

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, March 1, 1966.

The SPEAKER (Hon. L. G. Riches) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

THE FLINDERS UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA BILL.

His Excellency the Governor returned to the House of Assembly The Flinders University of South Australia Bill and recommended for consideration the amendments specified in the schedule annexed thereto.

ASSENT TO BILLS.

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:

Acts Republication,
Compulsory Acquisition of Land Act Amendment,
Criminal Law Consolidation Act Amendment,
Electricity Trust of South Australia Act Amendment,
Employees Registry Offices Act Amendment,
Impounding Act Amendment,
Kapinnie and Mount Hope Railway Discontinuance,
Nurses Registration Act Amendment,
Parliamentary Salaries and Allowances Act Amendment,
Public Service Act Amendment,
Renmark Irrigation Trust Act Amendment,
Road Traffic Act Amendment.

PETITION: GRAPE PRICES.

Mr. CURREN presented a petition signed by 495 residents of the Chaffey and Ridley Districts. It stated that wine grapegrowers had, for many years, been dissatisfied with the prices paid for grapes by proprietary wine makers; that the method of arriving at a price for each year's crop had been most unsatisfactory; and that payment for grapes purchased should be finalized by September of the vintage year. It urged that legislation be passed during the present session to fix wine grape prices at a realistic level taking into account the established cost of production.

Received and read.

DEATH OF HON. R. L. BUTLER.

The SPEAKER: I have received from Lady Butler and her family kind acknowledgment of the remembrances of the House on the occasion of her recent sad bereavement. Lady Butler writes:

I am most grateful for the honour extended to my husband in Parliament, and wish that you would convey my thanks to the members.

QUESTIONS

TEACHERS' SALARIES.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I noticed that, after the recent award increasing the salaries of teachers in this State had been announced, representatives of the teachers' organization stated that the terms of the award were not as generous as those of the award applying in New South Wales, and that there was some dissatisfaction with it. Can the Minister of Education say whether the claim was contested by the Government, or whether the award was in the terms of the original request by officers of his department?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I do not follow the last part of the question: "whether the award was in the terms of the original request by officers of his department."

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: The teachers.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I understand that the Leader is referring to the South Australian Institute of Teachers, which placed its case before the Teachers Salaries Board. The decision was made by that board, which is the proper authority to determine teachers' salaries, and the Government accepted the board's determination. In the report the chairman stated that most of the decisions were arrived at without his casting vote.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Will the Minister say whether the Government, in fact, supported or opposed the claim?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: A Government representative is on the Teachers Salaries Board. It could be said that many aspects of the claim lodged by the South Australian Institute of Teachers were supported, but not all of them. Consequently, the board brought down its ruling. I emphasize again that most of the decisions reached by the board were made without the Chairman's casting vote.

WATER STORAGES.

Mr. BROOMHILL: Has the Minister of Works the latest information relating to water at present held in the metropolitan reservoirs and details of future pumping activities?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Following the rain which fell about a fortnight ago and the cooler weather since that time, there has

been a general improvement in the water supply situation in the metropolitan area. The quantity of water stored in the Onkaparinga storages (Mount Bold and Happy Valley) is now 4,306,000 gallons which is 450,000,000 gallons above the target line. This means that if early autumn rains are received further pumping to the storages could possibly be avoided and in these circumstances it is advisable in the interests of economy to suspend pumping into the Onkaparinga River for the time being. If the autumn months are dry it could be necessary to pump some more water into the Onkaparinga in April and May.

Arrangements have been made to suspend pumping into the Onkaparinga as from today. The position will be kept under close observation and more water will be pumped into this river if and when this becomes necessary. I point out that it costs more to pump water into the Onkaparinga than into the Torrens, as two additional pumping lifts are involved, that is, the water must be pumped six times instead of four.

