

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Wednesday, July 22, 1953.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir Walter Duncan) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

(Continued from July 21. Page 70.)

The Hon. F. J. CONDON (Leader of the Opposition)—During this debate various viewpoints will be expressed, but there will be no difference of opinion in regard to our loyalty to Her Gracious Majesty the Queen. We all unite in expressing good wishes for a long and successful reign. Nowhere in the world will Her Majesty receive a warmer welcome than in South Australia. Both His Excellency and Lady George have endeared themselves to us, and the people of this State trust that their stay will not be of short duration. They have the love and respect of everybody in the State. I congratulate those members who have been re-elected to this Chamber. I may have to cross swords with members during the session, but I feel sure that the good feeling and unity for which this place is noted will continue. I may not receive any marks for the references I propose to make about a member of this Council whom I have always esteemed and respected, the Chief Secretary, but I join in offering my sincere congratulations to the man who has carried on the destiny of this State during the absence of the Premier overseas. When he entered Parliamentary life I expressed the view that he would go a long way and would achieve much. This afternoon I with other members join in wishing him continued success in his career. He has done wonderful work for the State. It is an honour for anybody to be asked to move and second the adoption of the Address in Reply and the two gentlemen who were called upon to carry out this duty did a good job. They were conscientious, concise and to the point and most gentlemanly in their remarks. I congratulate them. They did not speak at any great length—and I can quite understand that.

Reference has been made to you, Mr. President, and if I was to speak as I feel on various matters referred to in the Governor's speech I might be transgressing against the Standing Orders. I shall not do so because I know you are very much alive to the position. I am glad to see you occupying the position you do because your humour and friendly

feeling keep this place alive. No reference was made in the Governor's Speech to electoral reform but I would like members to consider the position under which we are working. Although in opposition my three colleagues and I represent the majority of the electors. The electoral system under which we work is unfair, unjust and undemocratic.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—Very strong terms.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I have said that before and I repeat it. We should not take a selfish view of the position, but should consider the question of equal rights. We must remember, too, that we are no better than anybody else. Let us consider the position in this Council. There are eight metropolitan members representing 105,043 electors but the 12 country members represent only 63,715. It is an outstanding fact that for a number of years the Labor Party has always received the most votes but the present set-up prevents it from taking office. We have endeavoured to alter the position and will again try by constitutional means. There are 52,296 electors in Central No. 1 district, 52,747 in Central No. 2 and only 25,367 in Southern district. Country and metropolitan electors are entitled to representation on equal terms and our policy is to bring that about. Today we are working under the same system which existed 96 years ago, but I suggest that in several respects Parliamentarians then were more democratic than we are. At the last Federal elections the Labor Party secured 219,628 votes or 53 per cent and the Liberal Party 189,105 or 45 per cent of the votes of electors in this State. This Government is only a minority Government because it carries out the policy of this State with a minority vote. I hope the time will come when members will cease to be selfish and will support electoral reform.

In his speech His Excellency referred to the appointment of two additional Ministers. The Legislative Council is an important part of Parliament and no law can be placed on the Statute Books without its sanction. I hope those in authority will recognize that the Council is entitled to an additional Minister and that the metropolitan electors will receive consideration as the present Ministers all represent country constituencies. I do not subscribe to the belief expressed by some that no metropolitan member is capable of occupying a Ministerial position. Every member of this Chamber would be fully qualified.

The Hon. A. L. McEwin—Are you applying for a position?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I could have been in two Ministries but was not prepared to sacrifice my principles to obtain a portfolio.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—Do you suggest that is one of the qualifications?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—An essential qualification is ability and if the honourable member was appointed I would be the first to congratulate him because he has rendered valuable service to this State. This is an unbalanced Ministry and 62 per cent of the people of this State, in the metropolitan area, have no representation. During the course of my remarks I will make some criticisms which I hope will be friendly and constructive.

His Excellency's Speech mentioned the appointment of a committee in connection with the Workmen's Compensation Act. There are two matters which I suggest for consideration. The first relates to disability payments. The Act sets out the amounts workmen may receive for various disabilities. However, they do not receive those amounts. The schedule prescribes specific amounts for the loss of a limb and various injuries down to the loss of one joint of a finger. We have passed legislation limiting the payment to a married man to £11 and to a single man £8 a week. He may be absent from work for 12 or 18 months and when the time arrives for final settlement all he gets is, perhaps, half of the prescribed amount because he will have been paid the other half in weekly instalments to keep body and soul together during his illness. I have had wide experience of workmen's compensation and I have known a man who has lost a joint of a finger not to receive a penny piece in a lump sum because the prescribed amount has been paid to him in weekly instalments.

Another aspect of compensation is injury whilst going to and from work. I am now handling a case of this type with, I regret to say, not much success. An employee is asked by his employer to work a double shift and consents to do so. Having started at 8 a.m. he naturally desires a meal before commencing the second shift and in journeying to or from the place where he partakes of his meal he meets with an accident. Notwithstanding that he is paid for the whole of the time he is absent from his place of employment in order to get a meal, and the accident takes place during the meal hour, he is denied workmen's compensation. In the case I am handling the insurance company, which is of the highest repute and has always acted fairly, simply says, "There is the law," and consequently we should amend the

Act in order to provide for such cases. Members may say that this would have far-reaching effects and that might be so in many cases, but I would be prepared to accept limitations. For example, if a man finished work by 4 p.m. and was injured at 6 p.m. probably his case should not be considered, but in a case such as I have illustrated the man should be entitled to compensation.

His Excellency referred to the progressive improvement in living standards and I suggest that one way to improve living standards still further is to grant long service leave to employees in industry. Parliament has legislated for long service leave for its own employees; every person engaged in the Government service in South Australia is entitled to long service leave and for many years some private firms have granted it to their employees. I congratulate them on their attitude. Members of the organization with which I am connected are entitled to long service leave, but those members of the union employed in the same class of work in outside firms are not, which seems to be a striking anomaly.

The Hon. F. T. Perry—But they do not have to retire at 65.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Why should a man have to wait until retirement? The opportunity to rest and recuperate restores the health of the employee and the employer gets the benefit.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan—Does not that apply in other States?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Exactly, and it is prescribed by legislation, too, but not by direction of the Commonwealth Arbitration Court. I am connected with an organization that has secured long service leave, and it was my honour and privilege to conduct the case. This is the only union under jurisdiction of the Commonwealth Arbitration Court which has received this benefit, but it should not be left to the courts for we should prescribe it by legislation. If we are prepared to accede long leave to Government employees we should do the same for those outside Government employment. Men who have given their lives to industries return to work after long service leave improved in health and with renewed vigour and energy.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan—The employers' say the burden of long leave would increase costs of production.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—In industries where the burden would not be great and an

employee has given long and faithful service he should be entitled to long leave on retirement.

