

## LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, July 15, 1970

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

### QUESTIONS

#### NURSES

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The Government in today's newspaper announces increased service payments to Government employees over a very wide range. Can the Chief Secretary tell the Council whether the nursing profession is to share in these increased payments?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The short answer to that is, "No, not in this particular regard", but I assure the Council that negotiations are taking place to correct the wrong that was done to the nurses in their last award.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Going on from the answer I have received to that question, during the election campaign promises were made that the Government, if elected, would intervene in the nurses award. I point out that it was a consent award. Can the Chief Secretary explain to the Council what is meant by the word "intervene" and whether further interventions will be made in other consent awards that are made?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: We ought to get our facts correct about the last award. From the information I have received since I have been in office, it was a consent award, a package deal, which was agreed to only on the final instruction of the Government, on the understanding that the Government would not proceed any further or extend the benefits for the nurses. We are taking steps but it is not easy to open an award that was made by consent and with the support of the previous Government for a period of two years. That I would never have accepted, because the nurses on the lower rung did not get a cent increase in their basic salary. In addition, in the package deal there was a clause stating that those very same nurses—I am talking about the trainees—who did not receive a cent increase in their salary, would have their board and lodging charges increased by \$1.85 a week. I have already expressed my views publicly on what I think of the award. It is not easy to reopen an award in respect of

everything that is done, but we will intervene, if possible, and see that the nurses get some payment commensurate with their duties. I hope I shall never be a party to a Government that would force the package deal upon the nursing profession that was forced upon it in the recent award.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I do not think the Chief Secretary has fully answered my question. Can he say whether the Government will in future interfere in a consent award made between the representatives of a section of the service and negotiators from the Public Service Board?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: All I can say (and I say it most forcefully) is that if the Government, an employer of labour, is approached it will deal with every case of intervention on its merits and separately from all other cases. If the Government is approached by an association such as the Public Service Association, the representing body, it will be prepared to discuss the position with the association. The Government believes in arbitration and, if necessary, it will take the part of an employer and see that South Australian employees are getting wages and conditions comparable with those of others. The Government will ensure that employees are not at a distinct disadvantage, as was the case with the last nurses award.

#### BOLIVAR EFFLUENT

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I ask leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister representing the Minister of Works.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: My question relates to the serious situation existing in the Adelaide Plains area of the Adelaide water basin, particularly near Virginia. Honourable members will know that for some time negotiations have been taking place with regard to the use of effluent to supplement the dwindling supplies from the underground basin. At present more than 9,000,000,000 gallons of water a year is channelled off into the sea from the effluent channel. More than 7,000,000,000 gallons a year is drawn from the underground basin, but I believe the recharge is only between 1,000,000,000 and 2,000,000,000 gallons. Of course, this situation is becoming worse every day. Will the Minister ascertain from his colleague whether the department has made any further progress towards using effluent water for irrigation purposes and

whether such water may be made available for use in irrigating certain types of vegetable?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer the question to my colleague and bring down a report.

#### TRANSPORTATION STUDY

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I ask leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Chief Secretary, representing the Premier.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The following paragraph appeared in the *Advertiser* of June 5:

Mr. Virgo—who is now Minister of Roads and Transport—referred to the “infamous” M.A.T.S. report which, he said, the Government would withdraw and revise.

In the *News* of July 3 the Premier was reported as saying that:

A Labor Government had promised to withdraw and revise the M.A.T.S. plan, although freeways from north to south and to Tea Tree Gully, Port Adelaide and Glenelg would be necessary.

Later, in the *News* on July 7, under the heading “M.A.T.S. Expert for South Australia”, the following report appeared:

A world-ranking transportation expert has been called in by the State Government to revise the controversial M.A.T.S. plan. This was announced today by the Roads and Transport Minister, Mr. Virgo. The expert, Dr. S. Breuning, has spent more than a month studying details of the original M.A.T.S. proposals. Dr. Breuning, an American, is expected to arrive in Adelaide with a two-man investigation team about July 20.

Then on July 10 there was a report in the *News*, under the heading “U.S. Traffic Man says S.A. Job a Surprise”, which stated:

American transportation expert Dr. S. Breuning said today he was puzzled by reports that the South Australian Government had summoned him for advice on Adelaide's traffic problems. “I know of no final plans,” he said. “I don't consider myself formally engaged. In fact, I'm a bit surprised that I should get news of this supposed arrangement from newspaper people.”

Then on July 11 the following report appeared:

“Final arrangements with the American transportation expert Dr. Breuning to come to Adelaide were made by phone,” the Premier said.

Then later there was some information that these arrangements were being concluded by correspondence. My questions of the Chief Secretary are these: Has the M.A.T.S. report been withdrawn; have those parts of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study which were approved by the previous Government

been withdrawn; have definite arrangements been made with Dr. Breuning; what is Dr. Breuning's experience in the preparation of metropolitan transportation study reports similar to M.A.T.S.; what fees have been agreed upon; and what estimated overall costs are involved if he is engaged?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I shall be pleased to refer the honourable member's questions to my colleague.

