

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, July 28, 1970

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

QUESTIONS

NATIONAL SERVICE

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: When speaking in this Council on Thursday last the Hon. Mr. Springett said:

The Premier has shocked a considerable section of the community by saying he would urge any young man to break the law which provides for compulsory National Service to defend his country.

The Chief Secretary interjected and said, "He did not actually say that, you know." I have checked the newspaper reports, and I find that the *News* of June 27 states:

Mr. Dunstan said tonight he would refuse to register for National Service if he were 20 and he would give the same advice to the public in general.

To avoid further misunderstanding in this Council as to what was said, will the Chief Secretary say whether or not he agrees that the newspaper report is a fair report of the statement made by the Premier?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: No.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Could the Chief Secretary make available to the Council the actual statement of the Premier on the *Four Corners* programme?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes, I should be pleased to make it available, because it confirms what I have said.

AUSTRALIAN FORCES FUND

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The Government from time to time has supported with donations any appeal launched for funds from the public for amenities to be provided to Australian troops serving overseas. Can the Chief Secretary say whether the Government is supporting the current appeal for the Australian Forces Fund?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The policy of the Government (of either political Party, as I understand it) is to make a donation to a given fund but rarely for the same fund from year to year as a recurring donation. On this occasion we considered that the Government had done the reasonable thing towards this particular fund, and it was not prepared at this stage to create a precedent by making a further donation which could be construed as a recurring one and which could set a precedent for other funds.

ELLISTON POLICE STATION

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: My question relates to Elliston police station. No repairs or maintenance have been carried out at the residence at this police station for some 14 years. Although the building is reasonably substantial, it is not in a fit enough state, in my opinion, to warrant asking a police officer or any other Government employee to occupy it at present. I understand plans are in hand to rebuild both the residence and the gaol there, but nothing has been done for so long that at present some repairs are necessary to make the place at least habitable for the young couple now there. Will the Chief Secretary take up the matter and see whether some alleviation of the problem can be obtained?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I shall be pleased to do that. For the information of the honourable member and the Council generally, I understand that this year an increased amount of money is available to the Police Department for buildings, etc. I do not know whether or not Elliston is included. However, I will take up the matter with the Commissioner of Police and the Public Buildings Department and bring back a report for the honourable member as soon as possible.

FLAMMABLE CLOTHING

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: I understand the Minister representing the Minister of Labour and Industry has a reply to a question I asked on July 16 about flammable material being used in the manufacture of clothing.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Before legislation can be introduced to prohibit or control the use of flammable materials in the manufacture of clothing, it is necessary to have some standard for testing the flammability

of various materials. Last year, after a draft standard for determining the flammability of textiles had proved unsatisfactory, the State Ministers of Labour approached the Commonwealth Minister in charge of the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization requesting full-time investigation. Resulting from a limited research programme undertaken by the C.S.I.R.O., the Standards Association of Australia has prepared a draft of a new standard method of testing the flammability of clothing. In accordance with usual practice of the Standards Association, this document has been sent to interested parties for their comments before August 31, 1970, on the proposed test procedures.

The Ministers of Labour of all States are awaiting the publication of this standard in its final form before proceeding to consider the details of legislation, which it has been agreed should be uniform throughout the various States. Pending the introduction of legislation, wide publicity has been given in all States to the dangers of using inappropriate designs and materials in the manufacture of children's nightclothes. In South Australia, a booklet titled *Safer Nightclothes for Children* has been published by the Department of Labour and Industry and is being distributed by the Child and Home Safety Committee of the National Safety Council of Australia, S.A. Division. It is a simplified version of the Standards Association Code *Safe Design for Children's Nightclothes*, which includes several recommended designs for children's night attire, all of which are close fitting, a comparison of the relative flammability of various materials and details of the hazards of fires and heating appliances which are especially dangerous when left unguarded near young children. A copy was sent to all honourable members at the time of publication.

TRANSPORTATION STUDY

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I direct a question to the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport. I refer to the impending arrival in a few days' time of the American, Dr. Breuning, and to the original insistence in 1965 that an Australian transportation engineer take part in the preparation of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Report. I refer also to the ultimate retention for that purpose of the firm of Rankine and Hill (of Sydney) together with de Leuw, Cather and Company (of Chicago) and Alan M. Voorhees and Associates, Incorporated (of Washington) to prepare the

M.A.T.S. Report. Will the Minister ask his colleague whether any Australian transportation planning engineer will be retained to work with Dr. Breuning in his investigations into future transportation trends in Adelaide?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I will convey the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring down a reply as soon as possible.

BENLATE

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question about Benlate?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Benlate has been cleared by the Australian technical committee on agricultural chemicals for use on turf, ornamentals and non-bearing fruit trees, and is registered under the Agricultural Chemicals Act, 1955, for these uses in South Australia. A further application by the manufacturer has recently been made to the technical committee for the use of Benlate on a range of edible fruit and vegetable crops and certain stored commodities. An application has also been made to the National Health and Medical Research Council for the establishment of residue tolerances in these crops and commodities.

A clearance cannot be given for the use of Benlate on fruit-bearing crops until these tolerances are fixed, and until all States have agreed to accept the efficacy claims put forward by the manufacturer. It is expected that a clearance will be issued in the near future, and when this occurs the product will come under immediate consideration for registration in South Australia. Authorities are well aware of the great potential value of this new chemical, and every effort is being made to get it on the market as soon as possible.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I ask leave to make a short statement before asking a further question on this matter of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The apricot growers of this State have spent much money on research into a disease called gummosis. This research has been supported by the Agriculture Department and the Commonwealth Government. The latest report that I have seen has been subscribed to by Dr. Moller and Dr. Carter.

The report recommends that Benlate should be sprayed immediately following pruning or, in some cases, just before pruning. Since

this spraying would not be on edible fruit (the tree would be dormant when the treatment was applied), will the Minister ascertain whether it is possible for Benlate to be released for this purpose for use on apricot trees?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will be delighted to do that.

WATER STORAGES

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Has the Minister of Agriculture obtained from the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about water storages?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: My colleague reports:

The present holding of the Warren reservoir is 538,000,000 gall., compared with 470,000,000 gall. at about the same time last year. Moderate intakes are being received into the reservoir and, if these do not increase, it is proposed to transfer some water from the Mannum-Adelaide main to the Warren reservoir during the months of August, September and possibly October. This would be in addition to the pumping of water as required through the Swan Reach-Stockwell main into the Warren trunk main near Moculta. The proposed supplementation from the Swan Reach-Stockwell main and the Mannum-Adelaide main as necessary will be sufficient to meet all demands from the Warren trunk main during the coming summer.

The present storages and the capacities of the Warren, South Para and Barossa reservoirs are as follows:

Warren reservoir—	million galls.
Capacity	1,401
Present storage	538
South Para reservoir—	
Capacity	11,300
Present storage	6,954
Barossa reservoir—	
Capacity	993
Present storage	558

RECREATION RESERVES

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I direct my question to the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Local Government, and refer to the recent announcement that some new grants for the development of recreation reserves are to be made to councils and that the councils of Henley and Grange, and Payneham, are benefiting by such allocations. Can the Minister say, first, what are the grounds on which councils can apply and expect to be granted this new subsidy; and, secondly, will such new grants affect in any way tourist grants approved by the Tourist Bureau to councils but which do not come from funds under the Public Parks Act?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I shall be pleased to convey the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring back a reply when one is available.