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—On retirement is a little different isn't it?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—In the industry I am speaking of nearly every employee has had long service leave and returned to work again and many will probably work another 15 or 20 years, but the employer has benefited by giving them some consideration. A representative of an employers' organization told me that between the time when the employees were spoken to and before the award was made a certain organization of employers in another State tried to get the ear of the Liberal Federal Attorney-General to prevent it.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—Why should the milling industry be the only one to benefit?

The Hon. S. C. Bevan—It is not; the South Australian Gas Company has just granted it to its employees.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I come now to a serious matter. In placing certain facts before members I know I will not enlist their sympathy; all I want is their support. I particularly appeal to the captains of industry in this Chamber, and particularly to Mr. Perry and Sir Wallace Sandford. The problem confronting the flour milling industry today might confront them tomorrow. I am not speaking on behalf of any section of employees, but of an industry that has meant so much to this State. I said recently that the position was becoming serious, but it is more serious today. Again, I am not appealing for employees engaged in the metropolitan area, but for the majority of employees in the country. There are six flour mills in the metropolitan area and 24 in the country, where more flour is manufactured than in the city. What have country representatives done to try and improve the position? Two flour mills, one at Balaklava and the other at Port Adelaide, will close down within the course of a week or so, and many country mills are on reduced time. These mills are told to produce more, but if they do the penalty will be unemployment. It is idle for members to say there is no unemployment. Men who have been in industry since boyhood have to sacrifice 27s. a week in order to keep in employment. These are times when we are boasting about a record harvest. Although 33,000,000 bushels of wheat were grown in South Australia in 1952-53 we have unemployment in the industry which has not existed for the past 11 years.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—What is the reason?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Lack of exports and greed. It is a one-way traffic by certain interests, which always want to send the manufactured article abroad instead of giving some preference to a South Australian industry. It is an outrage for the Menzies Government to make a free gift of 45,000 tons of wheat valued at £2,000,000 to Pakistan. It should have sent flour overseas instead of closing down the milling industry. When an overseas country buys a certain article it wants it in its own form, but the Federal Minister for Agriculture, who talks about increased production, has not the interests of the working man at heart.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—Was the position put to him before that was done?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Yes, and all the excuses in the world were made. What assistance have I got from country representatives on behalf of the flour milling industry? The largest crop of wheat we have had for years has been exported. That is detrimental; not only to the milling industry but to the pig, poultry and dairy industries. I raise this matter because members will be asked within a few weeks to pass a Bill agreed to by six other Australian Governments. The Minister will say, "There it is; you will have to take it." I want the Government to know the Opposition's views on it.

The Hon. E. H. Edmonds—Can't the millers purchase all the wheat they want?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—No, because it is controlled by the Australian Wheat Board.

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—Do you like those boards?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I will not be supporting these boards, but my friend and his colleagues will.

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—I have never supported them.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—We will see whether or not you will support the Bill I have mentioned. Under the proposed agreement 100,000,000 bush. of wheat are to be sent overseas. Last year Australia produced 197,000,000 bush. of wheat. We have gristed 86,000,000 bush. here for flour, but we also need wheat for seed. How much will be left for local consumption if we carry out the agreement? The position is becoming serious. Farmers are getting as much for their wheat sold locally to millers as they are for wheat sold overseas. We hear much about London parity. As far as that is concerned we have to deal with each case on its merits, but what do we see—a few observers going around the country.

Some may have gone overseas. They advocate a London parity price. Why did the British Government not come into the international agreement?

The Hon. E. Anthoney—Because it likes to be free.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—No, because it can buy our wheat at a cheaper rate. People who advocate a price of 15s. for wheat are aware that there is a likelihood of the price falling below 15s. If they want London parity for wheat will they accept it for butter, meat and eggs? It is all very well for them to say they want London parity, but that is only wanted when it suits. I would not like to see a London parity for meat, and particularly for butter, because the dairy farmer, who is the hardest worked man on the land, is entitled to everything he can get. We cannot have it both ways if we are to be consistent.

The Hon. W. W. Robinson—What is the London parity for wheat today?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—On August 1 wheat will be reduced by 1s. 8d. a bushel. In the free market we can get 21s. 8d., but not on the other markets. Wheat prices are falling every day and that is why the British Government kept out of the international agreement.

The Hon. F. T. Perry—You don't blame them for that?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—No. There has been a somersault and the industry is prepared to accept 15s. Probably it will be glad if the price falls to 13s., but we will be asked to make up the difference.

The Hon. R. R. Wilson—What is the cost of production of a bushel of wheat today?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I do not know but if it fell to 13s. a bushel I suggest the wheatgrowers would be entitled to receive 15s. We cannot have it both ways nor can we have a one-way traffic. It is no use any section of the community always wanting its own way; every section is entitled to consideration. This is no small matter and concerns us all. If I think any industry deserves assistance I will fight for it. Quite recently Sir George Jenkins, the Minister of Agriculture, went to a meeting in Canberra. He was approached by the wheat-growing interests and asked to vote for the removal of the industry representatives on the Australian Wheat Board but to his credit he refused.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—Growers have a preponderance of representation now.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Through their efforts they have secured two more. They have

controlled the Australian Wheat Board for some time. Business representatives who have been associated with the trade all their lives must be on the board. In 1950-51 the industry produced 1,696,000 tons of flour, 303,000 tons of bran and 339,000 tons of pollard, a total output of 2,338,000 tons. The output from South Australia was 206,570 tons of flour, 37,000 tons of bran and 33,000 tons of pollard, a total of 276,570 tons. It is an industry well worth fighting for. Of a total of 886,533 tons of flour exported South Australia contributed 128,882 tons. It is a mistake that the price of wheat is being kept high in Australia while other countries are selling at a lower price.

The Hon. N. L. Jude—Do you suggest the home consumption price is too high?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Other countries are competing in the export trade because wheat is being produced more cheaply elsewhere.

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—Do you agree with me that we are pricing ourselves out of the market?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—No, while under control we are not pricing ourselves out.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—What is preventing the miller from getting all the wheat he wants?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—He must buy through the Australian Wheat Board. At some later stage it will be suggested we must agree to legislation because other States have already accepted it.

The Hon. L. H. Densley—Would you be prepared to vote against the sale of wheat by the Australian Wheat Board?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—When I first came to this House I was asked if I would support a Bill and I said that I would express my opinion when I saw it.

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—But you want us to decide before we see it.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I am asking you to give consideration to an industry which is worth it and not to do something which is unfair. We are all prepared to assist the man on the land but it is a question of method. Because we do not always agree it does not necessarily mean that we are not doing what we consider is right. Country mills are working overtime to meet local requirements. They may not be affected to any great extent at present but they will be when the metropolitan mills cannot get the export trade and compete on the local markets. I have a great admiration for the flour milling industry. It has never had any industrial unrest and has

always done its best to keep the wheels of industry turning. When other countries were starving the employees worked on Saturdays and Sundays but what is their reward today?

