

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday, July 29, 1976

The PRESIDENT (Hon. F. J. Potter) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

PETITIONS: SEXUAL OFFENCES

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS presented a petition signed by 135 electors of South Australia alleging that the crime of incest and the crime of unlawful carnal knowledge of young girls were detrimental to society, and praying that the Council would reject or amend any legislation to abolish the crime of incest or lower the age of consent in respect of sexual offences.

Petition received and read.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER presented a similar petition signed by 47 electors of South Australia.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT presented a similar petition signed by 173 electors of South Australia.

Petitions received.

QUESTIONS

MODBURY HOSPITAL

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Minister of Health a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I have received a report that there is a possibility that one surgical ward at Modbury Hospital is about to close because of a shortage of nursing staff, and that the number of surgical beds in the hospital will be reduced, so that only 32 beds will be available. That number of beds may not be adequate in the event of a spate of unexpected accidents involving numerous in-patients. I understand that the staff members at the hospital are very concerned about this matter. Has the Minister any knowledge of such a situation and, if he has, will he tell the Council what measures are being taken to avert its seriousness? Will he agree that the nursing situation at Modbury Hospital is far from satisfactory and that one of the main causes is the block system of training nurses?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: If I heard the honourable member correctly, I think he said that only 32 beds would be available at the hospital.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: No. I said that there would be only 32 surgical beds.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: It has been suggested that there may be a temporary closing down of one ward to enable the block system of training nurses to take place. However, every endeavour is being made to avert this situation. We are at present investigating the possibility of sending other nurses to Modbury Hospital during the period of the block training system. This is a disadvantage, but I do not agree that the hospital is understaffed. The staffing is always kept under review, but in this case extra staff must be provided to allow nurses to be absent during the period of the block training system. I will seek further information on this system as to whether it is a disadvantage. Although it is probably a great advantage to the nurses, I can see that inconvenience may be caused if no other nurses are available to take the place of the nurses who are absent.

STUDENT TEACHERS

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Education.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I have been approached by some bonded student teachers in colleges of advanced education who have told me that their understanding of the previous arrangements was that, if upon graduation they could not get places of employment in the Education Department, they were to be paid six months wages; and, if during that period they could not be placed, their bonds were to be cancelled. These student teachers understand that this arrangement has been changed and that the new arrangement is that, if upon graduation they cannot be placed in the departmental system, their bonds are to be cancelled and they are not to receive any kind of payment for any period after graduation. I hasten to add that there is no suggestion that the former conditions were in the bonds, but this was their understanding of departmental policy. Will the Minister say what was the department's previous policy and what is its present policy in regard to bonded student teachers who, on graduation, cannot be placed in the State Education Department?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring down a reply as soon as possible.

SPORT

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I have seen in this morning's newspaper that Mr. D. Cameron, M.H.R., has made statements regarding financial support for sport in this country, duly recognising the money made available by the previous Federal Government. Would the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport care to comment on this matter from South Australia's point of view?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Yes, I did see reference in the press to a statement made in Canberra by Mr. D. Cameron, M.H.R., a member of the Liberal Party.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: He is their Whip.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Yes, I must say that it was like a ray of sunshine to read that report at this time, dealing with a statement by a member of the Federal Government regarding its financial provisions for sport. I do not know why the present Government has taken this attitude—

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: It's because of inflation.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable Minister is in the middle of giving a reply—

The Hon. N. K. Foster: And members opposite keep interjecting. I agree with you, Mr. President, it's terrible.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable Minister.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: It is all right to say that one has to cut expenses because of inflation but, on many occasions, honourable members opposite have asked us to increase expenditure on certain Budget lines. It seems rather remiss of the Leader of the Opposition to make such an interjection. The public of Australia has voiced conclusively its opinion that funds should be provided for sport in this country. How those funds are provided is another matter, but my own opinion is that funds be made available for facilities so that more people can participate in sport. We have the climatic conditions that

are conducive to sporting activities in this country and I believe that facilities can be provided not only to cater to those specifically interested in sport but also to improve the general health of Australians. I will not elaborate further on this matter, but I do sincerely hope that, in the interests of community health and in the interests of our sportsmen and sportswomen, the Federal Government will see the light and, as expounded by Mr. D. Cameron, M.H.R., provide as much money as was provided under the previous Federal Labor Government.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Having been asked to comment on statements made by Mr. D. Cameron, M.H.R., would the Minister also like to comment on the press report of Sir Jack Egerton, who said that the economic incompetence and overspending of the Whitlam Government was the downfall of the Labor Party federally and looked like keeping it out of office for 10 years?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I would not like to comment on that, because I was asked a specific question dealing with my specific responsibilities as Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport. The question that the Leader is asking is totally different and does not enter into my portfolio. We in South Australia think that sport is so important that I have made an announcement today that we will provide \$70 000 towards promoting sportsmen and sportswomen from this State and enabling them to attend the national championships. We are the only State in the Commonwealth that has taken this step. It is something in which the Commonwealth has shirked its responsibility, and it is high time this matter was brought to the notice of everyone interested in sport and recreation in this country; it is time they brought an enormous amount of pressure to bear on the Liberal Government in Canberra to continue what was started by the Federal Labor Government.

FISHING

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to directing a question to the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: It has come to my notice that negotiations have been proceeding between the Commonwealth and the State (and/or States) concerning the impasse that has arisen in recent months in the fishing industry regarding who is in charge of the fisheries and who will eventually control them or initiate management policies for them. Can the Minister say whether negotiations are in progress regarding the fishing industry, especially in relation to the prawn industry? In connection with the negotiations, has a suggestion been advanced that processors in South Australia should receive licences? If this is the case, how many licences are to be issued? Does the Minister support the concept of processors obtaining licences, or does he support the concept of extra licences being granted to people to operate in already over-crowded sections of the industry?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I understand that negotiations are taking place with the Commonwealth Government regarding a joint management policy for the prawn industry. This appears to me to be the most practical solution to the present impasse concerning the constitutional question about the ownership of the seas, especially in the area of Investigator Strait. While these negotiations are taking place there are several matters upon which we have not been able to agree, one involving

processors' entry into a managed fishery. It has been the consistent policy of the South Australian Government that processors should not own licences, and this policy has been supported by the fishing industry. A recent meeting of the South Australian branch of the Australian Fisheries Industry Council confirmed support for the South Australian Government's decision not to allow processors into the industry. So that is one of the areas that we have not been able to resolve with the Commonwealth.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: Do you intend to maintain that stand?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: This is the stand we have maintained. I wrote recently to the Minister for Primary Industry (Mr. Ian Sinclair) confirming the decision of the South Australian Fisheries Industry Council in support of our policies, and this is the approach we have taken. We hope we shall be able to get a joint management policy for the prawn fishing industry, and that the Commonwealth will accept our view. I explained to the Minister for Primary Industry the reasons behind this decision and why we had excluded processors from the prawn fishing industry.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: I consider that, inadvertently or otherwise, the Minister did not answer some parts of the Hon. Mr. Cameron's question. I ask the Minister whether the addition of any prawn licences, particularly in regard to processors, has been proposed in negotiations with the Federal Government and, if it has been, how many such licences have been proposed.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: South Australia has not proposed—

The Hon. J. A. Carnie: I didn't say by South Australia: I said by anyone.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: Regarding the other States and the Commonwealth, the proposal was that the fisheries should be completely opened up to anyone, either processor or owner-operator units. It was intended that there should be no distinction between owner-operator fishing units, as we have in South Australia, and processors in relation not only to new licences but also to existing licences. That is the situation that obtains in Northern Australia. The Commonwealth Government proposed that exactly the same situation obtaining elsewhere should apply here. We have argued strongly that the situation in South Australia is different and that the development of the northern fisheries hinged very much on processors and the amount of capital required by a processor with a fishing fleet. In South Australia, we already have existing shore-based facilities and many owner-operator fishermen.

The other point which the Hon. Mr. Cameron raised and which I inadvertently overlooked was that of taking people out of some of the fisheries where there is an excessive number of boats. This is also a valid point that could relieve the situation in those fisheries. It certainly would not apply if processors built new boats to operate in the prawn fishery.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Is the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries aware of any prawn fishing activities taking place in Investigator Strait in recent weeks? If he is, is any action being taken to apprehend the people involved, and is he aware that groups of fishermen without prawn licences intend to conduct prawn fishing activities in Investigator Strait, as I understand it, from next week?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I have had reports at various times that there are prawn fishing activities in Investigator Strait by people who do not hold current South Australian authorities for the appropriate zone or

Ministerial permits for the area. The department is taking what action it can take to apprehend these people. Of course, we have the responsibility for the whole fishing industry of South Australia, and we cannot devote all our enforcement activities to one restricted area. This problem has been somewhat relieved lately because we have purchased a second patrol boat, which has given us greater opportunities to enforce our policy. We have apprehended a number of people in Investigator Strait on the ground that they were fishing there without an appropriate licence or an appropriate endorsement.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Are their catches still being confiscated?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I do not have a current report on the situation, but some catches have been confiscated. On one occasion there was some difficulty in apprehending one of the people concerned, and this matter is now, or shortly will be, before the court. Regarding the honourable member's question whether I was aware that groups of fishermen without licences intended to conduct prawn fishing activities in Investigator Strait, my answer is "No": I was not aware until the honourable member referred to the matter.

FRUITGROWERS

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: I seek leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries.

Leave granted.

The PRESIDENT: Would the Hon. Mr. Foster please moderate his voice? He has a very loud voice, much louder than the voice of the member on his feet.

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: Canning fruitgrowers in the South Australian Riverland marched through the streets last night in protest against the Federal Government's refusal to help them weather the crisis in their industry. Today, it was reported that the Federal Minister for Primary Industry (Mr. Sinclair) told growers at Waikerie that the South Australian State Government should support its own State's industries and that the Federal Government should not be expected to do this. Mr. Sinclair went on to say that the South Australian Government should remit State pay-roll tax to South Australian canneries in order to help them in this crisis. I seem to recall that the South Australian Government has been heavily involved in trying to find solutions to the problems of the canning fruit industry. Would the Minister of Agriculture tell the Council what the present situation is and what he is doing to try to resolve the problem?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: The South Australian Government has been heavily involved with the problems facing the canning fruit industry and was prepared to come to its assistance long before it could receive any support from the Federal Government. Not only did we advance loans to the cannery before the Federal-State loans were made available; before they were ready in Canberra, the State Government made a temporary advance of the Federal portion of that loan, so that the growers could receive payment more quickly than they otherwise would. I think the problem now really hinges on the whole structure of the canning fruit industry in Australia. We in South Australia have been disappointed that the Federal Government decided not to take any action on the Australian Industries Development Corporation report.

I do not know why it rejected this. Certainly, some recommendations in that report were out of date, because conditions change from time to time. However, that part

of the report dealing with the general principles involved in trying to rationalise the industry and to obtain a stable domestic market that would provide adequate returns on the crop supplied to that market should have been implemented. South Australia will be taking the matter up at the Agricultural Council meeting next week, and we are proposing that the industry have a stable domestic market quota and also that there be a two-pool price arrangement as far as the canning fruitgrowers are concerned. I have discussed these matters with the industry. I have met representatives of the industry on several occasions, and I met growers at Berri some months ago. These proposals have received widespread support within the industry. I hope that we can obtain assistance from the New South Wales Government, the Victorian Government, and the Federal Government in establishing stable and rational marketing plans for the fruit canning industry.

