

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, July 20, 1971

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

QUESTIONS

UNDERGROUND WATER

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Has the Chief Secretary, representing the Minister of Mines, a reply to a question I asked him last week about underground water supplies for the Northern Adelaide Plains?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The sociological committee was set up to advise the Government on aspects of the operation of the legislation dealing with the conservation of the underground water of the Northern Adelaide Plains. The committee has submitted two reports, the main recommendation of which involved a re-examination of the feasibility of distributing Bolivar effluent to ease the load on the underground basin. This examination is proceeding.

GREENOCK ACCIDENT

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I am sure honourable members will have been shocked by the news of the tragedy that occurred at Greenock last weekend. This dreadful event underlines the need for a by-pass for this township, plans for which I understand are well in hand. In the meantime, the very dangerous situation in Greenock itself continues to exist. Therefore, will the Minister ask his colleague to inquire of the Highways Department whether it can provide some additional warning signs and whether it will consider what other additional means of warning may be placed in the township of Greenock to reduce the hazard that has existed there for some time (where tragedy has been narrowly averted on more than one occasion previously) pending the construction of a by-pass?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I will convey to my colleague the honourable member's request for an investigation into this problem at Greenock and bring back an answer as soon as possible.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I seek leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister representing the Minister of Roads and Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. R. HART: My question is on similar lines to that asked by the Hon. Mr. Dawkins. I, too, express my view that the recent tragic accident in Greenock created much concern in the minds of all South Australians. The matter of a by-pass road not only for Greenock but also for Nuriootpa is a live topic in the area at this moment. The present plan, as I understand it, is for the by-pass to leave the highway in the vicinity of what is known as the Seppeltsfield turn-off. There is a good deal of opinion in the area that a more suitable by-pass could be obtained by the traffic continuing along the new Kapunda Road (that is, the road from Freeling to Kapunda) and then turning off at what is known as the Truro turn-off from this road. This alternative that has been considered by the local people at least is a less costly one and a less disturbing one than would be one built close to Greenock. Also, it would not require the building of another bridge. Will the Minister discuss with his colleagues the possibility of a better alternative by-pass site, possibly one along the lines I have mentioned, being considered?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I shall do that.

ASIAN MIGRATION

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary as the Leader of the Government in this Chamber.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I refer to a press announcement on July 13 on the subject of migration to Australia of non-Europeans. In that article the Premier was quoted as saying that he envisaged an intake of perhaps a little less than Canada's annual 27,000 from Asia, which is more than the total Australian intake since 1945. Further in the same interview he said that he would like to see the country as a racial melting pot.

The Premier then went overseas. On the 16th of this month an article in our newspaper carried a press release from Singapore. This was headed "South Australia needs Asians." The principal paragraph of this article read:

"We are looking for skilled people and we would be very happy to have them from here," the South Australian Premier, Mr. Dunstan, said on his arrival here today.

Two further sentences in the article read as follows:

Mr. Dunstan said he had no doubt that Australian migration policy would be mentioned in his talks during the next four days with

the Singapore Prime Minister (Mr. Lee Kuan Yew). Mr. Dunstan said Australia needed people with professional qualifications, particularly artisan skills, especially in the metal trades.

As a result of those announcements in the press, I ask the Chief Secretary whether the Premier was authorized by the South Australian Government to make any plans whatsoever whilst away to encourage mass migration to South Australia of Asian workers for our metal trades industries?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I think the question is one of policy. I do not know just what discussions have taken place on a Cabinet or Executive level in this matter, so I do not know what authority the Premier has. I will refer the matter to the Deputy Premier and my other Cabinet colleagues and bring back a reply soon.

POLDA-KIMBA MAIN

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I asked last Thursday regarding progress on the Pold-Kimba main?

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

A reply is still awaited from the Commonwealth Government on the application for financial assistance in constructing the Lock-Kimba main.

FLAMMABLE CLOTHING

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: Has the Minister of Lands obtained from the Minister of Labour and Industry a reply to my question of July 14 regarding flammable clothing?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: My colleague reports:

As any control of flammable clothing must regulate the design of the garment and the material used in it, it is desirable that the law should be uniform throughout Australia. The Ministers of Labour of each State at their annual conference last year agreed that "Uniform suitable legislation be introduced in all States as soon as a reliable standard for testing textile flammability is determined". The matter will be further considered at the 1971 conference of State Ministers of Labour to be held next Thursday.

FRUIT EXPORTS

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Information supplied to me today from the Apple and Pear Board warns of an impending 25 per

cent increase in the cost of exporting refrigerated fruit to Europe. At present the cost of such freight is \$2.43 a bushel, which is charged to us for all fresh fruit sent to Great Britain: the charge is greater for fruit sent to other European destinations. The effect of the increased freight costs on fresh fruit exports will be very much more serious than the effect of Britain's joining the European Common Market. It will result virtually in the failure of our exports.

