

**LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL**

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

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

**QUESTIONS****VERMIN AND WEED CONTROL**

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking a question of the Minister of Health, representing the Minister of Environment and Conservation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Several complaints have been lodged with me recently by people in the South-East and, prior to that, by people in other parts of the State whose properties adjoin national parks or other Government reserves; the complaints relate to what the people claim is a lack of vermin and weed control by the authorities controlling these areas. Will the Minister bring this matter to the attention of his colleague?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I shall do as asked.

**DAIRYING INDUSTRY**

The Hon. C. M. HILL: In view of the fact that the Commonwealth Government is to phase out bounties on butter and cheese production in Australia over the next two years, can the Minister of Agriculture say whether the South Australian Government intends taking any action to protect the interests of dairy farmers in this State?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: It is very difficult for the South Australian Government or, indeed, any State Government to act in this field. The Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry has already indicated that the marginal dairy farms reconstruction scheme, which I helped to establish at Agricultural Council meetings several years ago, will be expanded in the years to come. If our dairy farmers wish to take advantage of it, it will be available to them.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: The effect will be to phase out some dairy farmers.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Yes, if they want to leave the industry. The scheme is operating at present, and some dairy farmers have taken advantage of it, although not so many of them have been South Australian dairy farmers, because most of our dairy farmers are very efficient—probably the most efficient in Australia. I think the McCarthy report, brought down by a Select Committee in 1960, recommended to the Commonwealth Government that the bounty should be phased out over nine or 11 years; I am speaking from memory. However, that recommendation was not accepted by the Commonwealth Government. So, the situation rests where it is, and it will be in the interests of the dairying industry to take full advantage of the marginal dairy farm reconstruction scheme.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Does the Minister of Agriculture expect substantial imports of New Zealand butter into Australia in the foreseeable future and, if so, does he believe the protection to which he referred in his earlier reply will be effective in helping the South Australian dairying industry?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The situation regarding the supply of butter to South Australia is that we import 85 per cent of it at the moment from Victoria, so we are not concerned about our butter manufacturers in South Australia in relation to the dairying industry. It has

always been the case in South Australia that we do not produce enough butter for ourselves and we import most of it from Victoria. I do not know what the implication is at the Commonwealth level about New Zealand butter but reports I have had indicated that there would be no alarm at this stage about importing butter from New Zealand.

**IRRIGATION**

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: Regarding the salt channels along the irrigated areas of the Murray River, can the Minister of Irrigation say under what provisions of the Irrigation Act the charge is being made, and is it correct that the charge is \$5 an acre?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Regarding the water that is being drawn from the drainage channels (from memory, I cannot quote the exact section of the Act), there are legal grounds for applying the charge of \$5 an acre (.405 ha) only on the basis that the charge is applied to those areas where the water is used: it is not a charge of \$5 an acre on the holding of the person concerned but, if he uses the water to irrigate, the charge is \$5 an acre.

**GRAIN**

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I seek leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: In his Speech, the Governor intimated that a Bill relating to the bulk handling of grain would be introduced in this session. As far as I know, only one point is under discussion now with South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited, namely, rentals for silos from local government sources. Can the Minister give any details of the pending legislation?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Over the past year the co-operative's authorities have made representations to me regarding the rates charged for silos by local government bodies in country areas. In these discussions I said that I would forward the co-operative's proposals on to the Minister of Local Government, which I have done. I believe that the co-operative has also made its own representations to the Minister. Because of this, I think that what the honourable member has referred to in the Governor's Speech relates to that specific item.

**LAURA-CALTOWIE ROAD**

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I seek leave to make an explanation prior to asking a question of the Minister of Health representing the Minister of Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: There is a dangerous section of road on the outskirts of the Laura township where the Laura-Caltowie road crosses the railway line. There have been many accidents and some deaths on that small section of the road. I understand that plans were drawn up last year by the Highways Department to improve the road leading to the crossing, but no action has been taken. Will the Minister ask his colleague, in the interests of road safety, why no attempt has yet been made to upgrade this section of the road, when will funds be allocated for this work, and when will the work commence?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and obtain a reply.

**DRUGS**

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Has the Minister of Health a reply to my recent question concerning allegations that drugs have been illegally supplied by certain chemists?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Alcohol and Drug Addicts (Treatment) Board and its clinical staff have become concerned at the increasing number of those presenting for treatment who are misusing the so-called "soft drugs", the distribution of which is regulated to prescription by medical practitioners. The drugs concerned are sedatives, stimulants, tranquillizers, anti-depressants and various other mood-changing preparations. Contrary to general opinion, the misuse of these drugs is not limited to the older age groups but is prevalent in all ages. It is also a matter of concern that these people apparently find little difficulty in obtaining sufficient supplies of these drugs to fulfil their needs. They use considerable ingenuity in manipulating the legitimate sources, such as consulting several doctors, presenting in each case with the appropriate symptoms to justify the prescribing of the drug required. There have also been consistent statements from patients that they are able to obtain these preparations without prescription from certain pharmacies. As stated in the report, the information received indicated that this practice is not general amongst the pharmaceutical profession.

No action can be taken to use this information to make an official complaint to the authorities because such information is a part of the confidential communication between the patient and his therapist. Even if the patients were prepared to give evidence in an inquiry, the reliability of their evidence would be questioned because of their misuse of drugs. It would also be prejudicial to their treatment and recovery if they were involved in this type of proceeding. Although no formal complaint has been made, these matters have been discussed with the appropriate officer in the Department of Public Health.

#### CO-OPERATIVE FARMING

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I desire to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. A committee, which I understand was called the Rural Group Buying Co-operative, was set up in South Australia in 1970 or 1971 by the Minister to inquire into co-operative farming methods and ownership. Has a report been received from that committee; if so, when will it be tabled in Parliament so that members can ascertain its views?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I received this report several months ago, and I shall certainly look into the situation. I thought it had been tabled in Parliament, although I am not sure. I inform the honourable member that I have set up a committee within the Agriculture Department. It consists of the Chairman of the inquiry committee, Mr. Peter Barrow, Mr. Jack McAuliffe, of the Agriculture Department, who is an agriculturist, and the Senior Economist in the department, Mr. Colin Hunt. These gentlemen are to act as a committee to advise people with problems regarding co-operatives. People can put their case before the committee and get the appropriate advice. I shall look into the situation regarding the report and ascertain whether it has been tabled in Parliament.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Agriculture, following upon the reply he has just given. I ask leave to make a short statement before doing so.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: It seems to me that we have had so many committees on co-operatives in the past 12 months or so that it would be unnecessary for further evidence to be taken. Some very fine co-operatives have been set up in South Australia and I wonder why the Minister is setting up another committee to take evidence when I consider that all the evidence that could be given has been gathered.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I make this quite specific: this is not another committee of inquiry, but a committee set up within the Agriculture Department to make itself available to all people wanting advice on co-operatives. Naturally, more than one person would be involved for a co-operative to be formed. The committee will be available to anyone interested in forming a co-operative. People can see these three officers and receive the appropriate advice.

#### DUPLICATING INK

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: My question is directed to the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Education. Has he a reply to the question I asked some time ago about the quality of duplicating ink used in departmental schools?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: My colleague has furnished the following reply:

Complaints were received during 1972 from various schools regarding the quality of the duplicating ink made available to schools through the State Supply Department. As a result of the complaints, a committee was formed comprising officers of the Education Department, State Supply Department and teaching staff, to investigate the situation.

The representatives of the suppliers of the ink stated that adequate chemical and laboratory tests are carried out to ensure that their products are at least equal in quality to others and that most problems resulted from inefficiency in the use of the duplicators.

A demonstration was conducted and, after various tests had been carried out, all of the departmental officers and teachers agreed that the ink was satisfactory for school use when the machines were properly operated. A notice has been prepared for the next edition of the *Education Gazette*. Heads of schools are to be advised of the results of the tests and that the Senior Stores Officer will investigate any further problems that arise from the use of the ink. However, no complaints have been received recently.

#### FIREARMS

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to a question I asked on June 20 concerning the control of the advertising of firearms in this State?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: There is no requirement that any person must receive a permit before purchasing a firearm, other than a pistol. However, no person may purchase a pistol unless he is the holder of a licence for that pistol. The question of uniform firearms legislation throughout Australia has been receiving consideration for some time and the control of the sale and purchase of firearms is one of the factors receiving consideration.

#### FIRE BRIGADES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Chief Secretary) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Fire Brigades Act, 1936-1958. Read a first time.

#### POLICE REGULATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Chief Secretary) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Police Regulation Act, 1952-1972. Read a first time.

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 31. Page 59.)

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS (Midland): In rising to speak to this motion I hasten to endorse that portion of it that seeks to thank His Excellency the Governor for the Speech with which he opened this session. Also, I would like to endorse the remarks of other honourable members in expressing appreciation for the work he is doing in representing Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II,

throughout this State. I assure His Excellency of my continued loyalty to Her Majesty and to the Crown, and stress, once again, the importance of the Royal Family being removed from politics, as against other systems that are sometimes headed by an elected President who is respected by only half the people, and sometimes by less than that.

