continued, "No, I think it is an intelligent guess at this stage."

As a matter of fact that is the only true statement the honourable member made in the whole of his speech: "I think it is an intelligent guess at this stage." The honourable member was guessing throughout his speech. When he was dealing with the revolving finance of the company the member for Burra interjected, "Isn't the company operating under the principle that applies to all rotating reserves?" The member for Onkaparinga replied, "I do not know." That is about the only other true statement he made during his speech.

Getting back to the balance-sheet, the honourable member said "The balance-sheet discloses the vital factor that the only method by which this company can meet its obligations to its constituent members when the time arrives for the returning of tolls is by approaching a financial institution and pledging its assets, that is, if it still has room to pledge as it has already procured 50 per cent of its advances on its own valuations—£800,000 as against £1,600,000 in round figures." The honourable member went on to say, "Provided tolls remain at the present basis and the crops give the same annual return, and so long as the company enjoys the same amount of support of the same number of farmers, the tolls will return £200,000 to £240,000 per year."

The following is contained in the progress report of the Public Works Standing Committee dated November 18, 1954:—

At the Committee's request the financial implications of the proposal were examined by the Government Economist, Mr. Seaman . . . Mr. Seaman said, however, that the proposed levies would appear more than adequate to cover costs for which no provision had been made, and that the company would probably be provided with sufficient funds for all purposes if it borrowed the full amount of capital required at the outset and made a levy of 3d. a bushel on all wheat actually handled in bulk.

The company is committed under its agreement with its constituent members to return the first year's tolls in the thirteenth year, the second year's tolls in the fourteenth year, and so on. Mr. Shannon implied that the company would have to borrow against its assets to repay these tolls. He said, "Obviously money cannot be paid back from bricks and concrete or concrete and steel."

The honourable member for Stuart interjected, "That was pointed out to the farmers when the Bill was before the House." Mr. Shannon continued, "Yes, but unfortunately it was not understood." It was clear from that interjection that every other member in the House understood it, but not the honourable member for Onkaparinga himself. Mr. Heaslip then interjected, "The Government guaranteed it." Mr. Shannon continued, "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 is another wicked insinuation and again I repeat, it is just a question of how low one can get.

That statement is, of course, untrue because the Government did not wipe its hands of it. It was so pleased with the soundness of the scheme and so confident of it that it guaranteed £500,000. To illustrate how sound the company is, the secretary of the company has taken out an assessment of a financial forecast to the end of 1961, based on the operations of the company up to the present. The financial position would be that, it is estimated by 1967, the total tolls would be £5,609,000. The surplus funds at the end of 1968 would be £4,217,000 when the first repayment of $\frac{1}{12}$ th would commence. It is not possible, at this stage, to estimate with absolute accuracy, the annual toll repayment, as honourable members would understand, except to say that the average repayment over 12 years would be about £468,000, which the company has a cash asset of £4,217,000 to meet. It appears that tolls could be reduced at the end of the building programme, commensurate with meeting commitments and adequate reserves as it would be of no benefit to gather any huge surplus.

Mr. Quirke—It could be one farthing a bushel.

Mr. STOTT—Of course. The Co-operative Bulk Handling Company in Western Australia made a toll about two or three years ago of five-eighths of a penny a bushel. The South Australian company is a non-profit making concern, as honourable members are aware.

On an estimate of how the company has been running during the past few years, by 1965 the company will have completely paid back the £1,000,000 advanced by the Commonwealth Bank, completely repaid back commitments to the S.A. Railways, and, on its tolls and payments from the Australian Wheat Board, it will have £617,000 surplus in 1965 after all the silos have been built all over the State; £1,200,000 in 1966, plus that amount in 1967-68, making a total surplus of £4,217,000 to meet its contingent liabilities for toll repayments.

Mr. Quirke—And it could make bonus payments to growers if it wished.

Mr. STOTT—That is the way the wine industry revolving financial scheme works. This system is not new and it is not mine. The scheme used in South Australia by the company is an improvement on that which has been in operation in Western Australia for more than 30 years. It is amazing to me that anyone could doubt the soundness of this scheme. Surely no-one would say that the Commonwealth Bank would advance £1,000,000 on revolving finance if it were not sound.

Mr. Riches—Why did it want a £500,000 guarantee from the South Australian Government?

Mr. STOTT—There are no shareholders in this show. When I went to Sydney to interview the General Manager of the Commonwealth Bank he told me it would be better for the company if it got the State Government interested and for it to give a guarantee, and I said, "We do not want a bar of that as the scheme is sound enough." To this he replied, "Hold your horses a minute and the Commonwealth Bank will lean over backwards to help the scheme because it is so sound." He was right, and I was wrong on this occasion regarding a State Government guarantee.

So much for the honourable member for Onkaparinga, who poses as a financial expert. He told the House that he was going to give the farmers some advice. After his explanation, which proves conclusively that he does not know the first thing about finance, he proved conclusively that he is not even able to add up to 12, yet this is the man who posed as a financial expert and was going to give the farmers advice on finance. His alternative financial proposal was that the farmers should not pay the tolls to the company but only pay the charge of 3d. a bushel and then they would be better off by saving 3d. This, of

course, is absurd, as are all his other statements, because the farmer would not receive this 3d. back—the company would retain it, whereas the farmer will receive the 6d. toll returned to him.

The effect of the honourable members' financial proposal would be that the company would not be receiving sufficient income from tolls to continue its building programme as rapidly as it is now doing. He would then create the situation, for which he criticises the company, of not building silos in accordance with its obligations and keeping faith with its members. I think that disposes of the honourable member for Onkaparinga and I would suggest he now runs away and writes out his resignation, but, before he does so however, perhaps it would be just as well to silence him for ever on wheat matters. He had the temerity to attack me personally in the House, stating that I had forced the United Kingdom out of the International Wheat Agreement. This is about one of the silliest statements any responsible man could make but, of course, he is not a responsible man. His statements are irresponsible, without foundation, and not the slightest notice can be taken of any of them. This also applies to the statement he made against me personally.

The facts of course are, Mr. Speaker, that the United Kingdom would not take the slightest notice of what I wanted to do. Every member understands quite clearly that I would have no effect whatsoever, personally, on the policy of the United Kingdom. The statement is so childish that it is not even worth answering. I thank the honourable member for placing me on a pedestal and giving me credit for forcing the United Kingdom out of the International Wheat Agreement. The truth of the matter is, of course, that the United Kingdom saw fit, in 1953, to withdraw from the International Wheat Agreement. All the other nations rejoined the agreement and adopted the range of prices fixed under it, namely, a floor price of 13s. 8d. Australian currency and a ceiling price of 18s. 3d.

Since 1953 not one bushel of wheat has been sold at 18s. 3d.—all wheat has been sold at slightly above the floor price. What the United Kingdom wanted to do, of course, and what they thought they would do, was obviously if they remained outside the agreement they would be able to buy cheaper wheat at less than the floor price of 13s. 8d. However, this is where the Australian delegation in Washington played a major part in the discussions, because the exporting signatories to the agree-

ment refused to sell any wheat inside or outside the agreement at less than the floor price fixed under the agreement. This meant, of course, that the United Kingdom was unable to buy a bushel of wheat at the cheaper rates she had hoped for. They again attempted to wreck the agreement in 1956 and remained outside, still hoping they would buy cheaper wheat, but they failed to do so. In March last, realizing that they could not buy cheaper wheat outside the agreement, the United Kingdom rejoined and accepted the renewal of prices with a slight reduction in the maximum or ceiling price.