The position is very serious because experience has shown that we have virtually no possibility of negotiating a lower price with the conference lines. Consequently, will the Minister draw to the attention of the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry the disastrous effect that this must have on our citrus industry and the apple and pear industry, both of which export much fresh fruit overseas? Also, will the Minister co-ordinate his protest with those that must come from other States, so that it will have the greatest possible impact in putting forward our case for at least no further increase in freight costs? In connection with the period that has elapsed since the last very steep increase, there is no doubt whatsoever that shippers' costs have not increased by 25 per cent.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I shall be delighted to do what the honourable member has asked—to convey the message to the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry in Canberra. Not only will the fruit exports of this country suffer through the proposed steep increase in freight rates but also our fat lamb exports, which are almost ready now to go on the United Kingdom market. The Meat Board is at present very closely looking at this matter. It would appear to me at least and perhaps to some other honourable members that it is high time that we did something about forming a national shipping line in Australia, so that we would at least have some control over these costs that are crippling our export industries. I shall be delighted to take up this matter with other State Ministers of Agriculture and bring it to the attention of the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry.

ROSEWORTHY COLLEGE

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I desire to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture and I ask leave to make a short statement before doing so.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: In last Saturday's *Advertiser* an advertisement appeared for a group of senior lecturers at Roseworthy Agricultural College. For the position of senior lecturer in oenology the advertisement states that the only qualification necessary is extensive experience in the wine industry. All the other advertisements for senior lecturers require an appropriate university degree. Will the Minister explain why it is not necessary for a senior lecturer in this subject to have a degree appropriate to the subject he will be teaching?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will bring back a considered reply for the honourable member.

WOOL

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question concerning the new wool blend mark?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: No announcement has yet been made regarding the new woolblendmark (this is one word) proposed to be used in promoting woolrich blended products. The International Wool Secretariat in London is expected to announce shortly details of the design of the woolblendmark symbol. Details will also be released of the ratios of wool and artificial fibres permitted to be used in products sold under the woolblendmark.

CIGARETTES

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: I ask a question of the Chief Secretary, as the Minister of Health. Before doing so I ask leave to make a short statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: There is issued quarterly from Switzerland a bulletin called the *Bulletin of the International Union Against Cancer*. In its March issue the executive committee of the International Union Against Cancer resolved that through its group secretariat it would urge its member bodies to develop or expand active cigarette smoking control programmes, and appeal to Governments, where appropriate, to take administrative or legislative action to restrict cigarette advertising and to require a health warning label on all packets of cigarettes, domestic or imported, and that the suggested warning should be along the lines of warning against lung cancer, bronchitis, emphysema and cardiovascular disease. What is South Australia, in conjunction with the other States, doing about this matter?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: This is a hardy annual. While every State would like to do something, we feel it is practically useless for any State to do something along the lines suggested unless action is taken on a Commonwealth basis. If South Australia were prepared to take action along these lines it would be practically useless if other States did not do likewise. The matter was discussed again at the conference of Health Ministers last month. Speaking from memory, I think there was some inclination to go along with the idea of placing on packets advice against smoking and stating what damage it may do in connection with cancer.

TIMBER

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: My question is directed to the Minister of Agriculture. Is the timber available from the Woods and Forests Department plantations in the South-East fully committed to the present industries there or proposed extensions to those existing industries, or what further expansion is considered possible?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Speaking off the cuff, my answer to the first part of the honourable member's question is "Yes". Recently, when I was in the South-East during Timber Week, as the honourable member may recall, I did discuss fully with the Conservator and other officers of the department the amount of timber available to other industries operating in the district. I was then informed that, whilst there were many people in the area desirous of obtaining more timber, it was not available from the Woods and Forests Department. If I can add anything further to that, I will try to get it from the department and, if I can, I will let the honourable member know.

TRAMWAYS TRUST

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Has the Minister of Lands an answer to a question I asked last week about the possibility of the Municipal Tramways Trust taking over some private bus operators' lines in metropolitan Adelaide?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Cabinet has approved a plan put forward by the Municipal Tramways Trust for the resumption of two bus services—those private services operating to Flinders Park and to Athelstone. The Minister of Roads and Transport points out to the honourable member that in fact what has happened is that, instead of the trust approving a five-year licence from April 1, 1970, it has approved a three-year licence, which means in effect that these operators have been given three years' notice of the intention to resume these

services—which, I think the honourable member will agree, is a reasonable time. The Minister has also advised that the question of the terms and conditions surrounding this resumption has been the subject of considerable discussion and negotiation between the Tramways Trust, the Bus Proprietors Association and himself. No finality has yet been reached and, therefore, he is not in a position to inform the honourable member further.

TAKE-OVERS

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: In my district in the Adelaide Hills recently two industries have been taken over by interests in other States—the smallgoods factory of W. Jacobs Proprietary Limited and the tannery at Mount Barker. The ownership in those two firms now rests in other States. Recently, in our wine industry, there have been these take-overs, too: G. Gramp & Sons, now owned by the United Kingdom controlled Reckitt and Coleman group; McLaren Vale Wine Estates, now owned by Reed Consolidated Industries, also United Kingdom owners; and Glenloth Wines, now owned also in the United Kingdom by Allied Vintners Proprietary Limited, which is owned by Allied Breweries of the United Kingdom and Tooheys of Sydney. This pattern of the taking over of industry in South Australia which has been traditionally privately owned seems to be increasing in pace. It is a serious matter for the State. Can the Chief Secretary say whether the Government has any policy of encouraging or discouraging this?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I know of no Government policy on this matter. Speaking personally and, I think, for my colleagues, I am sure we would have no policy of encouraging this. I like the present family set-up in the wine industry that has been operating for many years. Nobody likes take-overs. Whether or not the Government has a policy on this, we cannot prevent human nature and private enterprise doing what it wants to. It has a right to do what it likes with its own businesses and I do not think we can do anything to prevent it.

