

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday, July 15, 1971

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

QUESTIONS**SOLDIER SETTLEMENT**

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Can the Minister of Lands inform the Council of any developments in what is known as the zone 5 soldier settlers' case in the South-East?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Yes. Because I have known that this is a very important question, I have been endeavouring to bring it to finality for a considerable time. I spoke to the soldier settlers themselves when they, in a body, saw me earlier this year. Subsequently, I discussed with nine of their representatives the whole problem, including the unfortunate spate of publicity that has been occurring since the problem was raised. Following the last meeting with those representatives, I sent officers of my department to Canberra, where they had lengthy discussions with officers of the Commonwealth Department of Primary Industry. At that time information was put before the Commonwealth officers that, I think, had a very important bearing on the matter.

Officers of my department last week met the Commonwealth officers in Melbourne, and I have to report that very good progress was made at that meeting. As a result, some further work needs to be done. When it has been completed, proposals will be put before the Commonwealth Minister, and I shall investigate those proposals, too. Subject to the agreement of the Commonwealth Minister and myself, we should be in a position to meet with the settlers' representatives in the near future—and I mean the near future. I think the settlers now realize that I am genuinely trying to solve their problems—despite all the hullabaloo that went on.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Demonstration was not the term?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I do not know, but it was a march through Victoria Square and there was no violence on this occasion. Following my meeting with those people a vote of thanks was expressed to me and supported by most of the people present, but this incident was not reported in the newspapers. I cannot say that the newspaper was untruthful in its reporting because it said that some people supported this vote. I was con-

cerned about publicity, and recently we found that there had been further publicity about this matter in the South-East. I have appealed to the settlers to be patient. I know that some of them have waited for 18 years, but I have not been in office for that time. I hope that they are patient, but I see another splurge in a newspaper in the South-East that is attacking us, and someone of a certain political Party was asked a question down there and then indulged in some politics about this matter. This should not be a political matter: it is a matter of reaching agreement with people who have not been well treated in the past.

LAND TAX

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to the question I asked him yesterday about land tax?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: It is not possible to give a forecast of a fixed percentage by which the value of primary producing lands may have fallen in value over the 12 months to June 30, 1971. For some lands almost the whole change due to depressed rural prices may have been reflected in sales to June 30, 1970, but for others there has apparently been a considerable fall reflected since that time. What will be the change in valuation will obviously not be known with any accuracy until the revaluation already in hand has been completed.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Has the Chief Secretary an answer to the question on land tax that I asked yesterday?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: It is proposed that 1971-72 land tax on primary-producing land will be based on the 1971 assessment, which will be authorized by legislation presently being drafted.

POLDA-KIMBA MAIN

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Works.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: A case was made out by the Engineering and Water Supply Department and presented, through the Minister, to the Commonwealth Government for assistance in constructing the Polda-Kimba main. As this was presented some months ago, can the Minister indicate what progress has been made with this application?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: My colleague has discussed this matter with the Commonwealth Government and is now awaiting a reply. If

he has anything further to add to this answer I will ask him for a considered reply for the honourable member and let him have it as soon as I can.

OATS

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: On Tuesday last His Excellency the Governor referred to the possibility of the Government's setting up a board for the marketing of oats, and the Minister also referred to this matter in his speech yesterday. My question is: is it intended that this board will deal only with oats for export or does the Government intend compulsorily to acquire all oats that are for sale in this State?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The position is not quite resolved at the moment because we are liaising with the Oat Board in Victoria with a view to introducing similar legislation to that applicable in Victoria. At this stage there will be no attempt whatsoever compulsorily to acquire all the oats produced in South Australia through this oat marketing board.

VICTORIA SQUARE

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: During last session I asked questions about a committee that was set up in 1968 known as the Lord Mayor's Committee on Victoria Square. The committee was joined by Professor Winston of the Department of Town and Country Planning of the University of Sydney. I was anxious throughout the session to be able to inform myself of the contents of that committee's report. The last reply I received was:

The report must be considered by the State Planning Authority, the Minister and Cabinet before any further release is made.

My questions are: (1) Was the information in the press yesterday concerning Victoria Square part of that committee's report? (2) Will the Premier table the report in Parliament so that members can inform themselves of its contents?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I am not in a position to answer the honourable member's questions off the cuff, but I will draw the attention of the Premier or his Deputy to the question and try to secure the information and bring it down as soon as possible.

HOSPITAL FIRE CONTROL

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: I address my questions to the Chief Secretary. First, what rules and regulations govern fire control measures in South Australian hospitals and nursing homes? Secondly, how often do nursing and other staffs in hospitals have to practise fire drill, with special reference to the evacuation of bed-ridden patients?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Again, I crave the indulgence of the Chamber. I cannot answer the honourable member's questions off the cuff but I will get a report and bring it back as soon as practicable.

DEEP SEA PORT

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to a question I asked yesterday about whether he has the report of a committee set up to investigate a second deep sea port in South Australia?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: My colleague, the Minister of Works, has furnished me with the following information:

The investigations of the Central Grain Terminal Investigation Committee are nearing completion. The committee is hopeful of finalizing the report by the end of August.

WOOL

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture, regarding the new wool blend mark proposed to be used this year. Can the Minister tell me what is the maximum ratio of man-made fibre to wool permitted to be used under a wool blend mark?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will get a report for the honourable member and bring it back as soon as possible.

ABATTOIRS

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: My question is directed to the Minister of Agriculture. Has the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board applied to the Government for financial assistance to cover expenses incurred in regaining United States export licences; has this request, if forwarded to the Minister, been rejected; if so, does the Minister expect a rise in the cost of killing; and because any such rise would be passed back to the producer would the Government reconsider the position if it refused this assistance?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board applied to the Government for financial assistance, and the Government has granted assistance. Whether

the board, in its wisdom, will decide to increase charges I cannot say. Nothing has come before me at this moment.

YORKETOWN AREA SCHOOL

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: My question refers to the Yorketown Area School. I would apologize for asking it again if it were not for the urgency of the matter. I have brought this matter to the attention of the Government previously. The Yorketown Area School virtually is a primary school with secondary students fitted into it. At some stages it may have been better to say they are squashed into it rather than fitted. The situation is most urgent. I had the matter again brought to my attention by residents of the district only last week. The proposed new high school, apparently to them at least, does not seem to be getting any closer, and I wish to underline to the Minister the urgency of the situation and to ask whether it is possible for the design and erection of the new high school to be speeded up in order to relieve the situation.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply as soon as it is available.

