

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, July 19, 1972

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

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: COURT COSTS

The Hon. L. R. HART: I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Yesterday, in explaining a question, I said that the Government had paid the fine of a union official. That statement was not intended to mislead the Council. Obviously, what I meant was that the Government had paid the costs awarded against Mr. Dunford.

QUESTIONS

COURT COSTS

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Section 91 of the Industrial Code provides *inter alia* that no person shall be injured in his employment because he is not a member of an association. As I understand the position, some time ago the Minister of Roads and Transport issued a directive to his department concerning preference and advancement in employment to unionists over non-unionists. That appears to be a contravention of section 91 of the Industrial Code. Following the Cabinet decision in the Dunford case, a gentleman has telephoned me to ascertain whether his costs will be paid in a test case against the Minister's directive, which this gentleman believes contravenes section 91 of the Industrial Code. Will the Chief Secretary raise this matter in Cabinet and inform the Council of Government policy on a matter of this nature, following the precedent set in the Dunford case?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: In my humble opinion, there is no precedent and no connection between the two cases. However, having been asked to refer the matter to Cabinet, I shall willingly do so.

WOOLENOOK BEND

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Will the Minister of Forests say whether he recently conducted a tour of Woolenook Bend with representatives of the Field and Game Association, with a view to inspecting the game reserve, and will he

tell the Council of any decisions his officers have made with regard to the management of that reserve?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I inspected the Woolenook Bend game reserve and forestry reserve, and I was very impressed with what I saw in the game reserve. There are problems there, but I think we can help to solve them. I have already taken up this matter with my departmental officers to see how we can fit in with what their requirements should be. I hope we can reach a very satisfactory conclusion.

OATS

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make an explanation prior to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: My question refers to the Oat Marketing Act, which was passed in the last session of Parliament. I understand that there is now no great urgency regarding this legislation, because the Chairman (Sir Allan Callaghan) will not be available for the time being. I believe the Minister has stated that he does not intend to conduct a poll and that he has received no complaints about the enactment of this legislation. I accept that. However, as there is no immediate urgency with regard to this legislation, will the Minister say whether he intends to amend it during this session before it has been proclaimed? I understand that one subsection provides that three persons shall be elected to the board triannually, which means that they would have to be appointed every four months. That is one amendment that I think will have to be made. Can the Minister say whether any other amendments to the Act are contemplated?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: No amendments are contemplated.

GAOL SENTENCE

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make an explanation prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: In a recent press report it was stated that a woman, Mrs. Doreen Moore, had been convicted of shop-stealing and had been given a six-month gaol sentence. Mrs. Moore is the mother of a baby girl aged five weeks. In the last session I asked the Chief Secretary whether, in relation to mothers with young children, the children could be taken into an institution with their mother, and he said that he was studying this

matter. I gather that the position in New South Wales is somewhat different. Can the Chief Secretary say whether this matter has been examined and whether this woman will be able to take the child with her, or what arrangements have been made?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: In this case, the Government did not interfere with the court's decision. I believe that the woman has three children. The Attorney-General has taken all aspects of the case into account and the prison term will not be served until arrangements have been made for the care of the children. I understand that when the warrant is executed provision will be made for the children to be cared for in an institution under the Community Welfare Department's control.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Separately?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes.

HOTEL FIRES

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: In view of the extreme danger and the risk of heavy loss of life if a fire were to occur in a hotel, can the Chief Secretary say whether he is satisfied with the present fire precautions, especially in residential hotels, how often the fire-fighting facilities have to be checked, and what arrangements are made for staff to undergo regular fire drill?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I am unable to give the reply now. However, I will take up this matter with the South Australian Fire Brigades Board, which has complete control in this matter, and obtain a report as soon as practicable.

SCHOOL BUS ROUTES

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Will the Minister of Agriculture ask the Minister of Education how many, and in what locality, Education Department subsidized bus routes there are in country areas where children must pay a fee in order to attend departmental primary or secondary schools, and what are the average costs a mile to run a school bus owned and operated by the Education Department?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and let him have a report as soon as it is available.

BOLIVAR WATER

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Some time ago, in the company of the Hon. Mr. Kemp, who

is unfortunately ill at present, I had the privilege of examining the progress being made in the use of the reclaimed water from the Bolivar treatment works, for which courtesy I thank the Minister. We saw some progress being made on soil tests as well as on some plots that had been irrigated, beneficially at that stage, with large quantities of reclaimed water. Will the Minister give the Council, as soon as he is able, any reports of further progress being made towards the use of this reclaimed water?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I shall be only too happy to comply with the honourable member's request. I am just as anxious as everyone is to see that, if it is possible, this water is used to the best advantage.

LAND VALUATIONS

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Local Government.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: The Minister of Local Government indicated to me and the dairy industry in the previous session of Parliament that the Local Government Act was to be amended to allow for any farm fixtures that could be removed without disturbing the soil to be deducted from the valuation. He also said that legislation was to be introduced to bring this into effect. Could the Minister of Lands now ascertain from his colleague when this will happen and whether it will finally relate to the valuation?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I shall be happy to convey the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring him back a reply.

CATTLE

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Will the Minister of Agriculture obtain an estimate of the number of cattle grazing in those parts of the State where it is considered probable that their sale and slaughter will be carried out at the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board works?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer this question to the Director of Agriculture to see whether this can be done. However, it will not be an easy exercise, because private buyers can go to the abattoirs, buy cattle and take them elsewhere for their own purposes, or for sale other than at Gepps Cross. There are three other abattoirs (Peterborough, Noarlunga and Murray Bridge), all of which are attended by private buyers. There are also abattoirs at

Whyalla, Port Augusta and Port Pirie. Nevertheless, I will try to obtain a reply for the honourable member as soon as possible.