#### WEEDS

The Hon. L. R. HART: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. R. HART: My question relates to the Weeds Act. With the widening of some of our major highways, there has been considerable acquisition of additional land, with the result that the adjoining landowners are in some difficulty in relation to the control of weeds. Under the present Act, measures for the control of noxious weeds would constitute a financial burden on the adjoining landowner or occupier and, indeed, in some cases on a district council itself. Can the Minister say whether the Government would consider amending the Weeds Act to allow for Government funds to be made available, either through subsidy or special grant, for the purpose of noxious weed control on these substantially widened roadways?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I am willing to have a look at the suggestions put forward by the honourable member, and I will give him a reply as soon as possible.

#### AIR GUNS

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: On page 5 of yesterday's *News* there was a report of quite a pathetic plea from the mother of a 14-year-old lad who had lost his eye as a result of an air rifle accident. The report states:

Under existing legislation, any child of any age can own or use an air gun provided it does not have a rifled barrel, a refinement which gives increased accuracy and penetration.

For a long time I have believed that if children were to be taught to use firearms they would be better off under supervision. For many years, adults, children and dumb animals have suffered as a result of the sale of Daisy air guns or air guns of any type. I strongly advocate that such sales be restricted

or banned altogether. Can the Chief Secretary say whether it is his Government's intention to take the action suggested by the mother of this child?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The Government has not considered this question, which has come at an opportune time for me as a conference will be held in Sydney, I think, towards the end of August to be attended by the Chief Secretaries from the various States to see whether some uniformity can be brought about in the use of firearms. I will certainly take up this question at the conference and submit a report to Cabinet containing also the personal views I have on this matter that I do not wish to express now. This is a serious matter on which I have definite views. As a boy I was never allowed to own an air gun, and I think the State would be better off if this applied to all boys.

#### MEAT STANDARDS

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: A notice appeared in the press a few weeks ago concerning meat exports to America. I realize that this is a matter for the Commonwealth Government, as far as the export of meat is concerned but, since a certain amount of that meat comes from South Australia, it must be the concern of this State as well. Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether, following the investigation into the standards of cleanliness, hygiene and safety of that meat, he and his department are satisfied that the cleanliness of the meat and the hygiene standards of the killing are adequate for the people of South Australia? In simple terms, if the meat is not good enough for America, is it good enough for South Australia?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that South Australian meatworks were not concerned in any way with the recent ban on the export of meat from Australia. The meatworks here that have export licences were given a clean bill of health by the inspectors concerned. Recently, at an Agricultural Council meeting at Mount Hagen, it was pointed out that if some of the interested people who were responsible for the export of meat came to South Australia and inspected the abattoirs operating here, they would perhaps be surprised at their hygienic condition and cleanliness. We in South Australia must be concerned at all times about the problems that face the export of meat, to America particularly, which is such a lucrative market but, at the same time, I assure honourable members that our abattoirs fulfil

their obligations admirably. Nevertheless, I will keep an eye on the situation and ensure that the standards do not fall below what is required.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I ask leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Lands.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I understand many stock agents think it is required that sheep should be crutched about a week before slaughter at the abattoirs. On the other hand, some leading meat industry authorities have suggested that at least a fortnight should be allowed for healing to take place. Can the Minister of Agriculture state specifically the policy of the abattoirs in this respect?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I cannot give a definite reply about the policy of the abattoirs. However, I can well understand the concern of some people regarding the crutching and cutting of sheep. I acknowledge that their suggestion about the need for a fortnight's grace to allow the cuts to heal is a good suggestion. The basic question is whether the sheep are classified dirty or otherwise. If the purchasers are satisfied that the sheep are not dirty, they have no cause for complaint. On the other hand, all the reports I have received indicate that the system, which has been in operation for some time, has always worked exceptionally well in South Australian abattoirs. If the purchaser thinks that sheep are dirty, the auctioneer will inspect some of them and a price reduction will be made for the dirty sheep. However, the system may be capable of improvement. If the honourable member suggests an improvement, I shall be happy to consider his suggestion.

#### GEPPS CROSS SALE YARDS

The Hon. L. R. HART: Recently, I wrote to the Minister of Agriculture and forwarded him a list of signatures of people who market their stock at the Gepps Cross abattoirs and drew his attention to the unhygienic state of the sale yards there. Those people were very much concerned about the amount of dirt that had been allowed to accumulate in these yards. They thought that this might possibly contribute to the rejection of sheep for export, even from South Australia, if killed at the Metropolitan Abattoirs here. At the same time I sent a copy of this letter and the signatures to this petition to the Chairman of the Metropolitan Abattoirs Board. So far, I have not had any acknowledgement of this correspondence from the Minister of Agriculture, although

