

## LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, July 25, 1972

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

### ACCIDENT TO HON. A. M. WHYTE

The PRESIDENT: I am sure all honourable members will join with me in extending a welcome to the Hon. Arthur Whyte on his return to the Council after his unfortunate accident. The honourable member is still suffering acute pain in his amputated shoulder as a result of the accident and I intend, with the leave of the Council, to permit him to remove his coat in the Chamber during the sittings of the Council.

## QUESTIONS

### FISHING INDUSTRY

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I have received in the post from the South Australian fishing industry a submission setting out a case for greater Government recognition of the fishing industry. The following three submissions are made to the Minister:

1. That South Australia's fisheries be raised to the status of a Ministerial portfolio.
2. That the South Australian Government provide modern fisheries research facilities in keeping with the value, the greatly increased size, and the obvious potential of the fishing industry.
3. That the South Australian Government provide funds to the Department of Fisheries in this State so that the department can function at a level at least comparable with similar departments in other States.

Has the Minister of Agriculture read the submission, and has he any comment to make on the three points raised in this document?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Regarding the first part of the question, I have read the report to which the honourable member has referred. Regarding the second part of the honourable member's question, I would like to have a detailed examination made of it because it is a matter of Government policy, so I ask the honourable Leader to put the question on notice.

### PETROL SUPPLIES

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Can the Chief Secretary assure the Council that emergency supplies of petrol will be made available to

all ambulance services throughout the State in the event of general petrol supplies being exhausted as a result of the current strike?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I cannot give a personal guarantee that such will be the case. However, I inform the honourable member and other honourable members that in the middle of last week my department and I instigated inquiries as to the availability or otherwise of emergency petrol supplies for doctors, hospitals and paramedical fields. The Government has been in touch with the various sources of petrol supplies, which have undertaken that, as far as practicable, petrol will be available for those services.

The Hon. E. K. RUSSACK: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. E. K. RUSSACK: Perhaps the Chief Secretary has already replied to this question in some degree, but since dairy produce is an essential food which, in its raw state, is perishable, continuation of the oil dispute could result in dairy farmers being forced to tip milk on the ground, losing in one week the net income of many weeks of production. What action will the Government take to ensure that the public will be provided with this essential commodity and that the primary producer will not be forced unnecessarily into an adverse financial situation?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The Government will take every action within its means to ensure that essential services are provided with petrol supplies wherever possible and that there is no wastage, particularly of foodstuffs.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I know that the Government will do its utmost to safeguard essential services and keep them going as long as there are fuel supplies available. Has the Government considered amongst those essential services some of the outback mail runs that supply rations to many families, work forces, road forces, etc.? Has the Government considered those runs a part of the essential services and, if not, will it give due consideration to that?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The Government has not yet considered that but I assure the honourable member it will.

### TRAFFIC LIGHTS

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to directing a question to the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The traffic lights on the corners of Unley Road and Greenhill Road and of King William Road and Greenhill Road are set to allow traffic to proceed straight ahead, with an arrow indicating that vehicles may at the same time turn right. The traffic lights on Goodwood Road are set so that traffic can proceed only straight ahead, and motorists must wait before turning right. This is a very busy intersection and traffic builds up to undesirable proportions. Will the Minister of Roads and Transport consider the possibility of installing, at the corner of Goodwood and Greenhill Roads, the same type of lights as those operating at the other intersection I have mentioned?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I will be happy to convey the honourable member's question to my colleague, the Minister of Roads and Transport, and to bring back a reply as soon as it is available.

#### CIGARETTES

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: Will the Minister of Health tell the Council of the Government's plan for the labelling of cigarette packets with a cancer warning? I ask this question because of an announcement on the radio this morning to the effect that some States will be bringing in this labelling in January and some not until May of next year.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The South Australian Act provides that, when the majority of the States bring in labelling of cigarette packets pointing out that cigarettes could be harmful to health, this State will do likewise. I understand that, while I was overseas, some different set of circumstances arose because of consideration of the Commonwealth Parliament's action on this matter. If my memory serves me correctly, it may be March 1 of next year when this labelling takes effect in South Australia. I am not clear on this, but I will find out and let the honourable member know the position within the next day or so.