SUCCESSION DUTIES

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: My question is directed to the Minister representing the Treasurer. Will the Government, as part of its action to remedy problems affecting the rural section, give consideration to a reduction in succession duties; secondly, is the Government aware that continuation of this tax at its present level in the economic climate of rural industry will destroy viable farming units and that in fact it drastically reduces the chances of rural reconstruction having any worthwhile effect?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I will refer the honourable member's question to the Treasurer and bring back a reply.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to make a short statement before directing a question to the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Local Government.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: During the previous session the report of the Local Government

Act Revision Committee was printed and circulated to councils throughout South Australia. As I recall it, the stated intention of the Government at that time was for a period to be given for councils to study the report and inform the Local Government Office of their views upon it, and the matter would then be taken further. So that I can inform members of local government who have asked me questions on this matter in recent times, I ask: have all the councils' replies been received; if not, what time limit has been fixed for the receipt of such replies; what procedure is proposed after the time limit expires to progress towards the ultimate goal of a new Local Government Act?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I will convey the honourable member's questions to my colleague and bring back a reply as soon as it is available.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 14. Page 40.)

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Central No. 2):

I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, as read. I join with the mover and seconder in complimenting His Excellency on the manner in which he delivered the Opening Speech. I extend my sympathy to the relatives of the late members of Parliament whose names were mentioned in that speech. I congratulate the two new members of Parliament, the Hon. Mr. Cameron in this Council, and Mr. Wright in the House of Assembly, upon their election.

I place on record my appreciation to the Hon. Sir Norman Jude for the help and guidance that he gave me whilst we served together in this place. I wish to refer particularly to the gracious assistance that the Hon. Sir Norman provided during my term as Minister of Roads.

The mover and seconder of the motion touched on several matters; I agree with some of those matters, but I strongly disagree with others. The main points in their speeches concerned compulsory unionism, the Maunsell report, rural matters generally, and the question of recognizing China. I shall leave the rural questions to those honourable members who serve rural areas.

The Hon. Mr. Banfield made a very strong point of his personal belief in compulsory unionism. He supported his argument by an open declaration that he believed in it personally. I do not know why he made this point

in the debate; I thought that perhaps he was hoping that the speakers who followed him would declare themselves on the issue, but the Minister of Agriculture did not mention the point. I am violently opposed to what the Hon. Mr. Banfield advocated in this connection. His argument was difficult for me to follow because he seemed to press the point that everyone demands or receives remuneration for services rendered and, somehow or other, he connected this point with a union's being entitled to some form of remuneration for the benefits it provides to its members.

Of course, it is not true that everyone expects reward for services rendered; people in local government and people responsible for the community services provided by many organizations do much for the community and give much time in the service of other people, but they do not receive any remuneration for their services. However, basically the honourable member meant to press the argument used by all who support compulsory unionism: that argument is that those who enjoy the benefits obtained by the unions should join the appropriate union.

Of course, the honourable member went further and said that the people should be compelled to join. The basic difference between this philosophy and the alternative approach is that, whereas the honourable member looks at it from the viewpoint of the union itself, I look at it from the viewpoint of the individual. We can take this matter further; we see the same great difference between the philosophies of the two major political Parties in this State.

When one looks at this question from the viewpoint of the individual, one sees that freedom is completely taken from the individual when he is compelled, in many cases against his will, to join a union. I think all people in this State should fully understand the basic difference that I have referred to.

In a television interview some young women who were assistants in Rundle Street shops invariably said that they were opposed to compulsion. They wanted a choice as to whether they should join a union or not. I think the majority of South Australians want to retain this freedom as one of the civil liberties. In the interests of this State, it is far more important to look at this question from the viewpoint of the individual concerned rather than from the viewpoint of the union.

The Minister of Agriculture pursued a long argument yesterday on the question of recognizing China. He based his argument purely and simply on the fact that he believed that

wheat could be sold to China if that country was recognized quickly. I believe that the Minister's submission was irresponsible and unwise for an honourable gentleman in his position. The whole question of recognizing China is in the hands of the elected Commonwealth Government, which has already announced that it is seeking dialogue with China, that it hopes that normal relationships can be achieved with China, and that both Australia and China thereafter will live in friendship and harmony.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Is that statement up to date?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Yes; it comes, in the main, from a press release of last Tuesday.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: If the honourable member looks at yesterday's *Australian* he will find that the dialogue is not going too well.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: If we take a responsible view we can expect that it will not go too well for some time, but that surely is not sufficient reason to throw caution completely to the wind and rush ahead in connection with this vital question. The only reason why the Minister wants to rush in is that he wants to sell our wheat. I ask him: what guarantee has he that we will sell our wheat to China? He has no guarantee, but is basing his view simply on expectation. I do not press the point further: I can understand his being concerned about the sale of wheat, but for him to become involved in the overall question of the recognition of Red China and to try to play the role of the Prime Minister or the Commonwealth Government is quite ridiculous.

I believe that, behind all the political aspects that have been referred to recently concerning the sale of wheat, ultimately China will buy our wheat if our price is best for it. I do not blame China if it takes that attitude: it is a proper business principle. However, this whole matter could well be left to those who have the nation's destiny in their hands.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: There is such a thing as a grains agreement that controls the price of wheat, so I do not know how we will be able to sell cheaper wheat than other countries involved in this agreement.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Canada had always bound itself to the grains agreement but, from what I know of the subject, I believe that in past years it has jumped out of that agreement. I return now to His Excellency's Speech: there are some parts of it about which I wish to comment, dealing with the

activities of the Housing Trust, standardization, a small point concerning the announcement about the School of Art on which I shall seek clarification, and in almost the last line of the Speech a reference to possible future revenue measures.

Some matters are conspicuous by their absence from this Government's programme for the session, and I will speak about them, including metropolitan transportation. In the Speech, prepared by the Government of the day, it is stated that the Housing Trust erected 500 more houses in the past year than it did in the previous year and that the percentage increase in production increased by 28.5 per cent. Also, it is mentioned that the trust's expenditure on industrial premises increased considerably from \$940,000 to \$1,600,000, and that future negotiations indicated that at least \$3,000,000 would be spent during 1971-72 by the trust on industrial construction.

Concerning housing, the claim is then made by the Government that the figures indicate a growth within the State. I submit that the real figures that would indicate whether there has been a growth within the State are statistics showing whether the overall construction of housing has increased. The fact that the trust has increased its production may well be an indication, but to me it indicates that there is an expansion of what I call a socialistic enterprise.

I have no quibble about the trust's building low-cost housing provided that it can build it more cheaply than can private enterprise, and I have no quibble about its building more rental accommodation and taking some part in the initiative towards urban renewal work, but the general expansion of the Housing Trust into overall residential construction means that the enterprise and initiative of the competitive building industry in this State is being adversely affected.