PINE FORESTS

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Can the Minister of Forests say whether the Government will consider imposing a small charge on timber felled in Government forests to compensate councils for revenue lost when land is purchased and planted to pines?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: As I think this is a question for the Government I will take it up on a Government level.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 23. Page 273.)

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I was very pleased that His Excellency the Governor's Deputy was in such fine health on the occasion of his performing the opening ceremony. Sir Mellis has rendered to the State outstanding service over a very long time and has acted in the absence of His Excellency on various occasions when he has either been out of the State or incapacitated. I join with other honourable members in expressing the hope that His Excellency the Governor will very soon be restored to full health and be able to perform his duties again. In the short time that he was in office before taking ill, he demonstrated to us that he was extremely interested in this State and in the welfare of its people. No doubt Parliament would want to express its gratitude to Lady Harrison who, during her husband's illness, has carried out very many of the duties that would normally have fallen to her husband.

I congratulate the new Ministers of this Parliament. I think we have all seen them in action at various times. I congratulate particularly the Hon. Mr. Casey on his election to this Council and on having taken over the portfolios of Agriculture and Forests. I am sure that his stay in this place will be a very pleasant one. I congratulate, too, the mover and the seconder of this motion. Both these gentlemen gave us the Government's policy, including some things not included in the Speech delivered by His Excellency. However, both speeches were most informative.

The Hon. Mr. Bevan, of whom we are all very fond, is no longer a member of this Council. I am sure we all wish him many happy years of retirement, because he did render very good service to this Parliament and to this State. We are all very sorry indeed that he has left this Council.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: He was very helpful to us occasionally.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes, and I think that was reciprocated. Turning to the Speech itself, I suppose one could say it is a give-and-take speech, because it gives a bit and it seems to take a fair bit. I think that two fairly hackneyed old expressions cover it fairly well: "Today's promises are tomorrow's taxes," and "Hard cases make bad laws." In reading this document it seems to me that we are setting out to block up many holes and to patch the old gill net up again. Those members who have heard me on that subject before will know what I mean. It seems to me that we are looking at the social legislation again very carefully, and when we read the Speech with which the previous Labor Government opened Parliament four or five years ago we see that we are in somewhat the same situation in that we have made many recommendations for committees and for inquiries but not very many recommendations on how we are to really get the show going. I applaud the Government's promise contained in paragraph 4 of His Excellency's Speech which states:

My Government is determined that forward planning is undertaken with all our water resources so as to ensure that all possible water resources available to this State are harnessed and developed to the fullest extent possible.

I think all of us thoroughly agree with this, not that there has not been a good deal of forward planning in the water resources of this State because, of all the States of the Commonwealth, we are the most fortunate in that we have always had forward planning for water. I believe we have done a remarkable job in supplying water from the very limited supplies available to us. However, we can never let up in a State as dry as this in harnessing the available water resources.

Having had the opportunity fairly recently of seeing what another country is doing in the way of water conservation, I believe that we have a long way to go before we really settle down to full utilization of our water supplies. I refer to Israel, which has done a fantastic job in harnessing its water resources, taking its water from the Jordan and from the

Sea of Galilee and even from the Dead Sea, water which at one time would have been considered completely useless for agriculture.

Every well and every soak has been taken into a complete water scheme in Israel, and the whole system of the country is integrated in the same way that we integrate our electricity supply. In consequence, Israel is able to utilize water of a very high salinity with water that is pure, and in so doing it is able to utilize every drop of water, including waste water. This latter problem is staring us in the face at the moment at Bolivar and at other places not only in the metropolitan area but also in other large towns in this State.

The use of waste water in Israel has not yet been put fully to the advantage that it will be, but a tremendous amount of experimental work has been done there. The authorities there have gone to extreme lengths to get legislation passed in Parliament on what can be used and on what it is to be used. I think one of the things that we in South Australia would be interested in is that the legislation in Israel comes under the Ministry of Health. Under the legislation affecting the proper operation of shops and industrial establishments, the Minister of Health is able to deal with this question of effluent water. It has published a regulation entitled *The special requirements for agricultural use of waste water*, 1965, and it defines various things including "spray irrigation", "irrigation", "secondary facilities", "effluent" and "waste water", and it lays down very clearly how this particular water can be used. It sets out that the water can be used on bananas, citrus, datepalms, egg plant, flowers, melons (including water melons), olive trees, potatoes, shade trees, and squash.

This is very interesting from our point of view, because during my term as Minister of Agriculture the Munno Para council approached the Government and asked whether it could experiment with certain water from the Bolivar scheme. Under an arrangement between the Minister of Works, the Minister of Health and the Minister of Agriculture this permission was granted, and the council has done some very interesting work. I pay the highest compliment to that council for trying, first, to provide its ratepayers with a more assured water supply. As all honourable members will know, at the moment they are facing great difficulty with the lowering of the water basin in that area. I pay a compliment to it, too, for its ingenuity in getting its ratepayers to co-operate fully with it in its experiments.

I have read the first report of the committee of that district which has been co-operating with the Government departments. I know that there is a certain amount of apprehension in the minds of some people that not sufficient work is being done. However, when one considers that the first report in Israel was made in 1963 and that the first report in America on this subject was made in 1955 and they still have not cleared effluent water for use on everything, then perhaps it is worth saying that we have to prove a little more than we have at present just exactly on what we can use this water.

There is no doubt in my mind that the water from Bolivar, with its present salinity content, is capable of growing any crops on which experiments have been conducted. The result is excellent. The only problem we have is whether or not it will pass the health regulations. I am pleased that the Government is continuing, as promised, the work of saying what use can be made of Bolivar effluent water.

At the present rate of discharge certain weed growths are occurring in that area and I am not sure whether marine life will not be affected considerably if that water is just allowed to flow out in its present condition. When the Bolivar scheme was installed we were given to understand that this was just about the best thing that could be done for the effluent water, that the purification was as good as we could get anywhere. I hope that everything that can be done is being done to ensure that we can use this water which, at the rate of about 450 gallons a person a day, is a considerable storage of water that we cannot afford to let go to the sea. I am pleased that that was mentioned in His Excellency's Speech.

Coupled with that, no doubt, are the other water resources in the South-East that the previous Government was working on. I note, too, that paragraph 4 states:

Negotiations are proceeding with the Commonwealth, New South Wales and Victoria concerning a revision of the River Murray Waters Agreement.

I hope they are proceeding, because we are wasting much time if they are not. I do not know how much longer it will take before a definite "No" is given to the Government. If the Government renegotiates the agreement, as it has suggested it will do, and that takes some time, we are only losing more and more time, and more and more decent water is running into the sea.