MINISTER'S OVERSEA VISIT

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Is the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport, in his official capacity, travelling to Hong Kong next month? If so, was the invitation to Hong Kong given to him personally? Has any officer of the Tourist Bureau also been invited to the same conference or convention and, if such officer has been invited, will he accompany the Minister?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: An A.F.T.A. conference will be held in Hong Kong in the latter part of August. A move was made whereby officers would be invited. Usually, the Director receives an invitation to attend these conferences. He does not always attend: sometimes another person fills in for him if he is not available. However, because this conference is so important, in view of the increasing significance of A.F.T.A., the South Australian President of that organisation approached me.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: What does A.F.T.A. mean?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The Australian Federation of Travel Agents. The South Australian President approached me, asking would I go to represent the South Australian Government because it is important that South Australia hold this conference in Adelaide in 1978. At present, under the constitution of A.F.T.A., the organisation has two conferences in Australia and then one overseas. A conference was held in Singapore three years ago and then two conferences were held in Australia. This year the conference is to be held in Hong Kong and next year it will be held in Tasmania. It was thought that, with the Festival of Arts being held here in 1978, it would be appropriate if the A.F.T.A. conference could take place in South Australia in that year. The South Australian President of the organisation asked me whether, in order to put the case for South Australia, I could make myself available to travel to Hong Kong. That is as far as the matter has gone. I am considering the matter but have not yet decided whether I will make a submission to Cabinet. I will have to take the matter to Cabinet and leave it to my colleagues to decide whether I should go in the interests of South Australia.

NARACORTE ABATTOIR

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I recently visited Naracoorte, where much concern has been expressed regarding the closure of the abattoir, which employed about 400 people. Certain press reports have been made, and I refer specifically to the report headed "Call to fight Samcor levies" in the July 12 issue of the *Naracoorte Herald*. This lengthy report states, in effect, that if the Government did not have such high levies or inspection fees the abattoir could possibly have continued to function. I do not believe that is so. Indeed, I believe that if the Government reviewed the legislation, eased the burden of levies, and met the inspection fees, South-East Meat's management would not reopen the abattoir. Part of the report, which refers to a statement by Mr. D. Allchurch, President of the Naracoorte and District Development League, is as follows:

He said the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Chatterton, maintained that he could not reopen the Naracoorte meat works. "At no time did we say that he could," Mr. Allchurch said. "That is up to the South-East Meat's management."

I agree with that. Will the Minister confer with South-East Meat's management and obtain from it an indication whether, if the Government was willing to review the levies and inspection fees, the management would give an assurance that it would reopen the meatworks so that the many unemployed trade unionists at Naracoorte who are seeking employment and want to work might resume a useful role in society, thereby assisting the town generally? At present, the Naracoorte community is in a depressed state because of the closure of the meatworks.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: The Government is indeed concerned about the situation and about the closure some time ago of the meatworks. As the Hon. Mr. Dunford has said, the effect on employment in the area is severe. I cannot recall at any time in the months preceeding the closure of the meatworks the company ever saying that inspection fees or levies were the problem. The discussion that we had hinged on the question of supplying meat to the metropolitan area. At no time that I recall, anyway, was the question of inspection charges raised. As I have explained before, the problem is that the abattoir was opened under a permit system and it agreed to the conditions relating thereto. The Government was extremely lenient regarding enforcement of the terms agreed to. Because of the inadequacy of the abattoir's plant, and because it did not have the freezing capacity that was really required to enable it to satisfy domestic and export markets (primarily the latter, which the abattoir was established to service), the abattoir was unable to carry out the undertakings to which it had agreed. Because of the present state of the export market and low returns being received, I presume the abattoir considered that it would not be justified in spending money to increase the freezing capacity of the works to meet the requirements. I think that if export demand picks up the meatworks will open again, because the company operating the works will be able to spend the required sum on upgrading its facilities.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Would the Minister admit that, had the Naracoorte works been constructed just a little farther east and over the South Australian border, he would have no jurisdiction whatsoever on the amount of meat that could be brought from the works into the metropolitan area? As the Minister has said, the abattoir did not object to the inspection fee, but the quota restrictions placed on it in relation to meat brought into the metropolitan area caused the works to close.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: That is so. Had the abattoir been situated in Victoria, the South Australian

Government would in no way have had any jurisdiction over it and, under section 92 of the Constitution, free trade would have been possible.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Also, there would have been a big saving in workmen's compensation.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: My question follows the interjection by the Leader of the Opposition, without shadow portfolio, in the Council. Would the Minister tell the Council which principal companies are involved in the Naracoorte abattoir operation? There is a readily available market in Melbourne, to which I understand the Hon. Mr. DeGaris said the abattoir could have exported. Supposing the abattoir had been built over the border, as has been suggested, and could have exported its meat into South Australia, will the Minister say why the situation could not apply the other way around? Can the Minister identify the companies involved, and say whether there could be any inhibitions on their operating in Naracoorte and exporting meat to Victoria, where the parent company of one of the companies involved at Naracoorte was situated?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: The original company, South-East Meat, subsequently had some of the shareholdings taken up by Angliss and Fosters, in connection with sending meat interstate. This would have complied with the conditions of the permit, from the South Australian Government's viewpoint. If they had sent portion of their meat interstate, where they had alternative outlets, this would have complied with the conditions as laid down.

MURRAY RIVER POLLUTION

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: On June 9, I asked a question of the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Works, regarding industrial pollution in the upper reaches of the Murray River. I received a reply by letter on July 20, when the Council was not sitting. However, so that the reply might be recorded in *Hansard* I ask that the Minister give it now.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The Minister of Works informed the honourable member that he had written to the Minister for Conservation and Water Resources in New South Wales seeking his assurance that the interests of this State would be protected should an industry such as the one mentioned be established.

PENOLA INDUSTRIES

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I recently visited Penola, a nice little town in the South-East.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: You get around.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: The honourable member never goes there, but I represent the people of Penola, and I suggest that the honourable member could assist by going there. The Minister of Agriculture is concerned about country people, and he wants to assist them wherever possible. I have discussed with the Minister the matter that I want to raise, and I am asking my question so that the Penola people will know that we are concerned about it. At the Penola butter factory there are between 12 and 15 workmen, several of whom are married and some of whom have rather large families. For five years they

have been living under the threat that the butter factory will close, and they believe that it will close in the next 12 months or so. In another part of Penola (a small town, with two hotels) there is Donnelly's sawmill, which employs about 15 workmen, several of whom are married with large families. They wish to continue to reside in the area. The closing of both establishments could affect the livelihood of between 50 and 60 people in this small town. Will the Minister investigate the situation of the butter factory and the sawmill, with a view to seeing whether the Government can do anything to keep both establishments open and give security of employment to these people?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I will investigate the matter to see what can be done, and I will see whether employment in the area can be maintained. We are all aware of the problems facing the dairying industry, and a certain amount of factory rationalisation and adjustment is taking place. It disturbs me that factory employees are usually the last people to find out whether changes are to take place that will affect their future employment in an area. I was very disturbed to learn that, when the Charleston cheese factory was closed, the employees received very little notice of the termination of their employment. In the Charleston area, employment had been very stable, and most of the people working in the factory had had between nine years and 23 years of service, yet they received very short notice that the factory would be closed. I hope we can do something about the employment situation in Penola.

PRIMARY INDUSTRIES

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: No doubt the Minister is aware of reports in Eastern States newspapers stating that the farming community has quickly awakened to the hypocrisy of the Minister for Primary Industry (Mr. Sinclair). In Traralgon, the membership of farmers organisations, totalling 15 000, has demanded that the Prime Minister sack Mr. Sinclair and, if the Prime Minister does not do that, the farmers have asked that Mr. Sinclair be given an Assistant Minister to teach him his task and to assist the farmers. An article in the *Financial Review* of June 23 states that the Commonwealth Minister misled meat exporters in regard to European Economic Community predictions. Can the Minister say whether primary industries have available to them the information available from properly recognised bodies in the E.E.C. area, to enable meat exporters to evaluate predictions more accurately, particularly if the predictions are based on false information?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: The Bureau of Agricultural Economics has on several occasions tried to predict overseas market trends. Sometimes its predictions have been inaccurate, but this is understandable because of the problems encountered in making projections in relation to overseas markets. While our meat exports comprise a major proportion of our production they often constitute only a small proportion of the domestic consumption of meat of the overseas countries that purchase our meat. Therefore, any small error in the projection of consumption in such countries is reflected as a large error in terms of what our meat exports to those countries are.

As is understandable, such overseas countries cut out Australian imports to protect their own domestic suppliers

if there is a reduction in local consumption. This is why our projections and predictions have sometimes been so inaccurate. Only a 2 per cent or a 3 per cent error in projection of the consumption of meat in, say, the United States of America would have a dramatic effect on our exports to that nation if all the shortfall were taken out of the Australian exports to the United States. This is why we have had such difficulties in predicting what our export markets will be.

RAILWAY TICKETS

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to make a short explanation prior to directing a question to the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Rail passengers catching the train at Clapham station this morning saw for the first time a notice indicating that ticket sales and other facilities would cease to be provided at that station on and from August 2. After that date passengers must buy daily tickets on the train, and weekly and other tickets must be bought at Adelaide railway station. What is the reason for this change? If this change is part of an overall metropolitan programme, can this Council be provided with details? Further, is the Minister satisfied that passenger volume will not be adversely affected by these proposals?

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

TRADE UNIONS

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I seek leave to make a statement before directing a question to the Leader of the Council.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: It is obvious that I just stopped short in a previous question of making a direct accusation that the Liberal Party shadow Cabinet had decided on an all-out attack on the trade union movement. At each and every available opportunity, not only the shadow Minister of Labour and Industry but all members of the Liberal Party in this Parliament take such action. Does the Minister agree that the action of the State Opposition Party in this matter should be deplored? Obviously, the Liberal Party intends to provoke the trade union movement into some form of action from which the Liberal Party hopes to gain. Also, is the Minister aware—

The Hon. C. M. Hill: What are you talking about?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: The unprovoked attacks on the trade union movement by members of your Party following a decision taken at a meeting of your shadow Ministry.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: When?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: You know when—you were there. You are a shadow Minister—DeGaris is not.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: When?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I am asking the questions, not you. I do not want to be drawn into a position, after having sought leave to make my explanation, of having to face such abuse from the interjections of the unscrupulous members opposite. Indeed, I would appreciate it if they were kept in order, Mr. President, in a way similar to that in which you keep order so far as I am concerned.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member has obtained leave to make an explanation. However, I hope the honourable Minister knows what the honourable member means regarding unprovoked attacks.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I am talking about the unprovoked attacks by members of the Liberal Party against the trade union movement. I am asking the Minister whether he agrees that it is an attempt by the Opposition in this State to discredit members of the community under the guise that they are other than citizens merely because they belong to a trade union organisation.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I have no doubt that there are members of the Liberal Party who do make unprovoked attacks on the trade union movement. If they congratulated the trade union movement—

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Does that include children's theatre, too?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Today, children are being taught in good schools and doubtless they will never become members of the Liberal Party. Because of their better education, they will see the error of the way of their parents and they will not become members of the Liberal Party. Consequently, they will not make unprovoked attacks on the trade union movement. These unprovoked attacks on the trade union movement by members of the Liberal Party are to be deplored. Such attacks do nothing to assist in the recovery of the economy of South Australia. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris continually refers to the economy in relation to inflation and one thing and another. Whenever members of the Liberal Party provoke the trade union movement into taking certain action, it is a step in the wrong direction and it is far removed from creating better conditions in Australia. There is no doubt that members opposite cannot do without the trade union movement any more than members of the trade union movement can do without employers from the other side. It is in the best interests of everyone to work in harmony; we do not want one side provoking the other.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Has the Minister any knowledge at all of the meeting of the shadow Cabinet to which the Hon. Mr. Foster referred? If he has such knowledge, can he say when the meeting did occur?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The knowledge I have on this matter I received about two minutes ago from the Hon. Mr. Foster, but I do not doubt his word for one moment, because, as every honourable member opposite knows, there are many leaks from within the Liberal Party and doubtless the Liberal Party has done what has been suggested by the Hon. Mr. Foster.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from July 28. Page 240.)

