

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, July 5, 1966.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. L. H. Densley) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS

FREE SCHOOL BOOKS.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: Has the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Education, a reply to my recent question in regard to school books?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: My colleague, the Minister of Education, has informed me that the Government intends to adhere to the scheme that it has formulated for the issue of free books. All aspects of this matter were considered carefully before the Government embarked on its present policy.

KIMBA-CLEVE ROAD.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Has the Minister of Roads a reply to my question regarding the Cleve to Kimba road?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The department has no firm plans for the sealing of the Kimba-Cleve road. Subject to the availability of funds, large-scale work may commence in 1969. About \$16,000 will be available for general maintenance for the existing road during 1966-67. However, the road will be surveyed and some work could possibly be commenced in a small way during 1967-68.

HIGHWAYS DEPARTMENT EXPENDITURE.

The Hon. C. C. D. OCTOMAN: Has the Minister of Roads a reply to the question I directed to him on June 22 regarding the pruning of expenditure on highways in the western division on Eyre Peninsula?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Yes. Contrary to the fears expressed by the honourable member, the proposed allocation for the western district is slightly above that approved in the 1965-66 schedule. The proposed allocation is below that desirable for the district, but this applies equally to all other districts and there is always a large gap between what the department would like to spend and what is available for expenditure.

PORT WAKEFIELD CROSSING.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Has the Minister of Transport an answer to the question I asked on June 29 in relation to the Port Wakefield crossing?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Yes. The Port Wakefield level crossing is not included in the current schedule of crossings from which officers of the Highways and Railways Departments have recommended the programme to be adopted during the year 1966-67. I am unable to forecast when action may be taken at Port Wakefield.

ROAD SEALING.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Has the Minister of Roads a reply to my recent question concerning roadside vegetation?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Trees on main road reserves are subject to a regulation under the Highways Act for the preservation of trees and vegetation on main roads. Trees may be removed on the recommendation of the Commissioner of Highways with the approval of the Minister of Roads. However, district roads are vested in and under the care and control of the particular council. The removal of trees and any clearing on these roads are, therefore, under the jurisdiction of the council. It is surely desirable in the ultimate to seal all roads, but the degree of upgrading of the alignment before sealing is usually determined by the volume of traffic using the particular road and the safe speeds in relation to the locality. However, in the hills district particular problems, such as scouring of open surface roads in the wet areas, exist, and increased maintenance costs result therefrom. Some councils in the hills area, therefore, have for this reason concentrated on sealing roads which are substandard but which at the same time have provided a dustless surface for motorists who wish to drive for the enjoyment of the scenery. The question of accepting a lower standard of roadside clearing in wooded districts to preserve the appearance of the hills is a matter for the particular councils, which in general are mindful of the scenic attractions of their districts and do not intentionally clear unnecessarily. New subdivisions in wooded hills districts are very good examples of large clearing over which there is no control.

TRADES AND LABOR COUNCIL DIRECTORY.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister acting as Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Before 1963 the United Trades and Labor Council

entered into a contract with a publisher to bring out a trade union directory. On October 30, 1963, it cancelled this contract in accordance with the terms set out, giving one month's notice. On April 9 the Trades and Labor Council again wrote to the publisher as follows:

I have been receiving phone calls from clients who have advertised in our directory in previous years to the effect that they have been receiving accounts for last year's space in the directory, which have already been paid. Further, in addition to this you are canvassing and enclosing accounts for space in the 1964 directory. This is contrary to all business ethics, and I must insist that you cease this practice or it will be necessary to take some further action, which I am loath to do.

In 1965 no trade union directory was brought out, to my knowledge, but in May of this year the attention of the Trades and Labor Council was drawn to the fact that accounts headed "Trade Union Directory—official directory of the United Trades and Labor Council of South Australia" were being sent out without the knowledge of the council. Will the Minister of Local Government, who is acting for the Chief Secretary, take up this matter with the Police Department, find out whether this is a fraudulent act and, if it is, take steps to have it stopped?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I think this question should be directed to the Attorney-General. I will direct it to him and see what can be done to stop the practice.

EFFLUENT CHANNEL.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Mines.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I am not sure whether my question should be directed to the Minister of Mines or to the Minister of Transport, so perhaps both could listen to it. Although I know the Minister of Mines is interested in the matter, it also involves the Minister of Works, who is represented in this Chamber by the Minister of Transport. The effluent channel from the new Bolivar sewage plant, which most of us inspected recently, travels for several miles in more or less a north-westerly direction, perhaps not quite parallel to the main Port Wakefield Road. Later it turns and is channelled into the sea. It is a very big channel designed to take a large amount of effluent. What I should like to find out from the Minister is whether, if it is found possible to use effluent for irrigation purposes, either on its own or mixed with underground water, provision has been made for the channel to be tapped at one or two points

or whether, in the event of this desirable conclusion being reached, provision will be made for this channel to be tapped.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I think it is primarily a question for the Minister of Works. Therefore, I shall be happy to refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring back a report as soon as it is available.

IMPOUNDING ACT.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I ask leave to make a statement prior to directing a question to the Minister representing the Attorney-General. Leave granted.

The Hon. L. R. HART: A deputation from a primary producer organization recently waited on the Attorney-General requesting that the Government give favourable consideration to a request to amend the Impounding Act in respect to straying stock. The request came following what is now known as the Bowey case, in which Mr. Justice Chamberlain handed down a judgment that reversed previous decisions. An appeal was made to the Full Court, which has reserved its judgment. It is reported that the Attorney-General was so impressed with the case presented to him by the representatives of the primary producer organization that he has now promised to place the matter before Cabinet. Does the Government intend to bring down any legislation to amend this particular section of the Impounding Act and, if so, has it instructed that no more prosecutions proceed until Parliament has considered this amendment; if not, will the Government consider doing so?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I ask the honourable member to put his question on notice.

GRAND JUNCTION ROAD.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Has the Minister of Roads a reply to a question I asked on June 21 about the median strip on Grand Junction Road?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Yes. I answered the honourable member's question on the day he asked it but ended my answer by saying, "However, I will call for a report." I now have the report, which will be further to the answer already given to the honourable member. It is as follows:

The median which has been installed on Grand Junction Road between Gepps Cross and Prospect Road forms part of the basic design for all major roads included in the metropolitan widening scheme, which was formulated in 1945 by the department. As part of the scheme, it has been the department's practice to provide openings in the median only at intersections or junctions where these roads

bisect the major highway at relatively safe and convenient locations. It has not been the department's practice to provide openings to serve individual properties as it would set a precedent for requests from all frontages abutting the highway for the same concession and, consequently, negate the effect and purpose of the median. It is appreciated that the construction of medians of this type does cause some inconvenience to adjacent property owners. These disadvantages are outweighed by the improved conditions thus provided for the majority of the motoring public and for pedestrians crossing the road.

The need to install this median, before the whole road was completed, arose primarily from the danger to which children were exposed in crossing the highway to gain access to the Gepps Cross Technical High School. Approximately 360 children attend this school, the majority of whom originate from the southern side of Grand Junction Road and are forced to cross this busy highway during the peak periods of traffic movement. To minimize the danger to the children crossing the road, the department decided to proceed with this section of the median in order to eliminate any overtaking manoeuvres and to curb turning traffic adjacent to the school which could endanger the children.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT: POTATO REJECTION.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP (Southern): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move a motion relating to a

matter of urgent public importance and which I have put in writing to the President.

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member has informed me in writing that he wishes to discuss as a matter of urgency the marketing of potatoes and in accordance with Standing Orders it will be necessary for three members to rise in their places as proof of the urgency of the matter.

Three members having risen:

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I move:

That the Council at its rising do adjourn until Wednesday, July 6, at 1.45 p.m.

It is with deep regret that I have taken this action and this procedure to ventilate a matter which should have been dealt with before now without any fuss and bother. At the instance of growers, whom I have come to respect very deeply, I asked a question in the Council last Tuesday regarding the rejection of potatoes. The following is the answer given by the Hon. S. C. Bevan:

My colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, informs me that the Department of Agriculture carries out all fruit and vegetable inspections for quality. Information supplied by the department indicates that rejections of potatoes at the receipt depot in the past three months, covering deliveries of the main hills crop, compared with the same period in 1965, have been:

	Deliveries to Depot		Rejections	
	1965 Tons	1966 Tons	1965 Tons	1966 Tons
April	4,787	3,902	84 (1.75%)	33 (.84%)
May	3,982	3,979	46 (1.15%)	41 (1.03%)
June (two weeks)	1,433	2,179	78 (5.44%)	19 (.87%)

The figures show that rejections this year are at a lower level than last year. There is no change in the standard being demanded by the inspectors this year. The standard is laid down in the regulations under the Fruit and Vegetables (Grading) Act, as approved by the Agricultural Council.