#### BOAT HAVEN

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Recently, there has been some publicity about a potential boat haven at Kingston in the South-East. Over the years there has been continual agitation in that respect from an area farther down, at Port MacDonnell. Can the Minister give

some indication whether there is a priority in this work and whether either one or the other project will take priority? The people at the bottom end are in greater need and have been waiting longer for a boat haven. I shall be interested to know whether the Government is developing a set of priorities in that respect.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring back a reply as soon as possible.

#### OUTER HARBOUR TERMINAL

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I was interested last week to see that His Excellency referred to the completion of the work of providing a new passenger terminal at Outer Harbour at a cost of some \$2,000,000. Some months ago, in company with other honourable members, I had the opportunity of seeing the structure as it then was; and a fortnight ago I was able to look at it again, although at some distance. It does not appear that much progress has been made in the intervening months. Does the Government expect that during the financial year the building will be completed in every detail and fitted out ready for use or is it intended that only the structure itself shall be completed?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will get an answer from my colleague and bring it back as soon as possible.

#### AGRICULTURAL POLICY

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: In a recent issue of a Socialist newsletter called *Fabian Review*, Mr. A. Grassby, the Labor member of the Commonwealth Parliament for Riverina, said this:

The Labor Party has drawn on the experiences of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and other countries to prepare a programme for Socialist agriculture for this nation.

As Mr. Grassby will be addressing a meeting in the South-East with the Deputy Premier in the next few days, does the Minister of Agriculture foresee any drastic change in the agricultural policy pursued by the South Australian Government following Mr. Grassby's visit?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The answer very simply is "No".

### ABATTOIRS

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I believe that Mr. Gray, who has been preparing a verbal report for the Minister on abattoirs, has considered regional abattoirs, and I wonder whether he has taken into account the situation in the Mount Gambier area. At present the abattoir at Mount Gambier is not up to export standard. It would save a considerable sum in transport costs and in costs related to bruising if that abattoir was at export standard. It would also mean that the abattoir would have access to the metropolitan area for a percentage of its kill. Can the Minister say whether Mr. Gray has considered this situation and whether he is likely to make any recommendations in relation to the Mount Gambier abattoir?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The Mount Gambier abattoir is owned by Thomas Borthwick and Sons Limited, which also has an abattoir across the border at Portland. It is up to that firm to decide whether it should upgrade the Mount Gambier abattoir to export standard; it has nothing to do with my department. Whether the firm wants to upgrade the abattoir (and I sincerely hope it will) I do not know, because the firm has not spoken to me about it.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: In view of the desirability of raising the Mount Gambier abattoir to export standard, will the Minister consider making a grant to enable Thomas Borthwick and Sons Limited to upgrade the abattoir if that firm applies for a grant?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The answer is simply "No". I would not recommend that in any circumstances.

### COURT COSTS

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to my question of last week about court costs?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Section 91 provides *inter alia* that an employer shall not dismiss any employee merely because he is not a member of a trade union. The Leader asked whether I would raise this matter in Cabinet and inform the Council of Government policy on this matter "following the precedent set in the Dunford case". There seems to be no connection between this matter and the Dunford case. The current direction of Cabinet regarding preference in employment

for members of trade unions is similar to one which applied before 1933 and was repeated by the Walsh Government in 1965. No court case has appeared necessary to ensure its validity.

### SOFTWOOD PLANTINGS

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: There has been a considerable controversy in the country press, particularly in the South-East, concerning the policy adopted in relation to Commonwealth assistance for increased plantings of softwoods in Australia, particularly South Australia. I believe that there was a five-year agreement with the Commonwealth Government which was negotiated some time ago through the Australian Forestry Council. The agreement provided that the Commonwealth Government would assist the States in connection with areas planted in excess of the plantings in a base period. I believe that the Australian Forestry Council has met and, as there has been a renegotiation of the five-year agreement, can the Minister give me the details of it?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: This matter is now before the Commonwealth Parliament. The necessary legislation should have been passed before the rising of the Commonwealth Parliament. I understand that it was No. 11 on the Notice Paper but that only Nos. 1 to 10 were debated. For that reason, this item is being held over until the August session. I have been told by the Minister (Sir Reginald Swartz) that it will be debated in the forthcoming session, and I am pleased that South Australia has obtained the agreement it set out to obtain in the first place.

### ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on the motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 20. Page 121.)