SYNDICATION ADVERTISEMENTS

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a statement before directing a question to the Chief Secretary, representing the Attorney-General.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: It is a rather difficult question to frame. I could give a long explanation but will try to explain my question as quickly as possible. Several advertisements have appeared lately, both in the press and on television (where I have seen them), in which certain syndicates are seeking investment from the public in real estate. I have no doubt the Attorney-General is aware of these advertisements. I have had several inquiries from people interested in these advertisements, and one question I have been asked by them is, "Where can we obtain a prospectus in relation to this investment?" I have had a quick look at the Companies Act, Part III of which deals with many matters, one of which is the prohibition of unincorporated associations of more than 20 members for gain. Also, I believe there is no need for a prospectus in this case to be issued.

I have no doubt that many of the syndicates are promoted by people with high motives and well qualified to promote such syndication and enterprises. However, has the Attorney-General seen these advertisements and has he had inquiries made about them? If so, in his opinion are there sufficient safeguards in the present legislation to protect the investing public?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I shall be delighted to take the honourable member's question to my colleague, draw his attention to it and bring back a reply.

COCKATOOS

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture. Did the Minister grant a permit, under the provisions of the Fauna Conservation Act, 1964-1965, to the Premier or a member of his staff to export the cockatoos presented last week by the Premier to the Jurong Bird Park in Singapore?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I sign many permits to people who wish to operate in this way. I will check through my list of permits and bring back a reply for the honourable member.

POLLUTION

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply from the Minister of Works to my question of last week in which I requested a statement of policy on control of pollution in our watershed area?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The Minister of Works has informed me that a statement on water pollution control in metropolitan watersheds was issued by the previous Government on April 29, 1970. The Minister of

Works is issuing a policy statement on Murray River pollution control today. I have both statements with me if the honourable member requires them. I point out that there is a booklet entitled *The River Murray in South Australia Water Pollution Control excluding Salinity*, which I understand is a public document and which can be obtained from the Government Printer or from the ground floor of the State Administration Building in Victoria Square. I am sure that if any honourable member wishes to obtain a copy he can do so quite readily, and I am sure that it will explain the whole position adequately.

SHIPPING

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary representing the Premier.

Leave granted.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: My earlier question to the Minister of Agriculture reflects the very serious position we are in in South Australia in regard to oversea freight which, ever since the war years, has been in the hands of a very narrow group of shipping conference lines, which have materially contracted to ship all our produce. This group of shipping lines has had a very strong bargaining position, and this has proved to be very costly indeed. The Commonwealth Government is subsidizing the construction of ships at Whyalla and elsewhere in Australia at a very high cost. Will the Premier explore with the Commonwealth Government the possibility of this subsidy being directed to the construction of refrigerated cargo ships, which could be employed in competition with the conference lines, which at present have a complete monopoly in freight from Australia?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I shall refer the honourable member's question to the Premier.

LEASEHOLD LAND

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Can the Minister of Lands say whether the Government intends to re-introduce legislation to limit the area of leasehold land that can be purchased and held in one ownership?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I know of no present intention to do this.

STATUTE CONSOLIDATION

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: Can the Chief Secretary obtain a report on the latest position concerning the consolidation of our State Statutes, as provided for in legislation some

years ago? Is it intended to wait until all the Statutes have been revised before reprinting, or is it possible for each volume to be issued as it is completed?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I will take up the question with the Attorney-General. This is not an easy matter, for we do not have sufficient staff to undertake the work. However, I shall be pleased to see what the position is.

ABATTOIRS

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Last week the Minister of Agriculture replied to a question regarding financial assistance to the Gepps Cross abattoir. Can the Minister indicate the extent of Government assistance to the abattoir in this matter? Can he say whether, at the time of granting this financial assistance, any consideration was given to the fact (or whether any discussions were held with the board on this subject) that there would be no increase in the killing charge for at least a certain period? Can the Minister also say whether it was necessary to make a loan to the abattoir and whether all other financial institutions had been approached prior to the Government's granting the loan?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: An application was received from the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board for a further loan of \$300,000. When I received the letter from the Chairman of the board asking for this money to be made available, I immediately contacted the board and asked whether it had made any attempt to raise this money outside. I was informed that it had made such an attempt. The Bank of Adelaide was one bank that it had contacted, and that bank had refused the loan. I understand that the board also tried other means of raising the money but that it was unsuccessful. It was necessary that major construction work within the abattoir be carried out for it to get back on to the export list. Honourable members know the complexity of the Gepps Cross abattoir and the enormous sum of money that would be required to bring the works up to the standard required by the Agriculture Department in the United States of America. I am very pleased to know now (and I am sure honourable members will also be pleased about this) that we are back on the export list to the U.S.A. for beef and mutton