SUPER CARS

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. R. HART: General Motors-Holden's and the Chrysler and Ford manufacturers are, I understand, in the interests of road safety, abandoning plans to develop high-speed super cars. The New South Wales Minister for Transport (Mr. Morris) has said that he believes there should be a national ban on high-speed super cars. Are the Minister of Transport in South Australia and the Government willing to support the New South Wales Minister for Transport in his efforts to have abandoned the development of high-speed cars?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I will be happy to convey the honourable member's question to my colleague and to bring back a reply.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I ask leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister representing the Minister of Roads and Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I was pleased that the Hon. Mr. Hart asked a question on this subject. I am certain that every honourable member in this Chamber will be pleased at the announcement that the three major manufacturers will not proceed to produce this type of vehicle. The South Australian Minister of Roads and Transport has also expressed his views, if I remember correctly, and I am sure they will be supported by honourable members of this Council.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: On this matter.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: On this matter.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Don't be so specific.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The number of road deaths in South Australia is still running at a high level. Indeed, the figure is higher than that for any other State of the Commonwealth. Could the Minister examine the matter of preventing modifications being made to stock model cars by amateur speedsters? Whilst we have an announcement that the manufacturers will not continue producing super cars, there is nothing to prevent young people who have a stock model car buying the equipment necessary to turn it into a high-speed car that very few people are able

to drive safely. Would the Minister investigate that situation as well?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Yes; I am sure that my colleague will be most interested in what the Leader has said. I shall refer the matter to my colleague and bring back a reply as soon as possible.

DAIRY INDUSTRY

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Has the Minister of Agriculture any knowledge of any dairy industry regulations that will be tabled in the current session; if he has, can he say on what date they will be tabled?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I cannot answer the question specifically. From memory, I do not think there will be, but I cannot give a guarantee. If I can find out something in the meantime, however, I will inform the honourable member.

AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION

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: For 3½ years a committee headed by Mr. Alec Ramsay and known as the Agricultural Education Committee laboured, and I believe its report has been made available to the Minister of Agriculture. I have asked numerous questions about whether the recommendations are likely to be implemented. Can the Minister give any up-to-date information on this subject and say whether the Government intends to hand over agricultural education to the Education Department?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The honourable member must realize that the document concerned was tabled in both Houses and is freely available even to the public. As has been indicated, the Government will not implement certain of the committee's recommendations. Agriculture has changed quite dramatically since that report came down, even to the present stage, and it is likely to continue to change in the future, as so many factors come into the situation today. The honourable member will be aware that agriculturists in Australia have to devise ways and means to market the goods produced. We have, for instance, a scheme of pulling out trees that the horticulturists have planted over quite a number of years. Controlled egg production is looming on the horizon. The Government is not unmindful of the fact that the committee put a great deal of work into this document, and to my knowledge much of this matter has been incorporated in certain actions

the department has taken in the past 12 months. I cannot name them specifically; I could not hazard a guess offhand about just what they were. To my knowledge, the department does not intend, at this stage at any rate, to hand over agricultural education to the Education Department.

ABATTOIRS

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: From the answers that the Minister of Agriculture gave yesterday to questions about grants to the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board, I got the impression that there was one sum of \$600,000 that had been granted by the Government and another sum of \$200,000, which was designed for the beef chain, was included in the \$600,000: in other words, there was \$400,000 for other works and \$200,000 for the beef chain. As the Minister has said, this amount of \$200,000 has been held back pending possible increases in the costing of the beef chain. This seems to be conflicting; I think there is a mistake somewhere. Therefore, will the Minister say whether the \$600,000 includes the \$200,000?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I should like to clear up this matter because I think a mistake was made yesterday, or at least a mistake was implied. First, the \$600,000 has already been granted to the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board, but that does not include the \$200,000 for the new beef chain. If the new beef chain was to come into operation, the money was withheld pending an investigation by consultants. I add that I have received information from the board that the consultants are working on this matter and are exchanging information at this very moment, so I hope they will be able to give me some information soon on whether the project is feasible at a figure of about \$200,000. To be more specific, on July 9, 1971, there was an initial advance for capital works in progress of \$150,000. On October 1, 1971, a second advance for capital works required in upgrading the facilities to retain the export licence was \$150,000; and then, of course, on June 27, 1972, a further \$300,000 was made available, as stated yesterday. The upgrading of the export abattoirs at Gepps Cross has paid off handsomely: the last report we got from the American veterinary surgeons was quite favourable.

COORONG

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I heard recently that the question of diverting drain water from the South-East to the Coorong had been referred to the Minister by the Lacedpede Bay District Council. Has the Minister any information about that matter, and will he ask the Government to consider extending the investigation being made of Lake Bonney to cover the Coorong, which is a very large stretch of water that, in the opinion of many local people, has deteriorated over the years? An investigation is needed to see whether the deterioration can be rectified.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: At present I have a report on my table regarding that matter. It has not yet been referred to Cabinet but, after that has been done, I shall speak further on the matter. In addition, I shall bring back a reply regarding the other matter raised by the honourable member.

GAUGE STANDARDIZATION

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: In his Speech His Excellency said that South Australian Railways officers, together with a group of consulting engineers, were preparing a master plan for the standard gauge railway to link Adelaide and its major industries with the existing Australia-wide standard gauge network. Can the Minister say whether Chrysler Australia Limited at Tonsley Park is included in that plan?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I could answer the question myself but, because I prefer that my colleague answer it, I shall refer it to him.

DAYLIGHT SAVING

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister representing the Minister of Development and Mines.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: A recent press report stated that a representative of this State would be visiting New South Wales next Friday to discuss with other State Ministers the question of daylight saving in the coming summer months. The press report said that this State

would possibly follow the decision made by New South Wales and Victorian Governments. Will the Minister representing this State take due regard of the many petitions that the United Farmers and Graziers has submitted to the Government, requesting that there be no daylight saving in the summer months?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I can say that all the facts mentioned and the overall position have been very well canvassed by the responsible Minister. No decision has yet been reached, but I can assure the honourable member that the Minister is aware of the matters the honourable member has mentioned.