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): As last Thursday I dealt almost entirely with the question of the Kangaroo Island dispute, there is little left for me to say on that topic except to reiterate that I believe the final act in this drama will be played out in this Council when the Government introduces legislation which, I believe, will include the Australian Labor Party's official policy adopted in 1971 at Surfers Paradise. I wish to stress one other matter before I leave

this topic, namely, that, as a result of the interjections made last Thursday, I believe that certain honourable members are trying to portray every action taken by a union as being part of an industrial dispute. To repeat, I believe that the Kangaroo Island dispute (if one may call it that) was not, in essence, an industrial dispute but, originally, an act initiated by Mr. Dunford that affected five farmers on the island who had, as I pointed out earlier, committed no misdemeanour.

Indeed, today in reply to a question the Chief Secretary quoted section 91 of the Industrial Code, and the first thing he quoted was that an employer shall not dismiss any employee merely because he is not a member of a trade union. I received that reply today following a question I asked on another matter. Yet pressure was brought to bear on Kangaroo Island. If any action taken by a union, an association, or an official of that union or association is always to be treated as an industrial dispute, we shall be placing certain people in the community in a position not enjoyed by any other section of the community. I ask the Government seriously to consider these submissions and the implications of the situation before introducing any legislation.

I bring to the notice of honourable members certain other matters which I believe to be important and with which I do not intend to deal at length, some having been brought to their attention previously. Last year, after almost 12 months work, the Select Committee on Capital Taxation presented its report to Parliament. The Government should take notice of this report. It is interesting to note that the Senate Select Committee appointed to investigate the impact of death duties has called for the report of this Council's Select Committee. Since the report was presented to Parliament it has been asked in both Houses whether the Government intends to implement any part of the report, but the only reply so far received has been that the Government is studying the report. There was no indication in the Governor's Speech whether the recommendations contained in the report would be implemented this year. I believe that one section of the public deserves relief in relation to taxation: that section which is most adversely affected by the impact of capital taxation.

Thirty or 40 years ago the Government placed a heavy responsibility on those with property and investments to produce revenue for State purposes. If one goes back 30 or 40 years, one can see that at that time, with

the wage and salary structure then obtaining, it was reasonable to assume that those who owned property and had capital investments were able to pay taxation. Although times have changed rapidly, very little change has been made to the overall taxation system operating at the local government, State and Commonwealth levels. In this changing situation no change, or very little change, has been made in the emphasis of taxation.

If one looks at local government, one will see that by far the greatest part of its income is derived from rates levied on properties. Although I have not done any calculations on this matter for some time, in 1956 I did much work on the question of the impact of local government rating in relation to road construction in Australia, where I found that local government ratepayers were making a greater contribution to the overall road system in Australia than were any other ratepayers in the Western democracies. Although I cannot recall the exact figure, I believe it was almost double the one closest to it: that of Canada. I do not expect there has been a great change in the relationship between the Australian ratepayers' contribution to the road system and the contribution, on a property basis, of ratepayers in other Western democracies.

At the State level, land tax, succession duties, gift duties and other forms of capital taxation provide the State with a large slice of its revenue. In the Commonwealth sphere the impact of death and gift duties is based purely on capital. I firmly believe that in the total taxation spectrum the property owner, in this changing economic structure, is bearing too large a burden of the taxation being levied. This field of taxation deserves closer scrutiny by researchers, first, because of its overall impact and, secondly, because of its impact in individual cases where sometimes absolute tragedy occurs. I refer the Council to some of the evidence placed before the Select Committee, on which the report was based. Although I do not want to refer to many cases, I should like to quote one, from memory, to illustrate the point I am making. I do not know that I have the facts absolutely correct but, if I make any mistakes, the matter is fully documented and can be studied by honourable members. I refer to the case of a widow of a soldier settler in the South-East. On his death the property involved was valued at \$97,000, which many casual observers would say was a

wealthy estate. However, \$32,000 was owing to stock agents, the Lands Department and the banks, leaving a net estate of about \$65,000.

Under the will, a life interest, based on the current basic wage, was left to the widow for the rest of her life, the property passing to her son when he reached 21 years of age. Also, \$17,000 in Commonwealth and State duties had to be paid, which increased the estate's liabilities to \$50,000. When the son turned 21 years of age, the liability of their property had increased to \$55,000, and the property value had, because of falling prices in the rural sector, decreased to about \$70,000. The son took over the property at the age of 21 with a \$55,000 debt on it. This property had been worked for 20 years, and it was brought from virtually nothing to a viable proposition. It was worth \$70,000, on which the total debt was \$55,000, and the son had to pay his mother \$2,500 a year as her life interest. Of course, it was impossible for him to do so, as a result of which his mother decided to forgo that part of the inheritance which was her right, and get a job, which she did, only to find that she was required to pay gift duties totalling \$5,000 for that part of the inheritance that she had relinquished. This is happening in relation to the impact of this capital taxation of which I have been speaking. Anyone looking at these cases who is not moved by the tragedy that is occurring is extremely hard hearted.