and that we are now for the first time on that list for veal and pork, and I believe that it is in the interests of the rural industries of this State that we remain on that export list to the U.S.A., which is the most affluent market we can get for our rural exports. When this loan was asked for, no recommendation was made to me regarding an increase in charges, and I have not received any information from the board on whether that is contemplated at this stage.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Can the Minister of Agriculture tell the Council the term of the loan of \$300,000 to the Gepps Cross abattoirs and the rate of interest the board will be charged?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will obtain a report on this matter from the Treasurer and bring back a reply as soon as possible.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The Minister said that the Government had been requested by the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board to provide \$300,000 as a loan to the board for bringing or assisting to bring the abattoirs up to a suitable standard to enable the board to get into the export market. Can the Minister say whether the sum was actually \$300,000 that the Government gave or lent, or was it a lesser amount? Secondly, linked with my previous question about whether the Government acted to see that the board did not quickly increase the killing charge, can the Minister say what action he or the Government can take to ensure that the board does not unduly increase the killing charge, and what action Parliament can take if the board does implement such an increase?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: An application was received from the board for a loan of \$300,000. The application was referred to the Treasury, which approved the loan. As a result, \$300,000 was available to the board; at that stage there was no inference regarding alterations to the killing charges—I know of none. If the board submits an application for further alterations to its killing charges, it will come before me, and, I believe, will necessitate new regulations. Such regulations will come before the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation; that is the normal procedure in regard to new regulations, but I know of none pending. I do not know whether the honourable member has been talking to board

members and, as a result, knows more than I do, but I know of no pending increases in charges. I assure the honourable member that, if I receive an application from the board for increased killing charges, it will be investigated in no uncertain fashion. One of the contributing factors in considering possible help to the rural industry is the cost factor. Every honourable member will realize this. If we can keep this as low as possible it will help the rural industries, particularly the meat industry, in South Australia.

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Has the Minister given consideration to the Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Co. report upon the operations of the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board in 1967; has he read the McCall report of 1969; and has he read the report of the Chairman of the Public Service Board who, in his triennial report of 1969, pointed out that very extensive amendments are necessary to the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Act and to the Abattoirs Act of South Australia, particularly since one of the recommendations is that the board should have to submit its regulations to Parliament in the same way as any other body? At present the board can make a regulation but it does not have to be laid on the table of this Parliament. Action must be taken in the Supreme Court of South Australia to upset such a regulation. Has the Government, particularly since it is making very large loans to the abattoirs, given consideration to putting this matter into its proper perspective?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I have read all the reports to which the honourable member has referred. No doubt he has read them, too, and he had an opportunity to alter the Acts when he was Minister of Agriculture in the same way as I have had. I intend to take some action along these lines. At this stage the matter is in its infancy and I am very hopeful that in the not too distant future I will be able to rewrite the Abattoirs Act and bring all the legislation under one Act rather than have it in three parts as at present. I thank the honourable member for his information regarding abattoirs charges. Possibly it could be in the interest of growers to bring this matter before Parliament, but nothing has been done in this direction at present.

Before any alterations are made to the present killing charges at the Gepps Cross abattoirs, if and when they come before me they will be given complete and very close scrutiny.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Has the Minister of Agriculture power to control the charges made by the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Yes.

FREEWAY

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to the question I asked last week concerning the possible encroachment on to the park lands in the City of Adelaide of freeway or road schemes?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The proposed route along Hackney Road and Dequetteville Terrace referred to by the honourable member is not a new route: in fact, it is the route determined in the 1962 Metropolitan Development Plan. It is at present being considered by the State Planning Authority as part of its re-examination of the 1962 Metropolitan Development Plan. The newspaper article referred to by the honourable member apparently did not take into account that the routes shown on the 1962 Metropolitan Development Plan were diagrammatic only. No work has been done on fixing routes in the area referred to, and no decisions will be made until all aspects have been fully considered by the Government. Appropriate publicity will be given to the Government's decisions in due course.

NORTH-EASTERN COMMUNITY HOSPITAL

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to my recent question about subsidy arrangements for the North-Eastern Community Hospital?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: In November, 1970, the Government adopted a policy of providing a subsidy beyond \$2 for \$1 for major community hospitals in circumstances where—

- (1) the board of management accepts as an objective the establishment of a hospital of about 200 beds;
- (2) the catchment area to be served by the hospital is accepted by the Director-General of Medical Services as appropriate, having regard to population, public transport and existing hospital provision in the vicinity; and

- (3) the establishment of a nursing home, or continued operation of an existing hospital building as a nursing home, is undertaken, particularly for the accommodation of aged persons under provisions of the Aged Persons Homes Act.

The architect's estimate of cost as at the end of December, 1970, was \$1,600,000 for the whole project, including a 40-bed hospital, a 44-bed nursing home and domiciliary services. Funds available to the board are as follows:

	\$
Hospital Board (loans and donations)	200,000
Commonwealth contribution to nursing home	254,800
Contributing organizations	96,000
	<hr/>
Total	\$550,800

The Government contribution, on present estimated costs, is \$1,050,000, representing 65.6 per cent of the total cost. The cost of the hospital facilities only was \$1,211,800, with the Government contribution representing 86.8 per cent of the cost. I think honourable members are aware that approaches to build this hospital commenced in 1966. With rising building costs, with which donations could not keep abreast, it was necessary to establish a more elastic means of subsidy if this type of project is to be proceeded with.