SOUTH-EAST DRAINAGE

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: A group of settlers in the Eight Mile Creek area has told me that they have submitted a proposal to the Minister regarding the unique drainage problem in their area, which is different from the normal South-East drainage areas. Does the Minister intend to introduce legislation during this session dealing with that problem and, if he does, when will it be introduced? The settlers are most concerned about the proposed increase in rates, amounting to about \$100 for each settler.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The settlers in the Eight Mile Creek area suggested to the Government that the maintenance and control of their area be put in the hands of the settlers themselves. They said that they would form a committee to administer the area themselves. The whole matter has been considered and a plan has been prepared laying down the conditions under which this would operate. One or two weeks ago the Deputy Director of Lands addressed a meeting of the settlers and explained the principles of the scheme. Of course, it would be necessary for all the settlers in the area to take part in the scheme. We are now awaiting the results of the settlers' consideration of the proposal. If they agree to the proposal early enough, a Bill will be introduced during this session to cover the whole situation.

PARK LANDS

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I address a question to the Minister of Lands, although the matter may come under the control of the Minister of Environment and Conservation. Will the Minister say whether the Government has any plans to take over the control of the

Adelaide park lands from the Adelaide City Council and vest that control in a new authority?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The matter is not under my control, as Minister of Lands, and it is not in the hands of the Minister of Environment and Conservation. Actually, it is in the hands of the Minister of Local Government, whom I also represent in this Council. I shall get a reply from that Minister and bring it back as soon as possible.

SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

The House of Assembly notified its appointment of Sessional Committees.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

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

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

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

3. We earnestly join in Your Excellency's prayer for the Divine blessing on the proceedings of the session.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Minister of Lands): I move:

That the Address in Reply as read be adopted.

It is with pleasure that I move the reply to His Excellency the Governor's Speech in opening this third session of the fortieth Parliament of South Australia. My colleagues and I congratulate him on his Speech and the manner in which he carried out the duties associated with the formal opening of the session. Sir Mark and Lady Oliphant have, in the short time they have been at Government House, endeared themselves to the people of this State. His Excellency has shown that not only in his official capacity as Governor but also as a South Australian he is most interested in seeing that the best possible use is made of the resources of this State for the benefit of the people of this State. We are proud that we have such an eminent son of South Australia as the Queen's representative.

We were all shocked at the sudden death of the former Governor, Sir James Harrison, while on his way to England for a short furlough. This Council carried a motion during the last session, expressing its profound regret at his

death, offering its deepest sympathy to Lady Harrison and family in their sad bereavement, and placing on record its appreciation of his distinguished service to South Australia.

Since the commencement of the second session several former members of Parliament have passed away. First, I refer to Lindsay Gordon Riches, a good friend of mine for many years and I am sure a friend of all of us here. Lindsay had a long and distinguished career both in local government and in politics. He was Mayor of Port Augusta for a record period, and a member of the House of Assembly for 37 years. He was Speaker of the House of Assembly during the Walsh Labor Government's term of office from 1965 to 1968. The following former members were also all well known to us: Percival Hillam Quirke, "Bill" to all of us, who was a previous Minister of Lands; William Walsh Robinson, who was a member of this Council when I first came here and who was most helpful to a new member such as I; and George Baron Bockelberg, who represented Eyre in the House of Assembly for 12 years. I express my sincere sympathy to the families of each of these members, who served the State so well.

At this point, I refer to the enforced retirement through ill health of one who for 13 years was a great help to all members of Parliament in this State. I refer to Edward Ludovici, who contributed much during that time by his lucid drafting of legislation for the consideration of Parliament, including those amendments sought by various members. I know that all members join with me in regretting Edward's retirement and in wishing him better health and every happiness in the future.

During April, May and June there was a marked absence of rain, it being recorded that less than 50 per cent of the normal rainfall for this period of the year fell. Also during this period there were widespread heavy frosts, and these circumstances combined to create a position which was comparable to that which occurred in the 1967 season, which honourable members will recall was one of the worst drought periods this State has experienced, as almost all aspects of agricultural production were affected. A close watch has been kept on seasonal conditions this year and, as soon as it appeared that assistance would be required in obtaining fodder for feeding stock and in transporting stock to and from agistment areas, this Government, as did the previous Labor Government in 1967, announced that freight

rebates would be available on such transport operations.

It is of interest to note here that, although there have been some discussions on a Commonwealth-State basis on drought relief finance, this State is still required by the Commonwealth Government to meet the first \$1,500,000 spent on drought relief before the Commonwealth will contribute to the relief of drought-affected farmers. The Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act, under which the assistance is provided by the State, is administered by the Lands Department. It is pleasing to find that several areas have received sufficient rain in July to bring a degree of relief, and it is to be hoped that the remainder of the season will develop in a normal way.

One of the features of the rural reconstruction scheme that has caused me concern since its inception was that there was no provision for assistance for people in rural areas other than those actually engaged in agricultural pursuits. Many other people in these areas suffered hardship as a result of the general rural recession. These people either supplied the services to the agriculturalists or were employed by such suppliers.

At conferences that took place when the scheme was being formulated, the plight of these people in small rural communities was stressed by me and by other State Ministers. I was pleased to see that the Commonwealth Government at last recognized the problem and in December, 1971, it announced that \$15,750,000 would be made available to the States for the relief of unemployment in non-metropolitan areas. The scheme was to operate for 18 months, with a review after the first six months. Originally South Australia's share was to have been \$945,000. However, approaches that were made by the Premier resulted in South Australia's receiving \$1,620,000 in the first six months.