I could mention many similar cases. Two questions in this connection deserve very close scrutiny. The first is the overall impact in our community of this form of taxation. I am not arguing for the abolition of capital taxation. There must be some capital taxation to prevent complete aggregation of wealth, but the overall impact of this taxation needs close examination. Secondly, individual cases which are absolutely tragic and which are occurring in our community should be corrected in our existing legislation.

I move on to another area of capital taxation, also part of the Select Committee Report, concerned with country water rating. Some time ago Mr. Sangster, Q.C., as he then was, brought down the Sangster report, which I do not think anyone has yet seen. I shall illustrate what is happening regarding the main from Tailem Bend to Keith. In the low-rainfall area around Tailem Bend water from about 20ft. is being pumped very cheaply

by windmills, but now that the new main has gone through, many properties have two-mile, three-mile, or four-mile frontages to a main the farmers will never use.

One person in this country, which has a rainfall of about 12in. or 13in., has been shearing about 1,100 wethers for many years. He does all the work on 4,000 acres of low-rainfall country, watered by four windmills which cost him practically nothing. He has been making a living. Because the main passes four miles of the frontage of his property, his water rating is about \$1,000 a year, and the property is no longer viable with this rating on it.

This report was made to Parliament almost 12 months ago, yet I have seen no announcement of any change regarding the impact of water rating on a frontage basis in country areas where the water cannot be used because of its cost, and yet a very high rating is placed on property purely on the question of frontage to the water main.

Another matter of fairly great concern to me is an area of taxation not applicable to the whole of the State. I refer to the drainage rates in the South-East. In the previous session a Bill came before this Parliament changing the accepted system of assessment for drainage rating. The system used for assessment has been always on the direct benefit received by the property from the drainage works. When this direct benefit is assessed, a rate for the maintenance of the drains is placed on the direct benefit. This produced an extremely difficult situation, particularly in the Western Division of the South-East, where some properties bore an impossibly high drainage maintenance rate.

In its wisdom, the Government decided to change the system in the Western and Eastern Divisions of the South-East, the area under the control of the South-Eastern Drainage Board. It changed to a valuation system based on an unimproved land values system, and on this placed a maximum rate of, I think, .3c in the dollar. This had the effect of reducing considerably the impact in the Western Division and of lifting slightly the impact in the Eastern Division, but overall the Government is contributing about \$250,000 a year to the drainage rates of the area.

In the adjoining areas of Millicent, Tantanoola and Eight-Mile Creek an entirely different system prevails, based on direct benefit received, and the people in that

area are paying fully for their drainage maintenance costs. A line could be drawn on a map between two properties, side by side, each receiving the same benefit from the drainage system, one area paying dollars an acre for drainage maintenance and the other over the fence paying only cents an acre. This anomaly has been created by the change in the system of valuation for drainage purposes in the Western and Eastern Divisions under the control of the South-Eastern Drainage Board.

When the Bill was before the Council, I said that I believed the only fair rate to impose was one based on direct benefit, but problems were involved in the Western and Eastern Divisions because of the extremely long period over which the whole scheme was constructed. Some in the Eastern Division had direct benefits as early as 1890, but in the Western Division benefits were not received, in some cases, until the 1960's. A long period had elapsed between the assessments, and the system was unworkable in the Western Division. I agree that this is so, but nevertheless in my view the anomaly existing today in the South-East is far greater than that which existed previously. It is up to the Government to make at least some gesture to apply the whole of the drainage rating system on an equitable basis throughout the South-East, particularly in the Eight-Mile Creek area, the Tantanoola area and the Millicent area.