Referring to Her Majesty and the Crown leads me to refer to the subject of the National Anthem. At present, it is being widely canvassed that there is a possibility of an alternative anthem. I remind honourable members that "anthem" is defined as a composition of sacred or semi-sacred character suitable to be sung with full choral effect. None of the songs that have recently been suggested as suitable alternatives to *God Save the Queen* and none of the songs in the recent competition and none of those used in recent years are suitable as national anthems. I hasten to inform the Council that I am not against using a national song; in fact, I favour it in some circumstances when it is used in association with (or, on less formal occasions, instead of) the National Anthem.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Don't you think we should have a national anthem?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Yes, but we have a very good one now. It is appropriate that we should also have a national song that can be used in association with or as an alternative to the National Anthem. Of all the songs I have heard and read about—which are, for the most part, a very ordinary lot—the *Song of Australia* (widely used in South Australia since 1859) is by far the best.

I wish to refer to the lamented death of Mr. Roy McLachlan. I first met Mr. McLachlan when I visited this Parliament about 20 years ago, and I also met him as a result of his occupation in the South-East. As the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill said, Mr. McLachlan was associated with a very wellknown and good company. He had a very great deal to do with the favourable name that that company had in the South-East. I make no comment about the fact that the Leader of the Opposition was prompted to mention what he considered to be a better company! I wish to place on record my appreciation of Mr. McLachlan's work as a member of the House of Assembly for six years and of the work he did in the South-East in the primary production field. I should like to convey my condolences to his family.

I now wish to refer to the untimely death of the Hon. Henry Kenneth Kemp. The late Harry Kemp, as we all knew him with affection (even if we did not always agree with him), was a man of high principle who knew right from wrong; to the Hon. Mr. Kemp black was black and white was white, and he did not know a great deal about the shades of grey. However, he was a man of very great ability with a dedicated interest in the projects that he considered to be vital to this State. Further, as the Leader of the Opposition said, the Hon. Harry Kemp was a man with a dedicated interest in the problems of the Virginia area.

The late honourable gentleman was almost apologetic to my colleagues and me for seeming to interfere in the Midland District in connection with the problems of Virginia. He had no need to apologize, because we knew that he was an authority, and we welcomed his specialized knowledge. Once again, I express my pleasure that the Minister of Agriculture provided an opportunity for the Hon. Mr. Kemp and me to accompany the Minister on a visit to the Bolivar experimental station and the irrigation plots set up by the Agriculture Department in the Virginia and St. Kilda areas. Of

course, the Hon. Mr. Kemp was vitally interested in the progress made there. In common with other honourable members, he was extremely impatient to see the long drawn-out tests successfully concluded. I want to pay my tribute to the Hon. Harry Kemp and to extend my condolences to Mrs. Kemp and the family.

I want to extend my congratulations to the Hon. Mr. Kneebone and the Hon. Mr. Banfield on their preferment in this Council. I have known both gentlemen for a number of years; actually, I have known the Hon. Mr. Kneebone for a longer period than I have known the Hon. Mr. Banfield. In common with other honourable members, I have every confidence in the appointments that have been made. I know that we will certainly not always agree with the Chief Secretary and the Minister of Health, but we will appreciate the work they do.

I wish to express my appreciation of the work of the Hon. Bert Shard. I well remember coming into this place 11 years ago with the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan, and I remember the Hon. Mr. Shard extending a cordial welcome to the new members and telling us that we would have our differences in the Council and that sometimes these differences would become a little tense. I am not attempting to quote the Hon. Mr. Shard verbatim, but I hope I have got the correct meaning of what he said. He said that even though we would have some differences in this Council and even though we may become a little tense occasionally, we would always be good friends in the lobbies of Parliament and we would learn to respect each other's views. This advice proved, by and large, to be correct. I personally have had my disagreements with the honourable gentleman, but I wish to express my appreciation to the Hon. Mr. Shard for the way in which he has (for perhaps slightly less than half the time I have been here) been Leader of the Opposition and (for a little more than half that time) Chief Secretary. Further, I wish to express my appreciation for the way in which the Council has worked successfully during that period; that has been due in no small measure to the attitude that the Hon. Mr. Shard adopted. Perhaps even before the afternoon is out we will have another difference.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It is on the cards that we will have a difference at any tick of the clock.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Yes, but we will remain friends, and I am sure that we will continue to respect each other. I want to extend a sincere welcome to the Hon. Mr. Creedon and the Hon. Mr. Chatterton. I congratulate them on their election and on having made their maiden speeches in this Council, brief though those speeches may have been. In congratulating those gentlemen on having made their maiden speeches and in wishing them well, I do not mean to imply that I could sincerely and honestly congratulate them on their actual speeches, which revealed, unfortunately, some lack of knowledge of the way in which second Chambers operate in the Commonwealth and in the rest of the world. I could echo the comment of the Leader of the Opposition the other day: we did not hear much of the problems of the Midland District in their speeches, but no doubt as time goes on those omissions will be corrected.

The Hon. Mr. Creedon, of course, owns a successful and thriving business in Gawler, and he is also the first citizen of that town. He is an employer of labour, and I am sure he will continue to be successful in that field of private enterprise.

The Hon. Mr. Chatterton, I understand, is a grazier and winemaker in the Lyndoch area and he, too, is carrying on a successful operation in private enterprise in that area.

I wish to refer to one or two things which they said, because I had some difficulty in following them. The Hon. Mr. Creedon said that rates received by councils were barely sufficient to pay the staff and the day-to-day running expenses. That would concern me considerably if it were true in a large number of instances.

In my 14 years experience in local government we were able to keep the administrative costs and the day-to-day running expenses down to a fairly low proportion of the council's overall revenue and to a reasonable proportion of the council's rate revenue. I know (and I am sure that every honourable member knows) that it is not difficult to turn up every council's rate revenue returns. The Gawler corporation, of which the Hon. Mr. Creedon is the first citizen at present, has a rate revenue of between \$170,000 and \$180,000 a year, and I would be shocked indeed if its day-to-day running expenses and administrative costs came anywhere near that sum. I am sure that, if it were so, it would be an indictment of the corporation that I am sure it does not deserve. I am certain that the situation is better than that, and I ask the honourable member whether he will check his statement because I consider that it is not correct. The Hon. Mr. Chatterton in his few remarks, after referring to being a member of the Legislative Council, said:

The question we now face is whether honourable members will accept their responsibility under the new Constitution and work for the benefit of the whole State and not merely for the narrow sectional interests that have been so well represented here in the past.

I think there is a definite implication there that the members of the Legislative Council have worked not for the benefit of the State but only for sectional interests. If that is so, I deny the implication emphatically because I believe that the Council has, by and large, worked for the benefit of the State for many years. If the honourable member is so convinced about his statement, I remind him that he also said:

Banking, land speculation, insurance companies and estate agents are but some of the groups that have had an undue influence over the legislation . . .

If he is so convinced that that is so and that they are only some of the groups that have had some influence, I suggest to him that he could well have added to his list wineries, vineyards, grazing interests and broad acres—in fact, the landed gentry. I point out to the honourable member, with goodwill, that he would qualify in the minds of very many of his more radically-minded colleagues under most of those categories (if not all of them) to which I have just referred.

I suggest that new honourable members of this Chamber should wait a little longer and learn a little more about the Chamber's operations before they criticize it in such wide-ranging terms. I congratulate these gentlemen also on the ease of their win. It was an easy win that was of no comfort to the Liberal and Country League Party, which has held Midland District for many years. It was an easy win which, whilst it may have reflected some credit on the two new honourable members, it also reflected some discredit on those people within the L.C.L. who were unable to do the right thing. I say that with some knowledge, because I have had the impression confirmed for me by members of the Australian Labor Party, people I have known personally and have respected not merely within Parliament but outside, that the ease of the win was not only because of the qualities of the honourable gentlemen who are now with us but also because of the manoeuvres of a person called Mr. John Freebairn, who carefully obtained L.C.L. endorsement but kept his Liberal

Movement affiliation very dark at the time and who then consistently refused to campaign under the banner of the Party that endorsed him. I cannot express any admiration: in fact, I express entirely the reverse for people who do that.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: In other words, he won't get endorsement again.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Not as far as I am concerned. I could tell you a few things about the matter, but not in this Chamber. I shall quote some words spoken by my former colleague, the Hon. Les Hart, at the declaration of the poll, reported in the following press article:

Mr. Hart said that although some of the L.C.L. members wore their hair "short back and sides," they were nevertheless just as progressive in their thoughts as those who were critical of them. The utterances of some people who had accepted endorsement by the L.C.L. were doing nothing but harm to the image of the Party, he said.