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. The first subject that took my eye in the Speech given to us was the old perennial subject of Monarto. I would have hoped that by now sensible men in a supposedly sane community would realise that we have just about reached the point where we should drop this project. I have been spending hours—

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Will the honourable member give way?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: No; sit down. I have been looking through interesting newspaper files on the Monarto project and, if anyone wants to know how to work as a confidence man, he should look through those files, because they show how to con the public—by the Labor Party. Some day the subject of a book will be how the Labor Party put it over us all these years. Every few months the brains trust of the Labor Party comes up with a new subject. The first subject I found (and there were plenty before this) involved a Mediterranean type of garden, with cactus suggested as the principal plant. I suppose that that is one way of curing alcoholism, because there is no way that one could come home under the weather in that sort of garden.

Then they gave that away and went on to native trees: about every three months someone goes there and plants a few more; they are getting up to 500 000. Then we were to have press-button transport—what that would do, nobody knows. We have not even got the first post-box there. "Dial-a-bus" was a bad term by then; that was too complicated, so now we have "press-button".

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Have you been to Monarto?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I have to drive through the darned place every time I go home, which is more than the honourable member who has just spoken has to do. I go once a week and he goes once a year, if he is lucky. First, a sign says, "This is where Monarto starts"; we go along the road and see a fire break, and then another sign "This is where Monarto finishes". How incredible! Don't talk to me about it.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: You have never been there.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: What does the Environment Protection Council say?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: The next thing was that Monarto might get video-phones. There will be no jobs—yes, there will be, because we shall be transporting public servants up there as compulsory residents. Then the city might get free transport. There is none at the moment because there is nobody there. Then there was the plan for Monarto to have an education supermarket. I guess that means that we go in and pluck something off a shelf and feed it in somewhere. I cannot follow that one. Then there is housing, and competitions for housing designs. New energy schemes would make power bills a thing of the past. And so it goes on—with huge tree planting schemes. The end result was that we got absolutely nowhere, because the Federal Labor Government said to the State Labor Government in the last Budget it brought down, "It is not on." That is the real key to the question, and any attempt to say that it is something to do with the present Federal Government is dishonest, because it was killed off by the Whitlam Government.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: That is not true; you are getting as bad as the Hon. Mr. DeGaris.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Then we come to a matter of great concern, the payment of \$100 000 to the man who was previously the Chairman of the Monarto Development Commission. I want to quote what was said when he resigned:

The Chairman of the Monarto Development Commission, Mr. R. C. Taylor, resigned from the \$30 000-a-year job yesterday because he said he did not have enough to do. "I could not just sit there and take a weekly wage," he said. "I am more reasonable in my attitude to the community than that."

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: You should take a leaf out of his book; at least, he is honest.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: He said "I could not become a person who would take money without the effort being given back to my employer." Yet now a sum of \$100 000 has been handed over in lieu of the four years, I think, that his contract ran for.

The Hon. D. H. Laidlaw: Three and a third years.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Three and a third years. The \$100 000 represents almost exactly the amount of money he would have received had he stayed there and carried out his commitments. I should like to see whether this is the correct interpretation of what Mr. Taylor said at that time; I should like to see him hand the money back if he meant what he said, that he would not take that money without giving something in return, because he has now taken what he said he would not stay there for.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Write and ask him.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: No, that is your job; the Government handed the money to him. I should like to know the reason for his resignation, because it is fairly obvious that the reason he gave is not the real reason. The next matter I refer to is the question asked by the Hon. Anne Levy on Tuesday. It would be funny if it was not so serious. The honourable member got up in this Chamber and complained strongly about the effect of two plays and others (I do not know what they were) on the union movement in the eyes of the community.

The Hon. Anne Levy: On children.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: The plays were the *Three Little Pigs* and the *Princess and the Frog*. That is a very serious matter indeed.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: I would sooner listen to that than to you.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: That is about the level of your education standard.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Mr. President, really you should seek some order in this place.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: This was at the beginning of a week in which we read in the paper that the Trades and Labor Council was proposing, and did apply, a week-long ban on fuel supplies for buses in this State, which bring the community to work. At the beginning of a week like that, the Hon. Anne Levy has the hide to get up in this Chamber and complain about the *Three Little Pigs* and the *Princess and the Frog*. It is time the members of the Government understood what has happened to the image of the trade union movement in this State, not through anything said on this side of the Council but through its own actions. I wholeheartedly support the concept of trade unions, but not in their present form.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: What form do you want them to take?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: They are determined at the moment to wreck this community. An important aspect was the bully boy tactics used in the last strike. In the Premier's Department there is the Industrial Democracy Unit. I do not know what it is doing—I think it is still trying to force the Housing Trust employees to carry out some sort of rearrangement. I call on the Government to use that Industrial Democracy Unit for an important purpose: it should take it to the Trades and Labor Council to convince it that when a union (in this case, the union involving bus drivers) takes a vote, the result of which is 600 to 100, it is a democratic decision that should be respected by the trade union movement.

It is an incredible indictment that these people who purport to support democracy should blackmail some workers, trying to ensure that in future they will not attempt

to make a democratic decision. Why, when this strike was called, was not every union allowed to take a vote? I know why—because, if a vote had been taken, hardly a union in this State would have supported what was done. If the people on South Terrace make a decision at that level, that is that and, if people do not agree to it, they will get done over by the trade union movement. There was case after case of people who were threatened with fines by the union movement and with all sorts of actions if they dared to go to work. Some people went to work and were sent home. If the Trades and Labor Council people are the sort of people who run this Government (and I know they run it), it is time that in this State we had a change of Government, because imagine what it will be like if they finally have total control of this State. They do not believe in democracy. There was a press report indicating that the Government did not agree, there being a statement in the *Advertiser* to the effect that it was believed that the Minister of Transport (Hon. G. T. Virgo) was very angry.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: He did not say that at all; you cannot even quote your own newspaper.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I am not interested in what he said. It would not be so bad if the Minister had actually said it himself, but he relied on somebody in the press to say it for him. That is because he has not the guts to stand up to these people, for the reason that they do things for him. I tell the Hon. Anne Levy that, if she wants the support of those people in future, she will have to find a much better subject than *Three Little Pigs* and the other play.

An important matter was involved in what happened on that infamous Monday, and that was the question of civil liberties. It is important that, if people wish to work and do not wish to abide by a purported decision or a decision that is made, they be allowed to work. If they are not allowed to work, surely that is a question for the Council of Civil Liberties, and I was interested to find that the Hon. Anne Levy was a member of the committee of that organisation. I ask her whether she has raised the matter and, if she has not, whether she will do so, because what happened that day was one of the most important matters affecting civil liberties in this country.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: She could talk about *Three Little Pigs* at the same time.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Would the honourable member give way, please?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: No.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: You are talking like a real Liberal and your Leader is pleased with you.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I am. I refer now to land rating, which received attention in the Governor's Speech. The Speech stated how concerned the Government was about the effect of the increasing encroachment into the Hills of hobby farmers and other people. I repeat a statement that I have made previously in this Council, namely, that the Government has a direct responsibility in this matter. The high rate of land tax is causing much of this problem. It is of no use Government members crying if they do not do something about the matter. They say in this Council how dreadful the position is, but they do not do anything about it.

I must commend the Government for one matter, and I refer now to the subject of the West Terrace cemetery. When I was looking through some old documents recently,

I found a report of a Select Committee of this Council that was appointed in 1854 to inquire into the management of the cemetery and to report thereon. Many matters concerned the committee but the first part that took my eye states:

Your committee learned with astonishment of the permission given to the Sexton to leave for the gold diggings, on the understanding that, should any parties be interred in ground not belonging to their families, the sexton was, on his return, to disinter them at his own expense.

The sexton was quite a gentleman, and he used to conduct a stonemason's business also. The report also states:

After the most careful consideration of the whole of the evidence, your committee have come to the conclusion that no time should be lost in selecting another site for a public cemetery for the city, and closing that on West Terrace.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: The Liberals didn't close it.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: They were sensible in those days. There was not a Labor Party then, and the State was managed in a better way. The next reference I could find is dated 1857. The report of Parliamentary debates for that year states:

Mr. Bagot asked the Hon. Chief Secretary what steps, if any, have been taken respecting the removal of the cemetery from its present site in pursuance of the report of a Select Committee appointed on September 6, 1854; and what policy the Government intended to pursue respecting it.

The report of what the then Chief Secretary stated (and what he said sounds like what the present Chief Secretary would say) is as follows:

The Chief Secretary said the Government had taken no steps to carry out the recommendation of the committee. He thought it desirable to have another committee, as the Government had doubts as to whether a better site could be obtained.

Another matter to which I wish to refer is the Parafield cemetery. A report made in 1890 states:

For the information of the Hon. Chief Secretary, I have the honour to report as follows:

1. The site consists of sections 2257, 2251, and 2235, hundred of Yatala, comprising 257 acres, and was purchased by Government from Messrs. Jones, Parry, in May, 1882, for £4 126.14s.

I have looked for a cemetery on land of that size or about that size around Adelaide but have not been able to find one. I should be interested to hear from the Chief Secretary about what has happened to that cemetery and why the proposal was not proceeded with. Even now, we still have a proposal for a cemetery in that area. It is a shame that it has taken so long for the matter of the West Terrace cemetery to be raised. I commend the Government for its move, but it will take 60 or 70 years to bring it to fruition. I commend the Government for obtaining the publicity that it has obtained about such an achievement because the publicity seems to indicate that action will be taken very soon. I refer now to maternity and paternity leave. I was disturbed at the reply given by the Chief Secretary to a question asked by the Hon. Mr. Carnie on June 9. The relevant part of the question states:

It was reported recently in the press and confirmed in His Excellency the Governor's Speech yesterday, that the Government intends to legislate for paid maternity and paternity leave for State public servants. As I assume that the Government would not be so irresponsible as to introduce such legislation unless it had some estimate of what it would cost, I ask the Minister to tell the Council what is the estimated cost, in terms of time and money, of such a scheme.

The Minister stated, in reply:

Because of so many unknown factors it is virtually impossible to make an accurate estimate of the annual cost to the Government of the maternity-paternity leave scheme. However, some two years ago the Public Service Board estimated the annual cost at about \$800 000.