A few days ago I asked the Minister representing the Minister of Roads and Transport a question regarding road injuries and road deaths in South Australia. I am certain that this is a matter of grave concern to every person in this Chamber. I remember the emotional pressure brought to bear when the seat-belt legislation was before Parliament and, if I remember correctly, in the debate at that time many members expressed doubt whether any change would take place in the number of road fatalities because of the seat-belt legislation. Many other members believed that seat belts would have a tremendous impact on the number of road deaths and road injuries in our community. I do not say for one moment that the compulsory wearing of seat belts is not reasonable, but in the last 12 months South Australia has seen an increase in the number of road fatalities and road injuries which must be extremely disappointing to the Minister of Roads and Transport, and indeed to every member of Parliament. To me, the fundamental problem in all this is that Governments have refused to face the major problems in this toll of road accidents

in our community. Anyone who wishes to make a study of this will see that the two main causes of road fatalities are speed and alcohol. Under those two main headings, of course, come other matters such as driving skills (or lack of driving skills, whichever way we like to look at it), the safety features of vehicles, road design, and so on. One could go on detailing various headings under those two major headings.

Speed and alcohol are the two major contributors to death and injury on the road, yet Governments are strangely reluctant to recognize this. I heartily support the attitude of this Government and other Governments in Australia to the recent announcement that car manufacturers intended to produce models capable of 140 m.p.h. or more. I also support the car manufacturers who, when they knew the official view of Governments in this matter, changed their decision in relation to the production of this type of motor car. At the same time, however, we allow an unskilled person to purchase, without restriction, kits to increase compression ratios and fuel intakes and to provide for straight-through exhaust systems, fat wheels, fat tyres, and the lowering of a vehicle to make it come within that category of vehicle. These changes to the original design of the vehicle are often made to vehicles between five and 20 years of age.

For example, one can see on the road many FJ Holdens that have been changed with these kits—and FJ Holdens ceased to be manufactured in 1958. In other words, a car 14 years old, which has probably done goodness knows how many miles, is being "souped up" to make it capable of doing between 100 m.p.h. and 110 m.p.h. In all probability, no attention has been paid to the braking system, to the tie rods or to the steering geometry of that vehicle.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Or to the springs and shock absorbers.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Yes. At the same time, I am not saying that some of these modifications have not been done well by some people who like doing that type of work. Nevertheless, we are not doing enough to recognize the major causes of road deaths in this State. We are overlooking the fundamental causes, and the Government seems strangely unable to grasp the nettle in this regard. The economic damage to the community is staggering. Some two or three years ago, when presenting figures to the Council, I said that the annual loss to the community in South Australia from road

accidents exceeded \$40,000,000. In all these things, Governments must be firm in their approach. They must recognize the major causes and enter the legislative field in an attempt to correct many of them.

As I have said, there are many other matters on which I could comment, one in particular being the present State Government's ability to blame the Commonwealth Government for everything that happens. I saw on television last night that the Premier attacked the Commonwealth Government for not paying enough attention financially to tourism. Previously he had said that the Commonwealth had not provided enough for forestry and education. It appears that the Commonwealth has come in for its share of blame in all things in which the State Government is concerned. I shall have more to say on this matter in a later debate. As regards the present financial arrangements between the State and the Commonwealth, I believe that the present Prime Minister has done more to recognize the financial plight of this State than any other Prime Minister has done in the history of Australia. With those few remarks, I support the motion.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS (Midland): I am pleased to rise to speak to the motion. First, I reaffirm my loyalty to Her Majesty the Queen and the Royal Family. Secondly, I congratulate His Excellency the Governor on assuming office as Her Majesty's representative in this State. We are all aware of the distinguished record in the field of science that His Excellency possesses, as I and other honourable members were reminded only yesterday at the opening of the United Farmers and Graziers conference by Mr. John Kerin, the President of that organization. I, too, endorse the comments of His Excellency on his predecessor, whose untimely death we still mourn. A motion of condolence with respect to Sir James Harrison was passed in this Chamber last year, but we would do well to remember his period of office, the work that he did in this State and the high esteem in which he was held.

I refer briefly also to those honourable gentlemen of the Legislative Council and the House of Assembly who have died in the last few months. I was privileged to know all four of them. I knew them as men of integrity, highly respected in the community. Mr. Riches, of course, was on the opposite side of politics from me. I knew him for the whole period I had been in this place; I respected him as a friend although I differed

from him politically. I was pleased when the previous Labor Government recommended a distinction for him and Her Majesty was happy to award him the honour of Companion of the Order of St. Michael and St. George in 1967. Also, I knew well the former Minister of Lands, Mr. Quirke, known to us all as Bill Quirke. The member for Eyre, Mr. Bockelberg, was a personal friend of mine.