the Chairman of the board was good enough to reply stating that the board recognized the unhygienic state of the sale yards at the abattoirs and was doing all in its power to have them cleaned up; in fact, it even had men working overtime for this purpose because it recognized that these conditions could place in jeopardy the marketing of export meat from the Gepps Cross works. Has the Minister received the correspondence I forwarded to him and has he taken any action in this matter?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: No; I have not seen any correspondence in this regard. I will certainly look into the matter to see whether the correspondence is still in the office; I give the honourable member an assurance that this will be done. I know this is an important aspect of sheep killing. It was raised at the Agricultural Council meeting that the dirty sheep being sold, particularly in other State abattoirs, was contributing to the adverse conditions under which sheep were being slaughtered. Whether or not dirty yards here in the Adelaide abattoirs would go to this extent I am not prepared to say at this juncture. Honourable members know, of course, that we have an amicable agreement between the seller and the purchaser here in South Australia, whereby the latter says to the auctioneer, "So many sheep are dirty in the yards." This means not dirty feet but dirty around the crutch, which means that they should have been crutched before they came in.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: Do you regard this as an amicable agreement?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I think it has worked exceptionally well in South Australia, and the other States are prepared to adopt the same principle we are adopting here to eliminate the problems existing there. From what I have learnt of this method, it has worked very well. If the honourable member has some cases in mind where he can say that it has not, I shall be pleased to hear about them because this is one way in which we want to see that clean sheep are available for the slaughter chain. I will definitely look into the matter of the correspondence and see whether it can be found, but I know nothing of it at the moment.

#### RECEIPTS TAX

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I direct a question to the Minister representing the Treasurer in another place. Can he get a statement from the Treasurer to clarify the position about the payment of receipts tax in South Australia; and, in particular, will he

indicate whether receipts from the sales of wool, sheep, cattle and grain are now exempt from receipts tax in South Australia?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I shall be pleased to refer the question to the Treasurer.

#### LOCAL GOVERNMENT STAFF

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I direct a question to the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Local Government. Has any approval been given by the new Minister for any increase in staff in the Local Government Office and, if so, how many new appointments are involved?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I shall be pleased to convey the honourable member's question to my colleague and get an answer from him.

#### YORKETOWN SCHOOL FACILITIES

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister representing the Minister of Education.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: My question refers to the provision of school facilities in Yorketown. As I have mentioned before in this Chamber, my colleagues and I visited the Yorketown Area School some time ago when it was very crowded. I believe some improvements have been made since then. However, the school is quite inadequate to serve the needs of both the primary and secondary pupils in that area. I am sure honourable members were glad to know some time ago that it is intended to build a new high school fairly shortly in the Yorketown district. This, of course, would mean that the existing area school might be adequate for some time anyway to serve the needs of the primary pupils who would be left there. Can the Minister find out whether the plans for this new high school, which it was suggested will be commenced in 1971 and will be available in 1972, are up to schedule and when it is proposed to submit them for approval to the Public Works Committee in the hope that the work can be commenced on time?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I shall be pleased to refer this matter to my colleague in another place.

#### FREEHOLD LAND

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I direct my questions to the Minister of Lands. First, is it anticipated that there will be any change in the existing situation with regard to the freeholding of land? Secondly, is there any

suggestion that the Government will revert to the previous position in respect of perpetual leases?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: In answer to the second question, at the moment there is no intention of reverting to a restrictive provision in regard to this matter. In regard to the freeholding of land, the situation is similar to what was operating at the end of the term of office of the last Labor Government when, although a statement was made in the first instance that there would be no freeholding of land, in fact there was some freeholding of land in certain circumstances, in cases where people had a big freehold and there was a parcel of land adjoining it and the people concerned desired to freehold. These things were taken into consideration and each matter was considered according to the various aspects of each application. This process will go on. We will look at each application on its merits and consider at that point whether there will be any freeholding. This is what happened last time. In matters that are before the Land Board at the present time, such as agreements or where negotiations are taking place now, those agreements or negotiations will be honoured, but in future each application will be looked at on its merits, whether or not land should be freeholded.

#### GAUGE STANDARDIZATION

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Will the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, table in this Council the recent Maunsell report on the proposed standardization of railway lines north of Adelaide?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I will discuss this matter with my colleague and bring down a reply.

#### COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I ask leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I am rather intrigued by an article in this morning's *Advertiser* that states that the Printing Committee representatives from this Chamber are the Hons. R. C. DeGaris, R. A. Geddes, L. R. Hart, V. G. Springett and A. F. Kneebone. I believe the members of the Printing Committee really are the Hons. R. A. Geddes, L. R. Hart, A. F. Kneebone, A. J. Shard, and V. G. Springett. The *Advertiser* report also states that Mr. Dunstan said the Government would be happy if representation were given to

the minority in the Upper House (this part of the report refers to the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation). Mr. Dunstan is reported as saying the following:

If they put a member of the Government on this Committee, we will be happy to make an arrangement here . . . but we could get no undertaking.