This State will, I believe, progress much better if more and more work is given to the private enterprise sector of the building industry and less is given to the Housing Trust. The Government's policy (and I can understand why the Government adopts it—because it believes in it) as evidenced in these figures is that the trust is now bent upon an expansion programme. This must mean that members of the Master Builders Association and the Housing Industries Association will find this great competitor adversely affecting their work.

Concerning individual builders or individual buyers of houses, I have no doubt that these

buyers prefer the house built by the private contractor to the house built by the trust. The question should be considered of how far the Housing Trust (and I stress the name Housing Trust) is to be permitted to enter the field of industrial construction.

I have no argument about the establishment of the Industries Assistance Corporation: I consider that this corporation can play a worthy part in this State if it aids and assists small new industries the directors of which wish to start an industry in this State. Also, I believe that from time to time the corporation should help ailing industries that need temporary assistance to overcome a certain problem.

However, once this Government instrumentality sets up and establishes private enterprise in this way it should get out of that enterprise as soon as it becomes viable. Similarly, when help has been given where financial difficulties have been encountered, once that company or business re-establishes itself and is viable the Government should withdraw. I cannot help thinking, when looking at these figures, that more and more involvement by the Housing Trust in an industrial activity and more and more trust houses built throughout metropolitan Adelaide will not be in the best interests of this State.

I do not believe that true value for money can be provided by a Public Service department or a semi-government instrumentality when compared to the value that is provided by the private enterprise sector. When figures are released of the total amount of construction in the State for the whole year, it will be interesting to see how much proportionately the Housing Trust is increasing its activities compared to the whole industry.

My second point concerns the standardization of the railway gauge between Adelaide and the northern standard line running from Port Pirie to Broken Hill, the line that goes from Perth to Sydney. Yesterday, I was taken to task by the Hon. Mr. Banfield, who said from time to time that, when I was Minister—

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: I did not mention any names.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: —of Roads and Transport, I panicked (I think that was the word he used) and rushed in and agreed to all sorts of plans provided within the Maunsell report, and that I had been prepared to accept that report as it was when it was placed on my desk. I think that is what he meant, although it is not easy to follow the honourable member's speech at relatively short

notice. I shall understand it more when I take it quietly.

The truth of the whole matter (I made this point 12 months ago and I am forced to stress it again) is that again only this year, on June 30, the Premier said (and it was printed on the front page of the *Advertiser* of that day) that the former Government accepted the Maunsell report, or words to that effect. The exact quotation is as follows:

The Government, soon after it came into office last June, told the Commonwealth that the plan agreed to by the previous Government was unacceptable as it did not connect the State's heavy industries directly to the standard gauge.

The plan was never agreed to by the previous Government: that Government agreed to the plan subject to the spur line being connected from the new north-south line into the Elizabeth industrial complex. The Commonwealth Government refused to agree to that condition laid down by the previous State Government, so no agreement was reached.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Were you satisfied with the line finishing at Islington?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I am pleased to see that progress has now been made. I said 12 months ago in this Chamber that, if the Government used the Maunsell report as its base, it would probably be able to reach agreement with the Commonwealth. I said I hoped that in the interest of this State it would reach agreement, so I am pleased that the agreement as announced has been reached. There are many details that are not included and I shall wait until the Bill to ratify the arrangement comes down before asking any further questions on this matter.

From the statements that have been made, I am pleased that agreement up to the present stage has been reached. From what I can see, two changes have been sought by South Australia and granted by the Commonwealth. The first is that the broad gauge and standard gauge freight yards that the Maunsell report advocated being completely rebuilt at Islington will not now be continued and the standard gauge line will run into the Mile End yards, where the facilities for loading on to the standard gauge will be built.

I presume the South Australian Railways will go on using its existing loading facilities for broad gauge purposes at Mile End. I trust that in the long term the plan to combine these two facilities at Mile End will not result in congestion, because it always appeared to me that starting this vast railway complex at Islington, designed, planned and built upon

modern lines in that new area, had considerable advantages in the long term.

The other difference that I can see in the announcement is that General Motors-Holden has been fortunate, in that there will be a standard gauge spur line running into its Woodville plant. (I am dealing in broad terms with the advantages or disadvantages that may accrue from this proposal.) I well remember discussing the whole matter with the senior officer from Maunsell and Partners. He pointed out to me that any Government should be very cautious about agreeing to provide separate spur lines into separate industries.

The spur line to the Elizabeth industrial complex does not come within the category of spur lines: that is entirely different. It is a line into a vast industrial complex, and that would give rise to requests for help in that respect to many industrial complexes, both large and small; but the officer pointed out to me that the disadvantage, based on world experience of running separate spur lines into individual industries, is that their provision and maintenance are costly.

If we do it for one, we shall have to consider every other industrial complex. I foresee the problem that will arise, for instance, with Chrysler Australia Limited: it may demand the same benefits, and it cannot be blamed for doing it.

All this transpires at a time when there is a world-wide trend for forwarding agents to be employed by factories to take goods from the factories to the freight yards and load them at the freight yards, in some cases being responsible for the container and unit work for the goods in shipment to their point of destination. The same forwarding agents are responsible for the distribution of those goods to various points.

The officer pointed out to me that, if the Government of the day was deeply concerned about costs to the Railways Department, it should be very cautious before it agreed to any individual spur lines to separate factories in this new proposal. However, the matter will be debated at greater length in the future, but the initial pleasing news is that headway is being made. The proposal is based upon the Maunsell report, and I am convinced that ultimately, when this line is built, it will be of great benefit overall to commerce and industry in South Australia.

In His Excellency's Speech reference was made to the School of Art being incorporated in one of the new teachers colleges, the one to be built in the western suburbs. There was

an implication that the present School of Art was to be shifted from its present site in North Adelaide to the proposed new area. I ask the Chief Secretary whether in due course he can give any information about future plans for the existing building in North Adelaide.

The residents of North Adelaide, the council concerned with administering North Adelaide and many other people concerned with the orderly and balanced future development of North Adelaide (there is an active society there that is watching closely this future development) were all concerned about the proposed expansion of the School of Art last year, and I know they will be concerned about the future use to which the Government intends to put the present building. It may well be that the school in some departments or in some respects will continue there, but I think it would be in the best interests of everyone to make it known whether plans have been formulated for the future use of the present building.

His Excellency's Speech also dealt with the necessity (necessity, that is, in the view of the Government) to increase revenues further in this State. I do not know what these proposals include but I know that Parliament will have to wait upon the Government to get firm information. The Government should be careful when proceeding further to increase taxation and revenues in this State.