Mr. Hart said it was regrettable that how-to-vote cards, approved by the Returning Officer for the State, were in some cases not allowed to be exhibited in polling booths because of the actions of candidates running under a dual banner. Some candidates were proud to display in the metropolitan area that they belonged to another political Party but were very careful to conceal this fact in country areas. This dual deception was something that could not be tolerated, Mr. Hart said. He was pleased to see that the L.C.L. had taken steps to ensure that it did not happen again.

I express my very great regret that my esteemed colleague, the Hon. Mr. Hart, went out of politics in a situation such as that. The Hon. Mr. Hart shared an office in this Parliament with me for 10 years. We sat alongside each other in this Chamber for a similar period, where the Hon. Mr. Creedon and the Hon. Mr. Shard now sit. I would not like to have to count the number of times in that period in which the honourable gentleman and I voted on opposite sides of the Chamber. Obviously I was not always right, nor was the Hon. Mr. Hart.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: He couldn't convince you of that at the time.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: This shows independence of attitude, and I would like to think that, after a period, we could see the Hon. Mr. Creedon and the Hon. Mr. Chatterton showing a like independence of attitude and that when they disagree they will vote according to their own thinking and not along a strict Party line. The essence of the success of a second Chamber is that members can vote independently and according to the merits of the legislation, not according to a strict Party line.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: The story of the day!

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That's a blue ribbon one! Oh, brother!

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Paragraph 4 of His Excellency's Speech refers to agriculture, and I wish to refer to the situation at Virginia. This matter was referred to by the Leader in his speech last week, and it has been referred to by my colleague, the Hon. Mr. Story, and me in this Chamber from time to time. The situation at Virginia was covered in some detail by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, and I do not wish to traverse the ground he has already covered. It is a difficult situation, and it is getting more difficult as days go by. The vegetable industry is most important to the city of Adelaide. As Virginia is only 18 miles (29 km) from the city, it is possible to grow vegetables there in quantity at a cheaper rate than anywhere else in this State, close to the city, making transport costs very low.

We were told by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris that Bolivar water (recycled water, reclaimed water, whatever you like to call it) was designed to be made available to

irrigate farmlands and horticultural land in that area. At the moment I understand we have come very close to the end of the second year of the soil tests being carried out by the Agriculture Department. I have made private inquiries from people in the area where the soil tests are being carried out and from what I can gather (and I think this bears out what the Minister told me about a month ago) the soil tests generally are most successful. The day must come soon, and it cannot come soon enough, when that recycled water is made available for some types of vegetable in the area so that the limited quantities of underground water can be conserved for vegetables not suitable for growing with recycled water.

I very much regret that the Premier (I have no doubt in good faith) told people from the Virginia, St. Kilda, and Salisbury areas about two years ago that, when quotas were reviewed, it would be done on the basis of the existing quotas. Responsible men in that area who realized that there was a limit to the basin conserved water. If we had a wet year, as we did the year before last, they used as little water as possible. As a result, some people used considerably less water than the quotas they had been granted. Two years after the Premier's undertaking we find that the Mines Department is attempting to impose further restrictive quotas on the water used, and not on the existing quotas, as had been suggested. The result is that some people are being penalized most unfairly. Unless some appeals are upheld, as I trust they will be, some people will be put out of business, and in most cases people will find this method very difficult.

When the new quotas are finally completed, no-one will use less than his quota, because he may be penalized for doing so. No-one in the area could be blamed for having that attitude, because people were told the new quotas would be based on the existing ones. However, they were reallocated on what they had used, and when they saved water they were penalized for doing so. I very much regret that situation, and I believe the Government should review it. The Mines Department is looking at the matter, and I hope it will come up with something better than what has been suggested and with some

improvement on the quotas fixed, which have been appealed against in many cases. I urge upon the Government the necessity of making available that recycled water as soon

as it is humanly possible to do so.

Regarding the possibility of transferring the Agriculture Department, or part of it, to Monarto, I endorse the protest made by my Deputy Leader, the Hon. Mr. Story, yesterday. As he said, three categories in particular have put money into the facilities at Northfield—the viticultural industry, the pig industry, and the dairying industry. These people, as we are all well aware, have had provision made whereby contributions can be set aside, and considerable sums have been set aside in funds under the Cattle Compensation Act and the Swine Compensation Act. Some of that money has been used to set up facilities, admittedly to minimize disease, and that in itself is a good idea. Nevertheless, this is basically money set aside from the returns of these producers; therefore it is their money. I protest at any scheme which suggests the wholesale transfer, or even partial transfer, of the department to Monarto, other than possibly the amount of normal activity which would take place in the southern part of the State. I am quite sure it would mean a further delay in the provision of appropriate facilities for the department.

We all know that the building in Gawler Place was renovated from being a warehouse some 30 or 40 years ago, and

at that time it may have been adequate. For a very long time it has been completely inadequate and completely unsuitable. I know quite well that its replacement is very much overdue, and to shift the department to Monarto would almost certainly cause a further delay before the facilities were replaced. I add my protests to those of others.

The Government, according to His Excellency's Speech, hopes to promote education in agricultural science by placing before Parliament a Bill to constitute Roseworthy Agricultural College as an autonomous college of advanced education. I asked the Minister last year when the Bill would come forward, and he told me it would be in the next session. Through what we might call a technicality, this is now the session after that next session, but that is of no great consequence because it is a normal procedure that these agricultural colleges are being made into colleges of advanced education. However, I do not see how it is going to promote education in agricultural science. That has been done, and large sums of Commonwealth money have gone into the college.

Whether the new legislation will increase greatly the present plans for the extension and the use of the college, I do not know. I believe that, in itself, the promotion of the college as a college of advanced education is a good thing, but I do not know that it is necessarily a good thing for it to be transferred to the Minister of Education. In Victoria there is a separate department of agricultural education and there are four colleges, two of which are of a slightly different standard from Roseworthy, Dookie and Longeronong, which are on a similar level. The Government will have to consider providing a college of the type now in operation at Glenormiston in Victoria, which provides a course in farm management for the sons of farmers who are going back on to the land. I understand that this college is very well patronized and it is one of the two colleges of a different standard from those I have previously mentioned.

I say this because, although Roseworthy Agricultural College has done a marvellous job, it has become more and more advanced. It will probably be in a position to grant degrees under its own authority, and it will become more and more an extension officers college, and less and less a college for people going back to the land. Therefore I believe the Government will have to consider the provision of an additional college of a slightly different type, along the lines suggested by the committee which went into the matter of agricultural education some time ago.

The Hon. C. R. Story: You were saying—

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I believe practice plays a most important part in the training of young men who are going back to the land. The practice at Roseworthy has been for that college to give a good practical education. Probably it has been the best college in practical education, as well as keeping up with standards academically. However, now the emphasis is more on the academic and less on the practical, and I believe there is a need for a second college.

With regard to railways, I notice that the Government is expecting to come to an agreement with the Commonwealth Government on the standard gauge line to Adelaide and that it is expected that early agreement will be reached on the line from Tarcoola to Alice Springs. I commend the Government for the progress that has been made; I hope it can hurry it up. The standard gauge line to Adelaide is much overdue. I have had the opportunity of travelling on the old line from Marree to Alice Springs on four occasions and have also seen something

the surveying going on in the area from Tarcoola through Coober Pedy up to Alice Springs. That is a necessary improvement. The old line could never really be made adequate in this case. I wish the Government well in this project.

With regard to highways, I notice that the Government is getting some satisfaction from the number of projects that have been completed—the Port Augusta bridge, certain parts of the South-Eastern Freeway and the Noarlunga by-pass. Some of these were planned before this Government came to office. However, I still congratulate the Government on the fact that they have been completed, but I take note of this, that in the old District of Midland there were 28 town and district councils, and I used to regard it as part of my duty, when I was moving around the whole of the district, as I hope the new members will, too, to find out what the situation was in the district councils, how they were managing their work and whether they were getting sufficient assistance. Four or five years ago, when the Hon. Mr. Hill was Minister of Roads and Local Government, I called on many councils in the District of Midland and almost without exception I found that those councils were fully employed, taking on more men and getting as much Government assistance as they could handle. Unfortunately, that is not so today. I know very well that the South-Eastern Freeway and the Eyre Highway are claiming the department's attention but I believe that district councils and corporations are being starved to some extent today. Some of them are being forced to put men off because insufficient money is being made available. Let's face it: we have heard it said that it is Government money and that the Government should control and dictate; but this is the people's money, provided by the people in the form of road taxes, motor registrations and the like.

An adequate proportion of this money should be allocated to the councils, which should be able to continue to act in a viable and progressive manner. I bring this to the notice of the Government: that many councils today are finding it difficult to carry on. The Government has also indicated in His Excellency's Speech that there will be an inquiry into boundaries. There is a Royal Commission on Local Government Boundaries. I would be the last to suggest that some adjustments are not necessary because I know that 41 years have passed since the last boundaries adjustments of any consequence were made, and at that time there was some resistance to the adjustments then effected. I would be the last person to suggest that some alteration should not be made, but I do not believe that the councils should be reduced from 137 to about 30 and that we should get many large local government regions, in which case the word "local" would no longer be effective and we would no longer have local government; we would have Governmental regions in the country, which would be dictated to by the Commonwealth Government or the State Government, as the case might be.