The offer of the previous Government for the North-Eastern Community Hospital was based on a total cost of \$1,500,000, with a hospital cost of \$1,120,000. The previous Government's offer on these costs was a subsidy of \$795,000, representing two-thirds of the hospital cost and including an additional contribution towards the cost of services of about \$45,000. On the present estimated cost of the hospital section of \$1,211,800, this would represent a subsidy totalling \$860,000 as against the present proposed subsidy of about \$1,050,000.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a further question on this matter.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I thank the Chief Secretary for the information he has just supplied. I think, as the Chief Secretary appreciates, that the previous Government adopted a policy in relation to a combination hospital, catering for the community's needs and geriatric needs alike. The previous scheme was applicable not only to the North-Eastern

Community Hospital but also to all community hospitals and all subsidized hospitals. Can the Chief Secretary say whether that policy still applies or whether the new policy will apply to subsidized hospitals as well?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I should like to examine the Leader's question. As far as I have been able to ascertain, there is no such policy. The policy we have adopted applies to complete new hospitals, whether they be subsidized hospitals, community hospitals, or the type set out in my reply. I am unaware of the previous Government's policy and I should like to check whether any policy was laid down, but at present I do not know anything about it.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my question asked last week regarding the report of the Local Government Act Revision Committee, the attitude of councils to this report and the ultimate target of a new Local Government Act for South Australia?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Approximately 50 councils have replied directly to the Local Government Office. Approximately 12 councils have asked the Local Government Association to consider the report and make submissions on their behalf. Local government authorities were asked to submit comments by June 30, 1971, but any others received within a reasonable time will, of course, be considered. When collated and considered by my colleague the Minister of Local Government, a report will be presented to Cabinet with the ultimate intention of framing appropriate legislation for a new Local Government Act.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from July 15. Page 88.)

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE (Northern): I rise to support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to His Excellency's Speech on the opening of the second session of our Fortieth Parliament. I was pleased to note the recovery which was most evident in His Excellency's health, and I wish him and Lady Harrison well in the future.

I express, too, my sincere regret at the sad loss to this State of the members and ex-members of Parliament who have passed on since our last Parliamentary opening. To

Sir Norman Jude I publicly say "Thank you" for his co-operation and kindness to me since my arrival in this Chamber, and I wish him and Lady Jude much happiness in their well-earned retirement. To Mr. Jack Wright, the member for Adelaide, and to the Hon. Martin Cameron I say "Welcome to Parliament and good legislating".

Very few of the items listed in His Excellency's Speech are new, but this makes them none the less meritorious if the Government has any really concrete intention of implementing them. His Excellency referred to the Government as his Government, and as I am a South Australian I find that I am stuck with the same Government; it is my Government, too! It is none of my choosing, but I intend to assist the Government in any way I can in any project I believe to be for the betterment of South Australia.

Looking at paragraph 5 of His Excellency's Speech we see our Government actively pursuing a policy to promote industry within the State. It lists a number of Asian countries with which contact has been made, and there is a promise to appoint a full-time Director of Industrial Development. The last part is an absolute certainty; there is no doubt this Government will appoint another director.

The point I make regarding industrial development is this: is it necessary for us to seek so much industry from overseas when indeed we have industry within our own State which this department could well afford to assist? I could name a number of small enterprises which could do with financial assistance and promotion, and I sincerely hope it will be one of the new director's intentions that, not only will we be seeking new industry from overseas, but that we will be doing something to assist industries which have been established and which are now struggling for existence. I am not being critical of any sincere attempt to entice industry to this State, but we must be careful not to emulate the process of the dog that dropped his bone into the river, by ignoring some of the enterprises we have in preference to some we know nothing about.

The Minister of Development and Mines is now vested with the promotion of tourism, and it is pleasing to note the Chief Secretary's praise for the magnificence of the Flinders Ranges in the Wilpena area. Many such spots of awe-inspiring beauty are evident throughout my district, and I am sure that the Gammon, Gawler, and Musgrave Ranges, and the western sea coast will attract tourists.

Many of the hidden sanctuaries have been made accessible only in the last few years as a result of the mechanization of the pastoral industry and by the search for minerals throughout those areas, both of which have necessitated the pioneering of access roads. The Minister's job in this respect will be to ensure that these areas do not become a dumping ground for rubbish, vermin, and noxious weeds, and that their attractions are not destroyed. I believe that there is a chance to achieve this situation by firmer control and by better instruction of tourists.

It is with pleasure that I note that tenders have been called for the building of the long-promised Government Printing Office. Following a reticulated water system for Kimba, this would be one of the State's most deserving projects. The members of the printing staff have performed well for a long time under the most antiquated conditions, and they have my admiration. I hope that none of the money for this project will be used for the newly proposed Victoria Square hotel. After all, the re-modelled South Australian Hotel should cope with most of Adelaide's requirements for first-class tourist accommodation.