It may well be that in some areas there will be an absolute need for some increase, but the full effect of the cost structure in its present fluctuating condition (it is getting higher) is not yet being noticed in the market places of South Australia or of Australia. The real effects of the increased costs of production in South Australia must be gauged with great sensitivity by the Government before it proceeds to increase taxation further.

It has been said in this place time and time again that there is no point in looking at our future prospects if we cannot sell our products on the Eastern seaboard, and we will not do that unless our costs of production remain lower than those in the Eastern States, because we must pay transportation costs on these articles from South Australia to their retail outlets in the big cities of Australia.

The argument has been used that because revenues and taxation are at certain levels in Victoria and New South Wales they can be increased in South Australia to the same level. The real tragedy of this philosophy has not yet had its full effect, and to give notice at this stage of further taxation might well mean

that a most serious position could occur for commerce and industry in South Australia. I warn the Government that in my view it should be extremely cautious before proceeding to increase taxation further in this new financial year.

The Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study was not referred to in His Excellency's Speech, but I am vitally interested in this matter and many people take a very deep interest in the subject.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: I thought it had been scrapped.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The honourable member raises a very interesting point. The Government has said it has been scrapped, and my point is that it has not been; it is being implemented and the Government is too scared politically to admit it.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Does that mean they are saying "freeway" instead of "corridor"?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: One saying that has brought ridicule upon the Government and anyone involved with it is that the Government says it is not now interested in freeways, because Dr. Breuning has altered the name from "freeway route" to "high-speed transportation corridor".

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: That is the only alteration.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The Government is frightened of the political consequences of admitting that it is implementing recommendations contained in the M.A.T.S. Report. I refer to the proposals approved by the previous Government. Both political Parties agreed that some proposals in the report were unacceptable.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: It was approved by the previous Parliament.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: It was approved by both Houses of the previous Parliament and given to people for public scrutiny for a long period of time, but one could doubt the knowledge of the Government concerning M.A.T.S. I notice that there are basic areas of complete ignorance of what M.A.T.S. is or has been about. One wonders whether it was ever understood by the leaders of the present Government. In the *Advertiser* of July 9 of last year I find the report:

The Premier (Mr. Dunstan) said last night that M.A.T.S. was a 35-year plan and transport systems would change a great deal in that time.

One of the basic principles, if not the main basic principle, of the whole M.A.T.S. Report was that it was a 20-year plan. The point was stressed over and over again. In 1965-66 the

experts believed that they could with reasonable certainty look forward to the motor car in its present state being with us for that period of time. Right through the M.A.T.S. Report the 20-year period is mentioned. I quote from page 6 of the report:

The recommended transportation plan was developed to serve the planning objectives and projected travel needs to the year 1986.

The Premier was quite wrong in calling it a 35-year plan.

In the United States in May the Minister of Roads and Transport (Mr. Virgo) was reported in our press here, talking on the general question of freeways and public transport, as saying that \$570,000,000 was estimated for the M.A.T.S. proposals, but he said he would not expect the rail system to get anywhere near that price. However, the estimates on pages 7 and 8 of the M.A.T.S. Report show that included in the \$570,000,000 estimate is \$79,000,000 for the M.A.T.S. rail system. Apparently this was quite unknown to the Minister. One cannot help but think that possibly there still remains a great lack of knowledge about the whole question of M.A.T.S.

I want to substantiate the point, on the general question of freeways, that the M.A.T.S. proposals are being implemented by the present Government, but it has not the political courage to tell the people that and to say what it is doing. The point was raised a moment ago by way of interjection that the name "freeway" has been dropped. This is the most ridiculous point in the whole ambit of the Government's approach to the question—"Forget the name freeways, and let us get another name", and Dr. Breuning was brought out and he provided another name to take its place.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: A very expensive exercise!

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Yes, it cost over \$9,000 to have Dr. Breuning and his associate here for four weeks. An interesting comment appears in the *News* of July 3 last year on the question of freeways being scrapped. It states:

The Premier (Mr. Dunstan) today denied claims that he had gone back on his word over freeway development in Adelaide. He said he had never promised that, if elected, no freeways would be built. He said 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.

There is a disclosure by the Premier that freeways will be necessary, and that they will be

built. Of course, land is still being purchased by the Government for that specific purpose.

Public transport was part of M.A.T.S. If any evidence is needed to substantiate that, we find on page 8 of the M.A.T.S. Report:

The recommended plan contemplates an integrated system of bus service and partially grade separated rail rapid transit facilities.

Included was the construction of the King William Street subway to connect the two main lines on the north with the two main lines on the south. Total expenditure for this proposed public transport system within M.A.T.S. was \$107,450,000, of which \$32,800,000 was for the King William Street subway. Then Dr. Breuning was called in, and he turned down rapid rail transit as an urgent measure for Adelaide. Page 18 of his report states:

Specific recommendations for suburban rail passenger service do not seem to be indicated at this time. Similarly, development of a subway system seems premature.

Dr. Breuning's report was adopted by the Government and passed by the House of Assembly in lieu of the M.A.T.S. plan. The present Minister subsequently went overseas, and then came another about-face. Time and time again, both when he was overseas and since he has been back here, he has said that he favours planning for a rapid rail transit system. So, the Government is simply going back to the M.A.T.S. plan: Dr. Breuning's report has been forgotten. I therefore ask the Government to make its position clear and tell the people that it is going back to the M.A.T.S. recommendations.

As further evidence, I shall refer to overways, which are constructed where roads are proposed to go over railways at dangerous sites. On page 147 of the M.A.T.S. Report 20 grade separations are recommended at a total cost of \$10,000,000. In the press of May 14 this year the first railway overpass was announced, and on June 4 more plans for overways were announced. All these overways were included in the M.A.T.S. recommendations, yet we are told that the M.A.T.S. plan has been scrapped! It is just not true, and the Government should admit it. On October 13, 1970, after being told that the M.A.T.S. plan had been scrapped, the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, said:

In the Highways Department's road programme for 1969-70 an amount of \$12,583,981 was spent on declared urban arterial roads, which are part of the roads and routes shown in the M.A.T.S. Report. This figure included Commonwealth funds totalling

\$7,780,000. The corresponding expenditure for the 1970-71 financial year is estimated to be \$12,896,850, including Commonwealth funds of \$9,450,000.

Here is an admission that the money is still being received from the Commonwealth Government; funds are being taken from the Highways Fund and are being spent in connection with roads in the M.A.T.S. Report. Years before the present Government came to office the Commonwealth Government declared roads referred to in the M.A.T.S. Report as being roads on which expenditure would be outlayed. Has the Commonwealth Government ever been asked to cancel its proposal? Of course it has not.