Whilst I believe that some adjustment is necessary. I do not believe in this wholesale alteration and enlargement of the councils so that the local contact is removed, because we have at present three tiers of government—the Commonwealth Government, the State Government and local government. Let us keep local government at that level in the local area where the ratepayer can get in touch with his local councillor without any trouble and so that local government has some say in what is done.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: What about regional local government as defined by the Commonwealth Government?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I was coming to that. Regional government could apply in the future to education, and that would mean bypassing the State Government. In conformity with Australian Labor Party policy the Government will then dictate to regions by money. In other words, if it has not the constitutional power to dictate to local government or to education within a region, it will dictate by saying, "The money is there if you will do so-and-so." That is the way in which the Government will aim to achieve unification in Australia; that is how we shall reach the situation at present obtaining in Darwin, which has its Government 2,000 miles (3 220 km) away and the Minister of the day is not on the spot: he is here today and gone tomorrow. The Northern Territory is governed by bureaucrats who sit in Canberra and do not appreciate the local scene. That is the sort of thing that will happen.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: It has been happening under a Liberal Government in Canberra for the past 23 years.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I do not agree with the Minister.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: The honourable member does not agree that the Liberals were in power for 23 years in Canberra?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I agree with that.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: And they governed the Northern Territory?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Yes, but I have just been up there. The situation is that the present Commonwealth Government has increased the salaries of the Legislative Councillors in Darwin and taken away many of their powers. The previous Government had just offered more powers. I suggest that the Minister go there and see for himself. I commend this Government for the school building programme. I notice that during the last financial year the school building programme incurred an over-expenditure of \$6,470,000 for a record new level of \$29,770,000.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: This will be good to hear.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I do not normally commend the Government for its expenditure but I believe that in the realm of school buildings and school facilities this is necessary progress. Perhaps the councils do not get enough money but I compliment the Government on its school building programme. I believe it is wise to suggest that this programme should continue.

I also notice that the Government has approved in principle proposals for water treatment works to purify and improve the quality of water supplied to Adelaide consumers. I am pleased about that. It was announced about four years ago when another Government was in power. I hope this Government will get on with the job. If it is going ahead with this scheme, I commend it, because we all know that the water supplied to Adelaide is of poor quality; we all know also that during and after the last war the people were not encouraged, for a very good reason at that time, to install rainwater tanks. In the country they were needed where water was not then reticulated, but in South Australia and other places we expect to have the water reticulated in such a way that it is suitable for drinking. I commend the Government for that project.

I notice that the Electricity Trust of South Australia is continuing to expand its supplies to the community. However, I am sorry it has had to increase its charges. The trust deserves the admiration of all sections of the community for the job it has done over the very many years it

has been supplying electric power in South Australia. In his Speech, the Governor said:

The South Australian Housing Trust will continue to provide housing of good quality and varied designs. In particular, a wider choice, both as regards the design of houses and the locality in which they are situate, will be offered to the aged by the trust.

I commend the idea of a wider choice, and of better quality and more varied design. I have seen, on tours around various building sites, as have other honourable members, that trust buildings have not always compared advantageously with those of private developers. I believe there is a need for a better quality house and for more varied design. The proposal that houses will be made available by the trust to the aged on a rental basis is a commendable one. There are other matters I could mention.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Don't stop; we're enjoying it.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: However, I shall conclude my remarks and will deal with other matters during the Budget debate. I have pleasure in supporting the motion for adoption of the Address in Reply.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER (Central No. 2): I rise to support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I thank His Excellency the Governor for opening Parliament once more, and reaffirm my loyalty to Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II.

I have great confidence in the future of South Australia's legislation, when I see this Council at last reassembling to perform its traditionally democratic role after the attacks, denigrations and attempts by the ill-informed and ill-experienced to destroy it in recent months. It gives me great pleasure to be associated with this almost intact group of men, whom I know to have the welfare of all South Australia as their primary object, especially today, when we see pressure groups around us in other areas, would-be governing organizations and stirrers in the various social associations in this State, all exercising most undemocratic disruption in the community.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: They are not Communists, are they?

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: It is an honour to be part of this great Council, which has always maintained truth and integrity as being more important than personal popularity; the support of the Crown and established legislation is more important than political opportunism. The Council has been fortunate in having a long line of members who have given their services, not because being a member was a good job and one which would put them in the public eye, not because they desired personal aggrandizement, but because they believed that the highest service a member could give to his State was to provide it with good and just legislation. Such a member was the Hon. Harry Kemp, whom we mourn, remembering as we do his shining example only a few weeks ago. He was a man of many skills, of great humanity and erudition, and he had a deep and searching mind, a generous heart and great personal courage. He leaves behind him a fine young family who, with their mother to lead them, will follow along the path set by their father. May I quote the ancient valediction, "May God rest his brave soul".

In the pursuit of good legislation, the honourable members of this Council have been guided by a long line of leaders who have themselves not sought pomp and circumstance, but have had personal commitments to the highest tradition of the Legislative Council. In thinking of the great men who have dedicated many years of their lives to leadership in the Council, I believe that the Hon. Mr. Shard

ranks high among these figures. He has contributed greatly to the good of South Australia. For myself, I have on many occasions received great help and kindness from him and have had great respect for many of his judgments.

I congratulate the Hon. Mr. Kneebone on succeeding to the position of Leader of the House, and I wish him well in his appointment. Indeed, in the words of the Governor's Speech, "I trust that his deliberations will be guided by Divine providence to the advancement of the welfare of this State". I congratulate, too, the Hon. Mr. Banfield on his well-deserved appointment to the Ministry. Also, I congratulate the new members (the Hon. Mr. Creedon and the Hon. Mr. Chatterton) on joining the Council and trust that their association with its sincere and learned members will be to their advantage.

I now wish to raise one or two matters which have given me considerable concern in recent years. It is my belief that the proceedings of Parliament are insufficiently promulgated among the people who are supposed to be enlightened enough to vote democratically for the proper government of their country. Since the newspapers have been forced to drop regular Parliamentary reports, as formerly, in order to make more football and more spectacle sports reportage for their readers (we have all heard the excuse—"We give the readers what they wish"), and since radio stations in their news reports give very little Parliamentary news, except the more controversial types of statement by members, the public has been left to discover Parliament through collections of summaries and opinions expressed by what are not very highly skilled or very philosophical writers.

I believe that the time has arrived for Parliament to look seriously at the matter of promulgating reports of its activities in a proper fashion, and I say this for two basic reasons: first, that the dignity of Parliament and the law of the land would be better upheld if the people were more informed about the type of debate, discussion and research that goes into the making of those laws; secondly, that the public, by being better informed, might exercise its vote intelligently for its own government. We all know that a high proportion of voters have little more than primary education and little knowledge of the world's history or, indeed, of their own history, and no knowledge of political history or of the welfare of man.

As a result of these thoughts, I therefore suggest that the Government establish a joint Party committee to examine the possibility of distributing *Hansard* on a much wider basis throughout the State, probably free. Secondly, perhaps a small pamphlet, published regularly, and giving a precis or extracts from members' speeches would be valuable. This, of course, would make it necessary for members to be prepared to provide written summaries of what they considered the most important items of their speeches, with a limit of perhaps 250 words for each speech. I do not feel strongly that the above method is the best way of putting the suggestion into operation, but I believe there is a very serious need—I repeat, serious—to improve the political education of our voters.

I turn now to the big issue this year: the environment. We are indebted to the Hon. Mr. Springett for his contribution to the debate yesterday. Without wishing to weary honourable members, I desire to refer to one aspect of modern technology which I and many others find annoying, physically and mentally irritating, and dangerous—namely, the excessive use of noise-making devices. I find that the under-controlled use of electrical amplification of so much of the human voice, of so much alleged music

and other noises, is not only wearisome but medically harmful to the rather delicate hearing apparatus of the human body. An article in yesterday's *Advertiser* says:

It is generally considered that few people will have their hearing damaged by continuous exposure to noise up to the 85-decibel level. At 100 decibels, maximum recommended exposure is 75 minutes a week. At 109 decibels, human tolerance drops to 10 minutes a week. At 120 decibels—close to the threshold of pain—it is barely tolerable for half a minute weekly.

Elsewhere I have read that eardrum rupture occurs at 185 decibels and that 194 decibels bring lung damage. When I tell honourable members that the sound of rotary mowers is somewhere between 95 and 100 decibels, they can understand the danger. In this connection I refer not only to blaring advertising loud-speakers in Rundle Street shops, the extraordinary and unnecessary blanket of sound sent out around every sports ground, and the infatuation of suppliers of motor cycles and other vehicles to the young with the provision of unnecessarily noisy exhausts, but also to the many motor cycles of, I believe, the two-stroke design that have no muffling system at all.