I am somewhat surprised at this comment; indeed, I believe it is not factual. Can the Chief Secretary say to whom an approach was made for an undertaking and when that approach was made?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I think the Hon. Mr. DeGaris referred to the Printing Committee.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I referred to it because there was a misprint.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: To the best of my knowledge, there were no approaches. As I read the statement I thought it referred to an approach for a guarantee in another place, not in this place.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Can the Chief Secretary say to whom an approach was made?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: No; I have no information about that.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Will the Chief Secretary take up the matter with the Premier?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: We must look at this question. There was never any doubt in my mind as to what the position was in connection with the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation. Facts are facts, and we must face them. At present we are not able to nominate anyone for membership of the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation, as the Statute provides that on this committee there shall be three members from another place and three from this Council. I shall be delighted to nominate three members of the Opposition for membership of the committee. Because of the Statute, no discussion in another place can be given effect to.

#### SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

The House of Assembly notified its appointment of sessional committees.

#### JOINT HOUSE COMMITTEE

The House of Assembly intimated its appointment of four members to the Joint House Committee.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): In accordance with section 4 of the Joint House Committee Act, 1941, I move:

That the members of the Legislative Council on the Joint House Committee be the President and the Hons. D. H. L. Banfield, T. M. Casey, and Jessie Cooper.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): Under Standing Order No. 415 I call for a ballot.

A ballot having been held, the President and the Hons. D. H. L. Banfield, Jessie Cooper, and Sir Norman Jude were declared elected.

#### JOINT COMMITTEE ON SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION

A message was received from the House of Assembly requesting the concurrence of the Legislative Council in the appointment of a Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): In accordance with Joint Standing Orders Nos. 19 to 31, I move:

That the members of the Legislative Council on the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation be the Hons. Sir Norman Jude, F. J. Potter, and C. R. Story.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): Under Standing Order No. 415 I call for a ballot.

A ballot having been held, the Hons. Sir Norman Jude, F. J. Potter, and C. R. Story were declared elected.

#### ADELAIDE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary) moved:

That two members of this Council be appointed, by ballot, to the Council of the University of Adelaide.

Motion carried.

A ballot having been held, the Hons. A. F. Kneebone and F. J. Potter were declared elected.

#### FLINDERS UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA COUNCIL

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary) moved:

That two members of this Council be appointed, by ballot, to the Council of the Flinders University of South Australia.

Motion carried.

A ballot having been held, the Hons. D. H. L. Banfield and V. G. Springett were declared elected.

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary) brought up the following report of the committee appointed to prepare the draft Address in Reply to His Excellency the Governor's Deputy:

1. We, the members of the Legislative Council, thank Your Excellency for the Speech with which you have been pleased to open Parliament.

2. We assure Your Excellency that we will give our best attention to all matters placed before us.

3. We express the sincere hope that His Excellency the Governor will be speedily restored to the best of health.

4. We earnestly join in the prayer for Divine blessing on the proceedings of the session.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture): I move:

That the Address in Reply as read be adopted.

I sincerely hope that each member of this Council will concur in that statement I have just made, that the motion be adopted. At this stage I should like to pay my respects to Sir Mellis Napier for the magnificent way in which he read the Speech. Sir Mellis, of course, is well up in years, and he has had a tiring task to perform during the illness of His Excellency the Governor. I commend Sir Mellis for the way in which he performed his duties in opening Parliament. It was a magnificent effort, and I sincerely hope he can fulfil his obligations for many more years. I wish His Excellency the Governor a speedy recovery from his recent illness.

I am very pleased to be a member of this Council. His Excellency's Speech demonstrates the Government's resourcefulness in approaching problems affecting this State. In connection with our water resources, it has been said many times that South Australia is the driest State in the driest country in the world. Consequently, it is only natural that we should ensure that all our water resources are harnessed in the best possible way; of course, the water resources of the whole Commonwealth should be so harnessed. Unfortunately, the inland of the continent is very susceptible to adverse seasonal conditions. At present some parts of South Australia are enjoying a good season whilst other parts are experiencing adverse conditions.

Members of the rural community in one part of the world have to rely on the misfortunes of their counterparts elsewhere in order to sell all their commodities. The wheat industry provides an example of this situation. In the western world there is over-production of wheat, whilst countries that once imported wheat from Australia are now enjoying the conditions that we used to enjoy. I sincerely hope that new markets will be found for our wheat. The latest agreement, signed between the United Arab Republic and Australia, came

out of the blue. That part of the world had not been canvassed for several years, but we were fortunate enough to secure the contract, which I hope will be the first of many more.

As a result of the difficulties facing the wheat industry, the Government will set up a special committee to consider the wheat quota system in South Australia. We realize that quotas are necessary at this stage. It was inevitable that anomalies should creep into the system. I have no personal criticism of the present wheat quota committee, which worked under difficult conditions initially. I do not think anyone could have done a better job. However, this does not mean that a better overall result cannot be achieved: I think it can be, and one means to this end is to set up a committee to collate and analyse all the available information.