Much publicity was given to Dr. Breuning's recommendation in regard to widening arterial roads. We were told that the M.A.T.S. plan had been scrapped, but we should remember that the M.A.T.S. Report recommended that \$91,200,000 be spent on widening arterial roads. The urgency of the proposal can be gauged by the recommendation that \$29,000,000 of that total be spent as a first priority (over the first five-year period), \$27,080,000 be spent as a second priority (that can be interpreted as meaning that it should be spent over the second five-year period), \$17,510,000 be spent as a third priority, and \$17,610,000 be spent as a fourth priority (or over the fourth five-year period).

Dr. Breuning's recommendation that road widening should be continued was simply a confirmation of the appropriate part of the M.A.T.S. Report. When the M.A.T.S. plan was announced in 1968 the Hon. Mr. Virgo violently opposed the proposed route of the Noarlunga Freeway through Marion, and he was entitled to do that. On September 19, 1968, he presented a petition that was signed by 5,679 objectors. He and the Hon. Mr. Hudson joined with others in a deputation to me, as Minister. The exact route through Marion was never decided by the previous Government, as alternative proposals were being investigated.

Now, the Minister for Conservation is being asked this month either to approve or disapprove the M.A.T.S. route through Marion, and everyone knows that he will approve this old M.A.T.S. route. Surely this is evidence of how the Government is going back to the M.A.T.S. plan. All the upgrading of buses that was recommended in the M.A.T.S. Report is being proceeded with. On June 1, 1970, it was announced that \$5,200,000 was planned to be spent to replace 260 metropolitan buses over three years. Soon after the Government

came to office it was announced that the Railways Department had begun planning to extend the railway line to Christies Downs; that extension was part of the M.A.T.S. plan. So, the truth of the matter is that it is proceeding slowly.

The Government is trying to pull the wool over the eyes of motorists and public transport patrons. The Government should remember that motorists are being delayed every night as a result of traffic congestion in city outlets. On behalf of the many people who travel on public transport (I use buses myself), I can assure the Government that the public demands that action be taken to improve metropolitan transportation—

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Have you ever been to Sydney and Melbourne?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Yes.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: There are traffic snarls in those cities, too.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Yes, but it must be remembered that those cities are much larger than Adelaide. Both cities left it too late to introduce their metropolitan transport plans but, through splendid initial enterprise and planning by the Playford Government in 1964 and 1965, planning in connection with M.A.T.S. was begun. The Minister knows that the Labor Party supported the plan when it was in office in 1967, and South Australians are now very dissatisfied that not enough is being done.

Two things follow from the Government's failure to admit that it is proceeding with the M.A.T.S. plan: one is that the Government is suffering in that it is giving evidence of political insincerity. That is a problem that the Government must contend with, but the problem will get worse during the next year or two. A more important aspect is that only slow progress is being made because of the stealth by which the plan is being introduced.

Major changes cannot be brought about with the speed that is necessary to bring them about, because of the time it takes to complete this kind of planning in detail. That sort of change cannot be brought about quickly. If the Government does not work with speed, if it goes about this work without telling the people, and then tries to cover up for the jam into which it has got itself, it is the people who will suffer. This is the pity of it. It is not only the motorist who drives to work or the person who travels on a bus or train but also commerce and industry that suffer. It was stressed that the costs would be lessened by \$60,000,000 a year when the M.A.T.S. proposal was fully implemented, and that is a

matter that the Government should consider seriously as that is important to the prosperity and degree of economic progress in this State that we wish to see achieved.

I said when in Opposition last year, and emphasis Government, regulations were being prepared to system should be proceeded with forthwith, but planning for it, as disclosed in the M.A.T.S. plan, is now about two years behind. The King William Street underground railway is an absolute must, joining as it will the two main routes to the north of the city proper with the two metropolitan rail routes to pass to the south. The terms of reference for a detailed study of this proposal are in the Minister's file; they were there when he took office in 1970, and included in them is the matter of a complete investigation into the question of electrification of our suburban railway lines.

I consider that this electrification must come, and the sooner the better, but the Government cannot proceed with the King William Street underground line, with the rail rapid transit system, or with the electrification until it conducts a full feasibility study following the M.A.T.S. proposal. I plead with the Government to get on with this job for the benefit of people in the metropolitan area, for the motorist who will change to public transport when a modern facility is provided, and ultimately for the benefit of the whole State.

It is absolute rubbish to talk about keeping options open whilst all these changes are taking place around us. The Government knows that the M.A.T.S. plan always contemplated a continuous and ever-changing plan for change and improvement in transportation technology. Transportation planning has never been a static matter: it is always fluid. During the 20-year period of the M.A.T.S. plan, during which the Adelaide transportation system would be up-graded to world standards, it was always considered that planning would continue, and the four 5-year spans in the M.A.T.S. plan indicate this. Towards the end of the century we may see some of these futuristic schemes, which have been brought to the forefront of publicity on this question simply as a smoke screen.

The Government should get this matter in proper perspective and should permit future planning, as was always contemplated by the M.A.T.S. plan. It should get on with the immediate object of implementing a first-class system of transportation that could be compared to that enjoyed by any city in the world of the same size as Adelaide.

Another matter, which has given me some concern and was raised in this Council towards the end of last session, concerns the procedure being adopted by the Government in the matter of land acquisition. I think it is fair for me to put it that way, because the Government must take responsibility for the Lands Department, the Public Buildings Department, and the Hospitals Department in this matter. It concerns the policy being adopted by the Government for the acquisition of residential properties, specifically in the Bedford Park area, in which the Government has announced plans to buy properties so that the construction of the new hospital in the south-west area can proceed.

A new Land Acquisition Act was passed in 1969, and this flowed from the M.A.T.S. proposals. The Government of the day, with the support of the then Opposition, believed that the existing land acquisition machinery was old, cumbersome, and should be brought up to date, so that the people whose properties were being acquired could receive absolute fairness in treatment and obtain generous compensation when their properties were needed in the public interest.

A committee was set up, its recommendation was adopted, and Parliament passed the new Act. One could expect that individuals and the Government would abide by the machinery of the new legislation, but this has not been the case. The manner of negotiation by Government departments with property owners in the Bedford Park area leaves much to be desired. Public announcements in the press stated, in effect, that the Government would ultimately require the properties but that people could stay in their houses if they wished or, if they wished to sell, private negotiations would be entered into. Following that, Government valuers suddenly knocked at doors in that area and began negotiations in that way.