Instead of myself being responsible for forcing the United Kingdom out of the agreement, the facts are, of course, that the United Kingdom has been forced to rejoin the agreement.

Mr. Shannon—On their terms.

Mr. STOTT—The terms of the International Wheat Agreement were satisfactory to 43 other nations.

Mr. Shannon—The terms of the United Kingdom, and the honourable member knows it.

Mr. STOTT—What difference did it make whether it was their terms or not? Their terms as to the selling price had no effect whatever. We did not care whether they reduced the maximum price, because it is extremely unlikely that we shall see 18s. 3d. a bushel for wheat in the next three years, having in mind the huge surplus. The honourable member then saw fit to attack me personally for explaining the five point wool plan to the farmers as to the fixing of a reserve minimum price for wool sold at auction. Quite clearly he does not understand this plan either and I suggest, for his own education and betterment, that he makes a close study of any proposal before he casts doubt and aspersions on it. He said in effect that the stock firms had been generous in their advances and that is true. There is no intention whatsoever under the five point wool plan to interfere with the wool marketing system in any way or to do away with any wool brokers or with the auction system. His inference was that under that plan wool handling firms would be abolished, and that this would also apply to the wool auction system. The five point plan does not attempt to interfere with the wool marketing system in any way. All the reserve minimum price plan does is ensure, in effect, that wool shall not be sold below that price. If they want to raise carrels or rings to increase the price above

that minimum reserve price they may do so; if they like to manipulate a price they can do so. It was indicated in evidence before the commission in New South Wales on the Goulburn inquiry that they can do this, and no less a person than Mr. Rollo Hawkes, chairman of the Stockowners' Association, has indicated that although his association has condemned the plan, cartels have been formed and they manipulate the price of wool. That is common knowledge. If it is right for the buyers of wool overseas to make a profit surely it is right for the growers to have the protection of a minimum price? I do not wish to give a dissertation on the five point wool plan except to say that it is as simple as this—wool shall not be sold below that figure.

Mr. Nankivell—What do you do with the surplus?

Mr. STOTT—We do exactly as South Africa and New Zealand are doing. They fix a reserve minimum price for wool with the approval of the growers. In the last two seasons prior to April of this year the authority in South Africa had to buy in 96,000 bales of wool because overseas buyers would not bid above the reserve price. Since April 13 South Africa has disposed of between 8,000 and 10,000 bales of wool from that stockpile at a price between 15 and 20 per cent higher than the reserve. Nobody can tell me this is against the interests of the grower as he is getting the benefit of the price rise. If they did not have a reserve minimum price or the authority in South Africa had not fixed the price the wool would have been sacrificed at bankrupt prices to growers, and the speculators would have been making the extra 15 to 20 per cent. In the United Kingdom a stockpile of 368,000 bales of wool is being unloaded on to the market. The quota has been cut down because they did not want to flood the market. Consequently the price of wool will be 10 per cent higher than that existing on April 13. The difference between the two places is that the stockpile of wool in the United Kingdom will be sold at a profit to speculators, but in South Africa growers will make the profit.

I had hoped to deal with some district matters, but I will close my remarks by referring to the problems of surplus wheat. Many suggestions have been made about the terrific surplus of wheat. At present the United States of America has a surplus of 1,400,000 bushels and is using Public Law 480 to dispose of it by "give-away" programmes. That country is going its own sweet way. Canada

has a long-term credit plan for selling wheat to Pakistan. Consequently, whereas we used to sell up to 35,000,000 bushels of wheat to India, we are now selling that country almost nothing. While India can have wheat given to her by the United States it is not likely that she will buy from Australia, so the matter of surplus disposal has become very vexed. I sincerely believe that the disposal of surplus wheat should not be dealt with by countries under bi-lateral agreements or by American Public Law 480, but by the United Nations Organization. Needy countries that require wheat should apply to United Nations and the countries with surplus wheat should provide a quota. The matter should be handled by United Nations and by the World Bank and adjustments made between one country and another.

The proposal to use one per cent of income tax revenue paid by the people of Australia to finance wheat to be given to these people is not very practical. It would yield only about £6,500,000 or 7,500,000 bushels of wheat—a drop in the bucket. There should be long-term purchases to match the competition of the United States of America and we should press for this matter to come before the United Nations to resolve the problem of needy people wanting wheat but not having the money to buy it. This would help dispose of the terrific world surplus of wheat.

I hope members will read my remarks if they have not already studied them. There is no doubt about the integrity of the South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited; it can answer any criticism made against it. If members want any more information about this matter they should ask for it instead of making wicked insinuations about the integrity of the men who operate it.

Mr. Quirke—Could I suggest that you put down in simple arithmetic for anyone to understand the method adopted in rotating finance?

Mr. STOTT—If members want it, it is all in the Public Works Committee report.

Mr. Quirke—Then set it out again and distribute it. Members badly need it.

Mr. STOTT—I do not say this derogatorily to members, but if they do not understand this type of finance they have the assurance of top-ranking economists about it. However, I shall be only too happy to set it out in a pamphlet and distribute it.

Mr. RALSTON (Mount Gambier)—Firstly may I congratulate you on your re-appointment, Mr. Speaker. I also congratulate the member for Unley (Mr. Dunnage) on his re-appointment as Chairman of Committees. I feel sure that he, too, will have the full confidence of the House. I join with my Leader and all other speakers in commending the member for Burnside (Mrs. Steele) for her splendid maiden speech. The able way she presented the many advantages of price control from the housewives' point of view was no doubt enlightening to some members who have consistently opposed its retention. Furthermore, her clear understanding of the social problems this State has to face and the obvious sincerity with which she advocated the much-needed reforms will make the honourable member a welcome addition to this House, and I trust she will continue along the lines on which she started.

I also congratulate the new members for Gouger, Port Pirie, Albert and Port Adelaide on their valuable contributions to the debate, especially the member for Port Adelaide who outlined the effect that large-scale mechanization of industry could have on the economy of this State unless suitable provisions were made to find alternative employment for those displaced by the ever-increasing use of machinery. As each year passes we will find price control more necessary than ever to protect consumers against exploitation by combines or organizations that make agreements or cartel arrangements and thus create a monopoly over commodities essential to the prosperity of the people and the State.

Members who were here last year will remember my saying that the public in Mount Gambier was paying 4½d. a gallon more for petrol than people in the metropolitan area, this being the freight differential between Birkenhead and Mount Gambier allowed under price control. If the petrol had been delivered from Birkenhead this would have been a just amount but, as I pointed out, most if not all of the petrol came from Portland in Victoria. This town is only 70 miles away and the freight cost would not exceed 2½d. a gallon, which means that on every gallon of petrol coming from Portland to Mount Gambier the people pay 2d. more than can be justified under the Prices Act. Millions of gallons come from this source. This year, at least 18,000 tons of inflammable oil, mostly petrol, came from Portland to Mount Gambier. This tonnage is over 5,000,000 gallons of petrol or inflammable oil.