I find this unbelievable. I asked this question in response to pressure that has been put on me by these growers, whom I have come to trust over the years. Immediately after getting this reply I checked with these growers who, I know, are really substantial men and have been engaged in the industry for many years and who could not be accused of harbouring light thought in considering this matter. When I put that answer to one of the principal growers, he was rendered speechless. This man's family had been growing potatoes in the Balhannah district for generations and

he and his two sons are now working the property in partnership. All three are experienced men. They spent two days preparing a load of potatoes to the standard that they hoped would conform to that demanded by the inspectors. That load was taken down by the senior member and was rejected summarily.

On Saturday one carrier told me that two loads from his district were rejected. These rejections are going on, despite the utmost endeavour by growers to conform to the grade quality standards required. Because growers are seeking to conform to the standards demanded, 25 per cent of the potatoes that normally would have been regarded as being marketable and acceptable on the Adelaide market are being rejected. The rejections are not occurring in Adelaide but by the growers in the Adelaide Hills at present.

In this year of low prices, they are being forced into the position of rejecting 25 per cent more of their crop than has been the case in previous years.

This is having an extremely damaging effect on the economy of the community and this matter should be examined with extreme urgency by an experienced man so that the true position can be ascertained. These growers are not likely to have become emotional and upset for no reason. They are men who are becoming desperate as the result of the economic position being forced on them this year and this is, to say the least, disastrous. I have no doubt that the truth of the matter is that, despite the Minister's figures showing that the rejections are fewer, the action of the inspecting staff is resulting in an average of 25 per cent of the number of potatoes normally marketable being thrown out to waste.

This matter was examined and reported fully in one of our local newspapers, the *Chronicle*, of June 16 last. Unfortunately, as is always the case when growers are asked to comment on the position, other irrelevant matters entered that report. However, there can be no doubt that the completely independent person who visited the hills that day and reported seething unrest in the South Australian potato industry was reporting the truth in regard to potato inspection.

The secondary disastrous effect of this action is very important. Because of the seething discontent that has arisen, many growers in the Adelaide Hills have signed a petition for a poll for the abolition of the board. Many of these growers have told me that they have no intention of voting the board out but that they signed the petition in protest at the standards to which they have been subjected this year regarding inspection. There is perhaps not that appreciation among growers of the complexity of administration of inspection and marketing that there ought to be.

Unfortunately, there has been confusion in regard to the responsibility of the Potato Board, but the responsibility in this matter has nothing to do with that authority. The responsibility rests wholly and solely with the Agriculture Department, which administers inspection. The board arranges the disposal of potatoes after they have been inspected.

The effect has been that the great majority of growers who have been approached have signed this petition, not with the intention of voting out the board, but in protest

against the standards and as a protest in a form that will not bring personal retaliation and intimidation on their heads. The growers in the hills fear raising any question on this subject because of the retaliation that will be directed at them if they do so. I have no doubt that I can give material proof that such intimidation and retaliation have occurred where growers have been prepared to protest.

This year, after many years of effort, we have a reconstituted board, which will administer the sale and distribution of potatoes under the control of responsible growers and in the best interests of the industry as a whole. This board is to take over responsibility this week. Up to the present, although it has been constituted, it has no responsibility. Its existence is in danger, although it has had no opportunity as yet to show what it can do.

The blame in this matter lies on the administration of grading by the Agriculture Department. If the board goes out of existence, the blame for that will rest squarely on those responsible for the administration of these grading regulations. It would be a bad thing for the potato industry if the board went out of existence; we would then have chaos that the board, with all its faults, has obviated for a long period.

I could speak at length on this matter. As I said at the outset, it was with deep regret that I had to adopt this method of ventilating it, because we had hoped that there would be no need to raise anything again in connection with the marketing of potatoes until there had been some opportunity for the new board to show its qualities, defects and powers. I deeply regret having had to use such harsh words and to assert that there has been intimidation of growers, but I have no doubt that this is so.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: This is a very serious claim.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I am making it.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: But you are making it under privilege.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I am making it on behalf of an industry that is selling its produce at a loss of at least \$20 a ton. This means that a grower in the Adelaide Hills who has four tons of potatoes he has grown and stored will face a loss of \$80. Apart from this, he is not allowed to sell one ton, so the total loss on that four tons is about \$100. The other day a man who has had much experience in marketing potatoes said that he would

challenge the inspectors to go into the hills and from a crop in the shed prepare the potatoes to the standard demanded in the Adelaide inspection depot. These men are not fly-by-night growers. I have spoken to the best men, every one of whom has told me the same tale.

I have been told, and I believe the figures presented to the Potato Board indicate, that there is no glut of potatoes in this State this year but that there are just sufficient potatoes comfortably to meet normal demand. The glut that is causing the crisis is across the border. In the Ballarat district and elsewhere potatoes are being freely sold at \$12 or \$14 a ton, well below the price offered in South Australia by the Potato Board.

The experienced grower to whom I first referred was speechless with rage at the reply that was given. It takes three experienced and hardworking men two days to prepare a five-ton load. If this load is rejected they must take it home, and this really causes trouble. I do not think the inspectors appreciate how much loss is involved when they reject a load of potatoes. The mere cartage costs \$2 each way.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: What is the cause of rejection—shape, disease, or what?

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I should like to leave that for a moment. If one load is rejected the grower has to take it home, and this costs another \$2 a ton in cartage. If he wants to get any income he must re-sort the potatoes, and this, even if he uses the best equipment available, costs at least \$10 a ton.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Isn't he aware of the standard required before he takes them?

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: He is aware of it and does everything possible to sort according to it, but the standard demanded is so high that an experienced grower is challenging the inspectors to come to his shed, take a line of potatoes, and prepare those potatoes to standards that will pass in Adelaide. The standard is laid down in regulations under the Fruit and Vegetable Grading Act. Naturally, the regulations list every defect that can be regarded as causing a potato to be of poor quality.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Has the standard been altered recently?

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Not for many years. The regulations cannot be altered until they come before both Houses.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: How do you account for the position being worse this year than it was last year?

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: The regulations have not been altered but the standards required by inspectors have been pushed up terrifically. It is the interpretation of the regulations that has altered. This matter has even reached the stage where these men are wondering whether they can possibly continue to use mechanical potato diggers, as any cut, a bruise, insect damage or infection with disease are regarded as defects for rejection. The interpretation of the regulations has always entailed a commonsense knowledge of values, as a potato may have a small blemish yet be completely acceptable in the short period between its preparation for market and its consumption.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: How much would the housewife have to cut off before it was consumed?

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: That has always been the point. If wastage is appreciable the potato has always been rejected, but now even smallest defects lead to rejection, and this is ridiculous. I have been told, and I do not doubt the veracity of the man who told me, that when potatoes go to inspection depots the bags are placed on an elevator that leads to the rollers beside which the inspectors stand. Every defective potato is taken off, placed in a channel, and then bagged and separately weighed as rejects.

At the bottom of the rollers an inspector takes off all the defective potatoes that he can see and periodically removes a perfect potato and peels it, looking for such things as potato moth (which may not appear on the surface) and bruising (which is not visible on the skin). If the potato is up to standard it is placed back on the rollers, at the other end of which another inspector is doing the same thing. The second inspector was recently seen to take off the peeled potato because it had a broken skin. How silly can you get!

This matter is seriously affecting the living of the people engaged in this industry. We have seen this type of inspection seriously damage another industry in the hills this year, and the same treatment is now being meted out to the potato industry. Because of this, which is completely, I think, beyond the knowledge of those finally in charge of administering these regulations, the board, to which the potato grower has to look for his future existence, is deeply endangered.

I do not know what the Minister is proposing to do with the petition that has been presented to him but, if he follows the letter of the Act, his action must be to uphold the growers'!

demand for the abolition of the Potato Board, while the board is being blamed for the actions of Agriculture Department, which is not connected with the board in any way.