It has been mentioned that the election was precipitated by the House of Assembly's rejection of the previous Government's Bill to ratify the agreement between the States and the Commonwealth. Much has been said about the fact that this agreement can be renegotiated. Some people have talked about a two-dam scheme. I am not sure where the Government stands at the moment in this matter, because it shifts its ground. From the debates and the press releases prior to the election, one would have thought that Government members were solid Chowilla people.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Which election are you talking about now?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: This was the election that brought three of your colleagues on to the front bench here.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: The Liberal and Country League Government spoke about Chowilla before the 1968 election. I did not know whether you were confusing it with the previous election; it is the same issue.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I am very clear on this matter because—

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: It brought your Government down.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: —I had the opportunity at the first meeting of the new Cabinet when it took over of having the benefit of the advice of Mr. Beaney—

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: So you promptly dropped your election promise.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: —who disclosed to Cabinet the true situation, a situation that was never discussed by the Labor Party during the election campaign. But, to get on with my yarn (and the honourable member can stick to his), I understood that the Labor Party's policy was to go solidly for Chowilla.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: It has gone quiet about that.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I suppose the fellow playing two-up at Broken Hill would say, "If you don't slew you'll blue." The Government is going on with a half-baked, two-dam scheme. Now the election is over and the Labor Party has won the front benches, I think the time has come for it to come out clearly and decide what is going to happen. It cannot act any more; it has to acknowledge facts and get on with the job. Many people in South Australia are interested in this matter—some whose livings are involved, some who are interested academically. Also, the Parliament of South Australia is extremely interested

because it has some obligation to the people to see that South Australia gets some water storage that will benefit it in the very near future. We considered that obtaining a 37 per cent increase in the volume of water coming our way and having a river that continued to flow all the time and thereby flushed itself constituted a fairly good deal for this State. Apparently, the Labor Party does not agree with that—it may now but it did not at that time. We shall be interested to see the Premier go to the other Premiers, have a conference and come back waving a flag.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: There was some mention of Sir Henry Bolte roaring like a lion but acting like a lamb.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I did not say what sort of flag he would be waving but, if it had not been for Sir Henry Bolte in the first place, maybe the Chowilla project would have been continued. However, Sir Henry Bolte has probably brought to us (or certainly his irrigators have brought to us) something that I do not think our engineers or anybody else visualized at the time—that we would have a flow of 900 cusecs past Mildura, which is the best guarantee, better than anything that anyone can put through Parliament, because 900 cusecs past a given point just on our own border is not a bad sort of water flow, at the very worst.

I am interested in paragraph 6 of His Excellency's Speech, which deals with amendments to the Industries Development Act. It states:

Amendments to the Industries Development Act will be placed before you to provide that in appropriate cases on the recommendation of the Industries Development Committee the Government may directly or in concert with other interests purchase an equitable share in industries seeking establishment or expansion in this State.

The Minister of Agriculture cited the case of an Italian firm that had come out here and won a contract to build the pipeline from Gidgealpa to Adelaide. This is being held up as something very wonderful, but there is nothing new in this.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: I did not say there was.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: It sounded like something marvellous. If the Minister had thrown his mind back a little and had looked at what had happened to Cellulose Australia Limited, in respect of which the Government came to the party—

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: It was an Australian firm.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes. It was a direct Government effort, but that was a South Australian firm that was helped over its difficulties. We eventually got our money out of it, which some may say we were fortunate to do, but I would be a little wary about this, having had a good look into previous industrial exploits in the State because at the moment we have all the power we require in our industries development legislation to guarantee industries in any difficulty. I do not see why we should tie up Government money in industries when it can be utilized in various other ways.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: There is no suggestion that this would be done all the time.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I hope that it would not be done all the time, because it is sometimes difficult to get money out. One buys into one of these businesses either because the firm cannot get accommodation anywhere else or because there is something fairly difficult about it. Perhaps the business is one that the Government may favour but no lending institution may favour. The lender cannot liquidate the debt when he wants to and, consequently, he may tie up his money for many years. On the other hand, under the guarantee system, the Government may be hit occasionally when a business fails but it is not becoming part and parcel of the business. When it invests in such businesses, the Government accepts much of the responsibility for their management. The guarantee system is a much better way of assisting industry than the way proposed by the Government. I do not think, however, that the "hostile" Legislative Council will hold up that type of legislation if it is brought before it. It may be necessary for the Government to get into trouble before the people will see what is involved in Socialism.

Much attention is given to education in His Excellency's Speech. The Government says that it will demand additional grants from the Commonwealth Government so that South Australian schools will have better conditions. The Government has stated its proposals in connection with swimming pools, assembly halls and canteen shells (which have been provided for three or four years, but apparently the subsidies will be increased). The Government, however, has not said anything about agricultural education. A press release by the Government states that the Roseworthy Agricultural College will receive \$900,000. There

is nothing new in this plan, because it was agreed to during the previous Government's term of office, when the college became a college of advanced education. Roseworthy Agricultural College has been set up for a specific purpose—as a college of advanced education. However, what I am much more interested in at present is the intermediate type of agricultural education.

In 1947 Israel, whose population is now only 2,500,000, had an influx of more than 1,000,000 people, practically all of whom had no agricultural knowledge. The first thing Israel had to do was to feed these immigrants. That country set up a wonderful system of adult education in agriculture, which the Government should closely examine. The Israeli Government runs courses that last from one week to three months. Many people have to be taught elementary mathematics before they can be taught anything else. Israel had to feed its population for a start, but it is now becoming highly industrialized. Before the young people commence army service at 18 years of age they receive a very good grounding in agricultural education, which any Government should closely examine.

When the Minister receives the committee's report, I hope that something along these lines will be proposed and that there will be no procrastination in implementing the recommendations that the Government thinks it should go ahead with. At present only about 2 per cent of agricultural workers have reached the intermediate certificate standard.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: In South Australia?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: That percentage is Australia-wide. In respect of the advanced type of education, the percentage is nothing like that. Last year for the first time more than 50 per cent of the students entering Roseworthy Agricultural College contemplated returning to farming. For many years only about one-third of the total number of students entering the college were destined for the land directly. That proportion, of course, is very low by standards in other countries, particularly America, where everyone either goes to a junior or senior high school or goes to a college and obtains a degree. Paragraph 21 of His Excellency's Speech states:

My Government has already made planning regulations aimed at lessening the risk of pollution of the Murray River and water catchment areas. The work of the Committee on Environment is proceeding, and legislation will be introduced to amend the Planning and Development Act to provide administrative control of various forms of pollution.

At present it seems to be the done thing to exaggerate as much as possible to get a message across. In television advertisements we see the dirtiest old floor, but one sweep with a mop that has been soaked in some detergent results in the floor's coming up like new. Everything has to be exaggerated for it to be believed, and pollution is one such matter. In the last six or eight months I have read statements made by university professors at seminars that have horrified me. It is all right to point out something to awaken people, but it also alarms them and they begin to believe that they will all die of some shocking disease unless immediate action is taken—and the immediate action normally is that Governments become panicky and put on the hand-brake without nearly enough research and investigation. Consequently, many people are hurt in the process.

If we put into the Murray River all the effluent that is disposed of it would not hurt anyone for a long time, because of the volume of water there. I do not suggest that we do this, but this is the type of thing that is exaggerated. Regarding the catchment areas of the Adelaide Hills, it has been suggested that people's normal activities be restricted. In connection with dairies, people are panicking in connection with what will happen in the area. I do not think we should do that sort of thing without some proper means of investigation and, if necessary, compensation, because people's livelihoods are involved. If people want everything very clean and hygienic they must pay for it. You cannot just tell people who have been established in an area for 50, 60 or 100 years that some practice must suddenly stop, without the whole of the community making some contribution towards it. This is what happens when we put too much power in one single Act, for then we have to amend the Act; a practice cannot be stopped sometimes because it would be unpopular to stop it.