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Unemployment.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—It is because of that industry's past services to the Commonwealth and State that I am speaking for it today. If a halfpenny or more a bushel can be obtained overseas why act to the detriment of what was once a flourishing industry? Once our markets are lost they will not be regained.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan—Haven't we lost our overseas flour markets?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—We have lost portion of them because other interests have entered the field. Today the Australian Wheat Board, comprised of a majority of farmers and representatives, is selling wheat overseas and the wheat exporter and miller must both work through it. The industry is facing a serious crisis.

The Hon. R. R. Wilson—Are the costs much higher when flour mills are not working full time?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—It is cheaper to work three shifts than one because the machinery is in constant use and the costs of production are lower. The miller has to pay more for his wheat because the Wheat Board charges him for the average number of bushels of wheat used to produce one ton of flour, formerly 47bush. but now 46.3. Do not get it mixed up with the home consumption price. We all realize that the public has been getting the benefit. If you want to pay London parity on local consumption very well, but you must be prepared to pay 2d. a loaf more for your bread. However, I am not so much concerned with a home consumption price for I am speaking of exports, and I say that the wheat farmer gets more for his wheat that is made into flour than for the wheat which he exports.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—Do you mean more or less?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I mean that it costs the miller more for the wheat he manufactures and sells overseas than the farmer gets for wheat if he exports it direct. This State was formerly the granary for Australia and supplied the flour required by all the other States as well as being the chief Australian exporter, but times have changed and with a surplus of wheat in the eastern and western States and shipping companies creating terminal ports in eastern Australia and making

the last port of call in the west, South Australia is now at a disadvantage. Great credit must go to the Department of Agriculture and the Waite Research Institute for what they have done to increase yields of the various varieties of wheat. We are told that last year we had a record yield of 33,000,000bush., but I recall that 14 years ago we had a harvest of 48,000,000bush. and although we may boast of a very heavy yield per acre what about our acreage? We have been neglectful in our efforts to increase production of certain lines.

The Hon. W. W. Robinson—What was the nature of the production in the 48,000,000bush. year?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—It was not so much barley, but I am not concerned so much whether we have a 28bush. or a 15bush. yield per acre as with the fact that much land which should be utilized is not under cultivation. If we want to supply the peoples of the world we must wake up to the position.

The Hon. N. L. Jude—Is it not better to thoroughly crop the better class land than to tinker around with the marginal stuff?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—We have much land which was formerly cropped but is now not under cultivation. The farmer has played a wonderful part in the history of Australia—

The Hon. R. R. Wilson—That is one reason why we are getting higher yields.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—That does not justify the farmer in not cropping every possible acre because if we can produce 23bush. an acre from 1,000,000 acres why cannot we get the same yield from 2,000,000 acres? With our increasing population it is only a matter of years before we will be unable to feed ourselves.

The Hon. L. H. Densley—It is only by rotation of cropping that we can get high yields.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—That may be so, but it must be admitted that we have not pulled our weight in many respects. In 1940-41 2,560,000 acres were sown.

The Hon. W. W. Robinson—We have over 3,000,000 acres under cereals today.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—The honourable member is including barley which does nobody any good. It is exported to Japan and not processed in South Australia, and therefore it would be better to grow wheat and process it here in order to supply the pig, poultry and dairying industries and maintain employment in industry. In order to get a cheaper article we must manufacture locally. If the industry closes down and there is a shortage of offal resulting in a higher price

who has to pay it but the dairyman, pig raiser and poultry man and ultimately the consumer?

The Hon. L. H. Densley—Is there any shortage?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Not at present, but there will be, make no mistake. When there is full production, as there has been in the past nine years, there is no shortage, but if we have half production we will soon find there is a shortage. My point is that as a young country we cannot afford to let up in our endeavours. We must cultivate every inch of ground possible if we are to feed ourselves and retain our country.

The Hon. R. R. Wilson—I have never seen any go-slow policy in operation on farms.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—There is a lot of land which should be under cultivation and some men are doing a wonderful job, but, as in other avocations, there is a section which will not do its best. For a number of years farmers' representatives have advocated overseas parity for wheat for local consumption. I am not opposed to the farmer securing the best possible price but if we want overseas parity for wheat are we to accept it for other commodities which are sold at lower prices in Britain? Take, for instance, butter which is sold for considerably less in England than locally. The farmers' representatives have turned a complete somersault, for whereas they formerly advocated overseas parity they now are urging acceptance of a uniform price of 15s. a bushel. Two schemes are under consideration—wheat marketing and price stabilization. It will be noted that there were two out of step at the last meeting of the Agricultural Council. I am not criticizing their attitude but I will criticize them if they do not protect an industry well worthy of protection. The essential points of the scheme that will be submitted to a ballot of wheatgrowers are:—

1. The price of wheat for human consumption in Australia will be the ascertained cost of production f.o.r. bulk ports. The price to operate for the period of the stabilization plan subject to any review which may take place during that period.

2. The price for stock feed wheat for the period of the stabilization plan to be the prevailing International Wheat Agreement quota parity, or export parity if there be no International Wheat Agreement.

3. The guarantee by the Commonwealth Government (which is related to the question of export tax and the stabilization fund) to be in respect of 100,000,000 bushels of wheat for export each year.

It is all one-way traffic. I want to protect the industry I have spoken of this afternoon and the consumers reasonably, but if a higher charge is put on the raw material the people will have to pay for it, and there should be no squeal about it if members are prepared to stand by and let it go through. Whether they agree with what I have said or not at least I hope they will give my remarks the consideration they deserve.

Now I pass on to challenge some of the figures which have been published recently regarding our public finances. I read that the revenue of the Engineering and Water Supply Department was considerably more than the expenditure. I immediately queried this and found that the following are the correct figures:—

1950-51.	
Waterworks—	
Revenue	£1,098,360
Expenditure (including interest and sinking fund)	£1,788,352
Loss for year	£689,992

Sewers—	
Revenue	£371,835
Expenditure	£415,262
Loss for year	£43,427

Total loss for year (Waterworks and Sewers)	£733,419
---	----------

1951-52.	
Waterworks—	
Revenue	£1,301,075
Expenditure	£2,027,128
Loss for year	£726,053

Sewers—	
Revenue	£515,303
Expenditure	£519,782
Loss for year	£4,479

Total loss for year (Waterworks and Sewers)	£730,532
---	----------

It will be worse this year, yet the Government states that they are showing a profit. To meet the full charges for interest these undertakings should have returned a surplus of earnings over working expenses of 2.9 per cent. The year's return was .083 per cent. Country water districts failed to meet working expenses by £394,000.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—All of them?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—The Government has told the people what it intends to do, but it is impossible and misleading to try to convince the people that it will do these things. It proposes a permanent water supply for Yorke Peninsula and the enlargement of the water main between Bundaleer and Clinton.