This matter has to be looked at as keenly as possible and brought to the attention of everybody concerned because, if this is not checked and corrected, it will do lasting injury to the industry, which would be a terrible thing if allowed to occur. I am sure that the Minister and those who prepared the answer given last week just cannot be aware of what is going on; otherwise, they could not have put it forward in that form. They should have been, because in the *Chronicle* of June 16, as far as it was possible for a reporter essentially ignorant of the industry and the position in the hills to do, he tried to report accurately what was going on. This brought violent reaction from the department, but there has been no move since then to correct the position. There has only been an apology for things that have been completely and unreasonably blamed on the board in the article.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Wouldn't the department's figures be more reliable than those of a reporter?

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I am not referring to any reporter.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You quoted an article in the *Chronicle*.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Only that the report in the *Chronicle* should surely have brought this matter of unrest in the hills urgently to the notice of those responsible in the department; but it seems completely to have escaped the notice of those who prepared the reply that there is any discontent with anything but the working of the board.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: The reply does not say there is no discontent.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: There has been discontent with the working of the board but everybody in the industry is standing by hoping that the board in its new guise and constitution will be able to rectify some of the past malpractices. If there is any move to get rid of the Potato Board, it will be wholly and solely because of this action by the Agriculture Department, not because of the board.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: But what about the petition signed by these people who are protesting?

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I am not blaming the people, who have been confused. The Chairman of the board, in his dual capacity as Chief Horticulturist, is responsible for the

administration of the Act, but some of these men in the Agriculture Department are being so grossly over-worked with extra-curricular jobs that they cannot give the attention and experienced guidance, which obviously is leading to this terrible mistake being made now.

The point that must be made (and I hope we can join with the Agriculture Department in making it) when this silly business has been cleaned up is that, when the matter is finally resolved, it will be found that it has arisen from inexperience and lack of communication. What must be done, and done systematically, is to lay the blame for this seething unrest exactly where it belongs, without endangering the organization of the industry, as is now the case. This is important from my point of view. I will not follow the normal procedure until other honourable members have spoken.

The Hon. L. R. HART (Midland): In rising to second this motion, I should like to say how much the Council is indebted to the Hon. Mr. Kemp for his explicit explanation of the problems facing the potato industry. The problems associated with the marketing of potatoes in this State are nothing new: they are before us every so often. We are facing either a period of glut with low prices or a period of shortage with high prices. At no time is the grower in a position where he is sure he will get an adequate return for his crop over a period of time; nor is the consumer ever in a position to know that he will have to pay only a stable and reasonable price for potatoes over a 12-month period.

The industry is, to a large extent, governed by seasonal conditions. The fact that at times we seem to have a surplus is perhaps beyond the control of those people appointed to look after the affairs of the potato industry. However, endeavours are made to regulate the supplies of potatoes on to the market. The growers themselves try to do this. That is one of the problems causing the present rejection of potatoes. If these same potatoes at present being marketed had been marketed when first dug, there would have been no rejection. They have perhaps been stored for a short period (and it is only short at this stage) in an endeavour to regulate the supplies to the market.

Because of this, they have incurred this penalty of rejection, because the stored potato shows up its defects perhaps more than the fresh potato does; but these defects do not make the potato deteriorate. The defect is merely a small one, noticeable to the eye. If

there was a shortage of potatoes now, these potatoes would not be rejected.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: They might have been held back to try to get a higher price later?

The Hon. L. R. HART: They are held back in an endeavour to regulate the flow to the market, but growers are being penalized by rejection because of this. The Potato Board, which is responsible under the Potato Marketing Act for regulating the supplies of potatoes to the market, is responsible for seeing that, in doing so, it does not penalize the grower. I also believe that the Potato Board has a responsibility to do some research into the marketing of potatoes.

At the present time the potato industry is in the hands of the merchants. This was clearly brought out when we had the Potato Marketing Act before this Chamber in 1964. If the Potato Board itself, being the responsible body for the marketing of potatoes, were to do some research into the marketing of potatoes, perhaps we would not be confronted with the problem that is before us today. The potato is not a truly perishable product, so that in periods of gluts it can be stored, and there should be some means of processing potatoes so as to allow them to be kept for a considerable time.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: Do you think the consumer is getting any advantage from the position?

The Hon. L. R. HART: The consumer never gets the advantage he should through an over-supply of the market, but he pays dearly when the supply is short. I understand that in other countries, particularly in the United States, the potato today is being processed in a frozen form; in fact, potatoes in frozen form are second only to frozen peas. If some research were done into this form of dealing with a glut, where potatoes could be processed in a way that they could be held to provide the consumer with potatoes at a reasonable price in periods of shortage, then the Potato Board would be serving a worthwhile function. I consider that this should be a responsibility of the board, and that it is not carrying out its full functions at this time.

Until we can find a means of dealing with surplus production we shall always have this problem within the potato industry. We have a classic example in the egg industry at the present time, where poultry producers are in even greater trouble because of a glut of eggs and a levy is to be imposed on the producers to discourage them from producing eggs.

Here we have the same thing in a different form—a restriction is being placed on the potato grower at the present time virtually to force him out of business by making potato-growing unprofitable, and then we shall again arrive at the position where there is a shortage of potatoes. We should not discourage people from producing an article that is the staple diet of people in this country, but should endeavour to find some means of processing the article so that the consumer will receive some advantage. I have very much pleasure in supporting the motion moved by the Honourable Mr. Kemp.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Minister of Local Government): I consider that some answers are warranted in this instance. I shall not attempt to answer what the Honourable Mr. Hart has said, because the whole of his comments dealt with the Potato Board itself. I consider that the remarks made by the Honourable Mr. Kemp this afternoon are an absolutely unwarranted and unjust attack upon the officers of the Agriculture Department. The statements that he has made this afternoon and the whole of his argument are not borne out by statistical figures insofar as potato rejections this year are concerned. The figures given to the honourable member when he asked a question were supplied by the department, and apparently this afternoon he has intimated that they are incorrect and that the department has deliberately gone out of its way to fool people.

It is one thing to get up on the floor of this Chamber, where we are under privilege, and make statements, but it is another thing to make statements outside this Chamber concerning officers of the Agriculture Department. I find myself in the position that I will not allow the honourable member's statements to go unchallenged. In April, 1965, there were 84 tons of potatoes rejected. In the same period this year, there were 33 tons rejected. The honourable member has been screaming that more potatoes have been rejected this year than previously.

The Hon. H. K. Kemp: You misinterpret me. You are playing Party politics and trying to cover up.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I am not going to play Party politics, but I consider that an unwarranted attack has been made on the officers of the Agriculture Department under privilege of this Chamber, and the honourable member cannot take it.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: It is the Minister who cannot take it.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Apparently it is thought I should not answer the allegations, but merely accept them. However, the allegations that have been made here this afternoon have been made against the officers of the Agriculture Department. The honourable member later asked another question after getting leave to make an explanation, and I quote:

The (Minister's) reply makes no mention of potatoes that have been diverted for re-sorting or for washing because of claimed low quality. Can the Minister give details of diversions to outlets not mentioned in the reply?

My answer was:

I will refer the honourable member's question to the Minister of Agriculture and obtain a reply as soon as possible.

The Hon. H. K. Kemp: In the meantime the waste goes on.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: In the meantime the honourable member goes on in this Council with his accusation against the officers of the Agriculture Department of putting an interpretation upon the regulations of a far higher standard so that the rejections this year are far more than they have been in previous years, yet the honourable member says he is not complaining about rejections this year. I should think he would not complain, because they are far fewer this year than in previous years. There are greater supplies of potatoes and the standards imposed this year have been lower than last year.

The Hon. Mr. Kemp has intimated that the growers who have complained to him are experienced in potato growing, the sorting of potatoes, and the standards required by the department. I do not dispute that; far from it. I appreciate the fact that an experienced grower would know the standards required and attempt to grade his potatoes accordingly. I also appreciate that the officers of the Agriculture Department are experienced men as far as inspection is concerned and are well aware of the standard required. Apparently, they have rejected some potatoes this year in accordance with the standards required.

The PRESIDENT: Order! It is time to call on the Orders of the Day.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN moved:

That Order of the Day No. 1 be postponed and taken into consideration after the debate in progress and questions have been disposed of.