I have seen pollution in a very serious form as a result of manufacturers' wastes from chemicals such as mercury being released when whole streams and lakes have become polluted. This is the vicious and villainous pollution that we must worry about. I think the Minister of Agriculture has been to America and no doubt knows that in certain areas there has been a reduction of anything up to one-third of the production from tree fruits and vines simply because the atmosphere was so polluted that it formed a smog that

cut down the amount of light each day by some hours. As a consequence, during the second period of these fruits there was insufficient sunlight. This is a very bad form of pollution and this is why I am pleased that an environmental committee has been established to investigate this problem. When the committee's report is brought down we should attack it in a sensible way, and not say "Stop everything" because there is a panic. As far as Australia is concerned, in the main waterways and in our main cities our pollution problem is nothing like that which exists in certain overseas countries.

However, I believe we should take the necessary action at this time but not be as stringent as we have been in the Adelaide Hills in the catchment areas there. The suggestions put forward are to many small people very frightening when they cannot subdivide a property that they might have held for a considerable time, except in 20-acre lots; this represents a financial hardship on such people. The same amount of money invested in Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited shares or something of the kind back in those earlier days would have made such a family very wealthy today. Now, all it has left is about 100 acres that it cannot sell off and, with the situation of primary industry today as a result of land tax and other taxes, some people are being virtually forced out of these areas.

Regarding the new wheat quotas committee which the Minister of Agriculture announced at the United Farmers and Graziers conference only a few days ago, I have nothing but praise for the fact that there is to be an investigation into the wheat quota system. No one knows better than I that this problem landed at the feet of State and Commonwealth Ministers in March of one year and that a formula had to be announced before sowing the following May: this did not allow much time to formulate any policy, but I believe that the present committee has done a very good job. There were many difficulties, one of which was brought about by an amendment to the proposed legislation in another place. We must maintain the objective of wheat quotas: to bring within due bounds the amount of wheat produced in Australia. In some quarters everyone seems to be setting out to defeat the objective of what the wheat industry itself has imposed, namely, a restriction on the amount of wheat to be produced. The wheat quota system cannot and must not be used as a means of highlighting an individual

farmer's problems and it cannot get farmers out of trouble by giving them additional wheat. This is something that must be faced up to by Governments on an entirely different plane.

Regarding the overall situation in the farming community, many people were heading for difficulties, and some where in difficulties even before the quota system was introduced. I do not believe the Minister requires the committee, and I do not believe that the public expects the committee, to be the one body or means to straighten out wheat farmers' individual financial problems. Someone must give wheat from his quota for another farmer to get a larger quota. Already 10 per cent of wheat has been taken from each farmer throughout the State to form the first pool, and I think that about 500,000 bushels of that wheat went into the Murray Mallee quotas. There are areas on the West Coast that have developmental problems, and the committee must look after them, too. What will happen if we continue to allow more and more farmers larger quotas is that we will reduce the quotas of farmers with viable holdings. We must find some other means of getting farmers now in difficulties into a better financial situation but we must not chip away too much from the people who have established their quotas over long periods, who have paid much for their land, and who have to pay their full dues and taxes. I think the Minister of Agriculture understands what I mean. The amendment which was inserted in another place and which the appeals committee has had to consider is not a good one, and I hope that the Minister will introduce amendments to the Act in order to straighten out one or two of these matters.

Paragraph 28 of His Excellency's Speech states:

An inquiry by the Director of Lands into the working of the Citrus Organization Committee with a view to reorganizing the activities of that committee is proceeding.

The committee was established as a result of an investigation instigated by the then Minister of Lands (Mr. Quirke) and legislation was introduced later by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Bywaters) and passed by Parliament. From the beginning, there have been problems, personality clashes, and people who did not want to be part of the system at any time; but, when one sees how citrus is distributed in other countries, I think that the basis for the organization committee is very good. Our legislation is almost identical to the legislation in two other countries, the only differences being that in those countries they believe, on

the one hand, that it is the best method of distribution and they stick fairly closely to it, and on the other hand they do not have in their constitutions anything like our section 92, which is what has bugged this whole organization.

As a citrus producing State, we are very small fry indeed. At present we have less than 60,000 tons of fruit of the two main varieties to dispose of, out of a total for the whole of Australia of between 300,000 and 320,000 tons. One-quarter of that may be offered at some time for export. Therefore, we are down very low in standards when one looks at the United States of America, which has about 8,000,000 tons, and at Israel, which has about 1,200,000 tons of fruit to dispose of. However, it is very important indeed to the people engaged in the citrus industry that they receive a reasonable price. I do not suppose that anything is more disorganized than the citrus industry, both in this State and in the other States, at the present time. The markets are heavily glutted, and citrus is being sold too cheaply compared to the cost of production. I believe that the middleman is getting too much out of what is actually being received. Also, there is no co-ordination to any degree that is worth while.

I am sure that the industry will go through worse times than it is experiencing at present, because production is still increasing, and unless something can be done by the South Australian group to get themselves back into an orderly marketing set-up this group, too, will be in grave danger. The South Australian citrus grower has a very great advantage over growers in other parts of Australia because he is fruit-fly free and can export to New Zealand and to Singapore. It is quite likely that there will be another outbreak at Mildura and in New South Wales, and if that happens South Australia will take over practically the whole of the export responsibility.

If the Commonwealth Government really wants to do something for the citrus industry it should try very hard to get at least South Australian fruit into Japan. At present there is a restriction on Australian fruit entering Japan because of the fruit fly here. As one State we cannot do anything, but if the Commonwealth Government, through its Trade Commissioners in Japan, really continued to peg away at this, I believe we could get somewhere, because Japan is a very good potential market. The people of Japan like citrus, which at present is imported from California.

We have broken into Japan with other commodities, but never without a terrific fight, and it takes a long time. However, I think the Australian Citrus Foundation and the Commonwealth Government should do everything in their power to try to develop that market, because I am firmly of the opinion that sending fruit in dribs and drabs, as we do, to the United Kingdom and trying to pick off a market in Europe every so often will bring us nothing but calamity.

At present we have fruit standing on the wharves in Melbourne because of an industrial dispute. It really intrigued me to find the other day a very gallant band of gentlemen marching down the street with the farmers and putting out a yellow pamphlet exhorting the farmers to "support us, and we will support you boys". At the same time, we have an industrial dispute regarding containers, which were developed specifically for primary industry. We have a dispute, yet we have fruit standing beside the wharf which somebody in some market is expecting, and no-one knows when the boys will decide when they have had enough and go back to work. We also have fruit in London in the same plight, because there is a dispute there with the waterside workers and the dockers, and that fruit will have to be diverted to Europe. Whether or not the fruit will actually be taken off in Holland is anybody's guess.

Last year we went very well indeed in the Singapore market until, through very bad management in shipping (the last ship took six weeks to get to Singapore) the out-turn of fruit was absolutely awful, and this left a nasty taste with the agents and merchants in Singapore. This is the sort of thing we do consistently. I saw no better fruit anywhere in the world than the fruit produced in this State, but the whole key-note then was on market service and market management, and somehow or other things were managed very much better than we seem to be able to manage them. I would say that if anyone has any influence at all with the industrial movement in this State he should use it to get the fresh fruit dispatched quickly in containers to where it belongs and thus get a few bob back into the hands of the producers.