I do not know what the unknown factors are, and I ask what the present cost would be. It is a great pity that the Minister had to look more deeply into that subject. I trust that we will soon hear more detailed information regarding it. We must be extremely careful when moving toward this concept, because it will be a cost to the community, and I say sincerely that we in this State cannot afford many more additional costs.

The next subject to which I refer is noise pollution. I trust that the Government is finally going to move on this matter, because people in this community have for too long had to put up with unnecessary and unjustifiable noise. I think particularly of areas such as Kensington Road and the transport corridors on which there is heavy traffic.

The Hon. B. A. Chatterton: Do you live on Kensington Road?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: No, I live far from here

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I trust that the Government, when dealing with the noise pollution problem, will keep this aspect in mind. It is essential that, where people live on main roads, some attempt is made to solve this problem. It is essential that the way of life of people who live on main traffic routes is not disturbed by traffic noise. The moment a road is widened or is more universally used by traffic, values drop and people are forced to leave because of the resultant noise level.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Can you suggest any solutions?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Yes. Although this is a matter about which I have doubts, it is an important subject. I refer to the matter of transportation corridors that are still being purchased in the community. It is essential that the Government be honest about this matter. However, it is difficult for one to get an answer from the Government regarding transport corridors, which are, as I understand it, almost exactly on the routes outlined in the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study report, which was commissioned by the Labor Party.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Are you supporting the M.A.T.S. plan?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I would like to see public transport that lowers noise levels. I am certain that in this day and age it is not impossible to find a method of public transport that does not disturb the community.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Push-button electric cars.

The Hon. Anne Levy: Or bicycles.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: If the honourable member wants to ride a bicycle, that is fine with me; I am not opposed to bicycles. In that event, it is a pity that some of the bicycle tracks have been removed. It would be worth it to provide a few of them around the place. The Government has provided a few, but not enough, of them. This is one of its public relations gimmicks. The Government should spend on such things a bit of money that it is saving on transport through the sale of its country rail services.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You didn't support the sale of the railways.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: That is not so. The Minister is showing his growing senility if he cannot remember that I supported the sale of this State's country rail services. The only difference between us on that subject was that I wanted the whole of the State's rail services sold to the Commonwealth, so that we would not have had the stupid artificial division that we have at

present. The Government will find it impossible to carry on with such a division. It is essential that the Government realise that it will be difficult to separate the two services. I should be interested to hear from the Minister how the Government is going with the separation.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: What will be your Party's views regarding your statement?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I am not worried about that. I speak in this place as an independent member of the House of Review. While dealing with transportation, I refer also to the Adelaide railway station. Who, in future, will undertake any changes there? I understand that the Lees report recommended that a mall with shops be constructed there and that the station be operated at a level at which it would not be such a drain on rail operations. Will the Minister say whether the Government has made, or intends to make, any changes to the Adelaide railway station?

The Hon. Anne Levy: You should ask that in Question Time.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Surely the Minister would be willing to reply to that question in this debate. I certainly hope that he will do so. The last subject to which I refer briefly is the Government's spending habits. I have raised this matter before, and I have no doubt that it will be raised again from time to time. It is time the Government realised that the community is not stupid. While examining the Monarto proposal, I thought briefly of the supposed free transport system. However, nothing in this life is free, and whenever the Government does something it costs the community money. Unless the Government wants to increase inflation, it should stop fooling the people. Whenever this or any other Government announces a project, it should make clear that the community is paying for it.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: What about the super bounty?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: The Hon. Mr. Foster should have a look at tariffs in this country before he criticises the superphosphate bounty. It is nothing, compared to the tariffs that are imposed on the people of this country. I have heard enough from this Government and other Governments regarding what they are doing for me or for the community generally. However, they are not doing anything for the community, which is charged for everything that is done. The only difference is that it costs more.

For instance, who on earth believes that Medibank costs nothing, which is what the Government has tried to say? If the Labor Government had still been in office, Medibank would have cost twice as much, because of that Government's prolific spending habits. It is time that the public realised that everything that is done in the community costs money. I am disturbed to see the State Government slipping in sideways with taxation measures as it has done almost all the time. It has tried to fool the people by saying that there will be no taxation increases as a result of its good spending habits. What nonsense! It already increased water rates, and so on, before the Budget was introduced. It is time it stopped fooling the community.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You want hand-outs all the time.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: We will not get many hand-outs from the Minister. I support the motion.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: In supporting the motion, I wish to express regret at the death of three former members of Parliament, Mr. Ferguson, Mr. Hogben and Mr. MacGillivray, men who served their districts to the best of

their ability. We recognise the work they did in the interests of South Australia.

I turn now to the question of research into solar energy, particularly as it affects South Australia. It is well known that, within the next 20 years, the known reserves of natural gas will run very low, perhaps too low for the industrial future of this State. Therefore, some alternative form of energy will have to be discovered within that period, and such a discovery will not be made by the mere flicking of a switch. The nation, and particularly this State, has either to venture into nuclear fuel to create electricity or to find a new alternative, and I point out that solar energy is free, in one respect. Scientists know that electricity can be created from the sun's heat, but some of the methods used will create excessive pollutants. Consequently, scientists and industrialists are not looking towards creating energy in this way. However, there are other ways of creating energy from the sun's heat, particularly by creating hydrogen, which is freely available, and using it for transportation and power.

Our forefathers in the early days of this State's history burnt firewood as fuel, but finally there was insufficient firewood for the growing population. South Australians then changed to coal, then to oil and, more recently, to natural gas. And we must now find another source of energy. Each of those sources of heat has been of progressively greater efficiency, and industry has progressed accordingly. We are now reaching the stage where we must find an even more efficient way of supplying the Electricity Trust of South Australia and the South Australian Gas Company and also of supplying fuel for motor vehicles.

This morning, during an Australian Broadcasting Commission programme, Professor Bockris of Flinders University said that only a few years ago Australia was in the vanguard of research into solar energy, but South Australia is now lagging behind in this respect. America is spending \$100 000 000 a year on the search for alternative forms of energy. Australia has been spoilt, because of Bass Strait oil and the agreement reached by the Labor Government in connection with importing Middle East oil. We are also spoilt as a result of the wonderful work done in the Moomba natural gas fields. The hard bargain that the Electricity Trust drove with Delhi Santos has resulted in the trust's getting very cheap gas, so that it can provide cheaper electricity to the State. Americans must pay dearly for their energy, as must the Japanese and many European countries. Many overseas Governments are spending large sums on research into these matters, and it is essential that the Government here should consider granting money to universities and industries so that scientists and manufacturers can investigate solar energy on a long-term basis. It is a relatively simple matter to create hot water by using solar heating in a private house. This is beneficial and necessary, but we must also have an efficient means of creating energy for industry.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Did Professor Bockris say why research was failing in Australia?

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: There has been little incentive from Governments. Our State Government shows very little concern about solar energy and its uses. Some years ago the Government formed a committee to investigate all forms of solar energy. The Government has the report but it has not been made public. The State Government seems to be more concerned about looking for alternative forms of propulsion for motor vehicles; for example, State funds are being spent on the development of an electric car at Flinders University. However, relatively little money is available for the work at Flinders University by four scientists and

their assistants who are ready and eager to make progress on the research to which I have referred.

The term "solar energy" does not only mean creation of heat from the sun, because heat from the sun is also responsible for wind power. Scientists at Flinders University claim that a grant of about \$50 000 could lead to the manufacture of efficient wind units at Sellick Beach, from which power could be fed into the Electricity Trust's grid. In this way, a reasonable amount of power could be created for domestic and industrial consumption at any time the wind was blowing, and this, in turn, would conserve fuel. We must be realistic and recognise that we cannot wait for other people to find out ways of doing things. Australia is recognised as having the second highest amount of sunlight of all the countries in the world; Saudi Arabia has the highest amount of sunlight. So, in Australia there is clearly a great deal of heat from the sun that should be used to create a more efficient method of power production.

I turn now to the petro-chemical industry and the Moomba natural gas fields. I guess that many honourable members are not really aware of where Moomba is. Actually, it is 800 km away, on the edge of Sturt's Stony Desert. The surroundings are mainly sand dunes and it is a depressing area where a field staffed by about 200 men supplies 30 per cent of South Australia's energy. The energy output is double the output obtained from Leigh Creek, and the amenities available at Leigh Creek far exceed those at Moomba.

Indeed, the conditions at Moomba are so harsh that no women and children are allowed to live there. Men staffing the Moomba field work for 19 days and have nine days off, with the company flying its employees back to Adelaide for their rest period. The Moomba airstrip has a sandy-clay surface but there are over 30 operations from the airstrip each week. The Dehli company provides two eight-seater aircraft five days a week for the flight between Adelaide and Moomba. These aircraft fly in all perishable foods, delicate equipment, men, and all the emergency equipment.

Aircraft provide the only quick means of communication to the area, because the alternative access over the Strzelecki Creek track involves an uncomfortable journey from Adelaide of three or four days. Sometimes the track is subject to flooding from Flinders Range creeks and Cooper Creek. Although we might regard this country as the dead heart, we know how flooded it has been on occasions in the past few years. Several areas in the Moomba gas field only a few months ago were 2.4 metres under water. Aircraft communication is vital, and that is my point. Indeed, recently there was an explosion at the field when one of the pre-pumping gas compressors for the Adelaide line blew up. From answers to the questions I asked of men working on the field it was apparent at the time of the explosion that no-one on the field was able to repair the ruined plant.

Whilst the Hon. Mr. Dunford has been dining and taking lunch in Parliament House, the Hon. Mr. DeGaris and I spent three days at Moomba learning about the field and trying to understand how it operates. Over 30 points of rain fell during that period and put the airstrip out of operation for 24 hours, yet soon the Moomba gas field will be providing Sydney with natural gas (it is expected to do so before the end of September).

Moomba will be providing 5 per cent of Australia's energy supply (30 per cent of South Australia's energy needs and five per cent of the nation's needs) once the Sydney link-up is completed. As a result, much of industry and many domestic users will be affected should any major breakdown occur at the field. If a breakdown occurs and

if technical experts cannot immediately be flown in, there could be a catastrophe, causing perhaps even a shutdown of industry in Sydney, Australia's largest city, and in Adelaide, Australia's best city.

We know well what would be the effect on the industrial and domestic scene if this situation obtained. I make a plea to the Government that it give serious consideration to providing every possible assistance, using its own finances and obtaining Federal financial assistance, to have the Moomba air strip upgraded to an all-weather strip. True, this plea sounds like a typical plea from a back-bench member, but I refer to the national importance of this small town and the natural gas it produces. Moomba is no longer merely a small town in the desert of South Australia.

The Hon. E. G. Whitlam wrote to the principal companies (the Delhi-Santos group) in 1973 and stated that Delhi-Santos was responsible for the field, it was their baby and they had to care for it. He said that until local government was formed in the area no financial assistance would be available. They were brave words by that famous former Prime Minister, especially as Moomba is over 321 km from any other habitation. It is a long way from Leigh Creek. To the west, the nearest neighbour is at Lake Eyre and to the east the nearest neighbour is in Bjelke-Petersen country. How can local government be formed in the area?