Paragraph 7 of the Speech refers to another new department, the Department of Environment and Conservation, and deals with that dirty word "pollution". I hope that every use of ecology will be studied by these people. Many of our fumigants and insecticides would be unnecessary if ecology were applied to its full advantage. Organisms and creatures properly understood and developed could cope with many of our pollution problems. Paragraph 9 refers to the acceptance at last of the Maunsell plan for standardizing the rail link between Adelaide and the other capital cities. This project could have been completed by now had the present Government not rejected that report out of hand instead of carefully studying it when it was first introduced.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: It is a variation of the Maunsell plan.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: So I believe, but the hook-up of the State and Commonwealth rail links will be virtually the same as that proposed earlier, and it will be of great benefit to the State. Of special interest to the people of Eyre Peninsula will be the completion of the Port Augusta to Whyalla line, and such schemes as reduced cartage rates for superphosphate, lift-on lift-off stock crates, and a co-ordinated road-rail system are amongst those things that are being spoken of by

those people, who believe that this spur line will be of great benefit to them. Perhaps a daily fast rail service from Whyalla to Adelaide and return will not be out of the question when this line is completed. Perhaps it is a dream, but we are not without hope that some day the North-South line as it is proposed at present when it joins the East-West line at Tarcoola will be extended to link with Whyalla.

Such a link would enable the connection of the State railways on Eyre Peninsula, and whether this is to be done by the State or the Commonwealth Government does not matter, as it would provide an outlet for the thousands of sheep that are sold to Western Australia almost every year from Eyre Peninsula and would provide direct access to store cattle in the north, many of which are being fattened on Eyre Peninsula at present. It would have several other valuable advantages in that it would link much of the top end of Eyre Peninsula grain with another seaport, if that were necessary. Wheat could be shipped from Whyalla and, at times of bottlenecks, it could be transported even to Wallaroo if economical.

This is a project that may seem a long way off, and I merely refer to it, for unless it is spoken of it may be overlooked. A few brief words are used in paragraph 15 of the Speech to refer to the plight of the rural community, in that "the Government is conscious of the problem of the industry". I believe that if it is not conscious of the problem at this stage there is little we can do. Every person who can read or write knows something of the present rural position. Another matter of interest was the proposed orderly marketing scheme for oats, and I believe that this is worth discussing. It must be carefully studied to a point where it does not hamper the exchange of oats for feed and the easy purchase of oats for seed. Although no details are given in the Speech, if it deals with an oversea marketing system it merits our support.

The Speech states that the Government will continue to take action to find solutions to various problems. What action has the Government taken and what will it take? Surely we need no more committees to be established to investigate committees so that there will be no unnecessary humbug. For instance, primary producers do not know from day to day what their wheat quota is and what it will be. I hope that we will get more assistance rather than additional investigations. Over the last two years, I believe, we have been

told that further investigations will be made; but they are not necessary. Everyone knows the position, that we need some action. If we see a man drowning, we do not wait to work out how to empty the river—we throw him a rope.

What benefit will be a greater slice of the European Economic Community or, for that matter, expanded trade to Asia if in the meantime those people who are struggling to provide this produce are denied their existence? Many of these people will be forced from the land or reduced to a point where they cannot produce unless they have assistance in the very near future. If the Government really wants to help there are many positive and quick steps it can take. It has said that a reassessment of land for land tax purposes is about to be made. Let us hope it is a more equitable valuation, and one that can be justified. If the Government wanted to move quickly to assist primary producers, it could drastically reduce land tax and abolish succession duties. It is no good talking about holding investigations into these things—we already know enough about them.

I believe we could make some attempt to acquire \$12,000,000 from the Commonwealth Government, which is South Australia's share under the rural reconstruction scheme. It could channel that money to assist a low interest rate borrowing capacity for the rural industry rather than wait and produce voluminous forms to fill in and have extensive investigations in each separate case. Low interest borrowing facilities would be a quick and perhaps the only method to save many producers.

Farming is not an enterprise that can be stopped and started at will: it has to be kept going. Countries throughout the world are aware and have become aware of this, and we should learn from it, that, regardless of whether or not we like farming, a nation cannot afford to disregard its farmers. The suggestion that wool should be subsidized has reached a stage, I believe, where something concrete has been arrived at—a suggestion of 35c a lb. for wool. I should have imagined that 10c a lb. subsidy on every pound of wool regardless of what is brought at auction would be a fairer way of distributing such a subsidy. It is a formidable thought that the wool industry, one of our greatest industries, has been reduced to a state where it has to accept a subsidy but, when we consider that so many other industries are subsidized, it is no wonder

that this situation, coupled with a decrease in demand, has brought about the present position.

It is always surprising to me that so much is made of a subsidy to woolgrowers. Taxpayers are continually alerted to the position. They are told that such a scheme would cost them \$200,000,000 a year, and \$600,000,000 over three years. Why a period of three years has been chosen I do not know. I imagine that, unless there is a substantial increase in demand for wool and a substantial rise in the price of wool, the wool industry will subside, whether or not it is propped up by a subsidy to keep the return up to 35c a lb. So I find it hard to understand why this period of three years is mentioned. It will not last three years unless there is some increase in demand and better sales of wool. As I say, the taxpayer is continually told it will cost him \$200,000,000 a year but he is never told that at present he is paying \$2,000,000,000 to support secondary industry; that is never spoken of. So, when we consider that the wool industry is perhaps, even in its present depressed state, one of our most worthwhile export industries, \$200,000,000 just to keep it alive is not a large sum.