Motion carried.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I do not want to labour this question but I suggest to the honourable member that he ought to have adopted

a different method from that which he has adopted this afternoon. Common decency at least would suggest that he first get a reply to his question regarding the diversion, marketing and disposal of rejected potatoes. If that was not satisfactory, he could then have moved the motion that he has moved this afternoon. I consider the attack made upon the officers of the Agriculture Department unwarranted. A question was asked when he was speaking but the honourable member did not give a reply. When he was asked what he would give as the reason, the honourable member asked Sir Lyell McEwin to let him pursue the argument he was pursuing at that time and said that he would come back to that.

The Hon. H. K. Kemp: And I did.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: What was the reason for the rejection?

The Hon. H. K. Kemp: Which rejection?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The rejection by officers of the Agriculture Department that the honourable member was complaining about.

The Hon. H. K. Kemp: Last week, or the ones rejected today?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I do not want to labour the matter. It may be that the honourable member thinks that moving such a motion will draw the attention of officers of the department to the allegations made and that, perhaps, a denial or something of that nature will be forthcoming regarding the rejection of potatoes. However, the portion that I consider more unjust than any other is the statement that the growers themselves are afraid to voice any objection to the department or to the board because of possible repercussions. In other words, that is an intimation that the repercussions will come from the department itself or from officers of the department in relation to particular growers who may complain regarding the rejection of their potatoes. I regard this allegation as unjust and unwarranted. I suggest that the honourable member make such allegations outside the Chamber, where he has not the protection of Parliamentary privilege. I consider that he would not be game to do that. I am making these denials because the officers concerned cannot be here to answer the allegations that have been levelled. A method different from that adopted this afternoon should have been used. I repeat that the figures are proof, in my opinion, that the grower himself is having more potatoes received this year than he has had received in previous years.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: In asking leave to withdraw the motion, I should like your ruling

that I have the privilege of replying, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT: If the honourable member cares to reply and finishes his reply by asking leave to withdraw the motion, he will be in order.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: If the Minister recalled my opening remarks, he would remember that I said then that it was with profound regret that I had been forced into taking this action, but that this matter has been causing huge losses to a large section of our community and nobody with a responsibility for the well-being of these people could have done anything but take action in the strongest possible way.

This is the more regretted because, as most members will be aware, the people concerned in this department are my former colleagues, for many of whom I have a high regard. As they are placed at present, some of them are so grossly overloaded with extraneous duties that have been loaded upon them that the experienced men available cannot give the attention to the matter that is needed and we have found repeatedly that the present Government is completely unreceptive to any of the normal methods of ventilating our complaints. Hence, this action has been forced on me.

All that the Minister has done in the last few minutes is indicate a complete and profound ignorance of the subject. In accordance with the usual procedure, I ask leave to withdraw the motion.

Leave granted; motion withdrawn.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

BRIDGES.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE (on notice): What financial provision has been made in the programme for 1966-67 on—

(a) the Jervois bridge and accommodation and adjacent works?

(b) the Keswick bridge and accommodation and adjacent works?

(c) the Hackney bridge and accommodation and adjacent works?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The replies are:

(a) Jervois bridge and accommodation and adjacent works, \$330,000.

(b) Keswick bridge and accommodation and adjacent works, \$290,000.

(c) Hackney bridge and accommodation and adjacent works, \$42,000. (This amount must be increased by \$75,000 during 1966-67 arising from delay in construction and expenditure during 1965-66.)

LAND AGGREGATION.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN (on notice): In view of the considerable increase in the assessment of unimproved land values, is it the intention of the Government to introduce a Bill at an early date to increase the amount of £12,000 contained in section 225 (2) of the Crown Lands Act, 1929-1960, by an amount in proportion to the increased assessment?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The Land Board is currently making a comprehensive investigation of the effects upon section 225 (2) of the Crown Lands Act of the increase in unimproved land values. When the report of the Land Board is received, my colleague, the Minister of Lands, will consider it and report to Cabinet on any amendment to the Crown Lands Act that may be considered desirable.

PUBLIC MEETINGS.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (on notice): In view of the recent increase in deliberate disruption of public meetings, is it the intention of the Government to take the necessary action to ensure that citizens who meet together for a legitimate purpose (that is, to listen to and question a public figure) will be able to do so without interference from disruptive elements?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The Government has the duty of maintaining law and order and will carry out that obligation. The Government has no intention of interfering with the public expression of persons' own views on political topics.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from June 30. Page 211.)

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS (Midland): I have pleasure in supporting the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to the Speech delivered by His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor. Once again, I am glad to be able to express loyalty, in common, I believe, with all other honourable members, to Her Most Gracious Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, and I wish to endorse most heartily the sentiments expressed in paragraph 2 of the Speech with reference to Her Majesty the Queen and also Her Majesty the Queen Mother. I draw the attention of honourable members to portion of paragraph 2:

The spontaneous welcome given to Her Majesty by all sections of the community at these and various other functions, formal and informal, were evidence of the great esteem in which Her Majesty and indeed all members of the Royal family are held in this State.

I, and I am sure all other honourable members (and I trust the vast majority of South Australians) completely endorse these sentiments. However, unfortunately one phrase of the statement is open to question, and in questioning it I am not criticizing the Government or anyone except the people concerned. The phrase to which I draw attention is "by all sections of the community". I regret that that is not completely accurate now.

I have always been a great believer in the constitutional form of Government in the Empire (or the Commonwealth, as it is now known) and in the Monarchy as the head of our Commonwealth of Nations. I have always thought that practically everyone, regardless of political affiliation, felt the same way, but in recent months I have been shocked at what appears to me to be the relatively large amount of disloyalty present in the community. About three or four months ago there were some questionable comments in one of the daily papers with reference to Her Majesty the Queen, and I was disturbed to note the proportion of anti-British comment in the press in succeeding days by individuals who at the best could be labelled as thoughtless and at worst as disloyal. This attitude has been highly prominent again recently, and I think it is to be deplored. While we can still be thankful that the vast majority (I sincerely trust it is the vast majority) of thinking people are loyal, we must not disregard and we cannot dismiss lightly the disloyalty and thoughtless elements within our midst.

In association with many other honourable members, last year I expressed sincere gratitude for the efforts of His Excellency the Governor and Lady Bastyan and expressed the hope that the Government would see fit to seek to extend their stay with us. I congratulate the Government on securing the consent of His Excellency to remain with us for an extended term and express the hope that both Sir Edric and Lady Bastyan will receive a very great benefit from their much-needed rest.

I join with other members in expressing appreciation of the long years of service of His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, Sir Mellis Napier, both in his capacity as Lieutenant-Governor and as Chief Justice of this State. I hasten to extend my sympathy to the relatives of former members who have passed on. I did not have the pleasure of knowing Mr. Craigie and I scarcely knew Mr. Thompson, but I am aware of their services to this country and of their sincerity of purpose, and I regret their decease. I had the pleasure of knowing Sir

Richard Butler, although not in his active Parliamentary days, and I knew of the honourable gentlemen's contributions to the welfare of this State as Premier from 1927 to 1930 and from 1933 to 1938. I knew something of the work he did in commencing industrialization in South Australia. I knew, in recent years, Sir Frank Perry as a great Parliamentarian and industrialist. He was a man who, incidentally, had some direct connection with the district in which I live, as some of his forebears came from that area in the early days of this State. Sir Frank, as the Hon. Mr. DeGaris said, was a great friend of new members, and honourable members appreciated his kindly advice. The Lieutenant-Governor made this comment:

In recording our appreciation of the services of these gentlemen I know that you join with me in expressing our sympathy to their respective families.

I am sure all honourable members will endorse those sentiments. I draw attention to paragraph 5 of His Excellency's Speech, the first portion of which states:

The Premier's Department has actively pursued the Government's policy for the attraction of new industries to the State and the expansion of existing enterprises.

All I can say is that if the Premier's Department has actively pursued the policy of attracting new industries it must surely be most disappointed with its conspicuous lack of success. Sir Thomas Playford, during his Premiership, was as conspicuously successful in attracting new industries to South Australia and building up the industrialization of this State and the balanced economy that we have enjoyed in recent years as the present Premier has been unsuccessful. This Government has made many excuses for its lack of success as an administration and for its spendthrift methods with money. Among these excuses is the statement that the Australian economy is slowing down, or words to that effect. I believe the truth is that by no stretch of the imagination can it be said that Australia is slowing down but that South Australia is doing that very thing, and I believe this is the result of the rising costs that have been brought about by this Government, and its restrictive measures, which follow the Socialist line.