I emphasise the important role of Moomba in the national scene. Moomba must be looked at in this way. Moreover, there is no doubt in the mind of the management of Delhi-Santos that there will soon be a great need for a petro-chemical plant near the gas fields. We know that the Government planned the establishment of a petro-chemical plant in the Redcliff area. Certainly, I do not want to argue about where the plant should be located, because we can all assume where that should be. However, in layman's terms, it must be appreciated that not every gas field has the same proportion of marketable extract. I refer to the hydro-carbon and petro-chemical feed stock available at Moomba. There is a small percentage of waste of hydro-carbons presently and the company well knows that, as the existing fields cease to be productive (Big Lake, Moomba and Gidgealpa) and as other fields are proven, new markets must be found for the feed stock. With such full knowledge of the high proportion of hydro-carbons which will come and which are necessary for petro-chemical operation (I refer to feed stock) and to meet the needs of the Sydney and Adelaide market, these fields will have to come on stream in years to come. The hydro-carbons that go into the feed stock for a petro-chemical plant are extremely valuable to mining engineers. They are too valuable (and it would be a crime for them) to be burnt on site and to be dissipated into the atmosphere.

There are two ways of disposing of this gas. The first is to pipe it to a sea port whence the hydro-carbons could be sold to overseas countries whose petro-chemical plants would then process the gases, and Australia would then have to import products coming from them, or we could consider building a petro-chemical plant here. The studies undertaken by the big companies show that there is room, working on a global zone, for one petro-chemical plant in the Pacific region. They are looking at two places—Indonesia and Australia. If we wish to pursue our policy of finding alternative employment for our work force, we must look seriously at this problem. We must see whether we can make it a viable proposition. We know that the Government and the

Dow Chemical company in the United States will have another look at this project prior to Mr. O'Connor looking at it, and have nothing more to do with him.

We know that the Government is serious and we know that the companies are most concerned about their economic future so that the finance that will come from exportable gases will come from the drilling of this area. We know it will take from five to eight years to drill. I add my concurrence at this stage in the fact that the Government is realistic and we must look at this matter in as many ways as possible. We should insist on the needs of industry for future employment in the industrial processes of this State, and at the same time we admit that we must look to the protection of the environment as of equal importance because, no matter which industry it is, it is a polluter of some sort. The history of man is such that over the centuries, and especially since the industrial revolution, he has not cared very much about the environment. He has gone ahead with the processes of manufacturing and has left a legacy of no great merit to himself. So nowadays we must be careful that in the case of petrochemical works—

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Will the honourable member give way?

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member will say whether or not he will.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I prefer to finish my speech.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Will you give way or not?

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: No. The point is that we must not neglect the fact that there are environmental problems that must not be overlooked. I may point out to the Hon. Mr. Foster who asked me to give way that I think the direction is that the member can finish the theme he is on before he gives way; I do that now.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Thank you. The honourable member mentioned pollution. As an industrialist and one engaged primarily in industrial matters for profit rather than for a salary or wage, what steps has he taken to avoid any pollution, particularly noise pollution, in his sawmill at Wirrabara?

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: We can still hear the kookaburras out there.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Do they write your speeches?

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: No. There is an awful lot of galahs up there.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: They are beautiful birds.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Yes, and they talk a lot. In 1973, the Government started a whole host of inquiries into these environmental problems in the Spencer Gulf area, where the Redcliff petro-chemical plant was to go. I wish to list four departments which, to the best of my knowledge, have not yet finished their reports on the studies they started, some as far back as 1973. First, there is the Fisheries Department, with a "Preliminary report upon the marine environment—Fisheries of Upper Spencer Gulf with recommendations for further studies". That was in 1973, and it is now 1976. From all the information I can find, no further work has been published on that point. Then there is the Public Health Department. In 1974 it published "Air pollution control for the Redcliff project—Interim Report". It also published a "Preliminary assessment of impact of Redcliff complex on health services of Port Augusta". I draw attention to the words "interim report" and "preliminary assessment".

Going back to 1973 again, the Engineering and Water Supply Department did a survey and published a report entitled "Spencer Gulf water pollution studies—recon-

naissance survey". The four printed reports, which are of a preliminary nature, have, to the best of my knowledge, not been completed. We, the Parliament, and you, the Government, will not win points by announcing details of a new industry to be started unless and until every environment study has been completed and the public and Parliament have been allowed to assess the sincerity of the reports. Although the State badly needs a diversity in the industrial scene, it must not neglect the future generations of men and women as far as environment control is concerned.

On the energy problem, the press has announced that a small railway line between Gladstone and Wilmington may have to be closed because it is not economic. In the past, I have always believed that uneconomic railway lines should be closed; but now, when we realise that the world supplies of fuel are running low and the main reserves are getting less, and when we realise that transport in Australia, because of its vastness, is one of our most important assets which must be nurtured, thought about and cared for in the future, a railway engine on that line can haul 760 tonnes of grain or products over the 112 km between Gladstone and Wilmington, using 500 litres of fuel. How many motor trucks would be needed to move 760 tonnes of grain and how many litres of fuel would those motor trucks use compared to the one railway engine?

I make the point that we must now look not only to the uneconomic running of a railway line but also to whether we can afford to close it, because in years to come it may be the only form of transport we can afford to use. If fuel shortages become as critical as some people predict, that may be the case.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Have you told Peter Nixon?

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: The point about Mr. Nixon raised by the Hon. Mr. Foster is that the railway itself must be run efficiently with the type of rolling stock, the number of men employed, and the hours of work done. Those things must be looked at to keep the railway line open, if it is obvious that there will be a fuel problem in years to come.

The Highways Department is having great difficulty in even repairing its country roads. If we are to have fleets of motor trucks carting grain, which it takes the railway six months to cart, road transport can do it much more quickly than in six months, but a lot of grain will be run over roads that the Government and the Highways Department cannot afford to repair; so there is a whole host of problems. In some areas in Victoria they are getting the roads back to gravel, because they have not the money to make them sealed roads. It is almost like H. G. Wells in turning back the clock. We must be realistic about the economic problem. I conclude my speech by paying my respects to His Excellency the Governor. In the Speech on June 8, when opening the forty-second Parliament, His Excellency stated:

In the ordinary course of events, this will be the last occasion when it will fall to me to call you together for the dispatch of business and I discharge my duties today in the sure confidence that the future Parliaments of this State will, with the example of those of the past, continue to serve its people well and faithfully.

Sir Mark, too, has served our people and our Parliament well and faithfully.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I also support the motion. I repeat what I said in a previous Address in Reply debate when I commended the Governor, and I agree with what the Hon. Mr. Geddes and other honourable members have

said about Sir Mark's work. It seems that Governors fall like manna from Heaven: there is no indication of how the Governor gets there. Of course, he is appointed by the Government, and it is interesting to note that Sir Mark was appointed by a Labor Government. He had taken part in protests against the Vietnam war, and his appointment was criticised by some people.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Who were they?

The Hon. Anne Levy: Members of your Party. McLeay called him a red.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: That is correct. Mr. McLeay is now a Minister in the Federal Government, and since his appointment to that position we have not heard anything about him. I hate to inject a nasty political tone into these laudable remarks, but politics pervade this Chamber, and the Labor Party is to be commended for appointing a person like Sir Mark, a person out of the main stream of previous appointments by Liberal Party Governments.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: And Labor Party Governments.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Perhaps the honourable member would give examples of that. Another matter that I wish to mention follows the speech, or contribution, whatever we may call it, made by the Hon. Mr. Cameron.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: The harangue.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Yes. He dealt with Monarto but refused to answer any questions put to him about it, because he was incapable of answering them. He would not say whether the Environmental Protection Council of this State, a specialist body established to deal with matters such as Monarto, supported the concept. Of course, the council does support it. Further, when I asked the Hon. Mr. Cameron whether he had been to Monarto, he did not answer that. It is clear that he has not been there.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Who would want to go there?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Obviously, the Hon. Mr. DeGaris has not been there either, yet he criticises the concept of establishing Monarto to cope with the expansion of Adelaide beyond present limits. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris and the Hon. Mr. Cameron say that the site is not suitable, but neither has been there.

The Hon. B. A. Chatterton: They say the site is unsuitable, yet they haven't been there.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: True. I will divide my remarks this afternoon into three categories: first, the state of the nation; secondly, the state of the State; and thirdly, the state of the Opposition. In dealing with the state of the nation, I will use as my text a famous document, the policy speech of the Liberal Party of Australia delivered by the present Prime Minister (Mr. Fraser), when he made many rather extravagant promises about what his Government would do when it got into office. The policy speech states:

The Liberal policy statement: Australia needs an immediate change of direction. What must be done is to establish, for the first time in three years, sound and honest management of Australia's affairs.

I draw attention to the word "honest". If we go through the document, we see that it becomes more and more difficult to ascribe the word "honest" to what the Prime Minister said. The document is full of promises that have been broken, and I will refer to some of them. The speech also states:

There will be an end to government extravagances and excesses. There will be no international safaris by members of Parliament.

That promise has been broken. There have been international safaris by members of the Government in Canberra. Mr. Peacock, who is the Minister for Foreign Affairs—

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You wouldn't know it.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: No. Mr. Peacock has been overseas for about 13 or 14 weeks. Where is the Prime Minister now? He has been watching the Olympic Games and he has seen the Queen, because she is concerned about the divisive nature of the Governor-General. The Prime Minister also will be going fishing. Many other Ministers have been overseas: for example, Mr. Anthony and Mr. Nixon have been to Russia, and Mr. MacKellar has been on an overseas tour. The Prime Minister's "honesty" in this respect has been discredited.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: He used the word "safari". That means a long trip, with a lot of people carrying luggage.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: What has Whitlam been doing in the past few weeks?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: If the Hon. Mr. Geddes had been in the Chamber, he would have heard what I said. Mr. Fraser has not kept his promise about overseas trips. He added some bite to his speech when he stated that Australia did not need a tourist as a Prime Minister. The next promise was that there would be no more jobs for the boys. What an extraordinary promise that was to make, particularly as he knew that he had no intention of keeping it. When we talk about jobs for the boys, we must think how lily-white the previous Liberal and Country Party Government was before 1972!

The Hon. C. M. Hill: You've got nothing to talk about: you worked for Senator Bishop.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Yes, and I am proud of the fact: he was a good Minister. I was a mere Ministerial aide. Let us look at some of the people that the Liberal and Country Party Government has put into jobs. I refer, for instance, to the Chief Justice of the High Court.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: Have you got anything on South Australia?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: That is next.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I thought you said you were talking about the Fraser Government.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: As the Hon. Mr. Burdett knows, a Liberal and Country Party Government was in power before 1972, and it appointed Sir Garfield Barwick as Chief Justice of the High Court. It also appointed Lord Casey and Sir Paul Hasluck, both former Liberal Ministers, as Governors-General. That Government appointed its cronies to the highest judicial positions in the land. I refer also to Mr. Freeth from Western Australia, who was defeated in an election. Where did he go? He was appointed Ambassador to Japan. I refer also to Sir Alexander Downer, who was appointed High Commissioner to Great Britain, and to Mr. Chaney, who was appointed Administrator of the Northern Territory in 1969. Then, there was Senator Dame Annabelle Rankin, who was appointed High Commissioner to New Zealand. One must ask honourable members opposite what this is if it is not jobs for the boys.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: It isn't jobs for the boys.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I am amazed to hear the Hon. Mr. DeGaris say that. What about Mr. Arthur, the former member for Barton, who was appointed Mr. Gorton's personal assistant in 1969? Mr. Freeth, Mr. Arthur and Mr. Chaney, who were all Liberal members, were appointed to jobs after they had been defeated at elections. That was the

pre-1972 record. Let us look at the post-1975 record in light of Mr. Fraser's promise of no jobs for the boys. I refer, first, to Harry M. Miller, organiser for the National Country Party, who was appointed to the Qantas board, as well as to Mr. John England, who was Country Party Whip from 1960 to 1975 and who after his defeat was sent to the Northern Territory as its Administrator. Then there was Mr. Jim Forbes, from our own State, who has been employed as personal assistant to the President of the Senate. Are these not jobs for the boys?