Is the Government really prepared to do something for the rural industry? What action will it take to rebuke the members of its Party who, for political reasons only, antagonize a nation like Japan, which imports over \$1,000,000,000 worth of our products every year? In Taiwan and in South Africa, whose figures I have not got, some of the investigations and inquiries will start. It is true that Mr. Whitlam did much better than Mr. Virgo, in as much as he was much more prudent and finished up with at least one friend. I understand that he also developed a liking for Chinese cooking, which may help him when Bill McMahon has finished with him: he may decide to open a Chinese restaurant. He could easily call it "Whitlam Chou Inn".

Paragraph 19 of the Governor's Speech deals with the development of the State's water resources. Since we have made no progress with either Chowilla or Dartmouth, the development of water resources in this State is of great importance. We shall watch with great interest what the project will be. I have watched for some 30 years a project that is developing slowly—the Poldo-Kimba water scheme. It is true that an application has been submitted (the Minister of Agriculture told me this today) to the Commonwealth Government for financial assistance. I hope something will

be forthcoming but, in the meantime, why are so many new projects, such as the multi-storey hotel that I have already mentioned, taking precedence of these more essential projects? If the Commonwealth is slow to come to the party with finance, the State itself must do more.

Before closing, I compliment my colleague the Hon. Mr. Geddes on his speech in support of the motion and particularly on his reference to the League of Rights. It was with great interest that I watched the recent debate on television between Mr. Hurford and Mr. Butler.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Is he one of the traitors who is working within the Liberal and Country League?

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: That is what he was accused of. Without wishing to adjudicate, I would like to say that in my opinion it is a pity we do not see more of this type of thing. I congratulate both these gentlemen on the part that they played. They would achieve more in the quarter of an hour that they debated than a thousand demonstrators would achieve in a week, and that is the type of thing that we want to see. I believe that this is exactly where we should be heading, and that people should be prepared to come out and debate an issue. I believe that mob rule is unfortunately becoming part of our living. We must do all possible to remain within the orbit of true democracy. I support the motion.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT (Southern): I, too, support the motion. I am sure we all have a great regard for the dignity of the ceremony of the Opening of Parliament. Like other honourable members, I pay my respectful greetings to His Excellency Sir James Harrison and Lady Harrison. I was glad to note from his appearance that he is obviously very much better than he has been in the past. I wish both him and his gracious lady continued good health.

I also express my condolences to the bereaved relatives of those members of Parliament who were serving at the time of their demise and those who had served in years gone by. I especially refer to the Hon. Colin Rowe, whose contributions to the work of this Council were outstanding. The late Hon. Sir Collier Cudmore must have been in his day a most outstanding servant of this State and one to whom society owes an enormous deal. The late Mr. John Cowan bore a name noted for noble service for this State, and he, like

his father the late Sir John Cowan, made his contribution to the work of this Parliament in this Council. The late Mr. Samuel Lawn had a personality which gained him the respect and friendship of members of this Parliament, as well as a wide circle of friends outside.

When I came into this Parliament I had the honour to succeed the Hon. Mr. Densley, who was retiring for health reasons, and my immediate partner (if I may use that term) as a member for Southern was Sir Norman Jude. No-one could have been more fortunate than I in that situation. Sir Norman's friendship and guidance were outstanding. His departure after 27 years of distinguished service must leave a gap, and this Council is the poorer for his going. I thank him personally for his help and wish him and his gracious wife, Lady Jude, many happy years of retirement.

In the House of Assembly Mr. Wright has succeeded the late Mr. Lawn, and to him I convey my greetings. The Hon. Martin Cameron has succeeded Sir Norman Jude. The honourable member is not an unknown personality. I wish him well and trust that at the end of his years in this Council his record may be as proud a one as that of his predecessor.

Thinking of those who preceded the members who today make up the present Council, one is conscious that every newcomer must bring a personal contribution and must ultimately leave some indelible impression when he departs. Of course, the same applies to every House of every Parliament. Some, coming in very young, offer enthusiasm, idealism and keenness. With these things as their basis, they add, with the passing years, experience and those other attributes which can come only with the passing of time. These people gain their experience almost entirely while they are in Parliament. There are others who enter at later stages in their lives and in consequence bring with them a background knowledge and experience gained in business, in trade, in a profession or in community life. Added to the mechanics of the Parliamentary life, these offerings make the contributions of those older members equally as valuable as those of the younger men.

I wonder: is it incorrect to think of ourselves in this Parliament, in both Houses, as seekers in the service of the State? Or is this just idealism? However, to me the more important question is: what view of us do the public hold, and how do we measure up to their expectations? I wonder how many of us before

we came into Parliament and became politicians were told, "You know, you ought to seek endorsement; you are the type of person we want in Parliament"? People saying this sort of thing refer to integrity and other qualities which they consider necessary in their members and which, perhaps strangely, they thought were possessed by those of us to whom they spoke. But meet those same people a little later and they are likely to say, "Good heavens, you haven't become one of those people in Parliament."