I need hardly remind honourable members that the noisy devices employed in so many of our leading so-called tourist hotels and restaurants make dining out more of an endurance test in a torture chamber than an occasion for food and pleasant conversation. Heaven knows what level of sound is reached nightly in these places. No wonder that more and more pop groups are suffering from incipient deafness. In all these public areas, it should be possible to devise sensitive meters to test the loudness rating of noise and to lay down a set of simple rules for the imposition of reasonable limits. Whilst in the amusement parks at the Royal Show it may or may not be proper to have a noise battle in which the showman prepared to use the greatest amount of electric power wins the contest, there are those of us who find no pleasure in this type of selfish advertising and genuinely fear for the sensitivity of the ears of the young. The use of excessive sound is the greatest pollution of all and can no longer be ignored. I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE (Northern): I join with previous speakers in supporting the motion and congratulating His Excellency the Governor on his Speech opening the second session of the Forty-first Parliament. I join, too, in expressing regret at the sad loss of the Hon. Mr. Kemp and Mr. Roy McLachlan, and I extend my sympathy to their relatives. Many kind words have been spoken about both these gentlemen; I often think what a wonderful place the world would be if we made such remarks while the people concerned were still alive. I did not know Mr. McLachlan, but I knew the Hon. Mr. Kemp extremely well. If the person who succeeds him in this Council can contribute as much to the State as did the Hon. Mr. Kemp, whichever Party the new member represents will have every reason to be proud of him. I congratulate the Hon. Mr. Kneebone and the Hon. Mr. Banfield on their new appointments. I know that there would be no dissentient voice if a call was taken to support the remarks that have been made concerning the Hon. Bert Shard.

The Hon. Mr. Chatterton and the Hon. Mr. Creedon have put behind them the awe-inspiring task of delivering their maiden speeches. They made a brief opening during a debate in the previous session; I must admit that I was considerably more impressed with their showing than I was with their speeches during this session. However, I know that both gentlemen have ability and will make many

more speeches in this Council, and many of their speeches will bring them greater credit than did their Address in Reply speeches.

His Excellency's Speech referred to the restoration of the rural and general economies of the State, brought about by the wonderful upsurge in markets, coupled with what has started out to be one of the best seasons that the rural industry has enjoyed for many years. I am pleased that a considerable sum will be made available for upgrading the Port Lincoln abattoir. There has been a continual struggle to bring the abattoir up to a specification that suits local requirements and will allow it to compete in the overseas markets. Upgrading all the facilities at the abattoir has been necessary to induce a full range of competition. Because in the past the abattoir has been sadly handicapped in this respect, we have not enjoyed a full contingent of buyers at the Port Lincoln markets. I hope the position will be corrected, as a result of the money that will be spent.

The Speech referred to the establishment of additional community welfare centres, and it said that autonomy was being encouraged in the administration of Aboriginal reserves, a step that I am sure will benefit the Aborigines. It was specially significant to read in yesterday's newspaper of an Aboriginal industrial co-operative that is expected to begin in Port Augusta next month. The co-operative, a private venture, will employ Aborigines only. No doubt honourable members know that a request has been made to the Commonwealth Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Mr. Bryant, for support for the project. I have no sway with the present Commonwealth Government, but I know that, faced with the same situation, I would grasp it with both hands. I believe that such a project is one of the things that has long been overdue in assisting and promoting the welfare of Aborigines.

The idea of solely Aboriginal labour being used is of great consequence, because it gives them an opportunity to show the rest of the world that, given a chance, they can compete. I know, too, that one of the best ways of achieving an efficient Aboriginal work force is to put a good, smart Aboriginal in charge of it. In support of such a project, not only should the Commonwealth Government be involved, but the State Government should give whatever assistance it can to ensure that the project gets off to a good start.

His Excellency hoped that at last negotiations for the standardization of the Adelaide to Crystal Brook railway line would reach finality. Perhaps one of the greatest fiascos we have witnessed has been the prolonged negotiations, amounting to humbug, between the State and Commonwealth Governments for sufficient finance to build what will be a very vital rail link and a very vital part of our economy. It always seemed to me to be a senseless argument, because we have had the State asking for money and the Commonwealth willing to grant it, but we could not reach agreement because of trivial matters that were, to me, of little consequence. It is with pleasure that at last we are reaching a stage of finality, and it is hoped that soon we will commence a project which should by this time have been completed.

It was interesting, too, to read further about the Alice Springs to Tarcoola line. It may perhaps be coincidental that this line now passes close to a new find of brown coal; this find could and should contribute substantially to the economy of the new line. There are added features, too, apart from the coal discovery, which will come into eventual use, because it is a further step towards the connection between north and south—that rail link



which has been promised and shelved for so many years. Such a link is most essential and, coupled with the potential of the Lake Phillipson coal, it could easily build Port Augusta into one of the main industrial centres of the State, perhaps of the Commonwealth. I am sure that all Northerners are looking forward to such a step.

I have argued that, even when this rail line is built, the need for a first-class highway from Port Augusta to Alice Springs will not diminish. It is most essential that work on the Stuart Highway be proceeded with as quickly as possible. Figures have been quoted to me (and I cannot vouch for their accuracy), but I believe that a first-class highway could be built for one-third of the cost of the rail link. As I am unsure whether that is an accurate statement, I am not willing to stand by it. However, I know that, even after the rail link is established, the road must go through. From a national planning point of view, I cannot understand why the road does not go through in the first place, because it would no doubt facilitate the work of building the line.

Regarding highways, it is of special interest, I am sure, to all South Australians to find that an additional \$3,000,000 has been allocated to proceed with the work on the Eyre Highway. This is wonderful news because I believe that, by the time the \$3,000,000 has been spent, there is every possibility that additional funds will be found to complete the sealing of the remaining 85 km of the highway. The report of the Royal Commission on Local Government Boundaries, to be tabled later in the year, is awaited with interest, as the Hon. Mr. Dawkins said earlier in the debate. The report is awaited with great interest because small communities do not wish to lose their identity or to hand over to regional areas which, once again to quote the Hon. Mr. Dawkins, could easily be dictated to from Canberra. Many grants that might be given to these regional areas could quite easily be earmarked to be spent on specified projects quite outside the jurisdiction of the people who know most about the requirements of the areas in which they live.

I think that most of the other matters in the Governor's Speech have been covered fully by previous speakers, and other speakers will follow me. It gives me pleasure to support the motion.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES (Northern): I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply delivered by His Excellency the Governor when opening the second session of the 41st Parliament. I am aware of the privilege that all honourable members have when speaking to the Address in Reply, because they are permitted to discuss any relevant matter which they believe may affect the interests of the people of the State. I listened to and read with interest the speeches of those honourable members who have preceded me. It is only correct that I should first pay homage and recognition to the memory of the late Harry Kemp and the late Mr. McLachlan, whose deaths were recorded in His Excellency's Speech. I cannot possibly express my own personal sentiments for the memory of the late Harry Kemp, because our friendship was such a deep one.

I can remember sitting in the Chamber and the late honourable member sitting on his bench where I could watch him when possibly the business of the Council was a little tedious and when he was writing the gardening notes for the press. He would be opening bags of samples sent to him and one never knew whether a smelly onion or a very diseased leaf would come out. The Hon. Mr. Kemp, with his very quick wit, would make suitable comment. One will not forget the memory of a man who was so able in so many fields, whether as a legislator, or

one pointing out what he believed to be wrong in the community (and he did it so ably when he had that opinion) or as a fine agriculturist with a great ability to express himself—attributes many other people, myself included, would love to have.

I have listened with interest to the comments some members have made about our two new members. I welcome them to the Council, but I do not welcome them so much as members for the District of Midland, as would have been the case when they were elected, realizing as I do that all members in this place, once the Act has been proclaimed, will be Councillors for the whole State of South Australia, regardless of our politics and our political idiosyncrasies. The responsibilities resting on members of this Council from now on will be far greater than they have been previously and it will behove us all, new and old, to carry out the traditions that the Legislative Council in South Australia has handed down to all of us. These traditions in future will come under a new electoral guise, a new system of voting, but the responsibility will still remain, whether we are considering legislation before the Council or carrying out our duties before the public as citizens of the State. I wish our new members well in their first few months in the Council. With other members, I congratulate the honourable members on the front bench. When the Hon. Mr. Banfield came into the Council in 1965 he was a rough and raw character, extremely pertinent in his comments in his maiden Address in Reply debate.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Do you think he has improved?

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: If I could just take it a little further, I want to comment on how he has mellowed. He has absorbed the traditions of the Council.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Oh, no!

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: He appreciates the influence we members on this side have had on him and he is a changed man in this regard. I congratulate him and wish him well in the responsibilities he has. I put him first on the list—

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Because I am the roughest?