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Of course not!

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: The Hon. Mr. DeGaris says they are not jobs for the boys. I wonder whether the Hon. Mr. Cameron would agree with him.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: I was wondering about Junie Morosi.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: The Hon. Mr. Cameron seems to be giving a decided lack of support to his Leader. I refer also to Mrs. Cecily Storey, Vice-President of the Victorian branch of the Liberal Party and wife of the Victorian Attorney-General, who was appointed to the Discrimination in Employment Committee.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: What was the salary?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I do not know. However, according to the Leader that is not a job for the boys. I refer also to Mr. H. Schreiber, a partner in a firm of lawyers of which the brother of the Minister of Consumer Affairs was a member, who was appointed to the committee to review the Trade Practices Act. I refer also to Mr. Paul Gerber, a Liberal academic from Queensland, who was appointed to a taxation review committee, and to Professor Owen Harries, who was appointed visiting academic to the Foreign Affairs Department, both supporters of and apologists for the Liberals.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: What does that mean?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: A job for the boys. I could add to the list, but I will not do so. I see that the Leader of the Opposition has left the Chamber. Obviously, this has got too much for him. If I continued, I am afraid that I would be here for some time. The Liberal policy speech continues:

Economies can and will be made in Government spending without disrupting essential programmes or programmes for which contracts have already been let.

We know what has happened to that. It continues:

Spending on essential education, health and welfare programmes will be protected against inflation.

What a lot of nonsense that turned out to be. It continues:

We will work positively in co-operation with trade unionists.

In doing so, the Fraser Government provoked the first national strike that this country has ever experienced.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: And what a flop that was.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You're still moaning about it.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Let us go on to pensions, regarding which the policy states:

The real value of pensions will be preserved.

But what happened? Pension increases were delayed for a month, saving the Government \$29 000 000. Later, the Prime Minister said:

We stand by our commitment to abolish the means test on pensions.

Instead, Cabinet decided to save \$200 000 000 by abandoning plans to phase out the final stage of the means test. The Hon. Mr. Hill has stopped interjecting, because he

now realises what a sham this document has turned out to be. The Government said that it would support wage indexation. Yet another one! What happened to wage indexation as soon as the present Federal Government got into power? Only a month or two after the election, it went to the Arbitration Commission and opposed wage indexation, trying to cut it down. That is what was stated in the policy speech.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: What did it say?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: That, if elected, a Liberal and Country Party Federal Government would support wage indexation.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: It did.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: The Hon. Mr. Hill says that the Federal Government is supporting wage indexation. That is almost as inane a statement as the last lot of interjections from the Leader of the Opposition, who has left the Chamber. Mr. Fraser also said in his policy speech that an improvement in industrial relations was fundamental to prosperity. That was a significant improvement when it provoked the national strike! The policy speech continues:

Our reforms will maintain the purchasing power of wages. Again, one wonders what the Commonwealth Government is doing before the Arbitration Commission. Mr. Fraser then set out his Party's reform in the taxation field, saying:

This will give the Arbitration Commission much greater opportunity to maintain its guidelines for wage indexation. But what has it done? It has done a complete turn-about. Although this is somewhat long, there is more to come, as follows:

We will maintain Medibank and ensure that the standard of health care does not decline.

They said that they would maintain Medibank. That is the latest travesty. The speech continues:

We will retain the tertiary education assistance scheme which we introduced.

The Fraser Government has retained it, but cut it back by making all sorts of exceptions—another broken promise. The speech also says:

We shall ensure that no person is denied legal aid because of lack of means.

The Fraser Government has cut down the legal aid programme, and it has decided to charge a \$50 fee on applications to the Family Court.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: There could be three or four applications in connection with the one family.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Yes.

The Hon. J. A. Carnie: Who wrote that document to which you are now referring?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: It is a newsletter from South Australian A.L.P. Senators. I am sure the honourable member is feeling ashamed of the Fraser Government, particularly as he used to be in a Party that said so much about this matter. The statement also says:

We will continue urban programmes.

The newsletter says:

The estimates of the Department of Environment, Housing, and Community Development are reduced by \$400 000 000, the sewerage programme is slashed from \$145 000 000 to \$50 000 000. Increase in rents in Housing Commission homes, growth centre budgets reduced to cover only essential legal commitments, and even these commitments are challenged.

Shame on the Fraser Government! What is the Prime Minister's justification? On one of the rare occasions when the Prime Minister submitted himself for questioning

by the press (on the television programme *Monday Conference*), Mr. Alan Barnes said:

You'd made promises that there would be no cuts . . .
The Prime Minister replied:

You will remember, though, that those words were used in the context of the last election campaign . . .

In other words, Mr. Fraser made the promises, although he had no intention of keeping them: he made them solely for the purposes of the election campaign. The Prime Minister continued:

. . . and in the context of what was going to happen immediately thereafter. We are making it quite plain that contracts, funds committed, would flow over the, you know, the financial year that we're still in.

Not surprisingly, Mr. Barnes was not very happy with that reply, and he later came back, as follows:

Prime Minister, you threw me a moment ago when you said, implied that the spending things listed in your policy speech last November applied only to the rest of the financial year.

The Prime Minister replied:

That policy speech was obviously specifically directed to the circumstances in which it was made.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: When Mr. Fraser got into office he discovered what a shocking state the economy was in.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: He got votes under false pretences.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: When he admitted it during *Monday Conference*, it was the only time he was honest.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Honourable members will recall that yesterday the Hon. Mr. Hill delivered a sermon about interjections. He said that he was discussing a serious matter.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: I said that I was discussing a non-controversial matter.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: This is a matter of pure fact. The points I have made are from direct quotes. It is clear that Mr. Fraser is either a fool or a deliberate dissembler; I suspect the latter. During the election campaign he made promises, knowing that he could not implement them. He was prepared to deceive the public well before the election in connection with the blocking of Supply. On November 28, 1974, Mr. Fraser was asked:

Mr. Fraser, do you believe you would be a better Leader than Bill Snedden?

Mr. Fraser replied:

I think Bill Snedden is the Leader. I support him completely.

On March 6, 1975, Mr. Fraser said:

Because of my concern, I discussed with Bill Snedden the continued and wrong press speculation that I am promoting a challenge to him as Leader of the Liberal Party. As a consequence of the discussion, I make this further statement: Bill Snedden has my full support.

Thirteen days later, Mr. Fraser said:

I have declared myself because I am not prepared to hide in the shadows on this particular issue.

In June, 1975, Mr. Fraser said:

While a Government has a majority in the Lower House, it has a right to expect that it will govern. What I said was dependent primarily upon a Government being able to keep a majority in the House of Representatives.

On August 22, 1975, the following press report appeared:

Mr. Malcolm Fraser last night ended speculation about a snap election when he said on A.B.C. television that the Opposition would allow the Budget to pass.

In October, 1975, an announcement was made that the Liberal Party would use its numbers in the Senate to block Supply. So, there is support for the viewpoint that Mr. Fraser is not a fool but a deliberate dissembler. His

recent statement in connection with funds for sport is an example of his hypocrisy. In Montreal, he said he would institute an inquiry into sport. No wonder the people back here were amazed, because the Fraser Government had earlier announced substantial cuts in funds for many sporting projects. This morning honourable members would have been surprised to read in the press that no less a person than the Federal Government's Deputy Whip, Mr. D. Cameron, strongly exposed the Fraser Government's hypocrisy for what it was. This morning's report is as follows:

He said it would have been worse for Australian athletes "if the previous Government had lost office earlier". He also said, "To give them their due, the Labor Party when in Government helped sport like it has never been helped before."

The report goes on to state that Mr. Fraser is expected to carpet Mr. Cameron. The report continues:

Mr. Cameron, who has led two Australian karate teams overseas in the past five years, said the Labor Party had been handing out about \$1 000 000 to Australian sporting organisations before our entry into the "chopping events".

That means the chopping of Government expenditure. This is another example of the complete hypocrisy of Mr. Fraser. Mr. Chipp, who has unfortunately been banished from the Cabinet, because Mr. Fraser considers him to be a somewhat small "I" Liberal (perhaps like the Hon. Mr. Cameron and the Hon. Mr. Carnie before they went back to the Party led by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris), spoke about Mr. Fraser's broken promises. The press report is as follows:

A former Liberal spokesman on social security, Mr. Chipp, said last night a Government social security Bill had made pensioners a political football again. He said he was disappointed the Bill did not make pension increases instant and automatic as the coalition had promised before last year's election.

Clearly, Mr. Fraser was deliberately lying at the time of the election. I should now like to compare Mr. Fraser's series of broken electoral promises with the first section of Mr. Whitlam's election speech in 1972. I was pleasantly surprised on reading this section (the section delivered over television) to find that most of the promises Mr. Whitlam made in his 1972 speech were fulfilled, and here are some of them:

We propose a new charter for the children of Australia. Certainly, that was done so far as education was concerned, and that cannot be denied. Mr. Whitlam also stated:

We will make pre-school education available to every Australian child.

That election promise may not have been completely fulfilled, but important steps were taken towards fulfilling it. Those provisions are now being destroyed by the Fraser Government. Mr. Whitlam went on to say:

Commonwealth spending on schools and teacher training will be the fastest expanding sector of Budget expenditure. That promise was carried out. There was an enormous increase in the Budget allocation on education. Mr. Whitlam further stated:

We will abolish fees at universities and colleges of advanced education.

That promise was completely fulfilled. Mr. Whitlam added:

We intend to raise the basic pension rate to 25 per cent of average weekly earnings. That was done.

The Hon. Anne Levy: It was increased from 19 per cent.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Yes, and now the rate is dropping back. Mr. Whitlam went on to say:

We will establish a universal health insurance system.

That was done. He then stated:

We will establish a national compensation scheme. A committee was set up and substantial steps were taken towards that goal. Mr. Whitlam went on to say:

We will involve the national Government in a massive effort to rebuild our existing cities and to build new ones.

That was done. He further stated:

We will make a massive attack on the problem of land and housing costs.

As a result of that policy the South Australian Government was able to establish a land commission. He then said:

We will give local government full access to the Loan Council and Grants Commission . . . We will establish a Prices Justification Tribunal . . . —(we) will move directly and solidly into the field of consumer protection . . . We will change the emphasis in immigration from Government recruiting to family reunion and to retaining the migrants already here . . . We will issue national development bonds through an expanded Australian Industry Development Corporation . . . We will abolish conscription forthwith . . . We will legislate to give Aborigines land rights . . . We will co-operate wholeheartedly with the New Guinea House of Assembly in reaching successfully its time table for self-Government and independence.