More than once I have been told by folk of considerable intelligence, "We really need you more as a doctor; any fool can go into Parliament." Anyone can legislate for the well-being of the State. Is there not something radically wrong with our sense of values if that is what we think? Surely, any fool should stay out of Parliament and, for the good of the State and the country, people who go into Parliament should have something really worth while to offer. The institution of Parliament, and also its members, have always been regarded as fair game for music halls and variety jesters. There is nothing wrong in that but, when more serious gatherings find occasion to denigrate the whole institution itself and feel justified in ridiculing it critically, then something is wrong and there is some danger to the State in such a practice and danger to Parliament itself. I wonder whether this sort of thing happens because of the way we conduct ourselves and our affairs.

I was told many years ago by a very well respected and wellknown Parliamentarian that, when a person sought Parliamentary preference, it was with the wish to represent a district as its member in Parliament. Once elected, he then becomes that district's member of Parliament. From then onwards the member's first duty is to the State, within the framework of the Constitution, although, of course, with special reference to his electoral district. Every one of us obviously recognizes the need for and believes in the value of change in a changing world, but it ill behoves any one of us, whether a Parliamentarian or a member of the general public, to assault the structure of Parliament itself without giving the most serious thought to what the consequences can be.

One thing we all, as members of Parliament, share (and this applies irrespective of the Party that we belong to) is the wish to serve for the betterment of the State. We may belong to different Parties and we may hold different

philosophies but ultimately we all have one end in view—the well-being of South Australia. It was noticeable in His Excellency's Speech that certain contentious measures have reappeared as matters for reconsideration—capital and corporal punishment, for instance. I suppose that we cannot grumble when we balance against that the speed with which certain other measures have been wiped off the board after being legislation for but a few days. The entertainment tax lasted for 14 days. It is a pity that certain other imposts, especially those having heavy bearing on the hard-hit primary producer, have not been dealt with likewise.

During speeches in this debate so far, considerable reference has been made to membership of trade unions. The term "preference to membership" in connection with gaining employment has been used, as against compulsion in order to earn a living. I personally believe in the general principle of union membership but I can assure the Hon. Mr. Banfield, in spite of what he presses, that no doctor is forced to join any organization or association and, if he does join, it is of his own free will. I strongly believe that this principle should apply to all workers of all grades and groups. To say that, because unions have achieved certain benefits, every person should join one before he can be sure of earning a living, is a very unhealthy form of compulsion.

Certain decisions and demands by some unions, especially of late, have made it very clear that they think little or nothing of holding the community to ransom when certain actions are not in accord with their particular wishes. As a result, people are coming increasingly to ask: who rules the country and who rules the State—the unions or the elected Government? Let it not be said that it is the unions through the Government. The one point about unionism that I personally deplore above all others is the compulsory levy that goes to the funds of one political Party. Surely no-one is so arrogant as to suggest in this day and generation that all the advantages and benefits to society, including union members, have been derived from the actions of one Party alone. Let there be a political levy, all right, but let the member decide which Party shall receive it. That would give some freedom of choice.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: A person is not obliged to pay it to a Party's funds because he is in a union; he can opt out at any time.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: I wish that that were made clearer to the general public.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I know that many businessmen are compelled to pay to a Party's funds.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: May we have the names of some of those Parties?

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The Liberal and Country League.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: And the Labor Party. At present, in order to earn a living, many persons are compelled to be financially aligned with a political body with whose teachings they are completely out of sympathy. No-one representing an area that contains large tracts of primary-producing land can view with other than extreme concern and dismay the plight of the rural industries. Apart from the dairying industry—and one could not call that exuberant—the remainder are in grim straits. I doubt whether this country can ever become completely dependent on secondary industries alone. So, it would be folly indeed if the the Commonwealth and State Governments let what has been the sole support of Australia in the past—and is still the backbone of our exports—slip away into the limbo of neglected and forgotten things.

Land tax, succession duties, water and sewerage rates, sales tax, the cost of transport, rising wages, loss of the real value of money and (I gather this from the headlines in this morning's paper) the severely rising cost of living in this State—all these things are an ever-tightening noose around the necks of those who live on the land. Social services

are important, and they are recognized and accepted by us all. One cannot, however, regard except with sad irony the measure to which distressed sections of the community that are barely subsisting on their crops and flocks and herds have to contribute to the provision of services that make life more acceptable and tolerable for metropolitan dwellers. There is nothing wrong with making life more pleasant—that is correct—but let us pay more than a passing thought to those on the land and let us remember that the day of the rich landowner is to all intents and purposes gone. Of course, there are a few rich landowners left, but they are very few nowadays. I trust that the Government will always legislate with that fact in mind.

In closing what I have to say, and in trusting that the debate that will encompass the range of Bills to be introduced will be informed and purposeful, I draw the attention of the Chief Secretary to one sentence in paragraph 19 of His Excellency's Speech, as follows:

During the current financial year work on improving the State's water supplies will be continued and a number of new projects will be commenced.

Does that all-embracing sentence echo despair, or do we dare hope for a new dam? I support the motion.

The Hon. L. R. HART secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 3.57 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, July 21, at 2.15 p.m.