Perhaps I could say a word about the Hon. W. W. Robinson, who was a member of this Chamber and sat in the place now occupied by the Hon. Mr. Banfield when I first entered the Chamber some 10 years ago. He and his colleague, the Hon. Bob Wilson (who, too, has passed on), were of great help to me as a new member in this Chamber. I should like to pay a particular tribute to the Hon. William Walsh Robinson and to the other members I have mentioned.

I was interested to see in His Excellency's Speech at least seven paragraphs relating to rural matters. That is a very great improvement on the single paragraph relating to rural matters that was in the Speech by the then Governor in 1965, when a previous Labor Government was in office. When I asked a question last week of the Minister of Agriculture I said that I appreciated the courtesy he had extended to the Hon. Mr. Kemp and me in giving us, in company with three senior officers of the Agriculture Department, the opportunity to visit the Bolivar laboratory to see the soil tests being conducted there. On that occasion, about five weeks ago, we also visited the plots that were being irrigated. One plot was being heavily irrigated with effluent by means of a portable tank. The plot I particularly remember had been given the equivalent of 48in. of rainfall in a few months to see how much the soil could take; it must be said that the foliage on that plot looked very well, and at that stage no detrimental effect could be seen as a result of the heavy irrigation.

We also visited the Munno Para experimental plot, which the former Minister and my Midland colleagues had previously visited from time to time; we have seen very luxuriant growth there, but on this occasion it was in a relatively dormant stage, and I am sorry that the present Minister has not yet seen that plot doing what we know it can do on a very poor piece of ground which one could not expect to give the best results. We also saw the irrigation plot of the first small grower to use reclaimed water for his irrigation work. This plot also looked very promising; this grower's small pump is located near the very

much larger pump of the Smithfield Pastoral Company, which irrigates promising areas of vineyard at Angle Vale. I pass those vineyards practically every time I come to Parliament House. I believe the Deputy Premier was quoted on the radio as saying that the Government was calling for monthly reports on the matter, because it wanted the investigation to proceed as quickly as possible; if that report is correct, I commend the Government for that, and I ask the Minister to make the results available to honourable members as soon as significant conclusions are reached.

The Hon. Mr. DeGaris referred to the Kangaroo Island dispute. I regard the Government as being pathetically weak in paying out \$9,985 of the taxpayers' money in connection with that dispute. I realize that, in comparison with the size of the Budget, that sum is not very large, but it is not so much the amount that is important: the principle involved and the precedent set by this rather weak-kneed action are very damaging. I believe the Government was reduced to a threadbare and pitifully weak argument in defence of its action when it used as an illustration what I consider to be an entirely different set of circumstances. The Government's argument related to a Government House employee who was paid what was apparently her entitlement some years ago. I want to know whether Government members say that that employee should not have been paid what was her due.

Does the Premier, who was her advocate on that occasion, criticize the Playford Government for making that settlement, and does he suggest that that Government was incorrect? If he does not do that, how can the Premier, or the Minister in this Council, possibly link that matter with what I consider to be an irresponsible act in connection with the Kanagroo Island dispute? If the money paid to the Government House employee was her correct due, does the Government say that the money that it has just paid was Mr. Dunford's correct entitlement? Any attempt to line up these two happenings as comparisons is utter rubbish. I believe the Government has set a precedent, as a result of which many people are asking: "Why should we pay fines? The Government should pay them! It makes a special case for a union secretary."

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: It was not a fine.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I agree; it was an award of costs. However, the man in the street still believes it was a fine.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You are not helping the situation.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Speeches would be shorter if the honourable member spoke when his turn came, instead of speaking when other honourable members are speaking. I do not go around asking people to raise this matter, but people voluntarily raise it with honourable members, and they complain bitterly about the Government's action. They do not believe that the Government would have paid the costs if they had been awarded against Mr. Woolley. I do not dispute the integrity of the gentlemen who have said that the Government would have paid the costs if that were so, but the man in the street finds it extremely hard to believe that claim. The Government has done itself much harm by its action.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: Many of the people who are complaining are Labor Party supporters, aren't they?