South Australia's share of the money made available by the Commonwealth has been about 6 per cent, but it is considered that on a population and on a rural unemployment basis a higher proportion of the funds provided should have been allocated to this State. When we find that for the purposes of the Commonwealth Department of Labour and National Service such places as the South Coast and Kangaroo Island are classed as metropolitan, it is evident that this State is not receiving its fair share of the finance. In New South Wales, Newcastle is considered to be rural, and in Tasmania, places such as Launceston are considered to be rural. The unfairness of the

assessment is shown when it is realized that places outside what we term as our metropolitan area, such as Kangaroo Island and the South Coast, are included in the metropolitan area and therefore excluded from the non-metropolitan area, which is the basis of the application of the rural unemployment scheme.

The \$1,620,000 allocated to South Australia was completely expended and provided employment for a total of about 3,500 people. The maximum number employed at any one time was 1,380. The funds were distributed through 105 district councils, which have ably supported the scheme. Grants ranged from \$1,000 to \$93,000. Recently the scheme has been reviewed and amounts to be made available to all States for the next six months have been increased. South Australia's share of this additional amount is \$2,160,000. Grants to various councils have already been made from these funds. Unfortunately, this sum will provide sufficient funds to employ in rural areas only a small proportion of those people who are enrolled for employment with the Department of Labour and National Service.

Generally, the grants are made on the basis of the unemployment level for each district, taking into account the rise and fall of such employment over a reasonable period. A detailed review of all aspects of the operation of the rural reconstruction scheme was completed at a meeting of Commonwealth and State Ministers in Sydney early in April this year. Originally, \$100,000,000 was allocated to the States for a four-year period. The sum of \$4,000,000 was allocated for the 1970-71 financial year, and \$40,000,000 for the 1971-72 financial year. In addition, \$9,500,000 was available to the States from pre-war reconstruction schemes, making a total of \$53,500,000 available for expenditure by June 30, 1972. The review indicated that \$25,000,000 of these moneys had been spent and that all of the \$53,500,000 had been committed. There is a time lag between the commitment of funds and actual payments to approved applicants.

Resulting from this review, the amount of funds provided for 1972-73 was substantially increased. The sum of \$56,000,000, or the whole of the balance of the \$100,000,000 originally allocated over a four-year period, is now available for the current year. The formula laid down under the scheme provides that South Australia's share is to be 12 per cent. In addition to the \$100,000,000 to be allocated by the end of 1972-73, and

to enable the administering authorities to continue operations in the latter part of the 1972-73 financial year, the Commonwealth Government indicated that it was willing to undertake to provide a further \$15,000,000 as a carry-over of commitments into the 1973-74 financial year. This additional amount is also to be allocated on the same formula as the rest of the funds, South Australia's share being \$1,800,000. The total funds available to South Australia under the scheme amount to \$13,800,000, plus \$800,000 from pre-war reconstruction schemes.

One of the conditions of the scheme that was amended was the period of loan to farmers for farm build-up purposes. It was agreed that the term could be extended up to 30 years at the discretion of the State administering authority. Additionally, rehabilitation loans for farmers obliged to leave the industry and suffering personal hardship have been increased from a maximum of \$1,000 to a maximum of \$3,000. The new financial arrangements and conditions that have been achieved were the result of a combined approach to the Commonwealth from State Ministers administering the scheme. That the scheme had to be amended so early completely justifies the criticism that I levelled against it when it was first introduced.

The latest statistics on the administration of the scheme up to July 14, 1972, are as follows: 755 applications were received; there were 79 applications for farm build-up; 12 were recommended for approval; 24 were recommended for refusal; one was withdrawn; and 42 were pending. Advances recommended amounted to \$412,424, and actual expenditure amounted to \$206,265. A total of 676 applications were received for debt reconstruction carry-on finance; 217 were recommended for approval, 282 were recommended for refusal, one was recommended for dismissal, seven were withdrawn, 84 were before the committee, and 85 were pending. Advances recommended amounted to \$4,244,421.52 and actual expenditure amounted to \$3,439,140; 87 budgets were approved, and total budgeted expenditure amounted to \$1,477,119.

Eight applications were approved for re-establishment loans, and advances recommended amounted to \$7,500. A total of 67 protection certificates were sought; seven were issued, three were cancelled, and 34 were declined. In other cases, the administering authority has been able to negotiate the deferment of proceedings.

I should like to move to another subject which, by the questions asked and by the attitude of certain honourable members, I am sure is of interest to all honourable members. I refer to the decision made by Cabinet, in which I played a part, to meet the costs awarded against Mr. Dunford in the case brought against him by Mr. Woolley, before His Honour Mr. Justice Wells. In doing so I do not want to encroach on any answer that the Chief Secretary will subsequently give on the matter.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: If you had told me, I would have asked you in the first place.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The Chief Secretary is the Leader of the Government in this Chamber and, therefore, should answer on the Government's behalf. However, I should like to comment on the matter, because it is evident from what happened yesterday that honourable members did not know the real facts of this matter. Indeed, when an honourable member gets up in this Council and refers to this matter in asking another question and is so far off the beam that he must the next day make a personal explanation on the matter, it shows how little some people know about the subject.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: And how sincere they are.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I am pleased the honourable member made that personal explanation, because I had intended to be most critical of him for making the statement, too much mileage having been made out of this dispute by many people. I was sure that someone was trying to make even more political mileage when the statement to which I have referred was made yesterday. However, I accept that the honourable gentleman did not know the facts and, indeed, I am sure many other people are in the same position. I intend this afternoon to refer to the case and the comments made by Mr. Justice Wells. It is an unfortunate feature of our society these days that the media and everyone else try to make a story out of a case. When things go well or when a situation is corrected by some action, then the media do not want to see or hear about that subject.

I was in a dispute with a group of farmers, the zone 5 case, which, thank heavens, has been settled satisfactorily. During that time I was chased from pillar to post by the media, or sections of it, for comments. However, I was not chased as much as the people who were having shots at me. Everyone who had a stick to wield to bash the Minister was invited

to make statements to the press. I received all kinds of letters from people as a result of the impression of me given by the media. I had letters threatening my life. It was all a story to the newspapers and the media in the same way as the matter I wish to deal with now.