The irresponsibility that has been displayed in this matter can be gauged by the fact that only this morning a lady whose house is involved rang me at home and, amongst other things, said that a Government valuer had offered her and her husband \$16,000 for their house, and that since then the Government, by negotiations, had increased its offer to \$17,700. They had been given a private valuation of \$18,454.

The lady referred to the question of disturbance and resettlement in another house and the costs involved in changing from one house to another. Apparently, the department

involved is trying to avoid that kind of outlay, and wants to buy the house by negotiation at one figure that is the market value of the property concerned. These people are unwilling sellers. Many of them have never dreamt of selling and, when they do sell, they have to find another property and bear the considerable cost of reinstating themselves in their new homes.

To make matters worse, understandably there were one or two people in this area who had their houses on the market at the time the first announcement was made. Those people were in a different category because they were willing sellers and they did their deals with the department involved. Those sale prices were being accepted by the Government valuers as the comparable prices upon which the new valuations for the new houses were to be based. All this unfairness is bringing considerable misery to the area.

As a matter of fact, one lady has been in hospital because of the worry and concern she has suffered. The Government should put its house in order on this whole matter, because it is very serious. I remember time and time again during my term of office in the previous Government the question of the acquisition of residential property loomed large. I remember it because I was involved in it. I accepted the responsibility that there are times when property must be acquired, but I and the previous Government made the point that, when it is necessary to acquire private property, Governments of the day must bend over backwards to be as generous as possible to those individuals being dispossessed of their property.

The whole crunch is the actual amount of money involved. People adjust themselves to the idea that they must sell and must move into another suburb, even though they have never dreamt of doing so or have never wanted to do so but what they cannot adjust themselves to (and it is easy to understand) is being offered an amount which will not permit them to move into a comparable house without financial loss to themselves.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: This includes everything?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Yes.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Was that policy adopted by you?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Yes; I laid it down at the time and took action.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Were those ideas always carried out?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Yes, they were, but we just did not talk about it from the front

bench. We brought down legislation so that the Government and individuals would be bound by the law. Section 10 of the new Act, under the heading "Proposal to acquire land", provides, in subsection (1):

Where the authority proposes to acquire land for the purposes of an authorized undertaking, it shall serve upon each person who has an interest in the land, or such of those persons as, after diligent inquiry, become known to the authority, a notice, in the prescribed form, of intention to acquire the land.

I emphasize there the word "shall". Under this new Act, the authority is bound—"it shall serve upon each person". There may be some explanation (and I ask the Minister to reply to this matter because the people in that area are most concerned) of the fact that the Government is not obeying the law, that the Government is acting outside the law, because it has not (despite the question asked at the end of last session) issued to some people in that area these notices of intention.

So the Government is dealing outside the Act, and disturbance and severance are not involved when we are dealing by private negotiation. The Government must bind itself to the law of this State. It should immediately issue these notices of intention to those people, who should have this reassurance, safety and backstop that the law will proceed stage by stage and ultimately, if there is disagreement between valuers, the matter will finish up in court; and the judge of that court will decide the amount of compensation the Government must pay.

But, unless the Government places itself within that Act, these people cannot proceed to that stage. Why has the Government not given these notices of intention? I ask the Government for an opinion on its interpretation of that part of section 10 that I have just read. The only question that can arise is the definition of "authorized undertaking". That appears in section 6, which states:

"Authorized undertaking" means the undertaking whose execution is authorized by the special Act.

"Special Act", as I understand it, means any Act under which any department is given the right to acquire property.

So I stress the point that there is grave concern in this area about the manner in which the departments involved are dealing with this matter; that it was brought to the notice of the present Government in this Chamber in the last session; that many of the people in that area are still grossly dissatisfied with the

treatment they are receiving; and that there is an urgent need for something to be done.

My next point deals with the Adelaide park lands and the encroachment upon them. This has been mooted in the press. I asked about this yesterday, and I realize there has not been sufficient time for a reply to be given. However, there are some alarming proposals which, as I see the position, are being introduced and are being agreed to stage by stage, in which the park lands of this city are being encroached upon, and in other areas they will be adversely affected to a great degree as a result of these transport proposals.

I refer to the matter of a new freeway route through the east park lands. I stress the point that in the M.A.T.S. proposals the only area of park lands that was to be affected in any major way was where M.A.T.S. proposed and the Government of the day agreed to spend an extra \$6,000,000 to put a road underground—and that was in the north park lands. But, if this Government is to agree to the State Planning Office's recommendation, as I understand it the Botanic Garden and the Rymill Gardens will be sliced into, and there will be a ring route (by which I assume we mean a freeway) right around the east park lands and along the south park lands where Greenhill Road now runs.

If we envisage all the underways and overways passing along that periphery of the Adelaide park lands we can see the tremendous damage aesthetically that will occur. Not only is it a matter of aesthetic damage: it is a question of the taking over of the park lands, involving community values. I am surprised that the time for objection at the level of the State Planning Office has expired and that great public objection has not been raised by the Town and Country Planning Association, because here is a proposal that will deeply affect the park lands, where the whole challenge of community values lies unanswered. We have in this city a Town and Country Planning Association which is supposed to be a watch-dog for affairs of this kind. Why has it not made its voice heard on this question? We heard much from it in the past, between 1968 and 1970, but I have heard no objection at all—

The Hon. C. R. Story: Something like the teachers: we have not heard much from them lately.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: That is so. I hope the Minister for Conservation and the Government, when this plan comes up at those levels for consideration and approval, will bear in

mind that the park lands are sacrosanct, and hands must be kept off them. This has been fundamental within the Labor Party itself.

I recall the late Mr. Frank Walsh saying time and time again that this was his Party's policy, so this will be a great challenge to the Government. There has not been a great deal of publicity given to it, and I look upon it as my responsibility to publicize it as much as I can so that the public will know what is going on and be given every opportunity to have its voice heard on the matter.

I mentioned road safety. I ask whether the Government will make some announcement of its intention regarding implementing the recommendations in the Pak-Poy report on road safety. The Pak-Poy committee was a very high-powered safety committee (I think Government members will agree) composed of men of many disciplines connected with road safety. It made a thorough investigation and, in my view, a splendid report. It was always the intention of the previous Government to use this report as a basis for action to introduce road safety legislation. Perhaps the Government will do this, but time is going on.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: It will be used as a basis.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I am pleased to hear that. I am sure people in this State will be interested to hear when we might know something regarding this.