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Not now! Next I pay my tribute to the Hon. Bert Shard for his work as Chief Secretary and Minister of Health. It is not until one has these responsibilities that one realizes the intensity of the demands of office. I know many Saturdays and Sundays were given up by the Hon. Mr. Shard and his fine wife to go into the country for the opening of new hospitals or wings of hospitals, sometimes in the middle of summer, sometimes in the middle of winter. It is not easy for a busy Minister to do this, but the people wanted them. Many a time in my own district I have known this to happen and I have a high regard for the Hon. Mr. Shard and for his diligence on the job. He believed that this devotion to duty was wanted of him. He did his job exactly as it should have been done.

The Hon. Mr. Kneebone, of course, with all his portfolios, has a hard row to hoe and, with other members, I wish him well and hope that his job will be made easier by the knowledge that Council members are with him in the responsibilities he has. One must not leave the preliminaries in this debate without paying respect to the Hon. Les Hart, whose perceptive mind and barbed tongue, together with his ability to do his homework, will not be forgotten by any of us. Many members are up to date with their work, but I can say quite honestly that Les

Hart was invariably up to date with his work in connection with legislation before the Council, and Government members must admit that many were the questions he asked that were curly ones.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: He got some curly answers, too.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: In a way, one expects tit for tat. I have only three points to make today, and the first relates to hospitals. It has come to my notice that, in Government subsidized hospitals, if the Government decides there must be an increase in the daily rate patients are to be charged (such as the recently announced increase of \$4 a day in the rates for all major hospitals), this increase must be carried into effect in subsidized hospitals right throughout the country. I have been told that, where a board in a Government subsidized hospital has indicated its ability to absorb possible increases, it has been told that if the daily rate is not increased the hospital will receive a reduced subsidy as a result. This matter should be looked at closely. I feel it is wrong that an efficient hospital board, which is able to watch the pennies and save the pounds, in the words of the old axiom, at the same time providing the services required, particularly in country areas, should be penalized by being told that it will lose its subsidy if it does not put up the rates. This could lead only to inefficiency from what has been an efficient board.

In our community today are many people who will put their backsides to the chair and say, "The Government should do something about it." This is not my concept of Government subsidy, or of hospital boards or of the way in which they should operate. We have inefficient hospitals that need subsidizing and we have hospitals experiencing problems with staff and the lack of medical practitioners—and I do not refer to those when I use the word "inefficient". Too much pandering and too much subsidizing, or threat of loss of subsidy, can have only a detrimental effect in the long run. Unfortunately, subsidies are necessary today because of the increased care needed for the aged, increasing problems of maintenance of buildings, and the cost of rebuilding hospitals. Some help must be given, but this problem must be looked at, and it is not right that a board should be told that, if prices are not increased, subsidies will not be forthcoming if the board says it is able to absorb costs.

Last week the Hon. Mr. Story asked a question of the Minister of Agriculture as to whether the Agriculture Department was being gradually absorbed into other departments. I listened with interest to the question and the answer. To my disappointment, however, I have just received a report made by two Government departments in this State, where a survey was made of primary industry relative to the needs of the farmer without any reference having been made to the Minister or to the Agriculture Department, except for criticism of that department. This report lays emphasis on the need to recognize a serious training deficiency for farmers and workers in primary industry. It criticizes the lack of training bulletins; it criticizes the fact that there are insufficient extension services of the Agriculture Department, whether in horticulture, vegetable growing, fruitgrowing, grazing, wool or wheat. These departments, from my own observations, have noted these deficiencies and produced this report about the complaints made by primary producers. This report has been furnished by the Labour and Industry Department and the Department of Further Education. I wish to quote from it, and first from page 7. The report is headed "Extract from the Report of the Survey

of Training Needs in Industry, Commerce and Government in South Australia, 1972", and it states:

Growers claim that the extension services of the Department of Agriculture should be improved. The growers require training in analysing and defining animal and crop problems and developing appropriate solutions. Because it is not possible for them to make continual reference to the extension officers, they need training to enable them to make greater use of printed information. They need to be able to select from the available information and apply it in an appropriate fashion to their own situation. It was repeatedly emphasized that agriculture is becoming an increasingly technical operation making greater demands on cost control and management skills. External training and back-up from extension and service industries is necessary because of more complex operations and marketing requirements. Growers and managers of properties require practical vocational training to cover:

- (a) total grower operations and technology;
- (b) production and management;
- (c) marketing;
- (d) problem solving and the use of agricultural services;
- (e) cost control, profitable business practice and decision-making.

Growers, farm managers and supervisors need training to help them in planning the training of farm workers who are recruited from the ranks of the unskilled and itinerant workers, hundreds of whom enter the industry each year. Executives and branch managers of rural wholesale/retail distribution companies point out the need for education and training for their employees in agricultural services technology.

The report concludes by stating:

The industry believes that special consideration should be given to its needs by education and training authorities. Relevant courses of training should be provided by the Department of Further Education in conjunction with the extension services of the Department of Agriculture and be available through technical colleges and further education centres in each region.

I have taken a deep interest in agriculture and have read the technical bulletins that come from the Agriculture Department where they apply to my part of the profession. I find them worth while, but this report suggests that there are people who do not receive the dissemination of information that the department has published in recent years. It has been updated but is not getting across to many people. Therefore, I ask the Minister whether he would be prepared for the Agriculture Department itself to look at this problem of news dissemination and technological dissemination in its many facets to the primary producer to see whether it is being received, understood and used by those wishing to avail themselves of it. As the Council knows, no longer can a member of the agricultural industry exist by rule of thumb or the seat of his pants. The knowledge and technical skills needed by him are skyrocketing in their complexity, so no longer can an efficient farmer work merely by rule of thumb or guesswork.

The department has these technical services, but this report, to me is damning for the primary industry, so I ask humbly but firmly that a look be taken to see how the department can get information out to the primary producer so that he himself can understand it and benefit from it in these changing times, as changing times they are. Thank goodness times do change and we do not stagnate all the time. Finally, I have a few comments to make on the reports received about the running of the railways in South Australia. I have not seen a copy of the report that the Minister of Transport has received, but I am told that many hundreds of miles (kilometres) of lines are to be closed and that all the railway lines on Eyre Peninsula have been mentioned, but whether or not that is correct I do not know.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: It is hard to get a copy of that report.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: That is so. The report is produced, the press gives its version, and that is just about where it ends.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: I remember the same thing happening in the case of a report which came out some time ago and which we couldn't get.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I am making a speech about my railway trains; I will leave the Minister alone. Let us worry about that report later. I am merely trying to cover myself so that, if the figures I have quoted are incorrect, I can be corrected. There are four points I wish to make about the railways. The world is now waking up to the fact that there is a growing shortage of fossilized fuels. The great United States of America, the home of the automobile and the reputed home of wealth and oil, is suffering the pangs of oil shortage.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Black gold.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: It is getting short of it.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: It is getting short only in America.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: If we are to close railway lines indiscriminately because of the unknown problems of the future after the year 2000, is it wise not to keep the nucleus of a main line railway system in each area of the State? Today, we do not talk of defence; we have no fear of war. We are living in a wonderful vacuum. The only problem we have is inflation, which produces poverty, but war will come because man is never able to contain himself for long. It does not need politics to start wars, either: consider what has happened in Ireland. The defence needs of this nation and of this State must not be forgotten in the long-term plan—(a) fuel shortage in the years to come and (b) if there is a defence need, a railway system is a wonderful godsend for any country; and South Australia with its difficult geographical features must keep sight of this problem. Governments complain that the railways are making a loss and therefore the public must pay in some other way. Usually, the spear is pointed at the road operator. I will have no truck with this argument today. The private truck operators must have assistance just as any other sector of the community that provides a service must have assistance. Railways are a public utility used for the transportation of cereals and products grown on the land (good for the export world and for us), and we must not allow rubber tyres to take control of the total rail system. I have no truck with handing our railways over to the Commonwealth Government, as I consider that this will produce greater inefficiency than we have ever seen. Furthermore, it would be something like the problem we have regarding subsidies for hospitals: the finger could be pointed from Canberra indicating that if charges were not increased no further subsidies would be given. The State should be proud of what it has, and should be able to run what it has. I strongly disapprove of handing control over willy-nilly to the grabbing claws from Canberra. I have no truck with the previous Government and its ability to be inefficient anymore than I have truck with the present Government, which has also proved its inefficiency.