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: The Commonwealth Government is not doing very well.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I agree that many critics of the State Government are Labor Party supporters. I suggest to the Hon. Mr. Banfield that it would be an improvement if he were to listen to other speakers in silence: he might even learn something.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: That would be impossible, coming from you.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: It might be difficult for some people. The Oats Marketing Act, which has been passed by the Government but which has yet to be proclaimed, came about largely as the result of an agreement between the United Farmers and Graziers Association and the Government. I do not wish to criticize the legislation, except to say that I think that more time should have been taken to prepare it and that the Government need not have been so inflexible on the subject of the holding of a poll. Recently, I asked the Minister whether the legislation would be amended (in one case, it is only the matter of one letter in one word), but he said that no amendment was being contemplated. The word in question is "triannual" (meaning every four months), whereas the word intended was "triennial" (meaning that the board would be appointed once every three years). Obviously, that amendment will have to be made because anything in a Statute remains there until amended.



I congratulate the Minister of Agriculture on Sir Allan Callaghan's appointment as Chairman of the Oat Board. His appointment is appropriate for the reasons that I shall give. Sir Allan has had a very distinguished career. He was a native of New South Wales and a student at the University of Sydney, where he gained a degree in Agricultural Science. Subsequently, he became a Rhodes Scholar and studied at Oxford. About 40 years ago he was appointed, by the governing council of Roseworthy Agricultural College, Principal of that institution, at the age of 27, I think, although his appointment was criticized to some extent because of his comparative youth. The college had a governing council in those days, and it is a matter of interest to point out the way in which we appear to go around in circles because, after a considerable period of having an advisory council at the college, it appears that we are once again to have a governing council, which is a very different matter. The Minister responsible for the appointment of the new governing council might well consider appointing Sir Allan as a member of the council. Sir Allan was appointed Principal by the then governing council of the college (of which my father, the late A. M. Dawkins, had the honour to be Chairman) in 1932. As a Rhodes Scholar in England Sir Allan secured a Bachelor of Science degree at Oxford and a doctorate in philosophy. If my memory serves me correctly, Sir Allan wrote his thesis on the oat plant. Therefore, with his wide knowledge of cereals (not merely oats), his position on the Wheat Board and the other offices he has held, it is particularly appropriate that the Minister should have appointed Sir Allan, in his semi-retirement, Chairman of the new Oat Board.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Did he teach you at Roseworthy?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Perhaps I was one of his less successful students. I have a great appreciation of his ability, and I am sure that the Minister also would have benefited had he studied under Sir Allan. The Gepps Cross abattoir represents an investment of, I think, about \$12,000,000 or \$13,000,000 of Government money. Recently, as a result of more American support for the purchase of our beef, I believe the Americans will buy more of our beef than they have bought hitherto.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: At a price!

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: The Americans are nothing if not good business men.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: But you can't trust them.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I shall not comment on that. However, if the Minister wants to say that, he can say it. We have had very long-standing arrangements with the Americans and with the British (and we know what the British Ministry of Food was like; they were good business men, too). This Government has given the abattoir about \$1,000,000 since it has been in office (but I do not necessarily object to that) to bring the works up to Department of Primary Industry requirements of hygiene and inspection, mainly because of the standards demanded by the Americans. I do not disagree with this kind of expenditure provided that the improved facilities are fully and properly used. I believe that my friend and colleague and former Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Story) has suggested that there should be a system of two shifts of seven hours each, with an adequate and appropriate cleaning-up period, so that better use could be made of the abattoir facilities and so that full and adequate use of the capital investment provided by the producers and the taxpayers could be made.

I wonder whether it is true that union leaders at the abattoir have lost control of their members. I understand that last week an employee of T. J. Jackson Proprietary Limited, which occupies a portion of the premises at Gepps Cross, refused to continue to work in the boning room. Subsequently, he was dismissed after he had been given several opportunities to return to his duties. It was decided (and this is the kind of decision to which we have become used and it is probably the kind of decision that men have a right to make if they think an injustice has been done) that all meat employees at Gepps Cross would go out on strike in sympathy with the man who had been dismissed. Commissioner Pryke ordered the men to go back to work pending an inquiry into the man's dismissal, and I understand that the union secretary (Mr. Tonkin) was reported as having recommended to his members that they return to work. However, he could not obtain sufficient union support. Consequently, producers have suffered considerable losses because of the delay and the cancellation of the following week's meat market. The inactivity until this week has been a hardship to many people, as a result of which housewives may have to pay more for their meat. This is indeed a most unfortunate state of affairs. During the term of office as Minister of the Hon. Mr. Story,

a report was prepared by Mr. McCall, some of the recommendations of which have been implemented. However, other parts of it will not be implemented. We are now awaiting a report from Mr. Gray, which I hope the Minister will be able to make available to honourable members shortly and—