I refer now to the electric light poles commonly known as stobie poles. Honourable members opposite may smile, but we had further evidence only a few days ago of a tragic road accident in the Marion area where several deaths occurred, and we saw a most stark photograph in the press of the damage caused when a vehicle, travelling apparently at high speed, struck a stobie pole. We must never give up trying to get rid of these poles in metropolitan Adelaide. Under the previous Government, regulations were being prepared to enforce, at the option of the Director of Planning, that subdividers of land must place wiring underground and thus be able to erect the tubular electric light pole which is of an impact-absorbing or semi-collapsible type.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Did you go into the extra cost of development involved?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Yes, I did, but I am sick and tired of hearing excuses about the cost when getting rid of stobie poles is mentioned. I am coming to a further point which might be of some assistance to the Minister. I believe there should be an independent inquiry into the question of stobie poles,

an inquiry at which the Electricity Trust and all other people interested in the subject could give evidence. I believe the ordinary-size stobie pole could be replaced with a pole which would be to some degree impact-absorbing and would not result in so many fatalities through impact. Of course, I realize these poles must be strong enough to carry some overhead wires.

I am not so unrealistic as to say one could get rid of stobie poles and overhead wires immediately, but some effective planning must be put in train, and it is very difficult to get that planning under way if the Government simply asks for reports from the Electricity Trust or from other departments. An independent authority should be given the opportunity to take evidence on this question, and I believe we could begin a programme of getting rid of stobie poles, or at least see that when new poles must be installed they are of a much safer type.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: Like the railways at railway crossings now.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: That is another matter, too. The Highways Department, during the term of office of the previous Government, undertook to install these impact-absorbing poles at intersections when reconstruction of those intersections took place. It also introduced underground wiring, which is something for which I give the department full marks and upon which I compliment it. Some pilot projects are being looked at, but only in a preliminary way, based on underground cables being installed for aesthetic purposes in some Adelaide suburbs. I am not referring so much today to underground cables as to the need to stop the production of standard-size stobie poles and in their place to produce and install much safer poles. I believe progress could be achieved and the public of South Australia would be most grateful to the Government for it.

Some of the larger poles must carry high-tension wires and a great number of overhead wires, and these may have to be of the strength of these concrete and steel monsters we see at some intersections and in some parts of the city, but there are thousands of standard-size poles, and I believe in many instances there is no need for a pole of such strength, one which causes so much damage when a vehicle collides with it.

I ask the Government to give serious consideration to this matter. I know it shelved the plan previously, but simply for political reasons. The Director of Planning was given an option in the matter of underground wiring

and it was not made mandatory, because where low-cost land was concerned it was necessary that wires should be left overhead because of the cost factor, but many subdividers could well afford underground cables and pass on the extra cost to purchasers. That would be a move in the right direction. Subdividers should be bound by Statute to carry out underground wiring in certain cases.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: Do you know if the stobie pole is a great factor in accidents?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: My point is that when a vehicle strikes a pole it could strike either a safe pole or a highly dangerous one, and the stobie pole is a highly dangerous pole in those circumstances.

The last topic I wish to mention concerns the Australia and New Zealand Bank building in King William Street. I read that the Government finished the last financial year with excess Loan funds of \$1,780,000. I have always believed that it is necessary for the Government to have in a busy part of Adelaide a display area for models of Government projects from all departments involved in construction and development. In addition, there is a need for the Director of Planning and the State Planning Office to be housed in offices that are more convenient than their present offices.

I believe that the Government should investigate the possibility of its acquiring the A.N.Z. Bank building as the headquarters of the State Planning Office and the main office of the new Minister for Conservation. If the Government carries out an exercise on the amount of rent it may have to pay for accommodation for the Minister of Conservation, his new Director and their officers and if that total outgoing is capitalized, it may well be that, even from a business viewpoint, the purchase of the building by compulsory acquisition (and I think the Minister may have that power) can well be afforded by the present Government.

It is a magnificent building. The main banking chamber compares in many respects with the great halls of Europe. Of course, the interior of the building could be redecorated. I was agreeably surprised at the amount of office space that would be available in the building, including the basement. Some of the main hall could be converted to office use, too. The Government should seriously consider this proposal. Many people believe that, while we should encourage new development, at the same time we should retain some of that which is old. Posterity will give grateful thanks to any Government that selectively

chooses such buildings and retains them in the public interest. It would be an absolute tragedy for the A.N.Z. Bank building to be demolished.

I am not the type of person who rushes in simply because there is a public outcry; I am not one who simply follows the leader on such questions but, when one inspects that building and when one realizes that in this world of rapid change the time will come when not many old buildings will be left in this beautiful city, one sees the need to preserve the A.N.Z. Bank building.

Unfortunately, some similar opportunities have not been taken in the past, and many people now regret the unwise decisions that were made, particularly in connection with the old Theatre Royal. I support the motion for the adoption of the draft Address in Reply, and I again compliment His Excellency on his Opening Speech. From time to time I will raise other matters that have been brought to my attention by electors in my district.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES (Northern): I support the motion for the adoption of the draft Address in Reply. I support the remarks of those who saluted His Excellency the Governor as the Queen's representative here, and I trust that his health and strength will remain at a level that will enable him to enjoy the traditional hospitality of the people of South Australia. I deeply regret the death of Sir Collier Cudmore, Mr. Sam Lawn and Mr. John Cowan. I personally regret that the Hon. Sir Norman Jude is no longer here to guide us. I know that he has guided many honourable members on both sides of the Council. I welcome the Hon. Mr. Cameron to this Council and I welcome Mr. Wright, the new member for Adelaide in another place.

There is a tendency today, amongst those who want change, to join the group commonly called the "permissive society". I have the feeling, whether we like it or not, that those who believe in some form of change are slowly growing in number in this society. We need to grapple with the fact that there are people who believe that it does not matter how one behaves; furthermore, there are the more radical people who wish to do what they like, regardless of the rules and discipline of society. We, who are called "squares", as parents, as legislators, as members of a Government, or as citizens, must individually and collectively do something more positive than protest or prohibit. It is up to us to show the falsity and the dangers of the excuses that are being used and of the philosophies that are being

embraced to justify the actions that the permissive society is trying to force on our way of life. Behind looseness in conduct there is a looseness of thinking.

Do we believe that it is correct that any person should be entitled to do as he likes? Man has had to learn to live not only with himself but with his neighbour—with society. As a result of living in society he learns to respect the need to observe the rules that have already been established, as a motorist learns to respect the basic rules of the road. If there were no basic traffic rules, motor cars would move according to the whims of the man in control—some on the left side of the road, some on the right, and maybe eccentric drivers would want to travel in a zigzag fashion.