In my view the Government has failed miserably to attract industry to this State. The only developments of any consequence in the last 12 months have been the further progress in and extensions of industries already brought here and assisted by Sir Thomas Playford's Government. The present Labor Government

has been quick to get on the bandwagon, and I do not suppose we can blame it for that. It has tried to claim the credit for these things; it is just as quick now to claim the credit as it was to offer criticism when in Opposition, where I venture to suggest it will be again before long if it continues its present sorry record. This jumping on the bandwagon and claiming credit for what the Playford Government initiated just will not wash. We noticed, particularly in the first few months of its office, that almost every day there was another announcement, and in almost every instance it was of something that had been pursued by the Playford Government for a considerable time.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Where is the deep sea port he used to announce almost weekly?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: The Public Works Committee, of which the honourable member is now a member, did not agree to that proposal. That is one reason why we have no deep sea port. Another reason is that we now have a Labor Government, which will not have any money to do anything about it. Jumping on the bandwagon and claiming credit will not wash, as there is now a considerable increase in unemployment. Our unemployment figures are higher now than they have been for a considerable time. For the most part, they are higher than when the Labor Party was complaining when in Opposition about three years ago, and they are far higher than they were when the Playford Government went out of office. I cannot give the exact figures, but I believe about 7,000 people are unemployed whereas when the Playford Government went out of office the figure was 3,420—1,129 males and 2,291 females. The unemployment position today is about twice as bad as it was when the previous Government went out of office.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: There has also been a slowing down in immigration.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: The present Government is slowing down on most things. It is the inevitable result of Socialist policy. We do not hear so much about unemployment now from the Labor Party. Apparently, the problem is nowhere near so serious when one is in office. However, we must be fair to the Government and state that at least one industry here was opened, about which a great song and dance was made. Last year the Premier made a great fuss about opening a new potato chips industry in South Australia. One must have full respect for those who make potato chips but, when the Government is reduced to making

great publicity about the opening of such a relatively small industry as its contribution (and perhaps its only contribution) to the development of the State, it is a sorry state of affairs.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: It may be a hot potato for the honourable member to handle.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: The honourable member will learn more if he interjects less and listens harder. He has not been here very long and has not gained much wisdom.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: I am prepared to argue about that.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: It is obvious that the Government has not learnt much about the importance of primary industry in South Australia. Last year the corresponding paragraph in His Excellency's Speech was paragraph 10 and, lacking as it was in detail and appreciation of the importance of agriculture and its allied industries, it had seven lines devoted to that in His Excellency's Speech. This year's paragraph 6 has only four lines. Last year something was slipped in (by mistake, I am sure) about "private industry being encouraged to the greatest possible extent". It meant nothing last year, as I tried to show in my Address in Reply speech then. This year it is conspicuous by its absence. In any case, primary producers who thought that this Government intended to do anything of value for the man on the land would have been thoroughly disillusioned by the attempts to pass the completely iniquitous Road and Rail Transport Co-ordination Bill, which was designed to force road transport off the roads by its crippling maximum charge of 2c per ton mile. Today, we all know that 2c is equivalent to 2.4d, and 2.4d. (which I know is a maximum charge) is more than seven times the amount of $\frac{3}{4}$ d. charged under the Road Maintenance Act, of which we heard plenty at the time. That latter amount did at least go towards road maintenance. I hope it still does. I know that the district councils have not seen much of it, directly at all events, since the advent of this Government. The 2.4d. or 2c was to go not to road maintenance but to the railways and would be taken off people using the roads and transferred to the railways. This was, in my view, iniquitous and deserved the fate it got. If this Bill did not disillusion the man on the land, he had only to turn to the equally iniquitous Succession Duties Act Amendment Bill, which would have seen his sons struggling against crippling debts for half of their lifetime or having to sell half their

properties, thus reducing them to non-economic units. For further evidence he could have turned to the Constitution Act Amendment Bill, which sought to disfranchise him. This was how the Government intended to "encourage private industry to the greatest possible extent"!

This Government, like all Socialist Governments, just will not learn that, if one gives a man five talents, he may, if he is progressive and enterprising, make them into ten talents, and thus he will be able to pay more taxes and contribute to the wealth of the nation, not merely to his own wellbeing; he can contribute to development and will be in a position to contribute to charity; whereas, if one insists, as so many socialistically inclined Governments seem to insist, on taking away two talents first, leaving him and all those like him with only three talents, he will scarcely be able to make six instead of ten talents. Thus, he and his fellows will contribute correspondingly less in taxation, developmental loans or charitable works.

I heard a well-known South Australian recently come very close to condemning the Commonwealth Treasurer for forecasting a stimulating Budget. I am sorry that he, and so many like him, although he may indeed be an excellent person in every other way, cannot see further than his nose politically; he cannot see that stimulation of the economy and encouragement of initiative in primary industry (and secondary industry, for that matter) must benefit the whole nation and enable its citizens to be in a better position to contribute to the good works that are so necessary in this world. That is, of course, what is wrong with this Government: it puts up costs left, right and centre and the result is that it leaves less capital for further development and expansion, not only of primary but also of secondary industry. It is rapidly pricing us out of Eastern States markets and increasing unemployment because of the facts stated—that there is less money for development and therefore less capital for increasing employment. If we are priced out of markets, people must inevitably be put off. This is a very serious state of affairs, of which I implore the Government to take note.

Last year I registered an emphatic protest about the Government's stated intention to "encourage private industry" (in reverse, as it proved to be) by refusing to grant any further Crown land as freehold. I make no apology for repeating and underlining that protest. I pointed out that most of the country left for development in this

State was of poor type and would take many years, much expense, hard labour and would have to be heavily built up with manures before it would be brought into full production. Therefore, anybody going into this country would develop something at present very nearly worthless into something worthwhile. When a man has developed something worthwhile out of something almost valueless, he should be entitled to call it his own. For as long as we are prepared to deny him the right to call it his own, we shall slow down the development of more land in South Australia. However, my protest fell on deaf ears and, I am afraid, uninformed minds agriculturally at all events. There is no doubt that this Government's policy is to restrict, not to encourage, primary industry, just as by its Socialistic levelling down it tends to restrict rather than develop all other sorts of industry as well.

Recently, I am glad to say, the project at Giles Point (and I am still directing my comments to paragraph 6 of His Excellency's Speech) was rescued from the wastepaper basket and put back into a pigeon hole. Some people have been prepared to congratulate the Government on its decision. Whilst I am glad that Giles Point has at least been restored to a position on the waiting list, I find myself quite unable to share any enthusiasm for the Government's handling of the matter. Who was it, after all, who removed it from the list of approved projects? Who was it who instituted a second, unnecessary, costly and delaying inquiry when the position had already been thoroughly investigated by the Public Works Committee? Who was it who finally postponed the estimated finishing date from 1968 to 1971? The Government, and the Government alone, is responsible for all these delays. If an organization should be congratulated on delaying a development project for three years, then I suppose the Government is to be congratulated upon yet another restrictive, slowing-down action.

Here, I should like to quote (and I make no apologies for repeating it, because I have quoted it previously) some comments by two prominent identities in this part of South Australia. The first is the Chairman of the Yorketown District Council, Mr. J. F. Honner. He made the following statement:

The postponing of Giles Point is a crushing blow to the people of Southern Yorke Peninsula. This area produces 4,000,000 bushels of barley and 1,000,000 bushels of wheat a year. It is the biggest barley producer for its size in the world. To get to a deep sea port, farmers have to cart 50 miles

to Ardrossan or 90 miles to Wallaroo. Those nearer the foot of the peninsula have to cart well over 100 miles. Their only alternative is to cart to roadside receiving centres or smaller outports where they have to pay differentials of up to 1s. a bushel and have their grain taken by ketch to Port Adelaide.

Mr. W. H. Baker, the Chairman of the Warooka District Council, made the following comment:

Most farmers around here have signed up for the bulk handling scheme and started paying tolls on the understanding that the deep sea port was on the way. Some are carting their grain 100 miles to the top end of the peninsula. Some Warooka farmers have already bought bulk handling equipment for their farms, such as elevators, bins, and headers.