I am disturbed that, because of the build-up and the stirring about this matter, an officer of mine has suffered. Unfortunately, he has a name similar to that of one of the prime participants in the dispute. I refer, of course, to my Director, Mr. Jack Dunsford. Everyone in this Chamber would know and respect him as a very efficient and most highly qualified officer of the Public Service, well respected everywhere. Because of the story and the stirring that went on, and because people do not check their facts to see who is who and what is what, my Director received the other day a letter which I shall quote.

It is unfortunate that, because of the handling of disputes by some sections of the media, people who are not of stable mind (and this must be so in this case) put pen to paper and write letters. This has happened to me previously, and now it has happened to one of my officers. Apparently the address for the letter was taken from the telephone directory, and Mr. Dunsford was thought to be the same person who is concerned in the current matter. He was referred to as "Dear Jack", although I think Mr. Dunford's name is Jim. The letter states:

No sentiment in business, but you would not have the neck to call a union secretary's job a business. You would not know the first thing about having an incentive to get your own living. You make me sick, you loud-speaking, beer-drinking louts trying to dictate to any business man how to run his own farm or business.

It beats me that somebody has not fixed you before this. Then again, Liberals do not do things like that. It is only Labor and Communist individuals that threaten the lives of decent men and women.

It must be gratifying to you to know that you are protected by Dunstan to get out of this mess, not to mention a fellow by the name of King, with some of his clever tricks.

Personally, I think unions are necessary, but not to the extent of overcoming common law and decency.

God bless your wife and all the young Dunsfords, for having to bear the shame brought on them by yourself. Yours truly,

and get this: the letter is signed "A straight-out Liberal".

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: That figures.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: This is what political stirring does in a dispute such as this.

It brings people out from under the stones to do these things.

It has been said that there is no precedent for what the Government did, but there is ample precedent in the Commonwealth sphere and even in South Australia itself. I know of a case affecting an employee at Government House, where the Playford Government paid the costs of legal representation for the person concerned and added to that amount a payment concerned with some dispute over wages. Do not let us say this has never been done previously in South Australia.

It has been done on a number of occasions in other British-speaking countries and in the Commonwealth sphere. We heard recently of a case where the costs of a number of trade union officials were paid to keep them out of gaol. The situation the Government faced when the decision was made in the matter we are now discussing was that there was a dispute and it was building up to something much greater. Do not take only my word for that. It was not my judgment. The Hon. Mr. Justice Wells expressed fear of the matter developing further.

Despite the desire of the Trades and Labor Council and everyone else to get together for talks, the Government was faced with an ultimatum that, unless the costs were paid, the costs of Mr. Woolley levied against Dunford, there would be no conference under the chairmanship of Commissioner Lean of the South Australian Industrial Commission. The Government was faced with a deadlock. Mr. Dunford had said that, rather than pay the costs, he would go to gaol. He meant it. We knew that further writs were being issued on other trade union officials and the Trades and Labor Council, and, had those writs proceeded, and had Dunford gone to gaol, we would have had in South Australia such an industrial dispute as has never been seen previously.

I know (and I knew last year) that the Commonwealth Government at least was looking for a peg on which to hang a hat for the election (law and order), and here was a golden opportunity for such a thing to happen. Immediately the word got out that the Government had paid the costs, then the screams commenced. Here was a golden opportunity wanted by people seeking political advantage, and it had gone. There is no doubt in my mind that that is the reason for all the protests. The demonstrators have lost something they thought they could use. It is a pity something cannot be drummed up

now for the demonstrators to get stuck into so that they could have a law and order issue. That is what they want to influence electors in the next elections: so that they can blame the Labor Party for disputes.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Law and order, or law and disorder?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: There are various sections of opposition to the Labor Government in this State—the Liberal movement, the L.C.L., and the Country Party people. We were being asked what we were going to do about settling the dispute. In my opinion, we did the right thing in cooling down the situation and bringing to it the sensible solution of people talking to each other, which has always been my policy since I first came into the trade union movement. As long as we can keep the unions and the employers talking, surely there is some way in which a solution or compromise can be reached to satisfy the people concerned.

We have been accused of doing the wrong thing because we did something to bring the people together to talk. As long as we can keep people talking and prevent them from making statements to the press, where they cannot save face, that affords us a better chance of solving problems connected with industrial disputes. I felt I had to say something of this nature so that people would know what caused the situation. I now propose to quote some of the things that His Honour Mr. Justice Wells said. On May 11, after publishing his reasons for judgment, His Honour said:

What I want to say now is not part of my judgment and I declare it not to be part of the reasons that I have just published, but it is nevertheless very important and I want it carefully considered by both sides. I indicated during the hearing of the case that, whatever the outcome, it seemed to me that the most strenuous efforts should be made by all persons concerned to achieve what I might call an all-round settlement of the case. The exploration of the facts and circumstances that was necessary for the purposes of the actual issues showed quite clearly to me that there was a much more deep-rooted dispute than merely appeared from the formal issues arising on the pleadings, and it seemed to me, and it still seems to me, that merely to decide this case as to the rights and wrongs according to the strict law is not going to compose the differences between the parties, and I would foresee, if the parties simply rely upon the strict rights and duties the law gives to them and imposes on them, a possibly long run of disputes and disturbances and upsets of one sort and another, without being too specific about it. Therefore, acting as I do now under the 1929 Conciliation Act, I strongly urge not only the parties (because they are, as it were,

almost nominees of the interests in the dispute) but all persons concerned to consider this: that, on the one hand, the trade unions concerned in this affair have plainly a legitimate interest in advancing the rights of their members through proper and constitutional means, and, on the other hand, the graziers on Kangaroo Island have obviously special problems of their own; and it is, therefore, not surprising to find that an all-Australian, Commonwealth award cannot take proper and due notice of these very special circumstances of the farmers, and, in particular, the shearing industry, in Kangaroo Island. Each party has his own interests centred upon the very special circumstances of Kangaroo Island; therefore, I would urge all persons concerned, as soon as practicable, to come together and to endeavour to compose their differences, with that sort of approach. Plainly it is not going to be settled just by looking at whether or not there was a tort. The legitimate interests of both persons arising from the special circumstances of Kangaroo Island must be fairly and properly considered from an overall point of view.