It also proposes to build storage tanks of 40,000,000 gall. near Paskeville and to complete the Uley-Wanilla water scheme. It states that schemes are under construction for Jamestown, Caltowie, Loxton and the Nairne pyrites undertaking. The Government proposes improvements in the metropolitan water supply, the Mannum-Adelaide water supply and additional water for the Warren system. Construction of the South Para reservoir is proposed, also a new reservoir on Kangaroo Creek to supply Clarendon and Myponga. These inquiries are still continuing. It also proposes sinking more bores and equipping them. I do not know how we are going to do these things, as the undertakings I have mentioned are showing losses.

I intended to deal with the financial position, but will leave that to other members. I could deal with afforestation, railways and taxation, but instead will conclude by referring to the Parliamentary Superannuation Fund. Started in 1948, 4½ years ago, the fund had a credit balance of £34,873 as at June 30, 1952. Members have subscribed that sum. It is time that the legislation was reviewed. This session, as is usual, members of the Opposition will not be obstructive. They will make constructive criticism as they realize that the Opposition is part and parcel of this institution.. It realizes, too, that good Government means a lot to the Commonwealth and South Australia. It appreciates that it takes an Opposition to make a Parliament and is not unmindful of its responsibilities, not only to those it represents but to the people generally.

You opened this Parliament today, Mr. President, with a prayer and yesterday referred to the Divine will and power. I conclude my speech with a prayer, which adopts the Christian principles and goes to make up Christian civilization. It is a prayer of Saint Francis of Assisi, who is my patron Saint:—

Lord, make me an instrument of Thy peace; where there is hatred, let me sow love; where there is injury, pardon; where there is doubt, faith; where there is despair, hope; where there is darkness, light; and where there is sadness, joy.

O Divine Master, grant that I may seek not so much to be understood, as to understand; to be loved, as to love; for it is in giving that we receive, it is in pardon that we are pardoned, and it is in dying that we are born to eternal life.

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS (Northern)—In supporting the motion I associate myself with the expressions of loyalty to Her Majesty the Queen that have been voiced by members who have preceded me. In common with many

other members I took the opportunity of seeing the full story of the Coronation ceremony as displayed by some pictures in our city theatres. I was greatly impressed by the solemnity of the ceremony, its grandeur and the dignity and courage that Her Majesty displayed. In viewing the pictures, I realized how much I would have liked to have been with those who actually saw the ceremony. At the theatre I felt I was looking at some of the grandeur of the Coronation ceremony itself and of all it meant to our Queen. In that vast assemblage there were representatives of nations from all over the world who are members of that great Commonwealth of Nations. They represented many countries and creeds and I thought that ceremony was in the nature of an emblem which demonstrated the unity we should endeavour to attain right throughout and which led ultimately to our pledge to support the democratic way of life. It did much to instil that idea and principle into our minds.

I associate myself with the welcome extended to His Excellency the Governor and Lady George and have no hesitation in saying that the people of my district will welcome any visit they may make to those areas. They will be assured of the same cordial and heartfelt welcome that has always been extended to all Vice-regal representatives who have visited various parts of the State.

The Governor's Speech covered a large number of matters and took on the usual form of such speeches. He made something in the nature of a resume of what had been achieved and went on to give a summary of what would be attempted. The Address in Reply debate offers full opportunity for covering every field. I do not know of any limitation within the bounds of decency that is not open to members in making their contribution to it. It is my intention to follow the usual practice and select a few subjects which I think are of particular importance and interest to the people of my district.

I have no wish to take a parochial view of various subjects because I appreciate it is not a question of their being in watertight compartments, but rather one of endeavouring to direct our energy and legislative activities to the well-being of the whole of the people. In selecting matters that are of particular interest, a member naturally selects those he knows most about and leaves to others matters with which he may not be so directly concerned. I shall commence by dealing with our aboriginal population, South Australia is as

much concerned and has as much consideration for our native population as any State. For years aboriginal stations have existed in areas extending to the far north and west even to Ernabella Mission Station, which is under the control of a religious organization. I have visited the smaller stations, which are sponsored and supported by the Government, and those in the more settled districts of Point Pearce and Point McLeay. On the West Coast we have Koonibba Mission Station, which is also under the control of a religious organization. The care of our natives is a perplexing problem and much more requires to be done. As one travels around and sees their conditions it appears there is a general desire on the part of many people to do what they can for our native population and get them assimilated into the Australian way of life. In this regard I refer to the property purchased two years ago for the express purpose of accommodating the aboriginal population previously stationed at Ooldea on the East-West line. Members will recall that legislation was introduced empowering the Government to purchase Yalata station in the Fowlers Bay district. There has been some delay in finalizing the arrangements for that project. The station at Ooldea was vacated at short notice and not much time was available to make alternative arrangements for the natives' accommodation and they were left more or less to their own resources. Officers from Koonibba Mission had to be enlisted to round up the natives in the area and transport them to Fowlers Bay. There had not been sufficient time to make necessary provision for their reception and consequently they became a menace and a trouble to the people in that area.

It might be recalled that when the Bill was before us opposition was displayed by some of the neighbouring residents to bringing the natives so close to the white settlement. Because of the circumstances mentioned many of their fears were realized. I was in that district earlier in the year and the position was not a happy one. A number of the natives were wandering about the country and those who have knowledge of natives will realize that when they go walk-about they are accompanied by dogs of all sizes and description which become a serious menace. The only provision made to control the natives was that a missionary had been placed in charge of the distribution of rations. As I indicated in a question yesterday, I hope that the position has been rectified and that some definite

arrangement has been made for managing the natives. I trust that in time this station will prove as worth-while as the mission at Koonibba which is controlled by the Lutheran Church. I am fortified in my opinion that it ultimately will prove satisfactory from my experience of the Koonibba Mission. The natives there provide a labour pool. They work on farms and numbers are engaged on the waterfront at Cape Thevenard in wheat loading and they have proved to be valuable in augmenting the labour force in that area. We cannot expect much in the way of reform of the older natives but I hope that the younger natives—and particularly those of half and quarter caste—will raise their standards and become useful members of society. It is their natural trait to wander. They never have been recognized as favouring fixed abodes but travel as circumstances and seasons demand. However, the younger natives in time may breed out that propensity to roam. The older ones will wander but if provision is made enabling a policeman to make periodical inspections the results should be satisfactory. There is no doubt that the natives have a great respect for the man in uniform who is sympathetic and good results usually follow from such supervision.