The best the Government can do about this is to bring it back on the list, and it has, in effect, been postponed for three years. These people have to put up with conditions mentioned by Mr. Honner, and those mentioned by Mr. Baker. Many people have already bought bulk handling equipment, and they will either be using that to cart grain 100 miles or not have any proper use for it until the deep sea port is brought in. I cannot find myself to have any enthusiasm whatever for the way in which the Government has handled Giles Point.

Passing on to paragraph 7 of His Excellency's Speech, I note that the Government is still investigating natural gas. I believe this is of vital importance to South Australia, and I am at least glad that the Government is investigating it, but I venture to suggest that, had Sir Thomas Playford still been Premier, a positive scheme would by now have emerged and would probably have been under way. I am also of the opinion that, had it been necessary, the former Premier would have accomplished in an oversea trip of 11 days all that has been accomplished by the present Premier and the Minister of Mines in three months. What is more, a Liberal and Country Party Government would know what to do about it. Delay and procrastination are only further restrictions upon development. I hope that the Government will do something positive and practical as soon as possible.

I was interested in the comments in paragraphs 8 and 9 of the activities of the Social Welfare Department and the Department of Aboriginal Affairs. The main way in which the Social Welfare Department has expanded (to use its own phrase) is in the expense and costs of this department which have snowballed, as will most of the costs of the activi-

ties of its Minister, and I query whether there has been any real benefit derived from these spiralling costs. The Department of Aboriginal Affairs may be idealistic, but it has to be realized that it is not always a benefit to a people to grant them full citizenship rights if they are not ready for them. Not all Aborigines are unprepared or unfitted for full responsibilities, but it is an unfortunate fact that most of them are. Perhaps it is to some degree our fault, and in saying that I am speaking of the white races in general. I think that over the years we might well have been able to do more for the Aborigines, but it is a fact that most of them are not ready for full citizenship rights.

Many examples could be given to substantiate my statement, but a complete lack of financial responsibility (and, indeed, in some cases of responsibility of any sort) on the part of many native citizens is one. In recent days the financial soundness of at least one Government-subsidized hospital has been undermined and jeopardized by the refusal of Aboriginal patients to pay, and by their complete indifference to responsibility, the hopelessness of getting money from them, and their complete refusal to continue to participate in medical benefit schemes. If only the Department of Aboriginal Affairs would stand up to its responsibilities—when the Aborigines do not—it would be possible to carry on. However, when a hospital receives a letter, such as I am about to quote, it is a serious matter. I have here a letter from the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs, Flinders Street, addressed to the Secretary of the Maitland Hospital Inc. The paragraph I now quote is as follows:

The Department itself is having to prosecute in numbers of cases of rent arrears at Point Pearce, and I fear that the only way in which there is likely to be any successful action in this matter is for legal action for the recovery of the debts to be taken.

I think honourable members would have some idea of the success possible in recovering debts from people who get rid of any assets they have almost before they get them. The letter continues:

I am afraid that the assistance which the department can give is exhausted.

The letter is signed by the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs. However, on page 7 of this morning's *Advertiser* appears a report from the Minister that makes it seem that everything in the garden is lovely and that we are on the threshold of an exciting period. I do not think he can have it both ways. Not only the department, but the Government is getting close to

being exhausted, and the department and its Minister must do very much better than this. I believe it is necessary to point out that if doors are to be opened for what is, after all, largely a primitive race—and let me make it clear that I am fully in favour of their development as far as it is possible to be done—these privileges or rights must be made available to these people slowly and carefully in accordance with their growing ability to utilize them. I repeat that it is not always to their benefit, nor is it wise or kind, to grant full responsibilities until they are ready to receive them.

Turning to paragraph 10, I notice that the Government continues to pursue an active policy with regard to education. I have noted that the Minister has said on more than one occasion that our overall increase in educational services or commitments in recent years has been of the order of 180 per cent whilst in New South Wales it has been only about half of that percentage. This shows an appreciation of the good job which the department has done, by and large, in a most difficult school population explosion, and I believe it shows what a good job that the previous Minister, Sir Baden Pattinson, did in these difficult circumstances. I have heard members of the Government side pay tribute to Sir Baden when they were in Opposition. I believe that the department has done a good job, but I refuse to believe, other than in the important matter that I have mentioned, that there is any real crisis in education. No-one would deny that more could be done, but neither could anyone deny that more is constantly being done in most spheres of education. If I wanted to take the Government to task about education I would refer in particular to the subsidy system which, in my view, is far from satisfactory and very much inferior to the position of the previous Government. However, I am more concerned at the moment in making some general comments and in making some suggestions, particularly with regard to agricultural education. However, before dealing with agricultural education, I would say that if anybody were prepared to take the long view over a period of years he could not help but be impressed by the expansion in general education in recent years in both the primary and secondary spheres as well as at tertiary level. One must have some patience and not expect perfection to come overnight. If the same rate of improvement and expansion continues, we need have no fears about the opportunities that will be available to our young people.

In certain sections of educational planning, however, room for improvement and innovation exists. Many people would be more competent than I to suggest what these new methods may be, and many more people (judging by the fuss about the crisis in education lately) seem perfectly confident that they know what to do, whether in fact they actually do or not. However, I am encouraged—in the midst of all the increase in secondary and tertiary education, the establishment of university colleges and institutes of technology, and even, to some degree, adult education centres—to make some comments on education in agriculture.

Increases and improvements have occurred in all the fields of education I have mentioned, but there is much to be said for more forward planning in the field of agricultural education. In the secondary field, agricultural science, as I have said before, is something of a Cinderella subject which does not count for matriculation, and I believe this position should be rectified. In the tertiary field, there is an agricultural science degree course in most of the major universities. However, I am concerned not so much about the comparative few who can do the university course but about some adequate agricultural education for the large numbers of young men who will make their careers on the land or as agricultural advisers in this modern-age. I am concerned with agricultural education at diploma or certificate level.

In this field, South Australia has only one agricultural college—Roseworthy, which was established about 80 years ago and which has accommodation for over 100 students. Victoria has two agricultural colleges, Dookie and Longerenong. In New South Wales there are two colleges (Hawkesbury and Wagga) but I understand that the number of applications for enrolment is three or four times greater than the number that can be accepted. Gatton Agricultural College in Queensland caters for about 600 students, an impossible task for one college that intends to give any practical experience—other than demonstrations—in its course of training. This all boils down to the fact that nowhere near enough accommodation exists in agricultural colleges in Australia. We must at least begin to consider future planning for another agricultural college, and possibly for a horticultural college as well.

Another aspect in need of consideration is the entrance standard at Roseworthy Agricultural College, and I believe this applies also to most other well-established agricultural colleges.

The present entrance standard required is the Leaving certificate, and no doubt it will eventually rise to matriculation level, because the standards of training on an academic, vocational and practical level are rising. This in itself is a good thing if provision is made for students who may be capable but are less academically inclined. In my view, this is most important. Too many people have been branded by our education system as nondescript but have eventually proved themselves to be capable. They were branded as nondescript, at least by implication if not in fact, because of their inability to cope with one or two academic subjects. Fortunately, our Education Department, which is constantly increasing the number of people passing through our secondary schools—this is a splendid thing because it means that our overall education level is constantly rising—has devised an internal Intermediate examination. We cannot overlook the activities of the technical schools, which direct less academically-inclined students into subjects they can do and send them out, not as failures or “no-hopers” but as people who are capable in some direction and who will probably be successful in life. In other words, their outlook is a proper one when they go out; they are channelled into things they can do and do not have a sense of failure as to the things they cannot do. I believe this is increasingly necessary. Provision for this excellent type of educational activity will need to be made for our agricultural students, particularly as in the course of time more and more of them (an increasing proportion of the agricultural population) seek more training. Many of them will not reach the entrance standards of Roseworthy or any other first-class agricultural college. Those who do but still cannot quite make the grade will need a slightly less-demanding certificate course that they can complete instead of being unceremoniously dumped by the wayside as at present.