In his judgment, he had something further to say which I think is important. It is this:

When I first gave judgment in this action, I indicated that I would make a declaration with respect to the American River incident, but I deferred the question of the injunction and damages because I wished the parties to have an opportunity of trying, by negotiation, to compose their differences along a wider front than was established by the formal issues at the trial. I said (in effect) then, and nothing that has been brought to my notice has caused me to change my mind, that plainly the unions involved, and the farmers and graziers involved, had been pursuing their legitimate interests, and that the differences disclosed by the evidence had arisen between them primarily because the special circumstances and conditions obtaining in, and in relation to, Kangaroo Island had not been adequately accommodated within the framework of the Commonwealth Pastoral Award.

I am satisfied that a real, prolonged and strenuous attempt has been made to compose those differences, but unhappily that attempt has failed. I sincerely trust that the efforts of those concerned have not been expended in vain and that what has been done will provide a basis for a lasting settlement. I am impressed with the necessity for such a settlement because, in my view, the present case has not arisen out of a transient and circumscribed departure from an orderly and well-established course of business and industrial relationships but is symptomatic of a fundamental disharmony between farmers and union shearers. Unless a comprehensive agreement is reached resolving their differences, I can see ahead a vista of disputes and further litigation which can only leave a legacy of bitterness, and which will represent fruitless attempts to deal with a problem piecemeal.

I am now obliged, however, to turn to the legal question whether, in all the circumstances, an injunction should be granted that would have the practical effect of lifting the "black

ban" on the plaintiff's wool. In my opinion, having regard to the facts generally and to my findings as to the American River incident in particular, I am constrained to grant the injunction. But I am moved to say that, if I thought I had the power, I should make the injunction conditional upon the plaintiff's filing a written undertaking in the court that, as soon as reasonably practicable after June 1 in 1972, and June 1 in 1973, he would give notice to the Secretary of the A.W.U. . . .

Mark you, this is the judge of the court talking, not the union secretary talking. Although this was the condition that the Trades and Labor Council tried to get the farmers on the island to agree to, they would not agree to it. It was not the Trades and Labor Council's idea; this was an idea put in their minds by the judge. His Honour continued:

. . . in Adelaide of the date (as nearly as could be stated) upon which it was his intention to commence shearing, and that he would not actually engage any shearing labour until 28 days after the giving of that notice. If I was being asked to grant an interlocutory injunction, that is how I should probably proceed; but, for reasons to be given later in this judgment, I am of the opinion that I have not the power to impose conditions of this kind when a final injunction is being sought.

I think that will give honourable members something to think about.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: It certainly gave the people on Kangaroo Island something to think about.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: But they rejected it. They accepted the other part, which was not part of the judgment: they accepted the injunction to lift the ban. I am saying that the committee that has been formed on Kangaroo Island to represent the farmers seems to me to be a reasonable committee.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I agree.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: Most farmers' committees are.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Sometimes.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I agree that it is a reasonable committee. I noticed in yesterday morning's newspaper that consideration is to be given to the proposals of the Trades and Labor Council. The conferences took place only because the Government paid the costs; the Government has been wrongly accused of doing that illegally. As a result of the conferences, all matters were fully discussed. I am sure that, if this matter is not stirred for political reasons and if there are discussions between the committee of farmers and the Trades and Labor Council, a decision will be reached. His Honour said that he could see no future for the matter

unless the parties got together and talked. Now, as a result of the Government's getting them together, they will reach a satisfactory conclusion. In his judgment His Honour said:

I have already indicated how I view the larger issues thrown up by the controversy in this case. I do not hesitate to assert that the plaintiff appears to have adopted a short-sighted and self-deluding attitude towards the growing interest of the A.W.U. in the conditions of shearing on the island. If his views are shared by other farmers on the island, then they have, as a group, behaved unwisely and been strangely unwilling to face facts. I do not wish to say more than that because I am not in the same position as I would be if, as a conciliator or arbitrator, I was formally seized of an industrial dispute, and accordingly cannot know all the facts of industrial significance.

That statement by His Honour is very important. I shall remind honourable members of these points if I am in the Chamber later in the session when industrial legislation is before the Council. If all the people who have tried to make capital out of this matter and inflame the situation knew what was said in the court, much of what has been said in the press would not have appeared.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture): I have much pleasure in seconding the motion so ably moved by the Minister of Lands. I wish to cover some aspects of agriculture in this State in a general way. First, I wish to pay my respects to the families of those deceased members whom I knew very well. Mr. Lindsay Gordon Riches, the member for Stuart for many years, entered Parliament at an early age and served Parliament for a longer period than any member who is still in Parliament. Mr. Riches was a great help to me when I entered Parliament in 1960, and I treasure the advice he gave me. I can say the same about Mr. Bill Quirke, the member for Burra for a number of years. I first got to know Mr. Quirke when I was a small boy, because he often used to come to the North of the State. Mr. Quirke always tried to encourage people to be just in all their dealings, and he himself applied that principle right to the time of his death, including the period when he served on the wheat committee.

The Hon. W. W. Robinson was a member of this Council for several years; I came to know him over a period of years in the North of this State because, when he travelled to Peterborough, he stayed at our hotel. I also knew Mr. Bob Wilson, a colleague of his, who has also passed on. I was often associated with Mr. Bockelberg, the member for Eyre in

the Lower House for a number of years, in the North of this State, and he was well respected as a member for his district. I extend my sincere sympathy to the members of the families of those gentlemen, and I hope my expression of sympathy is accepted in the spirit in which it is given.