I first raised this matter on September 25 last year by means of a question and the

Premier agreed to obtain a report. On November 12 I asked whether the report was available and received this remarkable answer from the Premier:—

The Prices Commissioner (Mr. Murphy) has been investigating this matter and has called up the accounts of the companies concerned. Some delay has occurred in getting the complete accounts from one or two companies, and Mr. Murphy has twice come to me expressing regret at the delay, and telling me that he will have a report as soon as possible. I assure the honourable member the matter has not been lost sight of.

I assure the House I have not lost sight of it either. I thought this statement was extremely strange in view of the powers available to the Prices Commissioner under sections 8, 9, 10 and 11 of the Prices Act. Section 8 provides:—

(1) For purposes of this Act an authorized officer may require any persons—

- (a) to furnish him with any information which he requires; or
- (b) to answer any question put to him; or
- (c) to produce at a time and place indicated by the authorized officer any books, papers and documents (including balance-sheets and accounts), relating to any goods or services, whether declared or not, or to any land or to any other matter arising under this Act.

(2) The authorized officer may require the information to be given, or the question to be answered, on oath or affirmation, and either orally or in writing, and for that purpose may administer an oath or affirmation.

(3) The authorized officer may, by notice in writing, require the information to be given, or the question to be answered, in writing and at the place specified in the notice.

(4) A person shall not, when so required under this section—

- (a) refuse or fail to furnish any information or to answer any question or to produce any books, papers and documents (including balance-sheets and accounts);
- (b) give any information or make any answer which is false in any particular;
- (c) refuse to take an oath or an affirmation in lieu of an oath, when required to do so by an authorized officer.

Section 9 (1) reads:—

For purposes of this Act an authorized officer may enter upon, inspect, and search any premises and inspect any documents, books and papers, and may inspect and take samples of any stocks of declared goods or of any other goods.

Then section 10 reads:—

For purposes of this Act an authorized officer may impound or retain any books, papers or documents produced to him or inspected by him in pursuance of this Act, and may make copies or abstracts of those documents, books and papers, or of any

entries therein, but the person entitled to those documents, books and papers, shall, in lieu thereof, be entitled within a reasonable time to a copy certified as correct by the Commissioner and such certified copy shall be received in all courts as evidence of, and as of equal validity with the original.

Honourable members will observe that the Commissioner has adequate power. Therefore, it was strange that he should twice have to express regret to the Premier—in fact, apologise—because one or two oil companies decided there was no need to hurry, and they would apparently please themselves as to when the returns would be available.

It seemed to me that the Commissioner was in no hurry to exercise his powers under the Act. Anyway, this reply did not give me any real confidence that the investigation was being pursued with much diligence by the Commissioner. In fact, I felt certain the opposite was the case.

Following all this procrastination, I was advised on December 15 that the investigation was then completed, that the Prices Commissioner considered the freight differentials for the region were equitable, and that he recommended they remain undisturbed. He advanced four reasons in support of this opinion. They were these:—

(1) Mr. Ralston's query concerning prices at Mount Gambier of petrol power kerosene and distillate has been thoroughly investigated by this department, together with prices applying to all other major products. In a review of the prices of petroleum products at Mount Gambier, the position must be examined on a regional basis.

(2) In assessing freight differentials, it is necessary to compute them on a weighted average basis for each individual product for the region concerned. On this basis, the gallonage of each product (I emphasize the words "each product") *ex Birkenhead* is considerably higher than the gallonage *ex Portland*.

(3) On several of its major products full freight costs are not recovered by the industry for sales in Mount Gambier.

(4) At towns and centres adjacent to Mount Gambier, almost without exception, the price to user does not permit recovery of the full amount of the freight costs.

I think freight costs justly incurred are and, if not, should be, recoverable. Therefore, some of the reasons advanced seem to me very odd—in fact, so odd that I requested through the Premier that some clarification of all four reasons be advanced. Let us look at the first reason, which said that the position must be examined on a regional basis. When asked what was the area of the region referred to, the Commissioner said he regretted that the oath of secrecy precluded him from describing

the area. What could possibly be secret about information of this nature is beyond me and, I think, beyond everyone else.

Let us look at the second reason, which stated that the gallonage of each product was considerably higher *ex Birkenhead* than *ex Portland*. This information was supplied to the Commissioner by the oil companies; but what did the Railways Commissioner have to say about quantities of inflammable oils delivered to Mount Gambier *ex Birkenhead* and *ex Portland*? It is all contained in reports to Parliament. He said exactly the opposite was the case. In his annual report for the year 1957-58, the figures given are: *ex Birkenhead*, 8,981 tons; and *ex Portland*, 10,548 tons. These, of course, are only the rail figures. In addition, three major oil companies bring all their petrol supplies from Portland to Mount Gambier by road. It is reasonable to assume that at least another 6,000 tons of motor spirit—possibly more; some authorities say 8,000 tons would be a reasonable estimate—is brought from Portland in this way.

Although the final figures for tonnage forwarded by rail for 1958-1959 are not yet available, the figures that are available indicate the tonnage *ex Birkenhead* to Mount Gambier will be down about 2,000 tons for the year ended 30/6/59 as against last year, so it is safe to assume the tonnage *ex Portland* to Mount Gambier will be up by at least that amount because the oil companies tell everybody that the use of petrol is increasing, and Mount Gambier has certainly had its increase. Of course, the three major oil companies that were road freighting their supplies last year still continue to do so. I disagree entirely with the findings of the Prices Commissioner on the price of petrol at Mount Gambier, but in fairness to him I agree that he is faced with a tough proposition in attempting to investigate the activities of oil companies, especially when bulk deliveries are made from a freight-free port established in another State. Nevertheless, he has ample power at his disposal, and it must be used if necessary. Honourable members will realize that records are kept at depots of every gallon of petrol that goes into them, and where it comes from. There is no trouble in finding out accurately if need be.

I feel sure that honourable members will agree that on the figures I have quoted today a further investigation is undoubtedly warranted. Irrespective of whether or not the Standard-Vacuum Oil Company establishes a refinery at Noarlunga, the requirements of the Lower

South-East will be supplied through Portland. I am firmly of the opinion that this matter is important enough to warrant an investigation by a Parliamentary Select Committee. This subject of petrol costs that I have been discussing affects nearly every form of production or transport and ties up very closely with other costs that operate in the electorate I have the honour to represent. Honourable members will appreciate this point. If costs—especially costs of petrol, water rating, corporation rates, or electricity tariffs—are substantially higher in one area as against another, it is extremely difficult if not impossible to induce industries to establish themselves in an area where higher costs prevail.

As far as my electorate is concerned, I am proud to say that corporation rates based on the generally accepted standard—that is, unimproved land values as assessed by the State Land Tax Department—are amongst the lowest in South Australia. Unfortunately, I cannot say the same about water rating. While the Mount Gambier water district is showing an increasing profit each year over the last four years, amounting in all to nearly £28,000, the Adelaide water district, which includes the districts of Salisbury and Elizabeth and is on the lowest percentage of water rating in South Australia—7.5 per cent—has the honour (if it could be described as such) of showing the greatest loss during the last four years for which official figures are available of any water district in the State. The Auditor-General's report for the years 1954-1955 to 1957-1958 shows the Adelaide Water District losses amount to £1,556,859, this amount being a charge on the consolidated revenue of the State. Audited figures for 1958-1959 are not yet available, but owing to the dry year the loss could be even greater than in 1957-1958.