Dealing with education, one of the main and growing problems is the question of school transport. From the Estimates one can see a substantial increase in the amounts set aside each year for the purpose of transporting children to the larger area and consolidated schools and in some places to high schools and technical schools. Had the Minister any idea of how that responsibility would grow when the scheme was first launched much misgiving and apprehension might have been felt about introducing it but having committed ourselves we must continue to provide transport. In order to relieve the position I hope the Minister will seriously consider the possibility of re-opening some of the smaller schools. Many small portable schools which used to render valuable assistance are no longer in use and the scholars are transported to larger schools. Now that the supply of teachers is becoming less acute it may be possible to carry out my suggestion. It would provide scholars with schools nearer their homes and would be of definite advantage to children in the lower grades. When they grew older and stronger they could then stand the longer journeys necessary to take them to larger schools.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Wouldn't your suggestion create difficulties for teachers?

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS—I do not think so. I was associated with school committees and when a teacher was transferred to a small school with as few as 12 scholars accommodation was frequently found for him in the home of parents of children attending the school. Sometimes a person without children of school-going age who desired to help the district would provide accommodation. The greatest problem is not the provision of teachers, and if relief in this direction is available I hope the department will consider my suggestion.

We have listened to a most interesting speech from Mr. Condon this afternoon. I am sure members always listen with interest to whatever he has to say, specially when he is dealing with the flour milling industry with which he has been associated practically all his life. He certainly knows its problems, but I was a little disappointed that he did not complete his theme by elaborating a little more fully on what he considers to be the remedies for the difficulties confronting it. He told us there was unemployment in the industry, but there is a big demand for its product, and its output is almost a record and therefore I rather failed to reconcile his statements and hoped he would have given us a little more information. As one representing a country district in which there are flour mills I naturally want to see these local industries carried on. Some were established in difficult circumstances and those associated with them are worthy of every consideration. Although beset by serious difficulties they were game enough to launch out and now, at a time when most of them have put themselves in a favourable position, there is this threat indicated by the honourable member. However, I cannot quite see why there should be a threat of closing down of country flour mills and I hope that he will take an early opportunity to elaborate his theme a little more, and perhaps tell us what we should do to remedy the situation.

Members will recall that in 1948 Parliament passed a Bill authorizing the construction of a spur line of railway from Kowulka siding on the far West Coast adjacent to Penong to the Lake Macdonnell gypsum and salt lake areas. For some years prior to that the gypsum industry had been established in that locality and mining of this mineral had been carried on fairly extensively. In association with it a factory was established at Cape Thevenard and considerable capital invested in the business. When the Bill authorizing the railway was

before us I remember saying how much I welcomed the evidence of the Government's intention to aid the establishment of industries in country districts and I expressed optimism of the results. However, I regret to say that my optimism was quite unfounded and that through various circumstances the industry has gradually gone downhill until, when I was there in the early part of the year in company with the Assembly member for the district, I found that preparations were being made for abandoning the whole of the work. Homes had been built at Penong and men had established themselves and their families, and the industry at Cape Thevenard was threatened with partial closure. Naturally we were very concerned and on our return made inquiries as to the reasons, and we found that the company can now get its raw material nearer to its markets and it no longer pays to work these outlying deposits.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Were they war-time developed areas?

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS—No, they were worked long before the war although by a different company. I understand a technique has now been developed for treating inferior raw material quite effectively and it is no longer necessary to utilize the richer deposits in the Penong district. We have always prided ourselves as a State on our encouragement of secondary industries, and in the metropolitan area and some of the larger towns this policy has proved very successful. If, however, it is a satisfactory economic proposition to give assistance to industries established in the city it is equally justifiable in respect of smaller industries in the country. Frankly, I do not know what may be entailed in helping this industry back into production but it is certainly worthy of consideration. We have a railway which was built under the agreement, but never utilized very much; we have the capital sunk in the buildings and establishments—

The Hon. F. T. Perry—Did the company build the houses?

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS—At Cape Thevenard I understand the Housing Trust built some and the company others but whether the trust homes were provided for employees in the industry I cannot say. We are told that there are millions of tons of raw material and I understand that it is one of the best deposits of its kind in South Australia, if not in the whole continent.

I now turn to the question of roads, which always present a difficult problem. We are

living in a time when we are endeavouring to meet the needs of modern transport with a road system devised many years ago, and particularly does that apply in the outlying areas. I was the member of a district council when the brattenizing system was first evolved. Under that system we were able very cheaply to build roads which answered admirably for the traffic requirements of that era, but at that time it was quite unusual to see motor vehicles carrying more than three or four tons. Nowadays, it is quite common to see enormous transports and semi-trailers, some from other States, carrying up to 16 tons and even more, traversing these dirt foundation roads built for lighter traffic. The Highways Department is endeavouring to meet the problem but it seems to me that we must make the necessary heavy foundations and seal the surfaces if we are to use heavily laden transports in our country districts. When I was first elected as representative of the Northern districts and started to move around more extensively in the remoter areas I was astonished to see that apparently nothing was being done to improve roads in our pastoral areas. I travelled many miles and gained the impression that little or nothing had been done since the first bullock drays of the early pioneers passed over the roads. With the assistance of my colleagues and others and with the hearty co-operation of officers of the Highways and Local Government Department and the Engineering and Water Supply Department the position was gradually improved and today we have 11 road-making units in the pastoral areas. They are stationed from Port Augusta to Marree, and at Leigh Creek, Oodnadatta, Kingoonya and Yunta, and beyond Burra in the north-east. It is gratifying to know how greatly these humble efforts have been appreciated.

I was in the Oodnadatta district early this year and travelled by motor along one of the roads that had been graded. I do not mean it was graded as we know graded roads in the settled areas. It appears that the grader had made two trips up and back over a long distance and the result was a serviceable and trafficable road for vehicles. The friend who accompanied me said that he was able to go from his station, which is situated nearly 200 miles north-west of Oodnadatta, in less than half the time it used to take him to make the trip, and he travelled much more comfortably. I pay the highest commendation to the men in charge of the

units. The Engineering and Water Supply Department is particularly fortunate in its selection of these men. They are a long way from towns and it is not possible to have strict supervision by the resident engineer, who is located at Crystal Brook. They are, to a great extent, left to their own resources and have to exercise their own initiative. They cannot depend on somebody telling them what they must do, from week to week, but from what I have seen they are doing an excellent job.

A matter of great importance to country districts is water supply. It is pleasing to notice the progress that has been made with the reticulation of Eyre Peninsula from the Uley-Wanilla water supply scheme. Members might have read in the press that the pipeline along the western shores of Spencer Gulf has reached Cleve, and soon will be connected at Cowell. The provision of that water will mean a considerable advance in the progress of the districts mentioned. It will assist in opening up further areas of productive land and will also make living conditions more congenial for residents. There is also the further extension of water supplies throughout Eyre Peninsula. The Tod River scheme has been extended as far as Ceduna and reticulation mains extend right through the country.