Something along these lines is being attempted at Gatton in Queensland at present, except that Gatton, with 600 students, is unable to provide adequate practical training. This, so far as it goes, is a good thing. Those boys or young men who matriculate can now go to Gatton for three years to do the diploma course. Those boys who can manage only the Intermediate (or Junior) standard at secondary schools can still go to Gatton to do the more practical but less academically demanding two-year certificate course. This is something the other agricultural colleges—or, rather, the

Governments—must consider in the future in the same way as the internal Intermediate examination was considered and implemented, and became successful. Not that Gatton's overcrowding should be considered, but the idea of two levels of instruction, probably in separate colleges, should.

I am a great believer in finding out the strong points of a boy (or girl) and sending him (or her) out into the world confident in his (or her) ability in that particular field. A person is then much more likely to be a success and to realize that life is a continuing education than if dropped by the wayside as a nondescript or failure as has so often happened in the past through being channelled into the relatively narrow confines of what he or she cannot do.

One could comment on many other matters in His Excellency's Speech, and there are many more items to which attention should be drawn. However, many of those items have been commented upon by my colleagues, and those who follow me will no doubt cover the remaining matters. There is one other matter on which I intend to comment. I refer to sewerage, which is dealt with in paragraph 13 of His Excellency's Speech. Last year I made the following comment:

I note with pleasure Government plans for sewerage,

The words “particularly for Gawler” were put in at the end of the announcement last year. Those words with reference to sewerage, like the phrase “private industry will be encouraged” with reference to agriculture, have vanished completely from this year's Speech. I live within seven miles of Gawler and I know that other people have been pushing for sewerage for ten years or more. I also know that the former Minister of Works, Mr. Pearson, had plans for Gawler sewerage to be started in 1967-68. The Minister gave me this as a considered opinion, after having consulted his officers about the end of 1964 or, perhaps, early in 1965, just before the Playford Government was defeated.

During the years in which other people sought sewerage for Gawler, while the Australian Labor Party was in Opposition, it was frequently stated to be the Playford Government's fault that it did not materialize. I can imagine the great disappointment that now, under a Labor Government, sewerage for Gawler has apparently been postponed for another two or three years, especially after the words “particularly for Gawler” in last year's Speech. This old, well-established town has been put off and another

town, which has not needed sewerage for nearly as long as Gawler has needed it, is apparently to get preference.

It must be galling for members on the Government side who have sought this facility for Gawler to find that, instead of the project being hurried on, it has been postponed. I add my protest at what appears to me to be unfair treatment of an old, well-established town which, by its very location and particularly because of the nature of the soil, desperately needs an adequate sewerage system. I sincerely hope the Government will reconsider this matter.

I have noticed with satisfaction the completion of the Bolivar sewage works, which are in the Midland District and for which much credit must go to the former Minister of Works, Mr. Pearson, and to top Engineering and Water Supply Department officers. I have also noted with satisfaction and have mentioned in this place this afternoon that the large outlet channel runs for some miles in the general direction, approximately at least, of the western side of Virginia and, therefore, to some of the irrigation areas west of that town before it suddenly turns out to the sea.

I hope it will become possible to use effluent for irrigation, if not by itself, at least in association with underground water, thereby reducing the present large demands on the underground basin, and that it will be possible to tap this channel at strategic points *en route* and thereby to save unnecessary double channeling. In conclusion, I hope the Government will take some notice of the points made by my colleagues and myself and that it will take a more constructive and developmental attitude to the advancement of the State than it has done hitherto.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN (Northern): I rise to support the motion of the adoption of the Address in Reply and, in doing so, wish to associate myself with the comments of other members regarding the visit of Her Majesty the Queen Mother to the Festival of Arts early this year. I also record my appreciation of the long and meritorious service Sir Mellis Napier, our Lieutenant-Governor, has given to this State. I hope that His Excellency the Governor and Lady Bastyan will continue to have a happy and rewarding term of office when they resume their duties.

It is with regret that we note the death of Sir Frank Perry, Sir Richard Butler, Albert Thompson and Edward Craigie, all of whom served in this Parliament. Sir Frank Perry

was known to me as a colleague, and the others were known to me by repute. Sir Frank lived a long and full life that held success and also some tragedy. As a member of this Chamber he made a valuable contribution to the workings of Parliament. He was particularly helpful to new members, and I wish to record my appreciation of the help and encouragement he gave me on several occasions.

Sir Richard Butler was well known in this State for his work as Premier and the acknowledged fact that he was largely responsible for laying the foundation for the development we have seen since the 1930's. It was his foresight in introducing special amendments that made later development possible. Turning to the Speech delivered at the opening of Parliament, which outlines the Government's programme for this session, I do not wish to cover the ground that has been covered by other members. Paragraph 5, which refers to new industries, has been covered in detail, and I hope that the Premier's Department that has been set up will meet with more success in the future.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: It has two public relation officers now.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: This must involve additional expense. Expense can be ill-afforded but, if this department can benefit the State by bringing new industries here, perhaps the expense will be justified. I hope the Government now realises that the encouragement of new industries involves far more than setting up an expensive department with an impressive name. Paragraph 6 states:

My Government continue to pursue policies designed to make full use of the potential of the State in agriculture, mining, land settlement irrigation, forestry and other fields.

This short paragraph of two lines carries a wide implication in the words "to make full use of the potential of this State". I refer particularly to agriculture. I do not believe that the legislation introduced last session was consistent with this policy of full development of the potential of the State. We had several measures that increased heavily the charges on primary production. We had legislation on land tax, a Bill to introduce transport control, an increase in water charges and another Bill to increase succession duties.

I have no doubt that this paragraph refers, to some extent, to research, and I am the first to admit that research in agriculture is most essential if we are to get the full value of the potential of our primary industries.

However, research is only part of the story and we can fulfil this desire to make full use of the potential of the State only by seeing that primary production, as an industry, is in a healthy state, and has the capital, the means, and the will to develop. Any measure that increases the charges on and costs of any industry has a detrimental effect. It is the reverse of encouragement. Measures introduced last year would, had they been passed in their full implication, have had a very severe effect on the economy of our rural districts. Any extra money raised by taxation is so much less available to the producer to finance his activities or spend in country towns, and this has an ever-widening effect.

The impact on the primary producer is such that, in years when net income is less than average, the producer has to cut down on his activities. He will possibly cut down his application of superphosphate or the replacement of machinery, which in turn affects secondary industry. Also—and this is important—there is an effect on fodder conservation, which is essential if this State is to carry through the leaner years. Fodder conservation is, in effect, tying up capital, and, unless a reasonable sum is left for primary industries to make full use of their potential, we shall not have full production. I hope that, in giving effect to paragraph 6, the Government will consider these matters, because transport charges, taxation and succession duties can have a detrimental effect on the producer.

Succession duties constitute a particularly vicious tax, as this charge often affects production for several years. In some other countries where these charges have been increased viciously there has been an adverse overall effect on the economy, as both primary and secondary industries have been slowed down and placed at a disadvantage in competition with other countries because they have lacked the money for replacement of plant and for full development.

In the same paragraph of the Speech land settlement is mentioned. Today I received a reply to a question I asked on notice regarding section 225 of the Crown Lands Act, which relates to the transfer of perpetual and pastoral leases. Under this Act the Minister has some discretion in relation to pastoral leases. Although the position in relation to perpetual leases is defined by the Act, there is some latitude in special circumstances, but this would be governed by the policy of the Minister of the time as defined by his Government.

Section 225 puts a maximum unimproved value on land that can be transferred to any person, and this includes any other land that may be held by him or his wife. The \$24,000 maximum is the unimproved value as set out in the quinquennial land tax assessment. In 1960, when the previous quinquennial assessment was made, the total assessment rose from \$414,000,000 to \$786,000,00—an increase of about 53 per cent. In that year the Government, fully recognizing the difficulties that could occur in relation to land settlement, sales and transfers, immediately raised the limit in section 225 from \$14,000 to \$24,000, which was an increase of 72 per cent.

A case was brought to my notice recently of a property which was offered for sale and which since the new assessment was adopted is valued at over \$24,000. The land is in rough hilly country, and it is too large to be a transferable unit under the present Act unless a special concession is given. On the other hand, it is too small to be divided into two units, as neither would be an economic unit. It cannot be purchased by adjoining landholders, because if they bought it they would have over the maximum value allowed by the Act. These things are causing very great hardship. I have heard of other instances, but I shall not mention them now. I ask the Government, when considering this matter, to take into account the points I have mentioned, because this is one anomaly that should be cleared up at the earliest possible moment so that people will know where they stand in relation to land transfers. A previous speaker today mentioned the Government's policy of no longer allowing leasehold land to be made freehold. This, too, is a limiting factor, as it means that there is no way out for a person such as I have mentioned unless the Government is prepared to provide a reasonable and fair increase in the figure in proportion to the increase in assessment.