I think it was in April, 1967, that the first decision was taken to make prawning a commercial industry in South Australia, and in the time that has elapsed since then we have gone from taking a few hundred pounds of prawns a year from Spencer Gulf and St. Vincent

Gulf to a figure that the department estimates as being about 2,000,000 lb. a year, although it is not known exactly what the figure is. With the assistance of some people who buy prawns, I have been able to estimate that over 3,000,000 lb. of prawn has been taken out of these gulfs in the last 12 months. This is a restricted fishery, and certain people have been licensed to take prawns in this area. In fact, some people are taking very large quantities of prawns. Some of the boats operating have taken well over 200,000 lb. of prawns at 50c a lb. at least, which is not a bad bit of income.

I believe we have gone a long way towards proving that there was an industry there big enough to support some more of the depressed people operating in the crayfishing industry and, in some instances, in the tuna industry, and I recommended that 12 more boats should go into the area. I thought that there were at least 20 people prepared to go into the area and that we could have got 12 suitable people to do the job. However, I understand from replies to questions I have asked the Minister that there may be a balloting system, or something like that. The balloting system is all right provided we use it from the beginning, but many people get into the industry because they happen to have the necessary gear. I do not quite know how it all originated but there are people in the crayfishing industry needing relief. The more boats we can get out into profitable fishing grounds, the better.

The fairest way to do this would be to go back through the records and find out when the various people lodged their applications, because some of them have been waiting for a very long time. They cannot make their plans for the future. There are factories that are not being supplied at present; two factories are not working at all. Those people who were given licences early in the piece broke away from their existing co-operative, in which the Government has a great deal of money invested, and formed a new co-operative of their own. They have a closed circle for the whole prawning industry. There are factories that have cost much money to establish and they cannot get supplies of prawns at the moment, except from the Gulf of Carpentaria or the few people who are outside the ring. The Minister should look at this problem, because we cannot set up industries for processing fish and not continue to supply them with fish. I am not suggesting that they should be supplied at one-quarter the cost or anything like that, but there is an opportunity

there for everybody in the processing business to have a share in the prawns. The fishermen themselves will have three or four buyers in the field, which is always a good thing in any industry, but at present I do not think the factories are working to anything like full capacity, and those people with licences are getting the cream as well on the processing and selling side.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: How do we stop those people from forming their own co-operative?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I am not asking people to stop forming their own co-operative. They had a big obligation to the one in existence, and that is one of the frailties of the Act. It has been covered in the new co-operative because it borrowed its money from the State Bank and both sides are subject to a joint agreement so that they cannot welsh on each other without buying themselves out. That has always been one of the frailties of the set-up under the Industrial and Provident Societies Act. They got out from under that so quickly that it did not matter.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: It does matter; that is the point.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I said they got out from under so quickly that it did not matter; I did not say it did not matter. More boats should be put into the industry and we should let the other boats continue because, in the long run, we must have competition in this industry. Otherwise, the price will drop to something that is not even equitable.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: What about the size of the co-operative?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I think the co-operative has made sure that it is a limited co-operative, not one easy to get into. I am giving the Minister some sound advice this afternoon. If he follows it, I shall be grateful to him. Paragraph 34 of His Excellency's Speech deals with one vote one value. Incidentally, after reading the speech I am left wondering why several paragraphs were put in; perhaps they were a bit of window-dressing or put there for the purpose of making things a little more difficult for the Legislative Council.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: There is no ulterior motive whatsoever.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Paragraph 34 reads:

My Government proposes, as part of the reform of the Legislative Council, adult suffrage and compulsory voting for Legislative

Council elections and a redistribution of the electoral districts of the Legislative Council to provide, as far as practicable, for one vote one value.

We have had one redistribution recently, in another place.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: And that was long overdue.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: That had the desired effect of weakening considerably the country representation. It has dawned on the people in the country that they do not have so many members of Parliament, that they do not have the representation they used to have. As a matter of fact, we could form a Government, without any trouble, of members within 10 miles of the General Post Office, with the present distribution. The country people are just waking up to that. We see that the Legislative Council is to provide "as far as practicable, for one vote one value". Government members have set out in the last five or six years to brainwash the people of South Australia in this business of one vote one value. It has been pointed out so many times to the people of this State and the people of Australia—

The Hon. T. M. Casey: It is part of the Commonwealth Constitution.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: —that this is a myth.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: No; it is written into the Commonwealth Constitution.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Where is that?

The Hon. T. M. Casey: You read it.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: But where?

The Hon. T. M. Casey: It states that, when there is a redistribution under the Commonwealth Constitution, it must be as close as possible to one vote one value.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: If the Minister knew a little more about the Commonwealth Constitution, he could speak with more accuracy.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: In no country except those without free elections is there one vote one value—it is as simple as that. In the rest of the Commonwealth the only place where we have equality of representation is the Senate, because the founders of our nation believed that the Upper House, in the form of the Senate, was to give the States equality. This is the only Upper House that I know of that has rigidly stuck over the years to the principles set up. If the Minister reads the early history of the State and why the

franchise for the Legislative Council is as it is, I think he will be much wiser about the whole thing. Over 80 per cent of the people are able to vote at the Legislative Council elections if they have enrolled and if they come out to vote. That is how the Legislative Council is elected. It is a balancing House.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: In what year was it set up?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: In 1857.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: That is 113 years ago!

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Quite. Many things that were set up in 1857 served very well until they were dickered with. The only problem is that, because it does not suit some people at present, they will take any action possible to modernize everything. The previous Labor Government was served very well by the Legislative Council; indeed, if it had not been for the Council's taking a fairly strong line at times, that Government would have got into tremendous trouble. So, the Government ought to get down on its hands and knees and thank the Legislative Council for preventing it from getting into troubles that might have been forced on it by its industrial movement. The Labor Party would have been in grave trouble at the polls if, during the term of the previous Labor Government, there had been a Legislative Council that was a rubber stamp and oriented to the Labor Party's political philosophy. It has happened before and it will happen again: the old whipping post is very handy. I can guarantee that the Government's legislation will receive the same type of treatment as it has received in the past. Paragraph 45 of His Excellency's Speech states:

Legislation will be introduced to remove anomalies in the law relating to receipt duty and gift duty and to alter the incidence of succession duty to give remissions to a spouse inheriting a house, to the inheritors of small estates and primary producing property. Other special remissions will be removed, successions will be aggregated and rates on larger successions will be increased. In order to grant some relief in the rural sector of our economy, the Government will introduce legislation to increase exemptions on land tax for primary producing property.

If the Government got rid of land tax on primary producing properties, half the problem would be over: it would be unnecessary to worry about exemptions for certain properties. Two or three years ago a succession duties Bill had exactly the same wording as the wording in the paragraph I have quoted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: It was almost identical.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: No.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The same sort of thing was trotted out before but, when it reached this Council as a Bill, it was not a bit like that. It provided that everything was to be aggregated: there is no doubt about that. Property in joint names did not mean a thing any more. We were told that people with \$50,000 were in the top bracket of wealth. At the meeting held after the farmers' march the Premier said that this sum would be increased to \$200,000. However, he has still said that he will hit the higher types of succession. I do not know how many of these higher types are encountered in a year.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: There are 150 successions a year that are over \$40,000.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I do not know whether the Government will be philanthropic and throw away the \$7,000,000 or \$8,000,000 that it receives in succession duties to bring this sort of thing about or whether it is just another glib-tongued election promise that trickles off so beautifully and looks so impressive on television. I sincerely hope that the rural community, together with others, will very closely watch their interests, because, having been caught once with this kind of pleasant wording, I am not too sure that this is not just a rehash of the previous measure. Primary producers will not have a chance to survive if the Government decides to take its pound of flesh at present. Much emotion is associated with the primary industry now: for the first time in their working lives many people are experiencing a very tight squeeze. If the Government really wants to do something worthwhile, it should get rid of land tax altogether and not try to introduce another Bill like the one that was previously introduced. I support the motion.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES (Northern): I, too, support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to the Speech of His Excellency the Governor's Deputy in opening the Fortieth Parliament. I join with other honourable members in the comments and compliments that have been paid not only to the Governor's Deputy himself for his services to the State over a great many years but also in regard to the health and good fortune of the Governor. May he recover from his illness as soon as possible so that he can resume the active role he played in the interests of South Australia before sickness overtook him. I join,

too, in the congratulations to the Government on its exceptionally clear-cut win at the last election. I congratulate the new Ministry, particularly the Ministers in this Council. May their jobs not be too onerous and may they at the same time be able to temper justice with mercy as often as possible.