West Coast settlers have many problems to contend with. Much time and capital has been expended, both by Government departments and individuals, in endeavours to find underground supplies, providing catchment areas and tanks. These efforts, however, have not met the position. The supply available in the Uley basin has lessened any chance of a water shortage and I feel that the Government could extend supplies further into the West Coast areas. Anybody who is familiar with the country will agree that there is a considerable area of land as far as Penong equal to anything in production on the western part of the Eyre Peninsula district. Frequently, the land is of superior quality. Penong landholders are fortunate in getting a small, although limited, supply of underground water. To the north of that town much country could be brought into profitable production if water supplies were extended from the present head of the Tod main at Ceduna.

We are repeatedly calling for increased cereal and primary production. Admittedly, much of that country is not as productive as other areas of the State, but its production is comparable with some of our mallee lands and also of land

in the district in which I have a particular interest. I ask the Government to have this matter further investigated.

The opening up of our mallee lands presented many problems which we did not appreciate at the time when their development commenced. When settlement of mallee lands commenced after World War I, it was with the idea that the same farm technique practised in the older settled districts could be carried on in that class of country. In the first few years of settlement that idea was true, but that was made possible by the fact that even in the poorer mallee types of soil there was a natural fertility. However, it became quickly exhausted by the system of agriculture which had to be followed in an endeavour to bring that country into production. It was necessary to carry out a short rotation of cropping in order to deal with the secondary growth of scrub that occurred from time to time. With the clearing of bigger areas and the introduction of sheep it became apparent that we would have to review our farm husbandry practice to meet the position. It was a position that was mostly brought about because such land was cleared and the burning off of growth of stubble crops did not return sufficient humus to the soil. That started the problem of erosion. As a means of rectifying it certain areas were declared to be marginal lands and made subject to marginal lands legislation. It was recognized that with the new technique the original holdings were far too small to permit of a wider range of crop rotation necessary to more effectively and sufficiently handle and rectify the position. It was found that the old crop rotation of three or four years would have to be extended to seven years or even longer. It was realized, too, that there had to be some cultivation and the application of superphosphate for a certain period or the land would soon revert to its original state. Unfortunately, some people found that they could not see it through and many who had spent the best years of their life on the blocks and had spent all their capital had to walk out.

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—What is the rainfall in those areas?

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS—Anything from 8in. to 12in. Ultimately a system of land husbandry had to be introduced to meet the position. A great deal of success has attended the efforts in that direction and land which at one time was thought beyond redemption has been reclaimed and brought into profitable

production. I have one criticism in this connection. Whilst I fully support the aggregation of holdings to implement the marginal areas system which has been evolved there has been a tendency to overdo it. There has been over-aggregation and many people are holding land out of production which could be brought into production and provide the necessary outlet for those who desire to engage in agricultural pursuits. I am frequently asked by young men—and some returned soldiers—why some lessees hold 12,000 acres and do not use half of it and why it should not be made available to them when they are prepared to work it.

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—Isn't that land being used to run sheep?

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS—No. It is not of much value as a sheep-running proposition because it is mainly scrub. To enable the land to be brought into production the natural scrub must be cleared, and to permit grazing better fodder must be grown. I obtained information from the district council of Murat Bay about the holdings in that area. In one instance a man, his wife, son and family have a holding of 9,735 acres, of which 30 per cent is undeveloped; another holding of 14,055 acres is 50 per cent undeveloped; a holding of 10,624 acres held by a mother and her unmarried son is 50 per cent undeveloped; and another of 22,042 acres, held by a man and wife but managed by their son-in-law and his family, is 60 per cent undeveloped. There are 16 cases altogether and the total holdings amount to 248,901 acres or 389 sq. miles, representing 20 per cent of the district council area. In that total is the Charra property of 36,755 acres. Excluding that property the average holding of the remaining 15 persons is 15,556 acres. By retaining these large holdings we are preventing the populating of areas.

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—Can't people buy that land if they want to?

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS—The land is held under marginal leases which contain certain restrictions.

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—You want the restrictions removed?

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS—I want the matter reviewed to see if it is possible to reduce the marginal areas so that instead of one man holding 10,000 acres two men could hold 5,000 acres each.

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—Do you think that a man can manage with only 5,000 acres in a 10in. rainfall area?

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS—Not in all areas but in some areas if a correct system of land husbandry is introduced it can be done and is done because many holdings are only 50 per cent developed.

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—A man cannot live on a crop once in seven years.

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS—It is not economic to endeavour to live on wheatgrowing alone in that or any other district. It must be diversified farming and include sheep running and some dairying or other sidelines. I was interested to hear some of Mr. Condon's comments about wheat and intended speaking on them but we will have an opportunity of expressing our opinions in that connection later when legislation is introduced. With those contributions I support the motion.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Midland)—At the outset I desire to congratulate the mover and seconder of this motion. They both delivered excellent speeches which contained much food for thought. However, there was one suggestion in Mr. Jude's speech with which I did not agree and that was that we should get away from the "give way to the man on the right" rule and establish a system of major roads in this State. I do not think that would be practicable because in many country areas it is difficult to know which is the major and which is the minor road and the policy of giving way to the person on the right leaves no room for confusion. One of the reasons for the difficulties which arise under the Road Traffic Act is that we alter and amend it too often with the result that the law is in a continual state of flux and no-one is quite certain what it is.

I join with other speakers in extending a welcome to Sir Robert and Lady George. I am sure they will do an excellent job and I am again pleased that we have a person from the Old Country to represent the Royal Family. We are also happy that the new Queen, Elizabeth II., has been crowned Monarch of Great Britain and all her realms, and we wish for her a very happy and successful reign. It is a matter for serious consideration when we remember that at the beginning of this century there were 20 crowned heads in Europe whereas now there are only six. Fourteen of the dynasties have gone. Kaiser Wilhelm II. who was a cousin of King George V. was banished under circumstances with which we are all familiar: Czar Nicholas II. of Russia, also a cousin of King George V., lost his throne; Alfonso the Thirteenth of Spain who married a first cousin of King George VI. also lost his

throne: King Carlos of Portugal was killed by an assassin's bullet in 1908 and Archduke Ferdinand, the heir apparent to the Austro-Hungarian Empire, was killed in 1914. The only monarchs who remain on the Continent are those of Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Holland, Belgium and Greece. The reason why the British monarchy has continued, and is more deeply rooted in the traditions of British history today than ever before, is that the occupants of the Monarch's position have carried out their duties so well and have met the wishes of the people so successfully that they remain while others have gone. It is to the great benefit of us who are British people and indeed to the whole world that this should continue. I sincerely hope we will do all in our power to assist the young Queen in her onerous duties and to make sure that her status and position is maintained.