As for electricity costs, although we are constantly informed of the splendid and economical arrangement whereby the waste timber and sawdust from the central mill provides the fuel at a nominal cost for generating purposes, the tariff there is at least 10 per cent higher than that charged in the metropolitan area. At present the consumption of electricity from the Mount Gambier power station is only about one-half of the total generating capacity of the station. The extension to Nangwarry and the requirements of Apcel and Cellulose will no doubt substantially increase the consumption, thereby decreasing the overall production costs. Previously I said that tariffs generally were 10

per cent higher than in Adelaide, but I have overlooked tariff J for hot water services, technically described as night water heating. It is agreed that night loading is an essential requirement for economical production of electricity; therefore, something to be encouraged. Tariff J in Adelaide is 1.04 pence per kilowatt hour, but in Mount Gambier it is 1.5 pence. In this case the tariff is 50 per cent higher, and this is an area where the trust is anxious to increase consumption. It appears to me that equalizing of costs is a one-way traffic operation for the benefit of the city area, which of course includes Elizabeth—the promised land of South Australia.

My reason for highlighting these aspects is to emphasize the fact that decentralization of industry is subject to the economics of production costs. All the costs mentioned are relevant to the establishment of new industries in country centres.

Recently many members attended the official opening of the new central saw mill at Mount Gambier. It is the most modern sawmill in the southern hemisphere and we should pay a tribute to the Minister of Agriculture, the Conservator of Forests and the Chairman and members of the Forestry Board for a job well done. Mention should also be made of Mr. Keith Ingram, supervisor of milling operations in the South-East. He is a man of genius and his foresight and ability played an important part in the planning and designing of the works, and the methods of production adopted in the efficient and highly mechanized mill. He should be congratulated on the results achieved.

For some time past I have been concerned about the safety precautions applying in factories in the South-East. At present the Country Factories Act applies only in the city of Mount Gambier, the district councils of Mount Gambier, Millicent, Penola and Tantanoola, and the hundred of Riddock, but not to Naracoorte, where there is extensive industry, or Robe, Beachport and Port McDonnell where there are saw mills and fish processing factories. At present the Minister of Industry has no authority to enforce the safety regulations in these areas. They should be proclaimed in the interests of safety. The Scaffolding Act applies in the South-East only to Mount Gambier. With the rapid advancement of Penola, Millicent and Naracoorte the time is opportune to proclaim their areas under that Act. The safety of the man working in a factory in these towns is just as important as the safety of a man working in

areas where the Act applies. I draw the attention of the Minister of Industry to these matters in the hope that a report will be submitted after an investigation.

The success of the Woods and Forests Department in the saw milling industry and pine forest cultivation is already established, but pine trees can be used for other purposes than timber. The Apcel and Cellulose works indicate the direction of activities in future. It is conceded that the paper pulp industry is the second fastest growing industry in America, and a profitable one. The following comment in a newspaper article shows what is happening in that country:—

The South-Western Settlement and Development Company is a division of the East Texas Pulp and Paper Company. With the reforestation phase of the project planned over a five year span 120,000 acres will be planted with pines. In 15 to 20 years some of the trees will be large enough to harvest. Each tree will become grist in the mills of America's second fastest growing industry, the production of pulp and paper.

The total area of pine forests in South Australia is 126,000 acres. This was the area planted at June 30, 1958, when the last figures were available. The people of South Australia own most of the pine forests in the State and certainly all the running water. These are two of the essentials for the production of paper pulp. The Conservator of Forests, in answer to a question put to him when giving evidence to the Select Committee on the proposed paper and pulp mill agreement between Cellulose, Apcel and the Government, agreed that it would be practicable for his department to establish a State-owned paper pulp industry. This information is worthy of careful consideration by the Government. The following is an extract from an article published in the *News* of July 31:—

Australians, like most other people, get "wrapped up" in paper. Each man, woman and child uses an average of 122 lb. of paper a year. Of this 57 lb. is newsprint. The remainder is for the multitude of uses to which paper is put in modern living.

It also said:—

Australia was a late starter. She has moved with giant strides to make good her deficiency. We began in 1938 with seven factories; today we have 18 paper mills. We began with 1961 operatives; today there are more than 8,000 persons employed in the industry. We began with a tiny output of a few thousand tons of paper in that first year of operations—20 years ago. Today our output is running at 257,000 tons of paper a year. And even at that figure our insatiable appetite for paper is far from satisfied for in the past year Australia has had to import 257,568 tons of paper mostly newsprint from overseas.

The article was prepared by Mr. Gwyn Lewis and the facts were obtained from the Department of Trade.

On June 30 last the Commonwealth scheme for land settlement ceased and it is to be hoped that the State Government will implement a State scheme of land settlement. It is of interest to note that the Land Development Branch of the Department of Lands prepared a statement dated December 1, 1958, for presentation to the Commonwealth Grants Commission. Statistical information therein showed that of the 540 developed and allotted holdings 324 were in the South-East, which is 60 per cent of the total number allotted in South Australia. There is still ample land in the South-East that could be made available for closer settlement and it would be to the advantage of the people and of the State if this were done.

Whilst discussing land development and agriculture, it is interesting to note that Roseworthy Agricultural College was established in 1885, 74 years ago. Surely, with the growth of this State since then, the time for another agricultural college in South Australia must be fast approaching and I suggest the lower South-East is the logical place to build such a college, as this is the area where the greatest expansion of agriculture must take place. The South-East is the largest area in the State with an assured rainfall, and as yet irrigation there is in its infancy. We are but on the threshold of its development. Now is the time to acquire land while it is still available and I trust the Minister of Agriculture and the Government will seriously consider this proposal.

Certain insurance provisions contained in section 29 (6b) of the Bush Fires Act are anomalous. That section reads as follows:—

If any person (whether a person such as is referred to in subsection (6a) or not) is appointed as a fire control officer by a council or by the Minister in exercise of the powers conferred by subsection (4) or if any person is appointed by a council as a member of the crew of any fire fighting appliance which is the property of or under the control of the council, and, under the conditions of his appointment, no payment is to be made to such person as fees, salary, or wages for his services as fire control officer or as member of a crew as aforesaid, then for the purposes of any Act relating to the liability of employers in respect of injury to or the death of workmen employed by them, the person so appointed shall not be deemed to be employed as a workman by the council by which he is appointed or, as the case may be, deemed to be appointed and the provisions of any such Act shall not except as herein provided apply upon the injury or death of any such person.

In principle, that section appears to exempt the council of any responsibility under the Workmen's Compensation Act. The section goes on:—

A council by which any such person is appointed or, as the case may be, is deemed to be appointed, shall obtain from an insurance office a policy of insurance under which the following benefits shall be payable to such person or his personal representatives on the death or total or partial incapacity of such person when such death or incapacity is brought about by accident arising out of and in the course of such person's duties as a fire control officer or, as the case may be, member of a crew as aforesaid, namely:—such amount or amounts as would have become payable in respect of such person under the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1932-1956, or any amendment thereof, if the accident had arisen out of and in the course of his ordinary employment in respect of which he was at the time of the accident insured by his employer in accordance with the provisions of that Act

It appears from that that with anyone who was ordinarily insured under the Workmen's Compensation Act the conditions of the policy would be exactly the same as the conditions provided in the Workmen's Compensation Act. However, it goes on to say:—

Or where such person was not so insured—
(a) on the death or total incapacity of such person—an amount not less than one thousand pounds: (b) on the partial incapacity of such person—an amount not less than ten pounds per week to be payable during such partial incapacity for a period of at least six months: (c) if any such person suffers any of the injuries mentioned in the first column of the table in section 26 of the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1932-1941—an amount being such ratio of the sum of one thousand pounds as is shown in the second column of the said table as being payable in respect to such injury: Provided that any amount payable in pursuance of paragraph (b) hereof shall be deducted from any amount payable under this paragraph.