In paragraph 7 His Excellency referred to natural gas. This is very good news, as we sorely need some factor in our economy that will at least contribute something to assist us in our present unfortunate position. In passing I pay a tribute not only to Sir Thomas Playford, who announced his retirement today as Leader of the L.C.L., for his interest in this project, but also to Sir Lyell McEwin, who was Minister of Mines when most of the major exploration for petroleum and natural gas was carried out. We owe a tribute to the Mines Department for its excellent work throughout the State in finding further natural assets that

will help to boost our economy. The Hon. Mr. Dawkins referred to paragraph 9 of His Excellency's Speech, which refers to the welfare of Aborigines. It states:

A Bill to prohibit discrimination on the grounds of race or colour will be laid before you.

It is startling to find that in our programme here in South Australia. I was not aware that any real discrimination existed on these grounds alone. We have to treat this approach with some caution because in bringing forward a Bill like this we are acknowledging publicly a discrimination on the grounds of race or colour which may not exist. It is not stated here just what is the intention of this Bill and what field it is expected to cover—employment, accommodation at hotels, etc. We must approach this matter cautiously, because it would be difficult to administer, and could aggravate the very thing we want to overcome.

Education has been well covered by previous speakers, but I make the point that we have heard much about education needs lately and we are all the better for the information that has come from many sources to help us in assessing the position. However, before we blame other Governments such as the Commonwealth Government (as has been done in some quarters), we should examine closely our own contribution to education in this State. We should make sure we are pulling our full weight before we blame another Government that is contributing to State education more substantially every year. We can always do with more money from the Commonwealth Government for many activities but, before we blame it for any shortcomings in our system, we should first examine thoroughly our own contribution.

Hospitals and medical services were covered extensively by Sir Lyell McEwin, who was of course the Minister of Health in the previous Government and has a wide knowledge of these matters, but I should like to mention again the concern that many people in the northern part of this State feel about the coverage of medical services in that area. The Chief Secretary, the Hon. Mr. Shard, as Minister of Health recently answered a question in this Chamber about the efforts of his department to overcome this difficulty. I wish him and his department every success in finding a solution to this problem. It will need reasonably strong measures on the part of him and his department to find a satisfactory solution to cover long-term planning for this

area, because it is not only that there is no medical officer at Quorn and Hawker (two towns now being served from Orroroo): it is also the fact that there are many other centres in that area, such as Booleroo Centre and Gladstone, where there is only one medical officer servicing a town and its adjacent districts with a population of up to 3,000 people. It would need only one of these medical men to break down in health or to go on leave for the whole northern area of the State to be in serious difficulty as regards medical services.

Paragraph 12 of the Speech refers to the State's road programme. Today's press announces that there is a road programme of \$33,000,000 for this coming financial year.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Are you sure that that is all in the one financial year?

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: This is hard to ascertain, because some moneys allocated for the previous year have not been paid.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: And some in the year following, too.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I do not know whether it is possible to count them twice, but they will have to be met out of this year's allocation. One point of concern to me is the implication in today's press article that a large amount of this money will be spent in or very near to the metropolitan area. It is, of course, impossible to go into any detail, until further information is available, but I hope that when we are given more detailed information we shall find that my fears are unjustified and that there will be a reasonable allocation to country districts.

As regards water, I am pleased that the programme for Coober Pedy (I know it is only a small place but it is important to the people living there) started some years ago will be completed. There is a long story of attempting to find water in this area. However, because of the persistence of the Mines Department and the previous Minister, saline water was eventually found and some allocation was made towards a desalination plant. The Government has announced recently that it is calling tenders and will make an additional amount of money available for this plant. That is good news but, unfortunately, in the same paragraph we see no mention of the town of Kimba. This is another project that I have followed with much interest.

The water supply for Kimba depended largely on the proving of the Poldia Basin on Eyre Peninsula. Water could be brought to Kimba from two sources—the River

Murray by an extension from Iron Knob, or the Polda Basin near Lock. The cost of Murray water would have been very high, and it would have had limited application in the area, so it was necessary to prove that sufficient water existed in the Polda Basin to justify the expense of a full-scale water scheme for Kimba and districts adjacent to the pipeline between Lock and Kimba. People in that district thought that their long wait for a permanent water supply was reaching an end. It is unfortunate that there is no mention of this scheme. I believe this is very unfair treatment of the people in this area.

It concerns me, when such a scheme as this is omitted, to see such a large programme of water mains and sewerage projects in areas in or adjacent to the metropolitan area. I fully appreciate that those works are important, but I point out that the town of Kimba has no permanent water supply. This is a matter of priority and urgency, and it is a pity that this has been omitted from the year's programme.

I do not wish to comment on paragraph 14, dealing with the Harbors Board, at length, but merely wish to say that I am surprised that the board is to be abolished and replaced by a Government department under the control of the Minister. The Auditor-General's report for many years past shows substantial profits in the operations of the Harbors Board. This money goes into Consolidate Revenue, from which an allocation is made to the board. I would be interested to know the reason for this change in policy; I hope it is not a reflection on the operations of the Harbors Board.

Paragraph 15 refers to fauna and floral preservation. I fully appreciate the intention of the Government to preserve some of our fauna and flora for future generations, but I stress that it should be realistic in its preservation programme. On Eyre Peninsula there are two very large reserves within 15 miles of each other that are holding up the development of town and district and are quite a handicap to the adjacent landholders. The previous Minister of Lands agreed to fence these and other reserves. I believe that, in the allocation of money for reserves, in all fairness a fairly high priority should be given to fencing and watering. The reserves around Lock have no permanent water supply, which means that fauna has to come out into surrounding farming country for water.

Paragraph 18 refers to the operations of the Electricity Trust of South Australia. I commend the trust on its operations in South Aus-

tralia. It has done a magnificent job, which has been the result of long-term wise planning and the development of our natural resources. Our forefathers would probably be amazed to know that the deposits of low-grade coal as far away as Leigh Creek are supplying electricity directly to Mount Gambier.

Paragraph 28 refers to a State Government insurance office. This is a completely new development in South Australia, and I am curious to see what is behind its introduction. We have heard some allegations or innuendoes regarding the practices of some insurance companies in this State, but we have not been given any concrete information. Until such information is to hand, I will not comment any further except to say that in my experience (and I have dealt with several insurance companies) I have never found any cause for complaint in the manner in which they conduct their business in this State. I shall be very interested to hear on what grounds the Government considers it necessary to introduce a State Government insurance scheme.

Finally, I wish to refer to the financial position of the State. We now have a published figure in the press of the loss to this State during the last 12 months of operations. This concerns every person in South Australia. Various estimates were made during the latter part of the financial year just concluded, but I do not think even the most pessimistic person forecast that the accumulated loss for the year's operations would be anywhere near \$8,000,000, particularly as South Australia had an above average season last year as far as agricultural returns were concerned, and particularly when we compare the position in this State with that of other States that actually experienced a very severe drought.

Even in New South Wales, with the very large amount of money handled by the Government of a State of that size, despite a disastrous drought that meant a loss of more than \$12,000,000 to its Railways Department and \$5,600,000 to its bus services, there was a deficit of only \$4,700,000. This leads me to wonder just what has gone wrong in this State. We will not know our position until we receive the Auditor-General's report, because the money has been spent in many ways, but this is a recurring problem one finds with a Labor administration if one looks back through the history of Government in this State. I believe the Labor Party made a bigger contribution to the welfare of this State when in Opposition than when in Government.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: It makes a pretty good Opposition.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: Yes. I do not think any fair-minded person will deny that the trade union movement has been responsible for many benefits to its members, but when it undertakes the role of policy making in Government I believe it tends to destroy the very climate that makes those benefits possible. I believe this is one of the handicaps

of the Government today; that is, some of the decisions on policy have not been its own. As long as this situation continues I believe we shall have financial difficulties. I support the motion.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.47 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, July 6, at 2.15 p.m.