I was not surprised when Mr. Condon mentioned electoral reform. I should have thought that the Labor Party would have realized that in talking about that matter it is riding rather a lame horse because when the facts are fully investigated a very strong case cannot be made out for electoral reform in this State. The basis of the argument seems to be that an ideal electoral system should be based on a "one vote one value" basis. As far as I have been able to ascertain from fairly exhaustive inquiries I can discover no system where that principle operates. It seems impossible, in view of geographical and other factors, to devise a system whereby that condition could apply. In proof of that I quote some figures which apply following the redistribution of electorates under the Federal Constitution. It is generally regarded, I think, that a very good job was done in that re-distribution, and much of the propaganda I have heard is based on the argument that we ought to get away from the position which obtains in South Australia and adopt the Federal set-up. We find, however, that whereas in South Australia the quota of votes needed to elect a member is 44,280, in Tasmania the quota is only 31,533. In other words, there is a difference of 10,747 between the quotas in these two States. On top of that, in South Australia the maximum number of people in an electorate is 50,736, whereas in Tasmania the minimum is 25,227, so that it takes two people in South Australia to elect a representative whereas it needs only one in Tasmania. The point I make is that, if because of geographical and other reasons it is necessary to have a smaller quota in Tasmania it is

not equally feasible that because of geographical or community interest reasons there must be a difference between the quotas for various electoral districts in South Australia?

If we take the matter further and look at the position in respect of the Senate we find that the set-up completely explodes the argument of the Labor Party, because notwithstanding the very great variation in population of the respective States, they each elect the same number of senators. Tasmania, with an electoral enrolment of 157,668 elects 10 senators and New South Wales with an enrolment of 1,880,779 also elects 10, so that the value of a Senate vote in Tasmania is 12 times as great as the value of the Senate vote in New South Wales, and if the Labor Party supports that principle—and I have heard no criticism from it about it—it is completely out of order in its criticism of the South Australian system. It seems to me that it is physically impossible to set up a system of equal quotas in each electorate, and I feel therefore that the great bulk of what has been said by the Labor Party on electoral reform is completely without substance. Its attitude boils down to this; that it wants to reduce the value of the vote of the country resident. In substance that is what they have been trying to tell the people by their arguments; in other words relegating them to the background. I hope that the people in the country will bear this in mind, because this electoral reform has to be watched very closely indeed or we will find that our efforts to further the interests of country people and give them more amenities and make life a little more pleasant will be washed overboard by a system which will take from them some of the electoral privileges they now enjoy. There is only one other point on this topic. We have been told that the Australian Labor Party is one indissoluble party throughout the whole of Australia. If that is so I suggest that its members give some consideration and assistance to their friends in Queensland in straightening out the position there and, having put their own house in order, it will be appropriate to do so here. I ask people who may be requested to sign petitions on this matter to see that they get the facts before they put their names to a document which may contain statements which are not substantiated.

I turn now to the question of primary production. I said some time ago that we were not going ahead with the volume of our production as I would have hoped and as I feel is necessary if we are to maintain our standards

of living. I do not want to deal any further with that angle today, but the late opening of the season brought to light another position which could have been serious, namely, that we are still not, as a State, conserving nearly enough fodder for the requirements of our stock. We have practically the record number of 11,500,000 sheep and last year we produced a record number of fat lambs. If the season had continued dry we would have had difficulty in feeding that number of stock. Our primary producers in these good years would be well advised to greatly increase the quantity of fodder stored. Also, looking forward, I feel that the prospects for the prices of primary products are not as bright as they have been. American storages seem to be quite full of wheat and the price is being propped up by certain Government support. Great Britain has retired from bulk buying and returned to ordinary open markets and has not signed the International Wheat Agreement so that future prices are by no means guaranteed. Also, some great alterations have taken place recently in regard to the price of barley. Some months ago we made sales of barley to Korea and Japan at from 16s. to 18s. a bushel. I compliment the foresight of the Australian Barley Board in sending its general manager, Mr. Tomlinson, to Japan to negotiate those sales, which has meant that through this and other avenues practically the bulk of the 1952-53 crop has been sold; of the total of 29,000,000 bushels received I believe all except 1,000,000 bushels has been sold. However, the most recent sale was a small parcel of about 550 tons, the price of which was only 11s. 7d. a bushel f.o.b. Port Adelaide, and that reveals the strength of the barley market today. This means that the future is not so bright as some would wish and I sincerely hope that farmers will take this into consideration when making up their budgets for future operations.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Are your constituents reverting to wheat?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—I would not make any forecast, but if the honourable member is referring to my Yorke Peninsula constituents I think that if the price of barley does come down they obviously will return to wheat, more especially if adequate superphosphate supplies become available. The position has been largely governed by the fact that barley can be grown with smaller dressings of superphosphate.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Don't you think the price had something to do with it?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—Undoubtedly, but the shortage of superphosphate was an important factor. I would also like to bring to the notice of primary producers the option which they now have under the provisions of the Federal Income Tax Assessment Act of making a provisional assessment of their income for the year which lies immediately ahead. The question of provisional tax has caused many problems and has taken quite a lot of working out and in some cases it has resulted in hardship, but the Federal Government has done what it could to get over the anomalies. It seems to me that the latest provision whereby it is optional for a person to calculate his provisional tax is a very wise one and I suggest that primary producers take advantage of this provision because I think it will help them in the management of their affairs.

The Hon. R. R. Wilson—Have many taken advantage of it?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—Quite a number. Many were not aware of it, but I think it is becoming more widely known now. There is another point on which I have made representations to the Federal authorities, and that is in connection with the J.O. wool distribution payments. The position is, of course, that the High Court decided that these payments are not subject to income tax, but there is an appeal to determine the matter finally. As the law stands those taxpayers who have not lodged the necessary objection on the proper form will be excluded from any rebate of tax on those payments if it is ultimately decided that they are tax free. The Federal Government should treat all woolgrowers on the same basis when the final result is known, whether they lodged an objection or not.

On Yorke Peninsula in a number of cases where there are houses within close proximity of one another the Electricity Trust has installed one converter to supply them. I have had several applications from farmers who desire to take power from the Electricity Trust, but have no near neighbours, which means that a converter must be supplied for one particular house. At present, the trust cannot meet the capital expenditure involved for the purchase of this equipment. I have several cases of farmers saying, "If that is the difficulty we will meet the capital cost immediately." We will pay the cost of a converter, which will not be much more than the installation of an electric lighting plant and battery." I understand that the trust is now considering the question of people who are prepared to meet the capital cost of equipment

and hope that the difficulty will be overcome. It will enable many of the farmers to have electricity much sooner.

Last year the first bulk wheat silo in South Australia was opened in Ardrossan and operated during the last harvest. It is interesting to note that whereas the capacity of that silo is 1,000,000 bushels there was, in fact, 1,200,000 bushels delivered in bulk during the 1952-53 season. In addition, 370,000 bushels were delivered to Ardrossan in bags. Some were delivered in bags because farmers did not have the bulk equipment, but most of the quantity in bags was delivered in that way because the silos were full and shipping was not available to take it from the silo and farmers were left with no other alternative. It is interesting to note that whereas the average delivery of grain to Ardrossan was between 350,000 and 400,000 bushels, the year before the silo was installed and in anticipation of it 900,000 bushels were delivered. That was in the 1951-52 season which shows that the farming community appreciated the facilities provided and was prepared to patronize them. All the wheat from the 1952-53 harvest has been shipped from Ardrossan. In addition to the 1952-53 season's wheat, 550,000 bushels of the 1951-52 season's wheat that is still stored has been placed in bulk from bags and put through the silo. At present grain is being carted from other ports on the Peninsula including Price, Port Julia, Port Rickaby and Pine Point and delivered to the silo. All this wheat is to be bulked into the silo and sent away by ship. I think that 12 ships have called at Ardrossan and they have cleared more than 2,000,000 bushels from the silo.