That is a very peculiar aspect of the Act. I have read to the House the conditions applying where a person is normally covered under the Workmen's Compensation Act in his ordinary employment. If he is not ordinarily insured, another policy is necessary. This section is interpreted by insurance companies to mean that two types of policies are required. Under the first type, where a person is an employee and is covered by the provisions of the Workmen's Compensation Act in the usual course of his employment, this policy provides that should the person die as the result of the fire his widow would receive £2,750; or, if injured, the provision of the Workmen's Compensation Act would apply, that is, hospital and medical costs would be paid and weekly

wage payments made as provided under the Act. The second type arises where a person is self-employed, or an employer, and that policy would contain the provisions in (a), (b) and (c) of section 29 (6b) which I have read.

The unusual point about this is that the premium payable on both policies is exactly the same, namely £1 8s. It could happen that both men were fire officers or members of the same fire crew and, as such, would take equal risks, but should they both die as the result of the fire, or be injured, the benefits payable under the first policy would be nearly three times greater than those payable under the second policy. The only answer at present seems to be for the councils to take out multiples of three on the second type of policy mentioned which would cost £4 12s. to give protection comparable with that provided under the first policy for a premium of £1 8s. This apparent anomaly is causing some concern in the South-East. There appears to be discrimination between one man and another on account of their every-day occupations—something that would have nothing to do with fire-fighting whatsoever. Perhaps the Minister of Agriculture will consider amending the Act in view of the points raised.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I refer to the great interest the honourable member for Light takes in the progress and development of Mount Gambier. It does him credit. I have no doubt his keen interest in this fine city was aroused during the by-election of last year, when his active participation contributed in no small way to the success of the Labor Party. I well remember, Mr. Speaker, that following the by-election, the member for Light expressed the wish during last year's Address in Reply debate that I would enjoy what he confidently predicted would be a short stay in this House. He may have felt a little disappointed in his ability as a prophet when the electors on March 7 not only extended my term for another three years, but also doubled the majority, making it an all-time high for that electorate. I support the motion.

Mr. CUMBE (Torrens)—I support the motion. In doing so, I briefly add my congratulations to all those who deserve them, including yourself, Mr. Acting Speaker, as Chairman of Committees, and the member for Angas as Speaker. I welcome the new members to this House and congratulate those who have returned from the old Parliament. The new members of this Parliament in their maiden speeches have shown such excellent

promise that they will be acquisitions to this Chamber. Their presence will be felt in the debates in this Chamber during the coming years.

On examining His Excellency's Speech one is struck by the way it is divided into sections. Each phase of the State's activities is comprehensively dealt with and the Speech reviews last year's activities as a whole and announces plans for future expansion in this financial year. It promises a continuation of the L.C.L. platform announced at the last election. My Party stated that its policy was based not only on past achievements, but on future expansion. Our platform was based on the simple phrase, "Progress and Prosperity with Playford." His Excellency's Speech outlined how that policy was to be implemented by a fearless programme of expansion. In the next three years the Government will implement its announced programme.

This 36th Parliament has three main features different from all past Parliaments. Although I have been a member only for three years I have read much of its past history. This year we have the first woman member of the Assembly. Other members spoke eloquently of our privilege in having her in our midst, and I join with them in their eulogies of her maiden speech. The second feature is that this State is no longer a mendicant State, but is taking its true place in the financial set-up of Australia. No longer do we have to go cap in hand to the Federal Treasury. This is a milestone in our history. The third feature is that the Playford Government has been returned to office after 20 years in power and a Liberal Government after 25 years in power—an outstanding achievement.

In the Address in Reply debate it is worth reviewing our financial position, especially in August, preceding the introduction of the Loan Estimates. We should carefully review our financial position, particularly after hearing some of the irresponsible remarks about finance this afternoon from the member for Adelaide. The State is passing through an interesting phase in its economic and industrial development. It is as though the people, having gone through a phase of record expansion in the last decade, are now preparing to go on with an even greater phase of unsurpassed prosperity and development. We know from the plans announced at the election, the proposals mentioned in the Governor's Speech, and public announcements since then, that major undertakings are coming to this State.

Mr. Ryan—Perhaps.

Mr. COURCE—Don't be too impatient, my friend. The honourable member will soon learn. Major projects to be established will bring further prosperity and increased employment, which is one of the most important phases of industrial expansion in any country. It is apparent from all announcements that we are about to have another industrial revolution.

Mr. Ryan—You said it!

Mr. COURCE—I used that term advisedly. From history we know what the old industrial revolution did in England and the bad things that came in its trail. We are about to have a modern industrial revolution which will have the support of all thinking people, whether they be workers in factories and offices, professional men, or leaders. Furthermore, I suggest it will have the whole-hearted support of every member of this House, no matter what side he is on. It is interesting to note that while these activities are proceeding and other activities are being announced there is an unusual sense of quietness and stability on the economic and political front. It is difficult to think of any major issue in the field of economics or politics that is nation-rocking in its appeal to the people or that has every person talking about it. There are certainly a number of minor matters and minor problems that exercise our minds, but there is no major problem of national importance transcending all others.

Mr. Jennings—There certainly isn't if you keep your head in the sand.

Mr. COURCE—I got mine out long before the honourable member did. How different is the situation compared with the position of 10 years ago, which we can review with profit to ourselves. In 1949 we were faced with certain problems, not of our own choosing, that came as the aftermath of the war. There were many undesirable conditions which we all remember. We had high personal income tax; many goods were scarce and hard to obtain, some were unobtainable; petrol was rationed.

Mr. Riches—Do you remember the price?

Mr. COURCE—Yes, and I remember that we had to walk the town to get cigarettes; and then they were sold from under the counter as a great boon to us. We had power restrictions, black-outs, and black markets. Compared with today it was a period of tightness, austerity, and control, when personal and private initiative was discouraged. In fact, there was little encouragement for personal and private expansion and, of course, over all was the

socialistic threat. At that time South Australia was the only State that enjoyed a Liberal Government. All the other States, and the Commonwealth, had Labor Governments. Also at that time in England there was the Atlee Labor Government. However, the position today is radically different. We remember the threat at that time to the banking institutions that eventually led to the defeat of the Chifley Labor Government and the return to power of the Menzies Liberal and Country Party Government, which has been in power ever since and has created a record for its term of office. The Prime Minister also has established a record for his term, and that applies to other Ministers, too. It does not appear that that Government will be removed from office for many years. Petrol rationing is no longer with us, and we can get as much as we want in several grades. Every station is full to the brim, and we can get many grades made in Australia for the first time. One can get not only cigarettes, but also almost any commodity in almost any quantity. As an indication of the prosperity we enjoy, one can obtain a number of household appliances and also motor cars. That is in striking contrast to the position of eight or 10 years ago.