The Hon. Mr. Casey, as we all know, has stepped into the shoes of the Hon. Mr. Bevan. I tender my best wishes to the Hon. Mr. Casey for success in his role as Minister of Agriculture in this State. We all miss the Hon. Stan Bevan for his dry humour, and more particularly for his ability to understand the Bills being debated in the Council and to show the Council that he had done his homework. Last, but not least, I mention the good work the former Government did, particularly the work done by the Chief Secretary, the Minister of Agriculture, and the Minister of Local Government in this Chamber, work well done and for which I wish to express my appreciation. My desk calendar the other day stated that it is not by shirking difficulties that we can remove them or escape them. The Labor Party with its comfortable majority can lead the Government in South Australia for many years provided that it is realistic in its approach not only to the approximate 50 per cent of the voters who supported it but also in its approach to the minority groups of people who were eligible to vote at the election. But should the Government shirk its responsibilities and be foolish enough to neglect the minority groups, it must be prepared to answer for its folly in due course; not only for neglecting minority groups, but also for neglecting the welfare of the State as a whole.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Is that what happened to your Government?

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I saw little evidence of neglect by the previous Government. It did a good job in extremely difficult circumstances from a political point of view. It had an excellent brand of generous consciousness.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: What is a "generous consciousness"?

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Looking to the best interests of all concerned. The Legislative Council has always done its best to protect the interests of minority groups. In the six short years that I have been privileged to be a member of the Council this has been evident to me, and I hope and pray that this principle will always apply. The characteristic of the Legislative Council trying to assist

minority groups in all sections of the community is one important attribute that is not understood by many people outside Parliament, and I feel that it is not understood by many members of the Australian Labor Party. By the principles that were laid down by our forebears in this Council and by endeavouring to protect minority groups, it can be said that the Legislative Council has played an extremely important part in the re-election of the Australian Labor Party at the 1970 elections. I believe that the public in all walks of life, whether rich or poor, would have an entirely different opinion of Socialism if, in the 1965-68 Walsh-Dunstan Government, the succession duties Bill had been passed by this Council. It would have meant an increase in duties of between 38 per cent and 60 per cent over the whole of South Australia, with all the aggregation problems involved. Again, if the A.L.P. in 1965-68 had been allowed to pass its road-rail co-ordination Bill, this would have left a far different taste in the mouths of the electors because of the restrictive nature of the legislation, and the same would have applied if the 1965 Land Tax Bill had been allowed to pass in this Council. Land tax values would have increased enormously and, as a result of the quinquennial assessment, to even a higher level.

The blame from the Liberal Party point of view can be attached to this Council by allowing the people of South Australia not to appreciate fully the extent of Socialism envisaged in the legislation of the 1965-68 Government. The Government can be assured of a long term in power if it is prepared to legislate for the good of South Australia, to be reasonable in its outlook, and to protect and remember the minority groups. The irony of the whole thing is that from press statements and the Government's policy speech it is evident that the A.L.P. is hell bent on abolishing the Legislative Council, the very hand that looked after it.

I have followed with interest the to-and-fro exchanges in the press between the Leader of the Opposition in the Council (Hon. Mr. DeGaris), the Premier in another place, and the press itself in editorials on what the role of the majority of the Liberal Party in this Council should be as regards Labor Party legislation. My mind went back to a quotation made by Mr. Churchill, as he then was, when he was being urged to state specifically what Britain's war policy would be during the Second World War. He said, "If you try to set forth in a catalogue what will be the exact

settlement of affairs, you will find that at the moment you leave the area of pious platitudes you will descend into the area of heated controversy." I suppose another way of saying that is, "Don't shoot until you see the whites of their eyes." I intend to review the legislation as it is introduced in this Council and to be critical or praiseworthy of it on its merits when I see the small print and the implications and complications it may have.

I, too, like other honourable members have been most interested in the suggestion that there will be one vote one value elections with a rearrangement of boundaries for this illustrious Council. It is important to realize that the population of South Australia averages about three people to the square mile; in the closely settled areas the population is about 16 to the square mile. This shows the difficulties of South Australia because of its geographical make-up, rainfall and agricultural set-up, but when one realizes that about three people to the square mile will be privileged to vote for this Council, as a result of the one vote one value proposal, it seems a little unnecessary to adopt it. In 1965, when Sir Thomas Playford was Premier and campaigning for his last election, he travelled the length and breadth of the State and told the people that, as a result of the increase in secondary industry and by maintaining a tight rein on the economic pulse and by his firmness in handling the Treasury, he had been able to advise the Commonwealth Government some time before 1965 that there was no further need for South Australia to seek assistance from the Commonwealth Grants Commission. As he used to say during the 1965 election campaign, we are no longer a mendicant State; we are able to spend our money as we see fit and as we feel it wise to spend it, and we are able to introduce taxation laws in South Australia as we need them.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: He had the numbers in the Legislative Council.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: He also had a State that was economically viable. He left the Treasury in 1965 with a surplus of \$1,200,000. It is rather interesting to note that the Hall Government in 1970 left a surplus in the Treasury of about \$2,900,000. Since the election, the Australian Labor Party has received an additional 12.9 per cent, or \$16,000,000, from the Commonwealth, yet now the State Treasury has said, in effect, that it is unable to balance the economy, despite this extra \$18,900,000 that the Government has received. This is far in excess of what our

predecessors actually governed on. The present Government has made this excuse—I do not know whether it is a genuine one or not—that there is not enough money in the extra \$16,000,000. Perhaps it is merely an attempt to embarrass the Commonwealth Government. The present Government is saying that it is prepared to go back to the Grants Commission, which will virtually tie up the State and its economy.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It doesn't do that.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: If the Chief Secretary thinks that once the Commonwealth Government gets a bit more control it does not put a few suggestions to the State and pull the strings attached to the grants, I am greatly surprised.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It did that during the last few years when we were not a mendicant State; it told us what to do.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: It is going to tell us even more so now.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: What about your receipts tax; where do you think that originated?