One of the problems in agriculture this year has already been covered briefly by the Minister of Lands. At the beginning of this year we were faced with a drought. One of the problems of a Minister of Agriculture is that everyone expects him to make rain. Some of the Aborigines in the Far North of this State, my very great friends, claim to be rain-makers, but I assure honourable members that, whenever I have asked those friends to make rain, they have always come up with an excuse. So, I believe it is beyond anyone's powers to make rain to satisfy all.

Last year was very satisfactory from all points of view. The farming community contributed very well towards South Australia's wheat quota last year; indeed, 37,500,000 bushels of barley was delivered to silos in 1971-72, together with 47,811,000 bushels of wheat and about 1,000,000 bushels of oats. In anyone's language, that is a very good harvest. South Australia's wheat quota this year is 46,000,000 bushels, plus another 4,000,000 bushels of hard wheat, making a total of 50,000,000 bushels, provided that not less than 4,000,000 bushels of hard wheat is received within the State quota of 46,000,000 bushels. "Hard wheats" are defined as wheats of a variety recommended or approved for sowing as hard wheats by the State Advisory Committee on Wheat Quotas and of uniform vitreous appearance, containing not more than 10 per cent of mottled and/or soft grains. In the not too distant future we will have to sell wheat on quality standards; that is inevitable, and I would not be surprised if the Commonwealth Government was handed a report along those lines very soon.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: What do you mean by "quality standards"?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: It will have to be done on a protein basis. It will be quite a headache for the bulk handling authorities in this State and for the grain elevator boards in other States to segregate the wheat, because the standard of wheat will have to be decided before it goes into the silos. The wheat industry must realize that that is inevitable, and the industry must meet the requirements demanded by importing countries in the years to come. One of the problems associated

with Australian agriculture is that we can grow many products too readily, and we tend to over-produce some commodities. The simple fact is that oversea markets are becoming harder to find in certain respects, particularly for canned fruits, for example. A scheme for pulling trees was initiated by Commonwealth Government officers some months ago, and this has been modified in the last few weeks. I do not know the full facts, because there is a meeting of departmental officers in Canberra today to ascertain what the situation is. I believe reference has been made to a statement of mine that I would not agree to the Commonwealth proposal. I believe it appeared in a newspaper along the river or in some country districts that New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland had agreed to the scheme but that South Australia and Western Australia had not agreed. The only reason I did not agree to the scheme, and could not agree to it anyway, was that I did not have the full facts, and I was not willing to buy a pig in a poke.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: I thought the press stated that South Australia was considering the position.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: That is right. There was a statement in the country press that I had refused to take part in the scheme, or something to that effect, but that is not correct. Basically, the scheme as proposed to me was that the Commonwealth would supply all the money, but this was a complete reversal of the initial proposition I received several weeks ago when I attended a special Agricultural Council meeting in Canberra. At that stage, the Commonwealth was to supply half the money, the States were to contribute 25 per cent, and the industry was to contribute 25 per cent. However, the industry told the Commonwealth that it was not financial enough to contribute anything, and some of the other States said they were unable to find any finance. The Commonwealth was left with the scheme, and it has now come up with the proposition that it will make \$4,600,000 available for a scheme involving canning and pome fruits. The scheme will operate under the rural reconstruction scheme, but it seems to me that the terms of that scheme will have to be altered to embrace this one. However, whether we can obtain any advantage from it for South Australia is debatable and will depend on the outcome of today's conference in Canberra.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Will the Minister say what control the State or Commonwealth

Government will have over the settlers in telling them what to replant?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The information I have received from the Commonwealth Minister (Mr. Sinclair) is that the Commonwealth will make \$4,600,000 available, based on a maximum payment for the pulling of canning fruits to the maximum value of \$500 an acre. This must average out at \$350 an acre, so I cannot see too many people obtaining the full amount of \$500 when the scheme must average out at \$350 an acre. Regarding pome fruits, the Commonwealth has proposed a sum of \$300 an acre, with an average of \$200 an acre. I cannot see many pome fruit people getting \$300 an acre when it must average out at \$200. These are some of the problems with which the States will be faced if they have to administer the scheme. One aspect of the scheme is worth noting: if the grower elects to have his trees pulled, he will be given a loan by the Commonwealth for five years and, if at the end of five years he does not replant any trees, it will be given to him as a grant. Basically, it is along those lines that the scheme will be administered.

The Hon. C. R. Story: I think some people are having their legs pulled as well as their trees pulled.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: These are some of the reasons why I could not commit South Australia, because I was not going to buy a pig in a poke. I believe that the first scheme initiated by the departmental officers would probably have been better. However, that appears to be water under the bridge, so I do not think it is worth while mentioning now. Regarding egg production control, honourable members will recall that last April I said that, in the event of the introduction of egg production controls in South Australia, the quota established would be based on the number of leviathan hens held over the 12-month period ended March 2, 1972. I warned producers that any expansion of hen flocks after that date would be carried out at the risk of not qualifying for a quota for such expansion. In discussions I had with the Victorian Minister of Agriculture (Sir Gilbert Chandler), he told me that Victoria had adopted South Australia's closing date of March 2, 1972. The Government, which has recognized the plight of the egg industry, has strongly urged the introduction of egg controls throughout Australia. Most responsible industry people realize that hitherto the egg industry has been able to dispose of its surplus production overseas, but the decline in traditional export markets has

meant that production will now have to be curtailed in order to meet the realistic demands of the home market.

Unfortunately, the Victorian Government consistently opposed this view, thereby throwing into doubt the prospect of introducing an effective system of production control throughout Australia. I was relieved to be told recently by the Victorian Minister that his Government is now seriously considering legislation to control egg production in Victoria for a three-year period. The Victorian Minister does not agree to continuing the controls but will agree to voluntary controls. Therefore, I hope that this matter can again be discussed and that general agreement will be reached at the forthcoming meeting of the Agricultural Council to be held next month in Queensland.