The need to learn to live in society means that rules have to be made—maybe for no reason other than that people will not then get in each other's road. The mass of our population realize not only that there must be simple rules of the road but also that there must be rules of conduct to cover most situations in life. Most people realize that it is logical to follow these rules so that they can avoid confusion and inconvenience and so that our society can function properly. As society has matured, so it has automatically fallen into line to conform to these basic rules, but on top of being able to live with society there has always been a need for personal standards, standards or disciplines that make it possible to understand and appreciate the greater society need. Should personal standards lapse so that one way of behaviour is considered as good as another, we have a similar example of what would occur in relation to having no rules of the road—complete confusion and inconvenience. Regrettably, personal standards are not enforced by society but, regardless of that, they are still accepted and are a guide to the correct way to behave.

To say, "Please" or "Thank you", to respect the aged, and to know when to apologize for a mistake are all accepted principles of personal behaviour that go towards meshing into the larger society. In fact, an easing of personal standards can become serious when they are forgotten and people argue that one way of behaving is just as good as another, which produces the problem that there is no clear way of what is right or wrong regarding behaviour. This is one of the disturbing facts of a section of the community today: not that they are dropping old rules or developing new ones, but people are becoming careless—careless about the need for rules of conduct or

behaviour amongst themselves and in relation to the society in which they live—and there are some who in their permissiveness seem to be openly defiant of both. The weak and the gullible quickly follow those leaders who believe in this so-called freedom, believing that this type of carelessness or defiance is more enlightening and that they are part of the liberated race.

A permissive society can operate within the web of the community only so long as the rules of conduct allow it (rules of conduct and laws that have been made by the majority) and by the permissive society being willing to agree to accept the basic personal standards that are laid down. Those who interpret a permissive society as meaning that anyone can do just what he feels like doing are giving permission to themselves to disregard the rest of society. They are not only attacking society itself but also are neglecting the feelings of others and lowering their personal standards to a level closely approaching the personal standards of the dark ages of our early history.

We read and hear much about the dangers of destroying the cities of the industrialized sections of Australia by the pollution of the atmosphere, of the environment, the soil and the sea. This is a common topic today. No doubt this problem is of great concern to us all, but is this the only problem? Is not our society being threatened by a moral pollution of its own making? The way we rectify these problems is of great concern, and the decisions when made must reflect the sober and considered views of society as a whole and not the radical claims of a few. If the way of life as we know it in Australia (or for that matter in the free world) is to survive, a way must be found to bring the basic requirements of society back into focus: the basic understanding that for man to live with man he must agree to accept as his personal rules of behaviour those standards which are acceptable to society.

To change from that extremely important subject, I now refer to the remarks of the Minister of Agriculture yesterday when he made a plea that a greater market should be established in Asia and the countries north of Australia. He was critical of the Commonwealth Government because he said it had been neglectful concerning the United Kingdom's entry into the common market talks, and he left me with the impression that he thought the market potential of Asia had not been touched to any great degree. It was interesting after his speech to study statistics of Aus-

tralian exports to those countries, because I found that Australia exports 42.8 per cent of its total exports to Asia, that is, from China in the north, to India in the west, and to the Philippines and New Guinea on the eastern side of the great land mass of Asia. Of this 42.8 per cent, exports valued at \$126,000,000 (or 3 per cent) are already being sold to mainland China, and exports valued at a mere \$30,000,000 (or .7 per cent) to Taiwan. Included in the 42.8 per cent, 24.7 per cent of our exports go to Japan.

Our total exports to the United Kingdom last year (the period for which these figures were taken) constituted a mere 11.8 per cent. This is one reason why Australia did not have much weight in any argument with the United Kingdom in relation to her entry into the E.C.M., and did not receive similar treatment to that accorded to New Zealand. New Zealand is essentially a primary producing country, and its economy and its production of lamb and dairy products has been geared to the British market for many years. It is primarily an agricultural country and, consequently, its need for survival was much greater than that of Australia. Although I have not been able to obtain New Zealand's export figures, Australia is a large country and its export potential is to the far corners of the world and not, as is New Zealand's, to selected markets. This is the problem that has to be faced by New Zealand. Furthermore, I was interested to hear the Prime Minister of Great Britain in a recent A.B.C. broadcast, in which Mr. Heath said that Australia's request for some preference during the early stages of the E.C.M. negotiations were waived so that our manufactured goods would have a more free entry into E.C.M. countries after some period of operation.

I have spent much time trying to find out from Commonwealth Government members what is the definition of "manufactured goods" in relation to this, but I have not received a satisfactory reply. It would be comforting if what the Prime Minister of Great Britain said subsequently proved to be correct, so that our manufactured goods, especially our canned fruit from the irrigated areas of the Murray River, would be able to get a foothold in the European market in future. There will be added problems for our horticultural products: the supply and demand of dried and canned fruits is a serious problem, which ranks high in our irrigated areas. Similarly, of course, there is the overall agricultural problem of marketing practically every other product that

is exportable—and, in particular, wheat and wool. The evidence that 42.8 per cent of our exports already go to Asian countries indicates that we are moving in the right direction—possibly better than the Minister was aware of when he spoke yesterday.

Mr. Whitlam and his A.L.P. travellers, to my way of thinking, must be an extremely gullible group of people. Do they really believe that the occidental Chinaman has altered his way of trading and his mental outlook on life because of Chairman Mao over a few years? The Chinese have been clever traders, not only under Chairman Mao's rule and Communism but also for centuries before that. They will trade for what they want when they want it, and they will get it from whom they want it when they want it, and any belief that Mr. Whitlam has that suddenly giving diplomatic recognition to mainland China will open the door to unlimited trading for Australians is a complete crystal ball illusion.

Should this recognition of China become a fact, as Mr. Whitlam suggests and in the way he suggests he will do it, our trading with many other nations in the Asian area could be seriously jeopardized.

In conclusion, I must make it quite clear that I am very familiar with the League of Rights sympathizers. I believe there are electors in Northern District who believe in

certain of the principles of the League of Rights. I know they are extremely loyal to many principles of the Liberal and Country League at the same time. I know they expect me, as one of their representatives, to respect them for their beliefs. I am not ashamed of the notable principles that they believe in—the adequate defence of Australia and of the seas around Australia, loyalty to the Crown, the need for a bicameral system of Parliament, and, possibly as important, a complete distrust of Communism. I believe in these things myself and I wish to place on record the intelligent support that people in the Northern District associated with these principles of the League of Rights have given not only to myself but also to other honourable members of this Council.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You will need them at the conference next month.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: And thank God for a so-called right wing point of view. I am not of the camp that believes in lowering the very essentials of liberalism to the point of pointing the bone at those who believe in views that do not coincide precisely with mine.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.19 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, July 20, at 2.15 p.m.