Certain difficulties which need serious consideration have arisen. Some difficulty was experienced about the intake capacity of the silo. Last year farmers delivered grain much faster than the silo could take it from the grids, but with a little mechanical alteration that position could be overcome. I sincerely trust that the Wheat Board will do something to obviate it. On top of that there was the excessive production of wheat last year. The average for the State was 23 bushels an acre which is five bushels more than the previous highest average. The most severe difficulty was that the Wheat Board, whilst making every effort that could be made to get a ship to Ardrossan to take the wheat away, was unable to arrange shipping and when it became known that within a week or two the silo would be full, farmers rushed their grain in before

the silo closed, which accentuated the receiving difficulty. This year, I think we can be assured that there will be ships available to take grain away if the silo fills. I hope that the Wheat and Barley Board will watch the system of bulk handling because I think it is a progressive move.

Another point on which there appears to be some confusion is in connection with the meat works that are to be established at Kadina. In his speech the Governor said:—

My Ministers are working out the details of the proposals for the establishment by private enterprise of an export meat works at Kadina. A Bill dealing with this matter is being prepared.

The position is that the company which proposes to operate the works has practically completed plans for their establishment. Mr. Sellars, the company's technical officer, is overseas investigating the latest abattoirs developments and the company hopes to pour the foundations for the building early next year. On its land, about 1½ miles on the Moonta road from Kadina, the company has done a certain amount of preliminary work and has cropped 200 acres to obtain fodder for when the works are in production. It expects to be in a position to receive the first lambs in the 1955 season. At the beginning the company will be able to handle 2,500 lambs a day, but hopes within a short time to be able to increase the figure to 5,000.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Does that mean that the works will be operating all the year?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—I cannot say, but there is considerable doubt as to the exact progress of the meat works, and that is why I have dealt with this subject. I have checked up on all the facts and the position is as I have stated.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Is it suggested under the proposal to send meat to the metropolitan area for resale?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—I think the works will be export abattoirs and that the lambs will go overseas. There are one or two points I want to make about our natives, more particularly those on the mission station at Point Pearce, a few miles from Maitland. I was asked to visit the station a few days ago and was surprised at the children's power of observation and their apparent intelligence in affairs generally. As at June 30, 1952, the population of the station was 444, whereas the official calculation

shows that, with the accommodation available, it should not exceed 300. More consideration should be given to the question of providing additional accommodation. Another matter I refer to is the education of the children. The school building is provided by the Aborigines Department and not by the Education Department, although the teachers are from the Education Department. About two years ago two additional rooms were promised—a domestic arts centre and a woodwork centre—but nothing further seems to have been done. It may be that there is some difficulty between the Aborigines Department and the Education Department as to which department is to foot the bill. I want the position resolved and would like to see the rooms supplied.

As regards the actual farm operations, production is not inconsiderable. For the year ended June 30, 1952, there were nearly 3,000 sheep and the value of the wool clip was more than £8,800. The number of sheepskins sold totalled 556 and the return was £857, whilst 88 cattle were sold for £1,517. The station is not producing to its capacity because insufficient funds were available to develop the property to its maximum. I would like to see officers of the Department of Agriculture or the Waite Agricultural Research Institute make an inspection of the property and offer suggestions and help on what could be done to increase production. There is plenty of labour on the station and something should be done in this regard.

An adequate water supply is obviously necessary. During the summer water is supplied from a well on the beach, which means that there is no real water supply at the other end of the station property, and sheep and cattle have to be brought to water. There is a very high death rate amongst the sheep. If a pipeline could be run from the well to other paddocks it would greatly assist in reducing the number of deaths and there would be an adequate supply for the staff and the people who live on the station. An assured water supply is also necessary in the interests of health and sanitation. The Aborigines Act, 1934-1939, provides certain exemptions:—

11a. (1) In any case where the board is of opinion that any aborigine by reason of his character and standard of intelligence and development should be exempted from the provisions of this Act, the board may, by notice in writing, declare that the aborigine shall cease to be an aborigine for the purposes of this Act. Any such declaration may be made

by the board whether or not an application is made by the person to whom the declaration refers.

(2) Any such declaration may be made unconditionally by the board and any unconditional declaration shall not be revocable.

Some of the station residents have acquired the necessary standard of intelligence to have the declaration made. Once that is unconditionally made they are forever released from the provisions of the Act. In many cases after a declaration has been made they have not proved worthy of the trust reposed in them and have fallen back in their standards. Because the declaration is irrevocable nothing can be done about it, and the position arises that these people who have received declarations establish themselves in groups on the fringes of the aborigine reserves in shacks or in small temporary homes. In the report for the year ended June 30, 1952, the following appears:—

The report discloses that, as in previous years, practically the whole of the offences committed by aborigines are due to indulgence in intoxicating liquor.

Those with declarations can buy whatever liquor they desire and can take it to their homes near the mission properties and make it available to the natives on the station.

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—Haven't they a branch in Light Square?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—They have branches everywhere. I was in a small country town recently and about two o'clock in the morning was awakened by a corroboree which created quite a disturbance. Whilst I approve the idea of giving aboriginals these conditions I believe we should retain the right to cancel

the declaration at any time if the person does not prove worthy of the trust. Portion of section 11a (3) of the Act states:—

If any unconditional declaration is made in respect of any person, the descendants of that person who are born after the making of the declaration, shall not be deemed to be aborigines for the purpose of this or any other Act.

Once a person is exempted his descendants are also exempted. It seems that the position has got out of control and I would like further consideration to be given to it.

I was pleased to note in His Excellency's Speech that the necessary work in connection with a water supply to Yorke Peninsula is going ahead and the point I make for the benefit of residents there is that a tremendous amount of initial work has to be done in rebuilding the main between Bundaleer and Paskeville. Whilst work is going on in that area there will not be much evidence of the money spent on the scheme until the stage of laying the pipes on Yorke Peninsula itself is reached. I am sure that work will proceed and, I trust, as speedily as possible. It is also gratifying to note that recently a tender was let for the erection of the Minlaton high school and that that work will proceed almost without delay. There are other matters I would like to mention, but have occupied sufficient time and I am indebted to members for their interest in my remarks. I have pleasure in supporting the motion.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.05 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday, July 23, at 2 p.m.