Meanwhile, I considered it desirable for draft egg production control legislation to be drawn up and put to the Government for consideration. Accordingly, I appointed a subcommittee of the Poultry Consultative Committee to draft the legislation. The Chairman is Mr. Ray Fuge, Senior Poultry Adviser of the Agriculture Department, and committee members include one representative of the United Farmers & Graziers (Poultry Section), a representative of the Red Comb Egg Association and a representative of the South Australian Egg Board. When the draft Bill is ready, the industry will again be consulted and, should it wish, a poll will be held on the question. However, judging by the strong representations made to me by many sectors of the industry for urgent regulatory action, I doubt whether a poll will be sought by a significant number of producers. This has happened in New South Wales, I believe. It was unnecessary and a complete waste of money, because I think that over 80 per cent of the producers voted in favour.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It was a waste of public money.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Yes. After all, the U.F. & G. Association, which is the producers' representative, has its ear close to the ground. I have much faith in its officers.

Other matters in which I will be interested when they are finally drafted include a Bill relating to the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board, which I hope will be introduced shortly and which, I believe, will be in the interests of the meat industry in South Australia generally. I refer also to amendments to the Bush Fires Act, and I have already referred to the amendments to the Marketing of Eggs Act and to the Stock

Diseases Act. I can remember earlier this afternoon answering a question asked by the Hon. Mr. Cameron regarding dairying. I believe a small amendment to the Dairy Industry Act is to be introduced. Although I cannot remember offhand what it involves, I believe it has something to do with the registration of bulls after they reach 12 months of age rather than six months of age, to which the Act refers at present. Although it is only a minor amendment, I wanted to put it on the record for the honourable member's sake.

I believe that, given the right type of marketing orientation within the agricultural field today, many markets throughout the world would be open to us. When speaking to some butter factory salesmen recently I was amazed to find that, in their tours throughout the world in the last few months, they had opened up markets for Australian dairy produce in many countries with which we had not entered into trade arrangements previously. This shows that, given the right type of people and the know-how, there may be markets for our products of which we are unaware. We must adopt a determined attitude regarding the marketing of our products, not only primary products but also secondary products. Australia makes a good quality secondary product; our tradesmen are second to none; and the agriculturist can meet the challenge by producing a quality product. We in Australia can do this.

There has been much talk recently about Turkish and Greek people who are going to flood the European Economic Community with dried fruits, and so on. However, from information I have received from oversea people, I am convinced that if we keep our quality high we can compete with these people. We in Australia have the know-how and can market a product that is readily marketable overseas and, indeed, we can compete with other products from these countries that do not measure up to our standards. If we can do this, agricultural industries in Australia will have a better future and outlook. It is interesting to note that the recent lifting of quotas for meat exported to America has been welcomed in Australia. This is, of course, only natural. Whether these quotas will be reimposed later, I would not like to say. However, that is always possible.

Another matter which is causing some concern and which, I am sure, is causing honourable members in this Chamber some concern, too, is that the Japanese are buying properties in the Northern Territory. I read

in the *Advertiser*, I think only two days ago, that three properties had been purchased by Japanese interests for the production of beef cattle and that they had been refused the transfer of a fourth property. I have no doubt that the Japanese will be interested in producing cattle in Australia for their benefit in their own country becoming, as they are, more accustomed to the consumption of beef, which, it seems to me, will have more of a premium status in Japan than mutton or lamb for which they have not yet acquired a taste. It will indeed be of concern to the beef industry if these people are let in to produce their own type of beef, especially when Australia can produce equally as good beef as oversea investors.

I refer now to the export of Australian lamb to the United Kingdom. All honourable members know that England was voted into the European Economic Community by a small majority—I think only eight votes. There was some concern whether we would be able to continue sending our lamb to the United Kingdom. I believe, however, that there will still be a market for Australian lamb there. I believe, too, that beef prices could possibly put beef out of the reach of many wage-earners in the United Kingdom once it goes into the European Economic Community and, if that is so, those people will turn to a cheaper commodity, namely, lamb. The Australian chilled lamb industry will still have a reasonable market in the United Kingdom in the years to come. That is, however, only my opinion. I am not a pessimist in any of these matters, because I know how agriculture can change so quickly. Nevertheless, we should adopt a more realistic attitude in our approach to this matter. Had we done so earlier, it would have saved many heartaches in the rural community.

Wool is on the up-turn, and prices today are relatively good compared with what they

were 12 months ago. They could have been even better had the monetary crisis throughout the world in the last few months not caused a reduction in sales. Had the monetary situation been more stable, the prices paid for wool in this country would have been higher than those we have received at the last couple of sales. It seems that the synthetic industry is in poor shape and that this is the time for the wool industry really to go forward and promote wool as it should have done many years ago. We sat back on our haunches then and relied on the fact that wool was a natural fibre and, because it was the best fibre one could use, it therefore had to be used. Of course, today promotion works in the reverse: one can have a really good fibre but that does not necessarily mean that people will buy it. It must be promoted, because a good secondary product, if promoted, can outstrip sales of the natural fibre. We must orientate ourselves in this direction.

The Agriculture Department has for some time set its sights more on market orientation than on production orientation. I do not want honourable members to think that it is not going to consider production orientation, because this is always uppermost in our minds. The department has become more market orientated, and I hope this change in emphasis will be advantageous to the rural community in the years to come.

I compliment His Excellency the Governor, Sir Mark Oliphant, on the way in which he delivered his Speech. It is not easy for one to come into the opening of a Parliamentary session as a new Governor. I think he did a fine job, and I congratulate him on it.

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

ADJOURNMENT

At 4 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday, July 20, at 2.15 p.m.