The political front has also changed radically. Today, instead of there being one Liberal Government in Australia, the Commonwealth and all States except New South Wales and Tasmania have Liberal Governments. England also has the MacMillan Conservative Government. We do not now have black-outs as we did in 1949 and previously, or the black marketing conditions that operated in those days. This has been swamped out by the best means, namely, free competition. We have a real confidence in the future of South Australia and we have the ability to maintain the programme announced by the Liberal and Country League Government. My Party has confidence that it can put that programme into effect. We have a wonderful future if we all put our backs to the wheel. The Government is playing its part and it is up to the rest of us to play our part. The Government is providing the spur and guidance to this achievement. Many industries, much capital, and more men with the know-how to work in the factories have been attracted to South Australia. Factory production is extremely important. This afternoon Mr. Lawn submitted numerous figures on factory output, the value of buildings, the number of men employed and so on, from the period 1939 to the present. I was surprised, as were

many other honourable members, to hear the tenor of Mr. Lawn's remarks and I consider he did a disservice to this State and to Parliament in belittling our progress. He seemed to take a delight in emphasizing what New South Wales had done, to the detriment of South Australia. He said that New South Wales was the paradise of workers and the ultimate of good government. The honourable member conveniently omitted certain figures. Let us consider the period I have been talking about. I noted the figures Mr. Lawn gave and I have taken out comparable figures. I will compare New South Wales and South Australia because they were the two States he talked about. Mr. Lawn said that in the period 1949 to 1959 South Australia had progressed less than the other States but actually the rate of the increase in New South Wales was 40.2 per cent and in South Australia 43 per cent. Far from going down, we have kept more or less level. He said that the value of production in factories in New South Wales for that period showed an increase of 40 per cent and in South Australia 41.3 per cent, and also that the value of investments in factories, on which he made great play, had increased more in New South Wales. Actually, the increase in New South Wales was 36 per cent, whereas in South Australia it was 43.7 per cent, which was the highest in the Commonwealth. In case that anyone has forgotten, I remind the House that New South Wales is governed by a Labor Government, whereas South Australia has a Liberal Government. It may be accident, but I suggest the advance in South Australia is the result of the Government's far-sighted policy. My authority for the figures I have given is the same authority as Mr. Lawn quoted, namely, the *Commonwealth Year Book*.

One of the phases the honourable member so conveniently omitted relates to the building industry, which is very susceptible to change. In recent years it has made great technological advances in methods of construction and handling, and new materials have been introduced. The best indication of the prosperity of a country and the living conditions of its people is the number of people employed in particular industries. Once again looking at the *Commonwealth Year Book*, I find it most interesting that in this 10-year period the building trade work force in the Labor State of New South Wales decreased by 1 per cent while there was an increase of 68 per cent in South Australia, yet New South Wales is held up to this House as

being the acme of good Government. In the last 12 months alone there was an increase of 1,500 people employed in the building trade in South Australia, and 12,039 were employed here as at March 31, 1959.

Mr. Ryan—Quote the number of homes built in the same period.

Mr. CUMBE—I think I have said sufficient to emphasize that South Australia is a good place in which to live, despite the Jeremiah remarks of the member for Adelaide. That is all I wish to say on industrial production. I shall now turn to one matter relating to my district. The Housing Trust recently introduced multi-storey flats at Gilberton for the first time, although these have been built in other parts of the State and the metropolitan area. As parts of Walkerville and North Adelaide, which are old-established parts of the community, had homes with long blocks and large backyards usually unused and covered by noxious weeds, I asked whether it would not be possible for the trust to use some of this land for building pensioner flats or multi-storey flats. This was done with the construction and opening of Mellor Court at Gilberton. I commend the trust for this work and hope it can be extended because it provides dwellings for many people of limited incomes, especially pensioners who must live near the city as many of them must come to the Royal Adelaide Hospital. If they live in outlying districts it is difficult for them to come to the hospital or to the city for shopping whereas with multi-storey flats near the city they have access to existing public utilities, whether it be transport, power, sewerage or shopping facilities. In the old-established parts of the city are modern facilities that could be used more fully, so I commend the Housing Trust for the work it has done in my area. I think this work could be extended to other older parts of the metropolitan area where we find old-fashioned, large blocks of land. The modern concept is to have a block only big enough to provide for the needs of one family, but in many of the older areas the blocks extend from street to street, and some are two blocks wide. In one part of Gilberton six backyards were bought by the trust and 32 flats were built.

Mr. Hughes—What type of flats?

Mr. CUMBE—A number of two-person flats and a number of single-person pensioner flats.

Mr. Ryan—Are they single-storey flats?

Mr. CUMBE—They are two-storey.

Mr. O'Halloran—That is what a Labor Government did in Sydney years ago.

Mr. CUMBE—It could have done so. I am talking about these flats, and if any member likes to see them I should be pleased to show him over. I commend the trust for its work and suggest that it continues in other directions. I have pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. HUGHES (Walleroo)—I have pleasure in supporting the motion, and I join with previous speakers in congratulating the member for Burnside, the mover, for her excellent contribution. Her knowledge of social questions, home requirements, and standards of living, and her forthright way of presenting this knowledge will, I feel sure, create great respect for her in this House in future debates. I also congratulate the member for Gouger on his maiden speech in seconding the motion. He revealed that he will add to the debating strength of this House. To you, Mr. Speaker, I offer my congratulations on your re-appointment. Parliament has every reason to be proud of your knowledge of Parliamentary procedure, your impartiality, and the distinction with which you carry out your duties. I also congratulate the member for Unley (Mr. Dunnage) on his re-appointment as Chairman of Committees.

This is the second occasion on which I have had the honour and privilege of speaking to the Address-in-Reply. I am proud that I have retained the confidence of my electors and fellow members since being elected nearly two years ago. That I have had to speak as a member of the Opposition instead of as a member of a Labor Government is, as will be readily appreciated, due to no fault of mine, my Party or the electors. Everyone knows that if we had anything like a democratic electoral system in this State—a system that the L.C.L. Government has repeatedly refused to adopt—a Labor Government would have been elected long ago. There has not been a Labor Government for a quarter of a century. The Labor Party has been kept out of office by a gerrymander that would be a disgrace to the most backward State of any country. There is no democracy in this State where the Assembly franchise is gerrymandered, and the Upper House is elected on a restricted franchise and represents nothing but wealth. Over the years the great Australian Labor Party has surmounted every problem that has confronted it, and will continue to do so. I am proud of my Party because its aims are not to serve a sect or section, but the people of the State as a whole. The Labor party is the only great force in Australian political life. We can

defeat all if we can pierce the fog of prejudice, misrepresentation, and distortion of our aims which is preached through the press, over the radio, and in more subtle ways—by the whispering campaign and the shocking device of character assassination.

This year was the first occasion I have had the honour and privilege of witnessing the opening of a new Parliament by His Excellency Sir Robert George. His dignified manner in presenting the opening Speech will stand as a memorial to him as the direct representative of Her Majesty the Queen. South Australia will miss both His Excellency and Lady George when the time comes for them to return home. They have endeared themselves to all sections of the community wherever they have travelled, and especially to those people living in the country. Thousands of people living in this State would never have had the opportunity of seeing or meeting them had it not been for their enthusiasm for seeing the living conditions of so many people. I think they will be best remembered for their personal share in giving hope and encouragement to those who suffered in the disastrous bush fire in 1955, and also for their visits to the people on the Murray during the flood. I feel sure I am right in saying that their kind words were an inspiration to many to fight on in an endeavour to save their homes. The people in my district are thrilled with the news that His Excellency and Lady George are proposing to visit them in October next. I trust that the remainder of their stay in this State will be a source of great joy to them.