I am very pleased to see that the Government has decided to become directly concerned with existing companies in this State. The Government is prepared to purchase an equitable share in a business organization if it sees fit to do so. As an example, I refer to the Italian company that recently completed the laying of the natural gas pipeline from Gidgealpa to Adelaide. That company has now been engaged to lay a pipeline from a natural gas field in Western Australia to Perth. Because the company was in dire need of capital several years ago, it approached the Italian Government, which took a share in the company and put it on its feet. As a result, it is now the foremost pipelaying company in the world. The Italians seem to have a flair for this type of work. In addition, Italians have been responsible for installing transmission lines throughout Europe. The South Australian Government's proposal is an excellent way of showing its confidence in the people of South Australia.

I hope that in the foreseeable future Adelaide will be linked with other States by means of a standard gauge railway. Of course, I realize that this question has not yet been completely resolved. Before the standardization of the railway line from Broken Hill to Port Pirie, three gauges met at Port Pirie. However, since that project has been completed only two gauges meet at that town. If it was linked to Adelaide, of course, gauge changing would be eliminated altogether. Unfortunately, it has created problems at Gladstone and Peterborough, each of which has three gauges. This is the sort of thing that is probably inevitable in the circumstances. However, the Commonwealth Government must be shown exactly

where we are going on this particular score. We must try to eliminate these gauge changes and get back to some basic semblance of rail standardization. In fact, this is necessary if we are to keep our transportation costs within reasonable bounds.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: Can't we do it slowly?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I suggest that that is what will be done. I merely point out to the Council that it is inevitable that where we try to eliminate one problem we create problems in other places.

A matter that has been brought to my attention on a re-reading of His Excellency's Speech concerns the Government's intention to reintroduce legislation for the establishment of a Government insurance office to cover all insurance risks except life assurance. I understand that whilst this measure was quite popular in another place several years ago it was quite unpopular in this Chamber. I sincerely hope that the tides of time have changed sufficiently to ensure that in the interests of the people of South Australia generally we shall see a Government insurance office in this State, which is the only State that does not have one. I have found on speaking to Ministers of Governments in other States (it is not necessary for me to intimate what those particular Governments are) that they all agree it is most essential that Government insurance offices be continued. I understand that there is no compulsion in any way on people to conduct business with these insurance offices, which create competition. As a believer of competition in any field, I think this is one way in which we can encourage competition throughout the State. I know that honourable members agree that competition in any field is very good for society in general. However, I will leave that matter until it comes before us in more positive terms.

I am very interested, of course, in rural problems. Indeed, I am sure that other honourable members are likewise interested, because some of them have a stake in the rural areas of this State. I draw the attention of honourable members to the proposed inquiry into the Citrus Organization Committee. It is essential that we get some form of stability into this industry, which is a very important one. I think any moves in the right direction to improve both the status of this organization and its marketing abilities should be supported by all sides of Parliament. Unfortunately, it has had many problems in the past, and I hope that when the committee's report becomes

available it will rectify some of the deficiencies that have occurred and are still occurring in this industry so that we can bring the industry back on to its feet. The C.O.C. was established some years ago to provide an orderly marketing system for our citrus fruit, but unfortunately some groups are not prepared to accept orderly marketing of citrus in this State. Apparently they think their own little nest egg is more important than the community generally. However, I hope that the problems of this industry will be resolved soon.

The Government also intends to carry out a complete revision of the Fisheries Act. I remind honourable members that a Select Committee was set up several years ago to examine all the problems in the fishing industry in this State. I also point out that originally it was a Parliamentary committee consisting of members of both Parties, but unfortunately the then Opposition decided to withdraw its representatives from the committee, which meant that the Government of the day had to appoint a Government committee to carry out this task. I firmly believe there was an attempt to play politics in this respect, and I condemn that action. If we are attempting to do something in the interests of this State and a Parliamentary committee is set up for that purpose, such a committee should function in the way it was intended to function. Nevertheless, that committee's report was a most comprehensive one, and it will be followed closely when the new fisheries legislation comes before this Council. Some of the problems of the industry will not be easy to solve, because fishermen are very independent people, more independent than many people imagine. Also, it is difficult to convey information to many of the fishermen because they are migrants and there is quite a diversity of tongues. Nevertheless, I believe that with the right approach by the people concerned we can solve many of the problems facing the industry.

I wish to say a few words about the prawning industry, which has been a wonderful source of revenue not only to the fishermen who have been privileged to have a licence to fish for prawns in this State but also to the State as a whole. Unfortunately, we know very little about the fishing resources of this State. In fact, I would go so far as to say that the Commonwealth Government knows very little about the fishing resources of Australia, and it is only in the last few years that it has taken any interest at all in carrying out research into the fishing industry. I am pleased that the

Commonwealth has now decided to undertake research into the prawning industry in the Gulf of Carpentaria. A few years ago prawn fishing in that gulf was particularly lucrative, with boats coming from Western Australia and as far south as Tasmania. Unfortunately, our fishermen clashed with a Russian vessel carrying out the same type of fishing, and things got a little hot up there. Nevertheless, the fishermen almost fished those grounds out of prawns, with the result that most of the boats had to return to their home ports.