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I say that the Government must cut its coat according to its cloth and adapt itself to changing circumstances. Industry, to match its competitor, must cut its costs. Mr. and Mrs. Everybody, whether they be farmer, worker, pensioner or investor, have to budget their expenditure to their income. I agree with the Chief Secretary that the Commonwealth Government does impose additional burdens on a State Treasury.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: There is no question about that.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I consider that there is still much more to be done to try to overcome this problem. We have our own internal revenue and we are getting additional moneys, so I say it is regrettable that we are evidently going back to the Grants Commission. To me it is an admission of failure and a shirking of responsibility.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: When a Prime Minister is biased against us we are left with no alternative.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: That is a matter of opinion.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: No, it is a matter of fact, and it will be proved. He would not give us \$3,000,000 we should have got, but you wait and see what we get.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: You got over \$16,000,000.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: We had \$2,900,000 in the Treasury when the present Government took office, and it has had an additional \$16,000,000, making a total of \$18,900,000 in excess of what was available last year.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It is still not enough.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: It never will be enough, and that is why I say the Government should adapt itself to the changing circumstances. I repeat that it is an admission of failure and a shirking of responsibility that within weeks of accepting office this Government goes cap in hand to the Commonwealth Government and says that it will not be able to balance its Budget and that it wants more help.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: We have to do something.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I wonder how much more it will spend on school buildings than the previous Government did?

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Yes. How much more will it spend on hospitals and on roads?

The Hon. A. J. Shard: We want all the money we can get, and we will do everything we can to get it.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I now turn to the problems of the citrus industry. I ask the Minister to stress to his Cabinet that there are urgent problems concerning the marketing of citrus. I would appreciate it if he would ask Cabinet to mark as urgent the report that the Director of Lands (Mr. Dunsford) has been commissioned to make in relation to the problems of the Citrus Organization Committee. In the irrigated areas of the State there is a near-record harvest, and for some classes of their products the growers are receiving as little as 6c a case when their minimum marketing cost is \$1.20 a case, added to which is a 10 per cent commission charge plus the cost of water and fertilizer and the cost of living for the 12 months. We are buying oranges in Adelaide for 4c each, and it is extremely difficult to get a first-class orange in this city. It seems to me that the Citrus Organization Committee, which was set up by the A.L.P. and for which I voted, has become too bureaucratic and too dyed in the wool in trying to steer oranges down set lines of supply from the grower to the wholesaler without any spur lines.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: There is an inquiry going on.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Yes, and I have asked the Government to treat this inquiry as urgent, because it is important. I think it is a most serious problem. Marketing must always be flexible, and the marketing of agricultural products must be even more flexible because there is no possibility in agriculture of setting down hard and fast guidelines. In secondary industry a slide rule or a micrometer can be used to work out the position at any given time, but with agricultural products things are never the same twice. For instance, there may be a glut in the market through over-production, or there may be under-production, and many other facets are involved. Surely in 1970 we can have a flexible marketing system to ensure that a product can be got quickly to the metropolitan area or, as the Hon. Mr. Story said, overseas, instead of fruit taking eight weeks to get from Adelaide to Singapore and then being rotten when it gets there. One law of economics is that of supply and demand. I say the citrus industry has the supply and Adelaide and the country have the demand. All it needs is the chain to be linked up in the middle so that the whole system can operate efficiently.

I mention the problems of the citrus industry first because those people who own trees that blossom and bear fruit are part of a great minority. Agriculture should never be mixed with politics, and *vice versa*. Agriculture is from the soil, the sun and the elements and, when it comes to the Government for help, it demands the best brains the Government can provide to sort out its difficulties. Not always do I envisage it needs monetary help, but it certainly needs guidance, leadership and support to overcome its problems as they arise. It is traditional for our country to greet farmers' complaints with a degree of scepticism, and a farmer is not a farmer if he has not something to worry about, talk about and possibly complain about. In the last year or so he has severely strained a large part of the rural sector's capacity to withstand the problems of marketing, combined with adverse seasonal conditions and price and cost squeeze difficulties. I instance the wheat problem, the wool problem and the seasonal problem, all of which lumped together have not made things at all easy. It seems probable that in this last financial year, 1969-70, there has been a drop of 25 per cent in farm income in the whole of Australia.

It would be appropriate to mention at this stage the various farm costs in relation to the gross value of farm output during the last 12

financial years, from 1958-59 to 1969-70. An average of the first three periods, 1958-59 to 1960-61, indicates that the costs, including depreciation, were equivalent to 62.6 per cent of the value of the output; but for the last three-year period, 1967-68 to 1969-70, the farm costs related to gross farm output went up to 75.6 per cent. In other words, in 1961 farming costs were equivalent to 62.6 per cent of the output of a property, but in 1970 these similar costs are equal to 75.6 per cent, a rise of 13 per cent. I hope my colleagues in Government in this Chamber will appreciate that not only must they nurse the hand that elects them but also they must pause and help the hand that feeds them.

I turn now to a topic that is debated in the press—road accidents and who is responsible for them. Whether or not the Government is doing its job is not a point I wish to debate now, but it is interesting to make some comparisons of what an accident means. For centuries, the word "accident" was regarded as suitably defined by what happened—that is, the occurrence of an unforeseen and unforeseeable event that had unfortunate consequences. Accidents, therefore, had no causes—at least, none under earthly control; they just happened. This resignation to the forces of fate characterized approaches to plagues and epidemics of past centuries. The prevention and eradication of contagious disease came with the development of scientific thought. Accidental injury, nowadays, remains the last mass disease of the developed world to be subjected to thoroughly unscientific countermeasures.

If a child is hit by a car (an unforeseen and undesirable event) this is called an accident, but if the same child is stricken by the poliomyelitis virus (also an unforeseen and undesirable event) this is called a disease: intense research is instigated and rational countermeasures are evolved on a logical basis to control the disease not only in that child but also in the community. So we are faced with the difficult problem of how to control an accident. Whether or not we are in Opposition, it is for all of us to lend as much weight as we can to solving this pertinent problem.

In 1968, 3,300 people were killed in 58,000 road accidents in Australia. Of those 3,300 people killed, half were under 30 years of age. This high rate of involvement of young people, and especially of young men, in fatal road

accidents is one of the factors that make the highway crash problem one of the most challenging fields for research in the present age. People have died in transport accidents from time immemorial; even before the evolution of the motor car people died from transport accidents, but the motor car is so selective. The death rate for young males in accidents, mostly road accidents, has risen sharply in the last 50 years. If causes of death are compared on the basis of male-life years lost, deaths from motor vehicle traffic accidents and deaths from degenerate heart disease run neck and neck as the leaders, followed a long way behind by the cancers. Half of all male deaths around the age of 20 years are the result of road crashes.

Where do we go from here? It needs money, research and education. I conclude my remarks in this debate with some words that Sir Mellis Napier used at the unveiling of a plaque put up by some citizens of Adelaide recently. Sir Mellis said:

The hope of a better time to come and of a bright new dawning of which young people dreamed and prayed . . . I trust that when that time dawns they will distinguish reality from dreams, that they will distinguish licence from liberty, and that they will not tear down things that serve a useful purpose without thinking what they can replace them with.

I support the motion.

The Hon. L. R. HART (Midland): I wish to speak only briefly in this debate. I join with other honourable members in expressing regret that His Excellency the Governor was prevented from opening Parliament because of indifferent health. I, too, hope he has a speedy recovery. I also express appreciation of Sir Mellis Napier's again opening our Parliament. He could well be described as one of South Australia's greatest sons. I must admit that the Hon. Mr. Geddes stole my thunder when he quoted from Sir Mellis Napier's speech, because I had planned to make a similar quotation. Sir Mellis, to whom South Australia owes so much, could well be quoted twice within a few minutes. The general public could well give much thought to the points he made at the unveiling of a life-size bronze bust of himself—and put those points into practice. The press report of his speech states:

Sir Mellis Napier, who will be 88 this year, reminded his audience of the Call To The Nation, a document issued 19 years ago by leaders of the churches and the Judiciary as a call to the Australian people for a restoration of moral order.