I should like to refer to the opening paragraph in His Excellency's Speech concerning the past season, and that the harvest produced a record total yield of 80,000,000 bushels. After such an achievement by the primary producers in this State, I fully expected to hear His Excellency compliment them on attaining such a highly productive figure in the interests of building up the State's prosperity. Although the Government has co-operated with producers, it cannot claim all the credit. Therefore, I think a word of encouragement would not have been out of place in the Governor's Speech.

As I represent one of the principal grain-growing districts in the State, I want to congratulate farmers as a whole, but more particularly in my own district, for their magnificent attention to every detail in an endeavour first to grow grain of good quality and, secondly, to get greater returns. At the same time I do not overlook the valuable

assistance they received and are still receiving from experimental farms and colleges.

Today the farming industry is highly mechanized, which we know is a contributing factor to better farming and greater returns. Since the beginning of this century, great strides have been made in breeding wheats with a stronger resistance to drought conditions and disease, to be followed by improved quality and yield. Recently, I was interested to hear the honourable member for Barossa (Mr. Laucke) raise the question of the growing of soft and semi-hard wheats in certain areas with a view to recommending to farmers that certain wheat can be grown to advantage in certain areas rather than in others. I believe that with encouragement farmers would co-operate in such a move. South Australia's wheat production is not a very large figure in world terms. Therefore, every encouragement and assistance should be given to farmers to grow wheat most suitable to the district.

As the member for Barossa says, the policy of segregating soft and semi-hard wheats in South Australia has worked well in recent seasons, but I say that it does not go far enough, and that different qualities should also be segregated.

South Australia and Victoria are the principal barley growing States in the Commonwealth: 80 to 90 per cent is grown by those two States. Before the war Australia produced only 10,000,000 bushels, and often well below that, but of recent seasons production has exceeded the 40,000,000 mark, and it was expected that this coming season would reach the 63,000,000 mark. Of course, that is very doubtful now that the season has been so late in opening.

This great achievement is the result of closer co-operation between South Australia and Victoria in discussing their problems—I am referring now to primary producers—in pooling their ideas, and in exchanging the knowledge they have gained from their own experience, not forgetting the great co-operation given by workers in industry who supply the farmers' requirements and handle their products, often at great cost to their health. If any member of this House disagrees with me, I invite him or her to visit any of the ships taking on bulk cargoes of grain, and I feel sure he would alter his opinion. The dust and foreign matter that rise from the grain as it pours into the ship is amazing. Men are expected to go into the ships' holds while grain is being discharged from the belt system into the ship. They are issued with

a hood that fits over the head and comes down to the middle of the body. A hose goes under the jacket which supplies air to the person wearing it. They do it because it is a job. When we speak with pride about our progress, let us stop for a moment to reflect; and then I think we might in fairness to the worker in this type of industry say, "We have progressed, but at a price to humanity."

Last year with others I appealed to primary producers throughout the State to have the energy and determination to plan for the future by storing up fodder reserves. Generally speaking, this was done on a large scale and in many parts of the State large fodder reserves were evidence that our producers of livestock, etc., were determined not to repeat the mistakes of the past. Nowadays, most producers are well aware of the need to conserve fodder. Too much emphasis cannot be placed on the value of research establishments in agriculture. Some people say that when we have the oil works established at Halletts Cove and the steelworks at Whyalla we will no longer depend on the land for our prosperity. I hope they are right, but I am yet to be convinced that that will be so. I support any worthwhile move in the field of research to make land more productive or to bring into being land that was hitherto regarded as unfertile. A perfect example of this is the area known as the 90-mile desert. Only a few days ago I read where similar work was going on in Western Australia in light soil tracts like those near Esperance Bay. I was pleased to read in the Governor's Speech that a new agricultural research centre with field and laboratory facilities to deal with agricultural and livestock problems would be established adjacent to the Northfield Hospital.

My constituents were not happy to read in the *Advertiser* a few days ago a report covering the speech made by Mr. Shannon in this debate. I remember the night that Mr. Stott addressed a meeting in the Wallaroo Town Hall. It was a hostile meeting and at times Mr. Stott had difficulty in getting a hearing. It was not so much that the meeting was opposed to bulk handling, but that the meeting could not extract from those responsible an assurance that some other form of employment would be found for those who would be affected by the introduction of bulk handling at Wallaroo. In the end Wallaroo gave its blessing to the scheme because it believed in progress. Many families sacrificed their homes and moved from the district. They were under the impression that the bulk handling proposal was a progressive step. After listening to Mr. Shan-

non say a few days ago that the Wallaroo facilities would become redundant before the bulk handling company could realize amortization, I begin to question the wisdom of those who recommended the installation in the first place and of those who prepared legislation allowing the company to proceed with such a costly installation against the advice of the Public Works Committee.

Mr. Hambour—That is not right. You are wrong.

Mr. HUGHES—I do not think so. I am amazed that 20 months after the opening of the terminal at Wallaroo a member of the committee that recommended its installation should find it necessary to inform members that he envisages the time when Ardrossan will be able to handle all the surplus wheat for overseas and that Wallaroo will no longer be needed. After listening to the contradictions this afternoon by Mr. Stott I am not so sure about the information given by Mr. Shannon. Did any member of the Public Works Committee envisage that the State would grow at such a rate that bulk wheat would be needed for home consumption? Did any member envisage that the Port Adelaide division would in a few years be no longer able to meet the growing needs of the State, and was the recommendation for the installation of bulk handling at Wallaroo a unanimous decision by the committee?

Surely five years ago leading men in this State could have visualized the growth that would take place within the next 10 years? Five years ago tremendous changes were already taking place. Only last year I strongly criticized the Government and its advisers for their lack of vision. We all make mistakes, but if what Mr. Shannon said turns out to be correct the farmers in the Wallaroo division will have been taken for a ride and someone will need some very good answers. There must be some foundation for the charge made by Mr. Shannon that the bulk handling company made mistakes in setting up the Wallaroo terminal and that it has broken faith with the farmers in the Wallaroo division by building silos far in excess of receipts, at the same time asking farmers to haul their wheat long distances by erecting installations that will become an increasing burden on the wheat-growers. There must be something behind it; otherwise Mr. Shannon would not have brought it forward. I feel sure that all farmers in the State will be interested to hear the Premier's reply on this matter. Legislation was passed granting a charter to the company. Many people feel that it is the responsibility of the

Government to safeguard their interests, as well as the economy of the State.

It would be untrue to say that bulk handling by the company had not been a success, even if there had been a breakdown by the company in honouring section 14 of the Act, as claimed by Mr. Shannon. Obviously in this matter a price will have to be paid. It may come about by a process of adjustments. The present position may be due to the company's trying to sidestep its obligations, the Government's not policing the charter, and the farmers' not taking an active part in things that have a great bearing on their finances. This is 1959, not 1954, and now that a hornet's nest has been stirred up the farmers want to know the full facts.