I am pleased to say that when I was in the north of the country recently I learned that the king prawns were returning to the Gulf of Carpentaria. Unfortunately, the banana type prawn, as it is commonly known, has not returned. If we do not know much about our own resources, how can we exploit these resources to the extent that we have been doing in some instances? The prawning industry in South Australia is a typical example of an industry about which we know very little and we must take extreme caution to ensure that the beds of prawns are not over-fished to the detriment of fishermen generally. I propose to take steps to the limit of my resources and power to ensure that this will not happen and that fishermen will be fully informed of the problems that are facing their industry and of what is likely to transpire in the industry so that they can comment accordingly.

I notice that the Government proposes, as part of the reform of the Legislative Council, to introduce adult suffrage and compulsory voting. This has been a bone of contention for many years and is akin to the question of voting at 18 years, should children be allowed to drink in hotels at the age of 21 years or 20 years, and exactly why was 21 years stipulated in the first place as the age of maturity? We must realize that we are living in a world that we have gradually accepted as an advanced world, both in the technological sense and in many other facets; therefore, certain changes must be made in the interests of people generally. I sincerely hope that reform of the Legislative Council will be given full consideration when it comes before the Parliament.

The Builders Licensing Act is also mentioned in His Excellency's Speech, and this is a very important measure indeed. I can remember when this legislation was passed by the Parliament several years ago but never proclaimed. This was an injustice not only to the people of South Australia but to the building industry generally because the Bill was submitted to the building industry, which approved of it in



every sense of the word. The Bill received the assent of Parliament but, because it was not proclaimed, it lapsed. This was detrimental to the industry, and I trust that this measure will be accepted when it comes before the Council.

There are many other topics in the Speech delivered by His Excellency and I commend the Government for the manner in which its programme has been arranged. I thank honourable members for listening to me in silence (something I did not expect), because even though it is my maiden speech in this Chamber it is not my maiden speech in this Parliament. I thank honourable members for their courteous attention.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Minister of Lands): Before seconding the adoption of the Address in Reply I wish to compliment my colleague the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. T. M. Casey) on the excellence of his maiden speech in this Chamber in moving the motion. He touched on most of the topics mentioned in His Excellency's Speech. I welcome him to this Chamber and to a lot of hard work as a member of the Government's small team of hard working members here.

We were honoured by having His Excellency the Governor's Deputy (Sir Mellis Napier) open Parliament yesterday. He has officiated on a number of occasions in the past in this same capacity and, as on those previous occasions, he carried out his duties in a most dignified manner. The motion we are now supporting expresses our thanks to His Excellency for his Speech on this occasion. I express my regret that His Excellency the Governor (Sir James Harrison) has suffered ill health in recent months; however, I am pleased to hear of his apparent progress towards recovery.

Although there was no mention in the Governor's Deputy's Speech of the passing of former members of Parliament since we met last year, reference was made to them in the previous opening of Parliament. I refer first to Sir Robert Nicholls, whose services to the State and Parliament are well known to everybody. He was a member from 1915 to 1956 and served as Speaker of the House of Assembly for a record term from 1933 to 1956. I am sure that all honourable members extend their condolences to his family. Another former member who passed away was Mr. Colin Dunnage, who also served for a long term in another place, from 1941 to 1962, including six years as Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees. I know that all members join with me in expressing sympathy to his family.

c

I am indeed pleased on this occasion to have the privilege of seconding the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I do so with a sense of deep satisfaction in the knowledge that the people of South Australia have again clearly indicated that they desire a Labor Government and that they support the traditional policies of this Government. It is abundantly clear that the Government has been given a mandate to carry out those policies. We witnessed during the years between 1965 and 1968, when the previous Labor Government was in office, members in this Chamber speaking and voting against Bills introduced that were designed to implement those policies. We saw amendments moved and carried by those members, and this had the effect of defeating the main purposes of those Bills.

We were told on those former occasions that the members were not sure that the Government had a mandate for those policies, but there should be no doubt now. We should now be able to look forward to the unimpeded progress of Bills introduced along the same lines in this Parliament, for example, succession duties, Government insurance office, adult franchise for the Legislative Council, and the Public Service Act. The Minister of Agriculture referred to one: the Government Insurance Office Bill, to which amendments were made; these were not acceptable and had the effect of defeating the main purpose of the Bill.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: What about the Transport Bill?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I think the Premier stated, even in 1968, what the attitude of the Labor Party and the Labor Government would be to that type of legislation in the future.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Members opposite are living in the past.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Yes. Apparently, they think this is 1967 or 1968, whereas we are on the verge of the 1970's and we have a different point of view.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: We are in the 1970's now.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: We are looking to a future of dynamic Government.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Do you say that the Government was right?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I say we are not introducing this type of Bill in this session.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Would you have got it through at that stage?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: That is a hypothetical question that I do not propose to answer at this moment.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: We have a better mandate than the Liberals ever had in the last 20 years.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: When other honourable members have finished their Address in Reply speeches, I will get on with mine. I have no need to go back and review the events that led to the defeat of the previous Government and the subsequent election for the other place. What we do see, however, is that, whereas the members of the other place had to face the electors, no members of this Chamber having completed their present six-year term were required to face the electors. There has been, nevertheless, one change which was brought about by the resignation of my old friend and colleague, the Hon. Stan Bevan.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Resignation, was it?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Yes. I have known Stan for a long time, from the time many years ago when I became an official in the industrial field in the trade union movement. We shared an industrial life together in Trades Hall activities and, when I followed him down here, we shared a Parliamentary life together. When in Opposition, we shared a room together, and in the Labor Government of 1965-68 we were Cabinet colleagues. I could not have wished for a better colleague or mate.