They were the initial comments in Mr. Whitlam's policy speech, and all honourable members would have to agree that by far the greater part of those promises were fulfilled. I compare that position with the shoddy and dishonest speech made by the current Prime Minister, Mr. Fraser, to which I have already referred. The double standards exhibited by Mr. Fraser are supported by certain sections to the right of politics in the country, including members of the press. I should now like to refer to what I believe was one of the most hypocritical and mischievous editorials that has ever appeared in a newspaper. In the *Australian* on June 16, 1976—

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: I rise on a point of order, Mr. President. Standing Order 185 provides that no member shall digress from the subject matter of the question under discussion. I understand that we are debating the Address in Reply, which deals exclusively with State Government matters.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Unfortunately, tradition has it that the Address in Reply debate is wide open for such discussion.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Honourable members have just seen an abortive intervention by the Hon. Mr. Carnie. I am glad to see that you, Mr. President, are upholding the traditions of Parliament. This is a debate, as you well know, Sir, where any matter can be canvassed. However, I thank the honourable member for his interjection because it leads me to my next point. I refer to the following disgraceful editorial that appeared in the *Australian* on June 16:

What would democrats like Gladstone and Deakin think of this?

This is talking about demonstrations generally against the Governor-General. The editorial continues:

If they were to see Australia now, observe the anti-Kerr riots and hear the snarls of the mob, what judgment would they make of the nation that pioneered adult suffrage, votes for women and many other liberal reforms? They would put us in the same category as Czarist Russia with its pogroms and stifling of that freedom and toleration which are civilisation's most hard-won privileges.

The editorial then goes on about the glorification of intolerance and further states:

Contrary to popular belief, toleration is not inherent in mankind. The story of history is the story of the efforts

of a minority to reform the selfish and thoughtless inclinations of human nature and establish mechanisms that operate as a compromise between stability and ordered change. In Australia these mechanisms are the Constitution, Parliament, the Federal system, the popular vote, the law and the general consensus that freedom and individualism should continue.

That is one of the most hypocritical editorials that I have ever read.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: What was the newspaper?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: The *Australian*. Mr. Fraser and the National Country Party have done more to destroy tolerance and consensus politics than any other Government in the history of this federation. These are the people who refused to allow the elected Government to complete its term of office; they threatened to destroy the Government in the Lower House by using their Senate numbers. However, honourable members on this side of the Council believe, as democratic socialists, that the reforms we seek can be obtained through the ballot box. I refer to increases in social justice and a greater degree of egalitarianism. We hope that society, if it is flexible, will allow such moderate persuasion to win the day. However, these ideals were dealt an enormous blow last November.

Large sections of the community (and it is not just the group referred to in the *Australian* who are demonstrating against Sir John Kerr) are wondering whether there is any alternative in this country to direct action. We have had a parade of constitutional experts from both sides commenting on this issue. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris has found conservative supporters for his position, and that is not surprising. However, the point that needs to be made is that it is not a matter of legalism or of solely what the Constitution provides in its wording, or what is meant technically. We all know that the Russian Constitution is a democratic Constitution, and yet anyone who has studied that community knows that it is an extremely repressive system of government.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: They never had a Parliament before the revolution.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I would be prepared to say that the system now is a vast improvement on what it was before the revolution; but, looking at it from our point of view, it is a repressive system, even though they have a Constitution that enshrines what we consider to be the democratic processes. The same happened with Hitler when he took over in Germany; he used the Constitution to get into power. So what a Constitution states technically cannot be the end of the matter.

The Constitution and the nature of politics in this country must depend on a consensus and an acceptance of the rules by all parts of the community, and not just by members on this side of the Council, who espouse their support for the system. The actions of honourable members opposite and their Federal counterparts put this consensus at grave risk; in fact, they put the whole democratic tradition at grave risk by the action they took, and that position has been exacerbated by the deliberate deceptions of the Prime Minister in his policy speech. It is too easy for the *Australian*, as it did, to use the far left in its editorial as the national scapegoat. That has been a ploy of the Liberal and Country Parties over the years. It is far too simplistic, and it cannot be used to stop them from debating the real issues.

When talking about the people who are demonstrating and the young people who do not accept the system, we have to think of what has placed them in this position,

what has destroyed their belief in this system of consensus politics. We must look at Vietnam and the intolerance and lack of freedom involved in the Government policy in that area; and the Pentagon papers, and what the Government did to embroil the United States in war in Vietnam. Sir Robert Menzies said that he had been requested by the United States and South Vietnam to come into the war, but that was quite clearly, from Government documents that appeared later, not the case. What Sir Robert did was try to get the United States further and further embroiled in the war, and he requested South Vietnam to be able to send troops. Yet in his replies to Parliament, he said, "We have been requested by the United States and South Vietnam." It is that sort of lying that is destroying the consensus in our community.

Let us look at President Nixon in America, a person whose ideological position is similar to that of the Prime Minister of this country, and the whole disaster of Watergate. Those honourable members who have read the book and seen the film *All the President's Men* will realise that those actions by President Nixon made a total farce of the democratic process in that country, and it is that sort of thing that is causing people to lose faith in that system. The actions that Mr. Fraser took pre-December, 1975, and afterwards in breaking his promises are in exactly the same category, albeit less dramatic.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Bringing Nixon into it is absolute rubbish.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I was making the point that the actions of President Nixon were in the same category as the actions (lesser in force, of course) of Mr. Fraser; and it is that sort of action that is causing people to lose faith in the system. The fabric of democracy is not easily held together, particularly in times of inflation. Inflation puts the institutions we support under great stress, and the politicians come to be held in contempt along with those institutions. We have the example of President Nixon who, in 1968, for instance, was elected on a basis of restoring the *laissez faire* approach to the economic system. In a short time, he was adopting a prices and incomes policy which he said he would not do. The same thing happened with Mr. Heath, the Conservative Leader, in 1970, when he said he would, at a stroke, reduce prices in Britain.

We know what happened to prices in Britain following that. The Labour Government in Britain has run into the same trouble as the Labor Government did here in regard to promises about unemployment and inflation. It means that politicians are losing the respect of the community because they are making promises that either wittingly or unwittingly they cannot keep. But, in the case of Mr. Fraser, it was quite clear that those promises were made knowing that he could not keep them; that is the real tragedy of his position.

It is, as I said, leading to a breakdown in the freedom and tolerance in our community. The *Australian* blamed the far left for leading to that breakdown and to an increase in cynicism, but the blame for that breakdown must squarely be laid on Mr. Fraser and the proponents of the actions he took prior to December, 1975.

The next matter I wish to deal with is the state of the State. Honourable members opposite have made much, in recent times, of excessive taxation, mismanagement of the State, discouraging industry, and that sort of thing. The Hon. Mr. Hill in one of his less creditable performances in the last week of our previous sitting referred to inflation and

unemployment and said that the Government was not doing anything to combat these evils. He also referred to high taxation.

I make two preliminary observations about the consistency of the Opposition's remarks in these matters. First, Dr. Eastick, who was the Leader in another place last year, stated that Mr. Dunstan had bankrupted the State (that was in his policy speech). Yet we find now that, having bankrupted the State and then producing a surplus this year, they are complaining. The other inconsistency of comment is the one that honourable members opposite often put forward, that deficit financing causes inflation. Now, if we budget for a surplus, they are complaining. I am not surprised that there is no response from honourable members opposite, because it is quite clear that their arguments are inconsistent. The Hon. Mr. Hill gave isolated instances of taxation, but the only valid comparison that one can make is a comparison between this State and the other States. He did not make any systematic analysis, and he took what suited his case. The Opposition uses that tactic as much as it can and it even went so far as to hold a protest meeting last April, but it did not provide any comparisons. I suppose the Hon. Mr. Hill says that that is an honest way to go about the matter, but it is completely dishonest. The document prepared for the rally in April states:

Dunstan Government taxes have risen by more than 330 per cent in the past five years.

That figure means nothing. The figures provided by the Treasury and quoted by the Premier on *This Day Tonight* indicate that, on the basis of the level of tax, we are fourth, behind Western Australia. Those figures are, on a per capita basis, as follows:

State	Tax \$
South Australia	177·50
New South Wales	234
Victoria	213

The Australian average was given as \$212·90.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Where did those figures come from?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: They came from the Treasury, and I understand that they are the figures provided to the Grants Commission by the various States.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: And you accept them without question, do you?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I am sure that the Hon. Mr. Hill knows that the Treasury comprises people who are independent.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: If you accept them without question, why did you ask your Leader to provide the same information in this Chamber last Tuesday?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I thought that honourable members would be interested in them.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Is the Hon. Mr. Hill not interested in them? Does he not want to see them?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: They are the figures that were provided to the Grants Commission, and honourable members know that there must be a certain level of taxation in order to get assistance from that authority. I have had an exercise done in regard to this matter.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: I had it done before you and you got my figures. They are vastly different from the ones you quoted.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I will quote those figures, and they do not paint the glum picture that honourable members opposite say they paint. These figures were obtained from the Library Research Service and they were incorrectly quoted by Dr. Tonkin. One would have to say that it was a deliberate attempt to deceive the public.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: I hope you are not reflecting on the Library Research Service. I thought you were being critical of the service.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: No. I make clear that I am not doing that. I was critical of Dr. Tonkin for distorting the figures.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Did the figures include the \$800 000 000 from the railway debt?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I will have to leave that to the honourable Leader. I made a note of what Dr. Tonkin stated, and he stated that South Australia was second highest after New South Wales. He also stated that he got the figures from the Library Research Service. The Hon. Mr. Hill is smiling, because he knows that his figures show that Victoria has the highest rate.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: One set of figures I have puts South Australia at the top.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: My word it does! That is your set.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I am not afraid of the figures that the Hon. Mr. Hill has, because they show that, on a per capita basis—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: The per capita figures indicate that in 1974-75 South Australia was third behind New South Wales and Victoria. That is after making the adjustment for pay-roll tax. I do not know how Dr. Tonkin got from the Library Research Service a figure showing New South Wales as the highest.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: He put South Australia second.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: He failed to make the adjustment that put South Australia third.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Mr. Acting President, I am trying to make a serious speech, and the Hon. Mr. Hill keeps on interjecting.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: I was provoked by a reference by the Hon. Mr. Dunford to the Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I ask for your protection, Mr. Acting President.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The Hon. Mr. Dunford ought to be made to withdraw the remark, and I take a point of order under Standing Order 193, which deals with objectionable language in this Chamber. It was most objectionable to me.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: I did not say it. I said that people were saying it.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The Hon. Mr. Dunford said or implied that Dr. Tonkin was a goose. That is most objectionable language and I call on the honourable member to both withdraw and apologise.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. C. W. Creedon): There was so much of a row that I did not hear what was said. I ask the Hon. Mr. Sumner to continue with his speech.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Thank you, Sir. Whichever set of figures one takes, the situation is nothing like the Opposition has presented it to be. Compared to the other States, South Australia is doing very well in the area of State taxation. Figures obtained from the Parliamentary Library indicate that South Australia's rate of increase for 1974-75 was second highest in Australia, behind Victoria. I agree that that is what the research showed, but whatever set of figures one takes it is clear that the situation is not what it has been made out to be. We are third, according to the Parliamentary Library figures—