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: Is it a written report?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I hope it will be, and that it will be made available to honourable members. However, I have not seen anything of it yet; nor has any other honourable member.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: I hope not. It is a report to me.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: That is correct. I am merely saying that I hope the Minister will make the report available to honourable members when he receives it. It will be interesting to know what improvements Mr. Gray suggests. I should like to mention a number of other matters, one of which concerns the pig industry. I refer to a comment made by the Chairman of the Commercial Pig Section of the United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia, Inc. regarding the Northfield research unit, which was set in train during the regime of the Hon. Mr. Story as Minister. Regarding the Pig Industry Research Committee, the Chairman, Mr. McAuliffe, in his report states:

I have also attended three pig industry research meetings in Canberra and am able to report that 33 research programmes have been recommended.

Regarding the Northfield research unit, Mr. McAuliffe later states:

I am very perturbed at our own State Government's attitude to the Northfield research unit. This attitude may jeopardize future grants from the Research Fund. It is Federal research policy not to make grants of money for salaries of academic staff. It is expected that such salaries would be paid by the instrumentalities concerned. This is not the case, however, at Northfield, which is at present understaffed, and where salaries and wages are now being paid from the grant of \$10,000 from the Swine Compensation Fund. If the State Government does not see its way clear to appoint a permanent research officer of high academic qualifications to the Northfield staff, then I am sure that Northfield's potential for research into diseases and its allied studies will be minimized. I would like to see a delegation wait on the Minister of Agriculture to discuss this vital matter.

I am confident that the Minister would be willing to receive a deputation on this matter in due course. I should like briefly to refer

to one or two other aspects of His Excellency's Speech. At Item 9, His Excellency said:

My Government has announced that a new town of some considerable size will be established in the vicinity of Murray Bridge and a further measure relating to this new town will be placed before you this session.

I believe developments along these lines are essential in the State's further development. The Murray Bridge area has much to commend it: it is on the main railway line and road to Melbourne, and an adequate water supply is close at hand. This is indeed a step in the right direction. I do not know whether much was gained by announcing the development of the town as soon as it was announced. I cannot imagine that Sir Thomas Playford would have announced it so soon; he would have had everything on the way before he did so.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Underhanded!

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: It is unfortunate that the honourable member has returned to the Chamber. This is a step in the right direction, and I commend the Government to that extent. However, I have one or two queries. The town of Geelong is only 45 miles from Melbourne and, although it has in its own right many industries, many people commute between Geelong and Melbourne daily. When one considers the new freeway being built to Murray Bridge and also that the distance between that township and Adelaide will not be great, Murray Bridge will to some extent be something of an outer suburb. Perhaps it would have been a good idea if the new town had been located a little farther away from Adelaide. However, the Murray Bridge site has much to commend it.

I was interested to see in paragraph 12 of His Excellency's Speech that the Railways Department is preparing a master plan for the new standard gauge railway to link Adelaide with the main line in the North. This must happen, and I am pleased that the Government is proceeding with it. I also commend the Government for its intention to seal the Eyre Highway. Although this highway is outside my district, I believe this is a matter that concerns the people of Australia generally. I agree with the Government that finance other than South Australian finance should be made available, as a large majority of the people who travel on that highway are not South Australians. Having travelled on it for some of the distance, I can see the necessity for it, and I commend the decision that has finally been made to proceed with this work.

His Excellency also said that the Government expects the Modbury Hospital to open early next year. Although I have criticized the location of this hospital, I commend the Government for its imminent opening next year, when it will have an initial capacity of 220 beds, which would be more than adequate for the time being. However, I am very interested in something that is more vital and urgent: the planning for the proposed 710-bed hospital and medical school at the Flinders Medical Centre near the Flinders University.

There are a number of other matters on which I could comment. I add a word of commendation to the Electricity Trust for its continuing good work and also to the Housing Trust; both organizations have over the years done, and are continuing to do, excellent work.

As the Hon. Mr. DeGaris has said, there are many other matters of interest in His Excellency's Speech with which I could deal at some length, including the financial matters referred to in paragraph 24. However, other opportunities will occur for me to discuss those matters. Indeed, they will doubtless be dealt with (as some have been already dealt with by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris) by other honourable members. I do not, therefore, intend to delay the Council any further. I support the motion.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 3.40 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, July 26, at 2.15 p.m.