Stan spent a lifetime in the industrial and the political field in support of policies that he believed would bring a better standard of living to the vast majority. He was always ready to give assistance to me and other members of my Party, even if in doing so it meant some self-sacrifice on his part. This principle he followed right up to his retirement. We will miss him greatly and I am sure that all honourable members will join with me in wishing Stan good health and long years of happy retirement.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Hear, Hear!

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: His Excellency's Speech contained many matters of importance which it is the intention of the Government to bring before Parliament for consideration. I propose to refer to only one or two of those matters that are associated with my own portfolio. One of them is the South-Eastern Drainage Act. This has caused some concern to the previous Government and to myself. I should like to refer to it in some

detail, mentioning the amount of money spent and the work done on that project. The completion of all phases of the Eastern Division scheme during March of 1970 brought to a close a long and close association between the South-Eastern Drainage Board and the Engineering and Water Supply Department. This association commenced in 1950 with the construction of the comprehensive scheme for the drainage of the Western Division of the South-East. During this period of 20 years, the capital value of drainage works under the board's control has increased from \$895,000 (in 1949) to \$18,089,000; the major proportion of this expenditure represents the value of work undertaken in the construction of approximately 500 miles of new drains (and the improvement of existing drains) together with the provision of 543 road and occupation bridges and numerous associated structures. The magnitude of the works undertaken is demonstrated by the fact that 18,400,000 cub. yds. of spoil was excavated in providing improved drainage for an area of 1,130,000 acres of land.

With the finalization of the present phase of operations in the South-East the board has no plans for construction works of any magnitude during the 1970-71 financial year; construction activity will be confined to the replacement of obsolete bridges and culverts to meet the needs of development. Following the recommendations of the Parliamentary Committee on Land Settlement, contained in Parliamentary Papers 17/1948 and 22/1956, and subsequent undertakings given to landholders in the South-East, the board has arranged with the Agriculture Department and the Mines Department for a joint investigation into the effect of drainage upon pasture production during the late spring and early summer months, and upon the ground water table.

A Cabinet-appointed committee under the chairmanship of the Director of Lands is currently investigating the financial provisions of the South-Eastern Drainage Act. An interim report was presented to the previous Government earlier this year. The report contained alternative recommendations in relation to this matter. That Government took no definite action on those recommendations up to the time of its defeat. I intend to study the interim report and any subsequent report that may be forthcoming from the committee. After such study I will make a full report to Cabinet for its consideration in regard to the Act itself.

Another matter that has caused me great concern since my becoming Minister of Lands

—I think the problem was there when I took office but it got even worse in the last weeks of June—is the problem of wild dogs in the north of the State and of the Wild Dogs Act as a result of the enormous increase in the number of wild dogs killed in the financial year ended June 30, 1970. I propose to quote from some reports I have received on this matter in the last few weeks. Following repeated submissions dating back to 1955 received from producer organizations requesting an increase in the wild dog bounty payments, the then Minister of Lands directed the Pastoral Board to convene a conference to consider this particular aspect of dingo control and at the same time to inquire into dingo control measures operating in other States confronted with this common problem.

Accordingly, invitations were extended to the appropriate authorities in New South Wales, Queensland, Western Australia and the Northern Territory to meet in Adelaide during the period May 29-30, 1969, to consider the question of increasing the bounty payments for wild dog scalps and for discussion of wild dog control measures in each State. The conference duly took place and was attended by delegates representing New South Wales, Queensland, Western Australia and South Australia. The Northern Territory was unable to send a representative. On the question of bounty payments, the following resolution was adopted by the conference:

Each State delegate to the Dingo Control Conference held in Adelaide May 29-30, 1969 (Mr. A. R. Tomlinson, Western Australia, dissenting) take back to his appropriate authority for their earnest consideration a request for increasing the bonus rate for wild dog scalps to a sum of \$6.