Further, he is reported as saying:

I trust that when that time dawns they will distinguish reality from dreams, that they will distinguish licence from liberty, and that they will not tear down the things that serve a useful purpose without thinking what they can replace them with.

I express my sympathy to the families of those members who passed on during the last 12 months. I congratulate the Ministers who now occupy the front benches. I congratulate the mover and the seconder of this motion, particularly the Hon. Mr. Casey, who has come from another place. I have no doubt that he will fit into the atmosphere of this Council well. He has already come to appreciate the decorum observed by honourable members. I was particularly interested in his statement that we must utilize all the water resources available in South Australia and, indeed, in the Commonwealth. I recommend the Minister to study deeply the possibilities of using some of the effluent water that is at present flowing to waste. I know that the Minister is interested in this matter, because he has made speeches on it. I am sure he could direct his good influence and his energies toward having this water usefully employed to take the place of some of the underground water that is so quickly being depleted.

The Hon. Mr. Casey referred to the committee that has been set up to investigate the effects of wheat quotas. I suggest that he should set up a committee to investigate the effects of water quotas, too. In saying that, I do not mean to be critical of the people responsible for establishing these quotas. However, perhaps the basis of the quotas did create certain anomalies, particularly for some producers in the Virginia area. After his appointment the Minister made press statements that his Party did not promise any reduction in land tax because, if it had made that kind of promise, the amount saved by the landowner would then have become assessable income. Of course, the problem today is that the people feeling the effects of land tax are mainly those who are not in the income-earning bracket. These people do not see any humour in the Minister's statement.

Land tax is a very heavy burden on some landowners. I have some figures that show the effect that land tax can have on landowners' costs; the figures refer to an 800-acre farm in the Virginia district. In 1955 its assessed value was \$42,432, its land tax was \$215.73, and council rates were \$215.89; in 1960 its assessed value had increased to

\$132,520, land tax had increased to \$919.05, and council rates had increased to \$499.79; and in 1965 its assessed value was \$208,010, land tax was \$1,408.18, and council rates were \$960. So, over five years ago the owner of this farm was paying almost \$1,500 in land tax. I suggest to the Government that any reduction in his land tax would be greatly appreciated. I assure the Government that the rates and taxes that this property incurs would probably exceed the income earned from it. Because a water main has recently been laid to the district, the landowner is paying water rates, too. Consequently, I recommend to the Government that there is a great need for a reduction in land tax.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: There are other properties in the same boat.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Yes. Further, the area in which the farm is situated is at present assessed as market garden country, but this landowner could not get a permit to sink a bore to use the country as market garden country. In addition, he cannot run livestock because of the dog menace: it is fairly closely settled country. As a result he is obliged to grow grain, and he is restricted by the wheat quotas. In South Australia in recent days we have seen something that has not happened for many years (although there was an instance back in the depression years): a rural march. We saw about 8,000 people marching down the streets of Adelaide trying to indicate not only to the State's Parliamentarians and to the Commonwealth Government but to the people of South Australia in general the desperate situation they now face. I do not think there is any question that the rural industry faces a desperate situation. The ailment is very serious, and when the ailment is serious the treatment is usually fairly distasteful.

I think we must have a very close look at how we can solve some of the problems of rural industry. I believe the people involved in these problems fall into three categories: first, the person who is perhaps able to survive under his own steam without Government assistance; second, the person who certainly does need help if he is again to become a viable producer; and third, the person who, no matter what assistance the Government gives him, is extremely unlikely to become an economic producer again. In saying this, I am not suggesting that the last-named person is not producing economically as a result of any of his own actions: he may be the

victim of a set of circumstances, his unit might be uneconomic because of the type of agriculture he is engaged in, or it may be because of the size of his property. Many people blame the size of properties for the situation some farmers are facing. This is true in some cases but not necessarily in all cases.

I think that with this particular person, rather than trying to prop him up any further and getting him further into the mire, we should look into the possibility of trying to phase him out of the industry. This is being done in the dairying industry (perhaps not successfully at present), and it is an effort to deal with uneconomic units. We must look into the whole ambit of farming to see which properties can become economically viable and which have no hope of becoming economically viable. We must also look at the reasons for producers getting into such a situation. One of the greatest obstacles facing primary producers now in trying to reduce their costs is the question of tariffs. I know that tariffs are a Commonwealth Government matter, but we should have a close look at the effects of tariffs on the costs of primary producers. The small size of a farm may be one of the reasons why it is not economic; likewise the reason why certain factories are seeking tariff protection could be their lack of size. There are a multiplicity of small firms trying to manufacture a product that allows them only a small percentage of the market.

Hitherto, perhaps, there were fewer firms manufacturing a certain commodity and there was profitability in manufacturing such an article; but as the profitability in a certain industry rose, so more industries were attracted into that field. To retain profitability it is necessary to increase prices, and once prices are increased the imported article is able to compete on the local market. We therefore get the situation where these firms go to the Tariff Board to seek an increase in the tariff.

In the past, it seems that the board has granted increases in many cases. Then we get the whole situation over again where more people manufacture the same article, a smaller percentage of the market is available to the manufacturer, and the manufacturers go to the board again and the whole process occurs over and over again. I have a booklet here published by an association of manufacturers of a piece of machinery that primary producers use. I think the same argument

advanced in this book could be advanced in support of tariff protection for many other commodities. It goes back to the whole situation I have explained where the small manufacturer does not have the benefit of economy of scale or a sufficient share of the market to make his industry viable. Therefore, we must look at the effects of these small industries on the costs of primary producers.

The other thing that affects costs to primary industry is the wage structure: every time there is an increase in wages in industry it must be borne by the primary producer, together with other people; but the trouble is that the primary producer has no way of passing on this extra cost. So we get an escalation of costs in primary industry. We see the situation where rural industry costs today are in many cases 10 times greater than they were 10 years ago and, on the same scale, we see where the primary producer's income has not increased in that period: in some cases it has decreased. At present we are seeing a new principle being sought in the application for increased wages. The new President of the Australian Council of Trade Unions (Mr. Hawke) is suggesting that the wage structure should be based on the profitability of the industry and its ability to pay increasing wages. In other words, a profitable industry should share its profits with its employees by paying increased wages to them. If that principle is correct, in the primary industry perhaps we should look into the possibility of reducing some wages. The shearing award today is at its highest peak ever; yet wool prices are probably lower than they have been

at any time in the last 20 years. So we should perhaps look at the question of whether primary industry can be expected to carry these wage increases.

There are many other matters that I could deal with in speaking to the Address in Reply debate, but the one thing that strikes me in looking at the Governor's Deputy's Speech is the lack of reference to rural industries. I feel that the whole of South Australia's economy must feel the effects of the depression in the rural industry, and it is the responsibility of all State and Commonwealth Governments to look into this question. I do not think we should merely say that we will have to subsidize primary industry. I think that subsidies are suggested because that is the easiest way to do it; but just because it is the easiest way to overcome the problem it does not necessarily mean it is the best way. I do not think there is a case for subsidizing an export industry, particularly when that industry has a surplus of its commodities. However, I ask the Government to look into the situation of the primary producer. I am sure that it will receive co-operation from both sides of this Council when it gets down to trying to solve the great problem we face at present. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.37 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, July 29, at 2.15 p.m.