I support the motion, and thank His Excellency for the way he has governed the State. I wish him and Lady Oliphant well and congratulate them on the way they have represented Her Majesty in South Australia. I join with other members in wishing that this Parliament will be one of constructive criticism and of good government.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Central No. 1): I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to the Speech made by His Excellency the Governor (Sir

Mark Oliphant) in opening the second session of the Forty-First Parliament. I congratulate His Excellency on the magnificent manner in which he delivered his Speech. Since he was appointed Governor I have probably had more contact with him than have most other people, and I have nothing but admiration for him and Lady Oliphant. Sir Mark Oliphant is somewhat of a departure from the usual type of Governor of this State; he is not of the rank we have been used to—I do not say that disrespectfully. He is not afraid to say what he believes when making public statements: I believe that is good, because if a person is to be only a figurehead he does not create much of an impression within the State. I admire the way Sir Mark has attacked his job and the vast amount of travel he has done in the short time he has been here; it is a remarkable indication of his ability and stamina to get on with his job and to inform himself of what is happening.

I am loath to speak in this debate without mentioning the sad death of the Hon. Harry Kemp. I did not know Mr. Kemp socially, or as well as most members did; my knowledge of him was as a member of the Chamber. Naturally, we had many differences of opinion, but, be that as it may, he had some admirable characteristics and qualities. My outstanding memory of him (and in this I am somewhat similar) is that if he believed he was right he had the tenacity to fight for it: he would not give up. He made me give in on more than one occasion. Once, he recommitted a Bill (which was his right) and on the third occasion it was recommitted he got the numbers. To his widow and family I, with other honourable members, extend my personal sympathy, and hope they will be able to bear their sad loss.

I did not know Roy McLachlan very well. However, he must have been an outstanding personality to have been returned in his district, because, in the main, only good people are elected to Parliament. For that reason, if for no other, I extend my personal sympathy to his family in their sad bereavement.

I extend a welcome and my personal congratulations to the Hon. Mr. Creedon and the Hon. Mr. Chatterton on being elected to the Council. If I had any regrets about doing what I did back in March this year, it was that I wished the number of Government members would improve by 50 per cent and we would get more help. If I had known what would happen shortly after that time I would have felt differently. I wish my two colleagues well. They will find, as other honourable members and I have found, that there will be differences of opinion to the point where those opinions will be expressed fearlessly and with conviction. However, if they conduct themselves well here they will be respected and acknowledged outside Parliament.

I disagree with some honourable members opposite, particularly the Leader of the Opposition, in their criticisms that the speeches made by the new members were too short. I believe they had just enough to say: they had something to say, and they said it pointedly. If each member had spoken for more than half an hour we would not have been able to get through the Address in Reply speeches until next week; as some honourable members opposite took a long time in replying to them. I hope that in future when they speak they will say what they have to say and then sit down. Many members in this Chamber use too many words in saying what they wish to say, so it was a tonic to my ears to have two new members, who had something pointed to say, saying it and sitting down.

I congratulate my friend and colleague, the Hon. Frank Kneebone, on being officially appointed Chief Secretary. There is no doubt that he can do the job: if I had doubted his ability I may still be Chief Secretary.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: He has been well trained.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Maybe he has. I wish him well, as it is not an easy job. I hope he stands up to it and gets satisfaction from it. I got much satisfaction out of it. I also congratulate the Hon. Mr. Don Banfield: I believe he will do his job well. There is no question about that. It is remarkable how many times the Hon. Mr. Banfield has taken my place over the last 20 years and has helped me through. He knows very well that, if he breaks down, he can expect the cane, but that will not be necessary, because I have every confidence that he will do the job well. My decision to retire from the positions of Chief Secretary and Minister of Health was a decision of my own making. I was appointed Leader of the Opposition in July, 1961, and I later became Chief Secretary and Minister of Health. During my periods as Leader of the Opposition and my periods as Chief Secretary I had kept fairly well in health, and I thought that, rather than go on for another term, it would be better to unwind quietly. Not one member of my Party knew about my decision; I do not believe that anyone actually knew that I would be retiring until I quietly told the Premier that I would not be a contender for a Cabinet position. I should like to think that most of the other Caucus members did not know that I would not accept nomination until after I had told the Premier. I want that to be understood, because some unpleasant things were thought about another matter, and I do not want anyone to think that any pressure was put on me.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Only from the boss!

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: No; I have got the best boss in the world. My family did not want me to accept nomination on a previous occasion. I sincerely appreciate the remarks that the Hon. Mr. DeGaris made about me last week. Further, I deeply appreciate what he said about my good wife; I have had tremendous support from her over many years, particularly while I was in Cabinet. We did not see much of each other but wherever I was expected to go she readily came along; that created a good impression and it uplifted the standing of Parliament. I thank the Hon. Mrs. Cooper for her remarks this afternoon; I mention her particularly because she is the only lady in this Council. However, I think she overrated me a little when she put me among the great Leaders of this place.

True, as the Hon. Mrs. Cooper said, one does not become a member of this Council to get a well-paid job, because members of Parliament are not well paid. I came into Parliament, the Labor Party, and the Trades and Labor Council because I thought I could do some good for the underdog, and I hope I will be pardoned if I say that I succeeded. Members of Parliament have a reasonable living, but no-one could become a rich man in Parliament. Indeed, a person would not be a success if he became a member of Parliament for monetary reasons only. A member must have the ambition to do something for the State and the country; otherwise, he will not succeed. I would like to pay a tribute to you, Mr. President. I wish to thank you for your help, guidance and friendship. I wish to thank the Clerks, the members of the *Hansard* staff, the librarians, the messengers, and everyone else connected with running this Council for their assistance to me; not once during the past 12 years has any assistance that I requested not been forthcoming.

I also express my deep appreciation to the staff of the Chief Secretary's Department, particularly the Under Secretary (Mr. Isbell) and the Assistant Under Secretary (Mr. Fleming). As the Leader of the Opposition and the Hon. Mr. Kneebone know, there is never an idle moment in the Chief Secretary's Department, but the magnificent staff of that department has always been unquestionably loyal. No matter what one wanted the staff to do, they did it well and willingly. This State has a wonderful Public Service, and there are some brilliant, capable, dedicated and sincere people among the departmental heads; they do their work in the interests of the people of the State and of their Ministers in particular.

I have retired as Chief Secretary and Minister of Health with some regrets, but age catches up with one, and it is nice to retire when one is getting along satisfactorily. I sincerely thank all the people who have written to me expressing their appreciation of what I have done over the years. Also, I thank all the people who have invited me to various functions and the people who have stopped me in the street to wish me well, particularly representatives of various organizations. Since I have retired, the path has not been so easy; I easily get emotionally upset, and some expressions of gratitude have got on top of me occasionally. I have tried to weather the storm, and I believe I have done so. I sincerely say "Thank you" to everyone who has been so kind to me. If my efforts in the Council have satisfied honourable members opposite and my colleagues, that is all the thanks I want.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL (Central No. 2): I, too, support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, and I join in the personal tributes that have been made, particularly to my old friend Harry Kemp. He was a man of real kindness; nothing to help his friends was too much trouble for him and, indeed, nothing to help anyone else was too much trouble for him. He was always willing to help even strangers in connection with the subject that he knew so much about. It is extremely sad and upsetting that so much knowledge and wisdom should be lost as a result of Harry Kemp's death at such a comparatively early age. I join in the tribute that has been paid to another old friend, Bert Shard. He has been a great Leader, whether or not he regards himself as such, and he has always been, and still is, an extremely astute tactician. I noticed during the last short session that, when the moment came when a little advice was necessary, he was certainly there. Regarding his successor, the Hon. Mr. Kneebone, I congratulate him and wish him well. He will be, as he has already been, a great success in the job. We know his personal qualities here, and I am sure he will also prove himself to be an eminent Leader.

I also mention the Hon. Mr. Shard's wife, because he said how much help a wife could be in a job such as he had. I know that myself, because I had an important job about 20 years ago and I know how much help my wife was to me and how much it meant in achieving any success I gained in that office. I join with other members in congratulating the Hon. Mr. Banfield as well. I have to agree with the Hon. Mr. Geddes to an extent, not necessarily in regard to the tough part to which he referred, but to the fact that he has quietened down a little in the Chamber, and I am sure that, from what the Hon. Mrs. Cooper said, she is pleased that he is using fewer decibels.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: She doesn't need ear-pads now.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I also join with the Hon. Mr. Shard in his tribute to the Public Service. I

agree with him entirely that we have a splendid Public Service. As I have the honour and pleasure quite often to meet some of the heads and officers near the top of the service, I pay tribute to their good work.

I have often talked about the pastoral industry as a city member, but honourable members know that not only am I practically interested in the industry but that I have been a director of a public company that is engaged in the selling of wool, livestock and country merchandise for almost 40 years; so I claim to know a little about the industry, at least from the city end. Until recently (we have not heard so much about it lately) there were tremendous complaints about the rise in the price of meat at a time when the poor old farmer for the first time in many years was getting a decent price for his products. I have seen this both as a minor producer of wool and fat lambs and also as a director of the company to which I have referred.

When the farmer was having a very bad time (which he was until about a year ago), we did not hear any congratulations for him about the way in which he was subsidizing the cost of meat to the housewife or any suggestion that there should be a home consumption price in his favour—not on your life, because people do not think that way. I can tell honourable members (and I know that several honourable members could do the same) that, literally, for three or four years prior to last year the farmer was producing wool and fat lambs at below the cost of production. He was forced to sell at below cost of production; that applied also to the big woolgrower, because I see his accounts as well.