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: That is on increase.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: On absolute per capita.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: We are second on increase?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Yes, according to the Library's figures. I do not want the Hon. Mr. DeGaris to go outside the Council, as he undoubtedly will, and say that I agreed with these figures. I have been careful to say what the figures are, although I do not necessarily agree with them. For the sake of completeness, I gave them to honourable members.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: How did you get hold of the Premier's figures?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I watched television and made a note of them.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Are you fair dinkum?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Yes.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: You say that in the Council?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Yes. Indeed, I have the original notes, and the President would know that those notes would even be admitted in a court of law. I have not only the Treasurer's but also Dr. Tonkin's figures. In any event, that is not the only indicator of how the State is doing. I refer also to inflation. I am sure the Hon. Mr. Hill was very upset when he saw the headline "Adelaide's inflation is lowest in Australia" in the Saturday, July 17, edition of the *Advertiser*.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: He would be disappointed.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: That is so. It can be seen from the press report that Hobart recorded the steepest inflation increase of 14.9 per cent. The rate for Canberra was 14.1 per cent, for Brisbane 14 per cent, for Perth 13.4 per cent, for Melbourne 12.2 per cent, for Sydney it was 11.9 per cent, and Adelaide was right at the bottom with an increase of 11.8 per cent. It had the lowest inflation rate in Australia. I will now turn to another indicator of how the State is going.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: Unemployment.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: That is so. Where do we stand in this regard? I am surprised to find that in the *Advertiser* of July 10 there was a report on unemployment. The national rate was 4.4 per cent; Tasmania's rate was 5.13 per cent; in New South Wales the figure was 4.9 per cent; in Queensland it was 4.57 per cent; in Western Australia it was 4.02 per cent; in Victoria it was 3.96 per cent; and in South Australia, again at the bottom, it was 3.14 per cent.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: Where is the Liberal Government in the opinion polls?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I am glad the honourable member raised that matter, because I have here another report headed "Drop in support for Liberal National Country Party Government".

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: What are the figures for South Australia?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: They show that the Liberal National Country Party's support was only 40 per cent. On that basis, Dr. Tonkin could become Premier only if they gerrymandered the electorates. The Labor Party support at that time was 51 per cent. Regarding unemployment, in addition to the figures which indicate that this State is doing better than any other State in the Commonwealth, the South Australian Government has provided the substantial sum of \$10 000 000 for unemployment relief. Victoria has also allocated a certain sum for this purpose. Industrial relations is another indicator of how well this State is going. Working days lost in industrial disputes in South Australia have averaged 4 per cent of

the Australian total over the last five years. In the six months ended April, 1976, it was an average of 3.4 per cent of the Australian total. This occurred even though South Australia's work force comprises 9 per cent of the national work force. So, in that respect we are ahead again.

One wonders what honourable members opposite have to contribute by their criticism. Disincentive to investors is another matter to which honourable members opposite have referred. I now refer to a series of reports written by Stewart Cockburn in the *Advertiser*, when the Hon. Mr. Hill was overseas. The following extracts therefrom may tend to put that criticism back where it belongs:

Like most middle-aged people of his generation, he was brought up to believe as an article of faith that unless South Australia could go on making most of its secondary products much more cheaply than they could be turned out in Melbourne or Sydney, we'd soon be back to a village economy. Whatever differentials once existed have certainly almost disappeared. So, in theory, we should all have had our begging bowls out long ago. The trouble with this theory is that, so far, it is confounded by facts.

In June, 1966, 15 months after Sir Thomas Playford and his Party finished their record 32-year term of power, South Australia had 120 600 men and women working as wage and salary earners in manufacturing industry. They represented 34.6 per cent of all civilian employees in South Australia, and 9.5 per cent of the manufacturing work force of Australia. The way private enterprise sees it, the industrial road in South Australia has since 1965 led mostly downhill.

Later, he said:

Between June, 1966 and June, 1975 South Australia has not merely increased its manufacturing industry work force by 12.6 per cent, from 120 600 to 135 800, but it now employs 10.4 per cent of all Australia's factory workers. So, from the time that the Playford era finished, when the figure was 9.5 per cent, it has now gone to 10.4 per cent of the Australian total. The article continues:

The truth seems to be that, in today's and tomorrow's world, it is not so much the lack of marginal cost differentials between South Australia, Melbourne and Sydney which will damage local industry. Rather is South Australia's future place in the Australian industrial spectrum likely to be determined (in the absence of major new mineral discoveries) by national monetary and fiscal policies.

The third article by Stewart Cockburn under the heading "Dunstan formula for the good life" says:

I asked one of Sir Thomas's former top aides and received a surprising answer. Refusing to give his name for publication he said this:

"The wage differentials were always somewhat exaggerated. I believe that, on average, they were never greater than about 5 per cent in our favour. Although average earnings per male unit still give South Australia an advantage of better than 5 per cent over Victoria and New South Wales, most wage rates are now much the same here as in other parts of Australia. But additional factors operated in our favour in Sir Thomas Playford's day, and in my opinion they still do. They are the intangibles of our community. Most of them probably derive from the fact that like Egypt and Israel, South Australia is seriously deficient in natural resources.

So by a sort of instinctive compensating process, South Australian workers have tended to be a bit more stable a bit harder working, a bit readier to put up with disadvantages. Management, too, may have been less extravagant, more cost-conscious and more efficient. By the same token, I believe most South Australian employers have been readier to accept slightly lower profit margins than their opposite numbers in Victoria and New South Wales, and to put away better reserves for the rainy day—and they still are."

The Statistician supports the former aide's statement. In June, 1966, for example, average minimum weekly award wage rates in South Australian manufacturing industry were only 1.5 per cent lower than the rates in Victoria and only 1.8 per cent lower than in New South

Wales. So by the end of the Playford era the earlier basic wage differentials had almost disappeared, anyway.

Later the article says:

Measured by such accepted criteria as capital investment an employee, or capital employed for each manufacturing establishment, there has so far been no net unilateral "flight of capital" from South Australia. Indeed, as late as 1973-74, South Australia proportionately was more than holding its own in new capital investment with New South Wales and Victoria.

The article also refers to the many other advantages that Adelaide has. This city has certainly not been destroyed, as honourable members opposite would like to make out, by the Dunstan Government. The article continues:

Adelaide has a higher percentage of owner-occupied dwellings than either Melbourne or Sydney, a higher percentage of homes with T.V., more homes with mains sewerage, more solid or brick-veneer houses, and more homes with two or more cars.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Are you trying to give credit to the Dunstan Government for all these things?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I am saying that a considerable number of benefits that South Australia enjoys have resulted from the Dunstan Government. Of course, what went before was also important. The Hon. Mr. Hill tries to tell his supporters that the Dunstan Government destroyed these things, that we have been going downhill since 1966, but that is completely contrary to the facts. Further, the Dunstan Government introduced an enormous range of social legislation, consumer legislation, welfare legislation, and support for the arts. There is therefore absolutely no basis for saying that, as a result of the democratic socialist Government in this State, the economy has deteriorated; it clearly has not deteriorated. Regarding national parks, we find that, apart from Tasmania, which has special circumstances, we have a greater percentage of national parks than has any other State.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: They were not all established in the Dunstan Government's time.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Many of them have been established since 1966. About 3.62 per cent of South Australia is comprised of national parks; in New South Wales, the figure is 2.3 per cent; Victoria, 0.55 per cent; Queensland, 0.6 per cent; Western Australia, 0.7 per cent; and Tasmania, 13.9 per cent. Below Goyder's rainfall line we have at least five per cent of our land mass in national parks; this was the figure recommended by the United Nations environment organisations, and this has been achieved since the Labor Government came to power. So, it is clear that South Australia is doing very well under its Labor Government. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

PARLIAMENTARY LAND SETTLEMENT COMMITTEE

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health) moved:

That leave be granted to the Parliamentary Land Settlement Committee to sit on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday, August 3-5, 1976, during the sittings of the Legislative Council.

Motion carried.

MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Medical Practitioners Act, 1919-1974. Read a first time.

DISTRICT COUNCIL OF LACEPEDE (VESTING OF LAND) BILL

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to vest certain land in the District Council of Lacedepe and for other purposes. Read a first time.

GOLD BUYERS ACT REPEAL BILL

Third reading.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health): I move:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

I would like to make a further explanation regarding what I said yesterday in answer to the Hon. Mr. Whyte. As I mentioned during my second reading explanation, the repeal of this Act is intended to enable South Australia to take advantage of the recent relaxation of Commonwealth requirements relating to the ownership of gold. While Commonwealth Government regulations prohibiting private ownership of gold were in force, the Gold Buyers Act apparently created no problems despite its quaint and anachronistic provisions. However, some concern has been expressed that transactions now allowed by the Commonwealth would contravene South Australian law.

Before the drafting of the Bill, the matter of amendment or repeal was given a good deal of consideration, and it was decided that there was no need to retain any of the provisions of the Act, as these are very much outdated. The police are involved in the matter in relation to the provisions dealing with control of wrought gold, wrought silver and precious stones, and in fact these only become a matter of concern when such items become the subject of theft. In such cases, the police need some control over persons whose business it is to buy and sell such goods in order that their purchases can be inspected at regular intervals.

However, control over the activities of those merchants engaged in such activities can be exercised under the terms of the Secondhand Dealers Act. My reference yesterday to amendments to the Secondhand Dealers Act being necessary was not quite correct. I had in mind section 4 (2), which provides:

Nothing in this Act shall affect any duties, rights, liabilities or obligations arising under any of the provisions of the Gold Buyers Act, 1916.

I am informed that no further action is necessary in relation to this section, since, on the repeal of the Gold Buyers Act, that provision will be exhausted.

Bill read a third time and passed.

POLICE OFFENCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Third reading.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health): I move:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

I have a reply to the question asked by the Hon. Mr. Burdett about how many prosecutions there have been in,

say, the past 12 months or in any other representative period under section 33 of the principal Act. The following figures have been supplied: in 1975-76 the number of persons reported was 12, there were eight prosecutions and four convictions; in 1974-75, eight persons were reported, there was one prosecution and one conviction.

Bill read a third time and passed.

FRUIT AND PLANT PROTECTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON (Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

It amends the Fruit and Plant Protection Act in two respects. First, it provides for a simplified and more expeditious procedure in the event of an outbreak of pests or disease affecting fruit or vegetables. At present when such an outbreak occurs, it is necessary for a proclamation to be made under section 7 of the Act proclaiming quarantine areas and restricting the movement of fruit and plants from those areas. The administrative procedures involved in making a proclamation necessarily take several days to complete. As the initiation of measures to control an outbreak of pests or disease is usually a matter of great urgency, the Government believes that it would be better if these measures could be initiated by the Minister by publishing a notice in the *Gazette*. The Bill also amends section 9 of the principal Act in a corresponding manner. This section, in its amended form, will enable the Minister to require orchardists to take specified measures to prevent the spread of pests or disease from an affected area.

A further amendment proposed by the Bill enables the Governor to prescribe fees to be paid in respect of services provided under the principal Act. A schedule of fees was prescribed under the Vine, Fruit and Vegetable Protection Act (the predecessor of the present Act) and, following advice from the Crown Solicitor, it is considered desirable that specific power be conferred to prescribe fees under the Fruit and Plant Protection Act. The Bill accordingly provides this authority. Clause 1 is formal. Clauses 2 and 3 transfer to the Minister powers formerly exercisable by the Governor. Clause 4 provides that the Governor may prescribe fees for the purposes of the Act.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.37 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, August 3, at 2.15 p.m.