The Pastoral Board after due consideration recommended on June 17, 1969, that effect be given to the resolution passed at the four-State conference on dingo control that the then bounty payment of \$2 for the scalp of a wild dog be increased to \$6. The notice increasing the bounty payment from \$2 to \$6 as from September 1, 1969, was published in the *Government Gazette* on August 14, 1969. South Australia was the only State to implement the resolution fully. In making this recommendation the board was influenced by the following factors:

- (1) The bounty payment was last upgraded in 1948 to the figure of \$2. Since that time costs of killing wild dogs have risen steeply, and the \$2 bounty payment provided insufficient incentive to interest people in wild dog

destruction. No professional dogger was operating in South Australia. Over the same period the payment made to owners of the dog fence to assist them in maintaining the fence in dog-proof condition has been increased from \$12 a mile to \$35 a mile. Amendments were made during the year to the Dog Fence Act to enable this sum to be further increased.

- (2) The Stockowners Association of South Australia and the Vermin Districts Association, the two producer organizations whose members are most directly concerned with the dingo problem, strongly advocated and supported an increase in the bounty payment to \$6. Both associations fully appreciated that such an increase would also involve their ratable members in the payment of additional wild dog rates. In fact, their contributions have been trebled with the rise in bounty payment from \$2 to \$6.
- (3) The board has received reports of unprecedented calf losses in the far northern cattle areas caused by dingo activity. These reports were confirmed by the pastoral inspectors and the board's own investigations. It was evident that urgent measures had to be taken to curb the rising dingo activity if cattle breeding programmes were to survive, particularly in the Far North of the State. It was obvious also that the build-up in the dingo population would place a dangerous pressure on the dog fence, which is now the only functional barrier between the sheep population of the State and the dingo breeding areas outside the fence. It was considered that the most expeditious manner of attaining this object was to increase the bounty payment.
- (4) The Wild Dogs Fund at June 30, 1969, was in a healthy position, having a credit balance of \$46,000 which, with rates and subsidy to be paid for the year 1969-70 totalling about \$28,000, would provide for the payment of 12,000 scalps at \$6 each. Despite reports of increased dingo activity it was not expected that this figure would be exceeded in the light of bounty payments made over the preceding 10 years. During that period the

following numbers of scalps were submitted:

Year	Scalps submitted
1959-60 . . . . .	6,802
1960-61 . . . . .	4,704
1961-62 . . . . .	5,489
1962-63 . . . . .	2,243
1963-64 . . . . .	3,216
1964-65 . . . . .	6,061
1965-66 . . . . .	3,167
1966-67 . . . . .	1,915
1967-68 . . . . .	2,021
1968-69 . . . . .	2,865

In fact, however, 19,490 scalps were submitted, requiring a total bounty pay-out of \$111,060, representing 1,470 scalps at \$2 each and 18,020 at \$6. After borrowing from the Treasury \$8,000 (the maximum advance permitted under the Wild Dogs Act) the Wild Dogs Fund at June 30, 1970, is \$39,200 in debt, which includes 5,800 scalps not yet paid for.

In order to curtail expenditure for the year 1970-71 the following steps have been taken: the bounty payment has been reduced from \$6 to \$4 for the scalp of a fully grown wild dog, and from \$6 to \$1 for the scalp of a wild dog that is not fully grown; also, the rate a square mile has been increased from 10c to 15c (the maximum rate permitted by the Act), which will provide an additional \$8,000 in revenue.

These measures however, will be inadequate to restore the fund to solvency if, as may reasonably be expected, 12,000 scalps are submitted during the 1970-71 financial year in the ratio of 10,000 fully grown dogs at \$4 to 2,000 pups at \$1. On the above hypothesis the position will then be:

Expenditure 1970-71	\$
*5,800 scalps at \$6 . . . . .	34,800
*Administration, handling charges, etc. . . . .	4,400
*Loan from Treasury . . . . .	8,000
10,000 scalps at \$4 . . . . .	40,000
2,000 scalps at \$1 . . . . .	2,000
Administration, handling charges etc. . . . .	4,500
Interest on \$8,000 at 5 per cent ..	400
	<u>94,100</u>

\*Committed.

The position, as the Wild Dogs Act is framed, will provide the following revenue for the current financial year:

Rates at 15c a square mile . . . .	\$ 28,000
Government subsidy . . . . .	8,000
	<u>36,000</u>

This leaves a deficit of \$58,100. Urgent amendments to the Wild Dogs Act are necessary if the Wild Dogs Fund is to meet its commitments. I will be making recommendations to Cabinet upon the necessary amendments and, after consideration by Cabinet, a Bill will be introduced during this session. It is obvious that the action taken in increasing the bounty payment to \$6 achieved the object of reducing the dingo menace. It is also clear that the menace was a more serious one than was envisaged at the time, and it was with great reluctance that a reduction in the bounty payment had to be made. However, with the fund exhausted, such action was unavoidable.

A letter was recently published in the newspaper saying that people were seeing more and more dogs around. It is amazing that so many dogs should be seen when 20,000 were killed in one season. I realize that the problem of wild dogs causes great concern to the cattle industry and also (if dogs get loose within the fence) to the sheep industry.

The Hon. C. R. Story: What will the Government do about subsidizing that matter?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: We have to go into the whole question. We have to consider whether we should continue the system now operating or adopt some other system. I have much pleasure in seconding the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 4.16 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday, July 16, at 2.15 p.m.