It was suggested that wheat not up to f.a.q. standard had been received as f.a.q. at bulk silos. This is not the first time I have heard such a suggestion, but unfortunately I have never been able to entice anyone to confirm those statements. Apparently the member for Onkaparinga has such evidence, otherwise he would never have told the story in this House of the licensed receiver being by-passed because of the 3d. docked on bagged wheat and the farmers taking their wheat 10 miles down the road where it would be accepted as f.a.q. wheat.

Mr. Quirke—You should have made that speech last week.

Mr. HUGHES—Not necessarily. The member for Burra is only being guided by his colleague's reply to the member for Onkaparinga. Turning to another matter, it is rather significant that history has been made in South Australia in the year 1959 by the admission of its first woman into Parliament. I use the word "woman" guardedly, because after speaking at a Country Women's Association gathering I was taken to task by a visiting member for addressing the female species as "ladies." One member said, "We are not ladies, but women."

Mr. Jennings—Always give them the benefit of the doubt.

Mr. HUGHES—Another woman made history 100 years ago, and the inspiration that was later to be a memorial to a talented woman came to her within a mile of this House. I refer to the late Mrs. Caroline Carleton, the writer of what is known by many as Australia's true National song—the *Song of Australia*. To use the words of Harvey Hewett, the *Song of Australia* is a tribute to her great Australian spirit which prompted such a beautiful lyric, well worthy to grace the national

qualities of things Australian in our fair land. The history in connection with the writer of the song would probably have remained unknown to our generation and generations to follow had it not been for Harvey Hewett, a returned serviceman of World War I, who has devoted many years of his life in an endeavour to piece together the family history of the late Mrs. Carleton and her descendants. The people of Wallaroo feel indebted to Mr. Hewett for his interest and success in tracing the life history of Mrs. Carleton and Carl Linger, the German immigrant who composed and set the music to the words.

In the *Advertiser* of May 16 this year the following article by Mr. Hewett appeared:—

In October this year Gawler will honour the centenary of *The Song of Australia*, hailed by many as Australia's true national song, and the woman who wrote its words in 1859—Mrs. Caroline Carleton. Carl Linger, the German immigrant who wrote the music of the song is well-known to every South Australian school child, but Caroline Carleton has always been a more obscure figure. Her story, however, is full of incident and pathos. *The Song of Australia* has more than a touch of the international, for the woman who wrote its words was descended from two people who escaped the guillotine in the French Revolution. When Louis XVI lost his head in 1793, the Count and Countess de la Mere were helped to escape by the loyalty and devotion of their servants, and sought refuge in England where they made their home. Their daughter married William Baynes, of Bonnars Hall, near London, and to them was born on July 1, 1819, a daughter whom they named Caroline. At 17 she married Charles James Carleton, a young medical student, the son of an old Cumberland family. Three years later, in 1839, they sailed for Australia with their two young children in the *Prince Regent*. The voyage took six months, the journey was rough, provisions were short, and both their children died on the journey.

In the Wallaroo Cemetery stands a monument to Caroline Carleton, just a few paces from where she is buried, and the people of Wallaroo have decided to move the obelisk to Centennial Park, which faces the main street of Wallaroo. On October 19 this year Wallaroo proposes to hold celebrations in connection with the writing of the song. The obelisk is to have a further inscription placed thereon, and it will be unveiled by His Excellency the Governor, Sir Robert George. If certain members of this House are not interested in the *Song of Australia*, I am very pleased to know that His Excellency the Governor is. Australia has no National Anthem of its own. Suggestions for such a National Anthem have been made from time to time, and I remember that on one occasion *Waltzing Matilda* was suggested.

I sincerely hope that no-one ever becomes serious regarding that suggestion. I most heartily agree with Harvey Hewett who wrote:—

The adoption of a National Anthem of our own is imperative, and the sooner the people of Australia decide the better. The serious error of judgment that occurred during the Melbourne Olympic Games should not be allowed to recur.

This year being the centenary of the writing of the song by Mrs. Carleton, I sincerely hope that the Gawler Institute will press for the *Song of Australia* to become a glorious tribute to a fine woman by being adopted as our National Anthem.

Mr. Millhouse—Why can't we keep *God Save the Queen*?

Mr. HUGHES—We can still keep that. Turning to another matter, since the retirement early this year of Mr. Hammill, who was a veterinary surgeon at Kadina, my district has been without the services of a veterinary surgeon.

Mr. Hambour—So has mine.

Mr. HUGHES—The Premier, in answer to a recent question concerning another matter, said:—

We have supported the Sydney University for a number of years with direct grants and with payments of fees for students to go to Sydney to get their degree in veterinary science.

He intimated that the arrangement was profitable to this State, but I am not sure that it meets with the approval of all stud breeders and farmers. I suggest it is not profitable if it does not carry an incentive for a larger number of students to go to Sydney to secure the degree. I would not complain if the State were adequately served, but it isn't. Last week the member for Light made a similar complaint. The nearest veterinary to Kadina, which is virtually the middle of my electorate, is at Maitland. There are many stud breeders and farmers with valuable stock in my district. One stud breeder paid the highest price for a bull at last year's Royal Show and only a few days ago a Landrace sow was sold from my district for a record South Australian price of 1,500 guineas. More students should be encouraged to study this science and then to set up in districts that require their services.

Mr. Nankivell—Pay them and you will get them.

Mr. HUGHES—Could the honourable member find me one? I am sure the stud breeders and farmers in my district would be willing to pay a good retainer to a veterinary prepared to practise in Kadina. I am not complaining of the services rendered by the Maitland veterinary, because he has helped my district.

For many years two veterinaries practised in Wallaroo, but they left the district. Farmers with valuable stock have asked me to raise this matter in an attempt to secure the services of a veterinary for the district.

For many years the Moonta district high school students have been subjected to an unsatisfactory accommodation arrangement. They are housed in part of the Moonta primary school which has not sufficient accommodation for all its activities. Both sections—primary and high school—are growing and there are prospects of increasing enrolments in future. The old Moonta is fading into history and a new Moonta is growing. The younger generation realizes the value of the tourist trade and Moonta's potential in that regard. The old copper mines, a relief of the past, will be turned into a profit-making concern as a tourist attraction, and the beaches have undergone a vast transformation which has already returned handsome profits. Earlier this year a queen competition conducted in Moonta raised £2,557. This reveals Moonta's potential and indicates the possibility of increasing school enrolments. Recently the Director of Education was asked to provide a modern high school at Moonta. When I compare the numbers attending high schools in other country districts and realize that Moonta has never had a high school I do not think that is an unjust request. We hear much about decentralization and encouraging people to live in country districts, but if we haven't schools comparable with those in the city we will not attract people to our district.

March 17 last was an important day for Moonta, because the first pile of the new Moonta jetty was then driven. When I entered this House I said I would give credit where it was due and would offer constructive criticism where I thought it would be helpful. I express the gratitude of the people of that town to the Minister of Works who, as Minister of Agriculture, started the project and to the present Minister of Agriculture who continued it. The fishing jetty has proved an asset and now that fishermen are assured of reasonable shelter for their valuable craft the fishing industry is growing. With the completion of the jetty Moonta Bay will become a thriving centre and the tourist trade has become well established and is proving a profitable industry. I support the motion.

Mr. QUIRKE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 10.31 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, August 5, at 2 p.m.