It may surprise a few honourable members who are not large-scale woolgrowers, but I do not believe that anyone could have made any sort of return on his property at all if he was a woolgrower in those times. We do not all have to eat the most expensive cuts of meat all the time; my family does not. I imagine that most honourable members work in a reasonably economical way in this direction. However, the law of supply and demand will rectify the situation. This relates to pig meats even now, because they are not bringing anything like the price they were bringing. There are many substitutes for meat. I am a great egg eater, and I am told here again that the producer of eggs is not getting a very great return for his product.

The Hon. C. R. Story: The Minister will fix it.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: That is good.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: The honourable member produces his own eggs but has only 20 fowls, so he is all right.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I do not intend to examine that situation now, but I may be constrained to do something about it later on, whether the colour should be No. 8, 15, 7 or 1. The whole history of the pastoral industry in Australia has always been one of boom and depression, peaks and troughs, wealth and hardship. As far as I can see, even if Governments try to iron out these waves, this situation will always appertain to some extent in any event, because the prices of livestock, wool and most other farm produce are attuned to world markets. To suggest (as I have seen recently) that we ought to damp down our export of meat just when the country as a whole, as well as the individual grower, must be profiting by it would be a retrograde step. In the interests of the country as a whole, while there is a good demand for our produce we ought not to damp down the demand but satisfy it by producing more. I do not believe in artificial controls.

In the last couple of days we have seen one or two strange things done in the name of democracy. At the Victorian Liberal Party convention held last Saturday, I think, among other things the death penalty was debated. I do not want to go into this matter now other than to say that I have thought previously that our vote on the death penalty was a matter of conscience. It appears that a Bill for the abolition of the death penalty will be introduced later in the session as a Government measure, with the Government claiming that it has a mandate for it. No doubt the new Bill will be different from previous ones and will have to receive different consideration from the House of Review.

I refer now to what the Victorian Premier is reported as having said. Apparently he urged that the convention in Victoria should resolve that the death penalty should be abolished, and the resolution resulted in a vote in favour of abolition of 207 to 202. The Victorian Premier claimed, if I remember rightly, that the vote was a triumph for democracy. What sort of triumph is that? I would have called it a Pyrrhic victory. If three people out of the 409 had voted the opposite way the resolution would have been lost and no doubt everyone would have been called decadent and reactionary. What is this democracy? Is it some one ruling given on the spur of the moment by five votes on such a major matter? Is there a permanent will of the people? It is rather sneered at by members opposite, but I believe there is such a thing. I believe this is where the House of Review comes in, to try to keep a steady line of thought rather than giving way to enthusiasm and the upset that might happen on the spur of the moment. I merely give this as an example. It was held up as a triumph for democracy when there was a majority of only five in 409 votes.

Let us consider another example. We had an important by-election in Western Australia last Saturday, and the results have just been announced. Labor has been preaching, both in the Commonwealth and in the State spheres, for a reversion to the single vote, the cross in the square, and the abandonment of preferential voting. In the Commonwealth sphere, the Prime Minister seemed to be trying to bring in this type of voting at one stage, but it was pointed out to him that he had made certain promises he should properly keep, and that damped it down. In this State, in the electoral measure before us a few weeks ago, the same thing happened. In this Chamber the issue was proportional representation. The Government proposed that there be a "one only" vote. This was equivalent to the cross in the square. Why do Labor Party members advocate this? I think there is only one answer—because they think it suits them when our side of politics is divided into Liberals and Country Party and one or two splinter groups. This applied in Queensland until Labor itself split and lost the Government in consequence of the cross in the square.

What happened in Western Australia on Saturday? If it had been a cross in the square not only would Labor have lost the by-election but it would have lost the Government, yet Labor has been advocating the cross in the square. Maybe this result will cause that Party to have further thoughts; I do not know. I am a believer in preferential voting. I believe that, certainly in a single electorate, it can be analysed any way one likes and preferential voting is identical with Labor's own system that it preaches in its own internal affairs, the exhaustive ballot. In a single-member election a preferential vote, if intelligently cast, must have the same result as an exhaustive ballot—that is, voting for all the candidates and

excluding the one with the least votes and voting for all those remaining until a result is reached. I think preferential voting expresses properly the will of the people and I hope it will not go out of existence.

In the previous session a type of preferential voting was retained in our system here, a "oncer". Preferences can be transferred in certain situations. This was about as good as we could get with the list system, which is a different system of voting. I think the result arrived at was probably as fair to both Parties as one could expect; nothing can be perfect. I think we got as close as we could get to proportional representation with the method designed for this Council. There can be no absolute in the matter. Always there must be people whose votes do not count in the ultimate. That is in the nature of things and cannot be helped, but I think the method got as close as possible to true proportional representation. We shall see how it works out.

I have always regarded it as a great honour to be a member of this Council, but our new members apparently do not quite go along with that. They said many things, and I do not want to comment on them in detail because I would probably say things they would not want me to say, but I think what they said showed that they do not know yet what goes on in this Council, and it would have been better if they had restrained themselves for a little while until they found out. I think they will find out that we do properly debate matters when we really get down to the crunch of debate on the various Bills that come along, and they will gain in respect for the Council as they experience its ways and, I think I can properly say, its wisdom—its aggregate wisdom. I wish them well in the expectation that they will, as has the Hon. Mr. Banfield, mature in the service of the Council. I should not single out the Hon. Mr. Banfield, because I can say it applies to us all. If any one of us has not matured in the service of this Council then we have not been doing our duty. I support the motion.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Chief Secretary): I support the motion wholeheartedly. I join with other members in their references to His Excellency and his good lady, and to the way in which His Excellency is representing the Queen in this State. I agree with members who say that he is doing a fine job. My only fear is that he could overdo it. I understand his health has not been the best in recent times, but he is so enthusiastic to do what he thinks should be done, to meet the people, and to make himself available to them, that I fear he may do too much.

I join with other members in their reference to the late Hon. Harry Kemp. I have spoken about him on a previous occasion, and I agree with all that has been said. I merely reiterate what I said previously. He did a fine job in this Chamber for his own Party and in expressing his own point of view on many subjects. He was a very efficient member.

I join with other members in their reference to the late Mr. McLachlan. Like my colleague, the Hon. Bert Shard, I did not know the honourable member very well, but I do know that he was a good and worthy member of the Parliament of South Australia. I join with all members in this Chamber in expressing our sympathy to the families of those gentlemen.

I congratulate the two new members, the Hon. Mr. Creedon, who moved the motion we are debating, and the Hon. Mr. Chatterton, who seconded it. Some members have expressed the view that they spoke too briefly and from a political point of view. Most of us, on many occasions in this Chamber, have spoken from a political point of view. The Chamber would not be what it is today if we had not done so. The honourable members spoke forcefully on the points they made and I look forward to further speeches from them, because I know they will put their points of view fearlessly, and without fear or favour, and they will speak well.

I assure the Council that I am happy to have these new honourable members behind me. I join with Bert Shard in saying that. Recently, he said, when he realized there would be more honourable members on this side of the Chamber, that he had regrets that he was retiring. I assure my colleagues that I am pleased to have two more members sitting behind me and I am sure that on occasions in the past Bert Shard would have wished to be as lucky as I am to have two members of the calibre of these gentlemen.

I join with all honourable members in what they said about my old colleague and friend with whom I have been associated not only in this Chamber but also in the industrial field. I only hope that, when my time comes to retire, I shall deserve compliments similar to those heaped upon Bert Shard this afternoon and in other places, too. I was happy to serve behind him because he was a good leader. I do not think it was gilding the lily at all to say what has been said about his being a great leader in this Chamber. As I say, I only hope that when I come to retire someone will be able to say of me that I have done my best in my job.

I cannot offer honourable members a light session. I know that many Bills are to be introduced. In fact, I have been informed by one of the Parliamentary Counsel that 45 Bills are almost ready now. There is much work to be done. I hope to be able, with the co-operation of honourable members, to keep the work flowing smoothly so that, if possible, we can avoid having those hectic last few weeks of the session when we have so many Bills to contend with. It will be my endeavor at least to try to manage the Council so that we can surmount that problem.

I do not think there is anything else I want to say now. Honourable members in their speeches raised many points but I do not think I should attempt to reply to them this afternoon; nor do I think honourable members would expect me to. No doubt, if they want answers to the points they have made, we shall be giving them in replies to questions asked at the appropriate time. Again, I thank honourable members for dealing with this motion expeditiously.

Motion carried.

The PRESIDENT: I have to inform honourable members that His Excellency the Governor has appointed Tuesday next at 2.30 p.m. as the time for the presentation of the Address in Reply.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 4.54 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, August 7, at 2.15 p.m.