SCHOOL SUBSIDIES.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I have a letter from the honorary secretary of the Loxton Primary School Committee concerning subsidies paid to parent bodies for providing certain facilities at schools. It states, in effect, that although the committee realizes that the State Government is assisting to the fullest extent, the only solution seems to be to obtain additional grants from the Commonwealth Government. The committee is so concerned about the matter that it is calling a meeting on March 11. I have also heard that some school committees are buying sports equipment for schools and that, as no subsidy is available for such purchases, sporting firms have been asked to carry the account over until June 30, so that the sum to be paid can be included in next year's budget. Has the Minister of Education information on the shortage of subsidies to school committees, as this shortage is causing much concern in other districts as well as in my own? Further, is there any foundation for the statement that certain firms are being asked to carry over accounts until after June 30?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: A number of public statements about subsidies have recently been made. In fact, a statement appeared in last Friday's *Advertiser* in answer to a letter that appeared from, I think, Mr. Overland of the Murray Bridge South

Primary School, and another letter appeared on Saturday in the letter column (written by me, as Minister) containing information that was transmitted to the *Advertiser* on the Friday but omitted in the statement that appeared in Friday's edition. However, the newspaper, at my request, kindly placed the remaining information in Saturday's edition. Those two statements set out fully the position relating to subsidies. In fact, there was information additional to that which had already been publicly stated. I draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that it has been repeatedly pointed out that the amount of subsidy money on the Estimates this year is 10 per cent more than the amount made available in the previous year. This has been a common practice for many years. In addition, when the Government took office it found that subsidy payments had not been made for some months and that this had been the case in previous years. School committees and councils had their requests deferred because of the shortage of funds. When the decision to change the policy was made, about \$224,000 had then been spent on subsidies and about \$250,000 remained for the rest of the year. Had I not taken action, with the consent of Cabinet, to introduce a new policy for subsidy payments in order to distribute the remaining money equitably, then a similar situation would have arisen at the end of this financial year. The department is equitably distributing the available money and will also ascertain, within a few weeks, which schools are not taking up their allocations. If certain schools are not taking up allocations this money will be distributed to those requiring extra funds.

The latter part of the honourable member's question referred to sports firms holding over accounts. I have not previously heard of this practice and, in any case, it would have nothing to do with the department. Perhaps school committees and councils are involved in this; it is entirely their business. However, if they spend money on items that have not been approved by the department they cannot expect to receive a subsidy for these items because, if the department approved applications for subsidies after action had been taken by school councils or committees, then obviously there would be no control whatever of the funds available for subsidy payments.

TEA TREE GULLY SEWERAGE.

Mrs. BYRNE: The Sewer Design Engineer of the Engineering and Water Supply Department has been examining the Tea Tree Gully

sewage effluent system to ascertain how the existing system can be intercepted by the construction of departmental sewers. Can the Minister of Works inform me of the result of these investigations?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Director and Engineer-in-Chief has informed me that discussions are proceeding with the District Council of Tea Tree Gully in regard to the financial return from a proposed trunk sewer designed to take the effluent discharge from a number of common effluent drainage schemes operating in this area. The estimated cost of the trunk sewer is \$240,000 and it is anticipated that the department will report concerning this project shortly.

NEWCASTLE DISEASE.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: While in Victoria last week, I noticed a report in a Victorian newspaper that the dreaded Newcastle disease had broken out amongst poultry in New South Wales and Queensland and that action had been taken by the Victorian Executive Council to ban the import of poultry and eggs into Victoria. The report stated that Dr. Forbes (Commonwealth Minister for Health) had stated in Canberra that a probability existed that this disease would become Australia-wide. Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether action has been taken to prevent the import of poultry and eggs into South Australia from those States affected by the disease?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Swift action was taken last week. I received a deputation from people associated with the broiler industry who were concerned because Newcastle disease had been found in New South Wales. Later, I received a telephone call from the Victorian Minister of Agriculture, who said that tests made in Victoria showed no evidence of Newcastle disease there. He said also that, in order to protect the interests of the industry in Victoria, a ban would be imposed on the import of poultry and eggs from New South Wales and Queensland. He suggested that if South Australia did not take similar action Victoria would place a ban on the import of these products from this State. South Australia had previously placed a ban on imports from Queensland but not on the imports from New South Wales, and was taking tests. Tests have now been taken from many hatcheries, and in each case the result has been negative. Because of this, we have now banned imports from New South Wales. The Vic-

torian Government has been informed of this so that it will not ban imports from South Australia. Both South Australia and Victoria have placed a ban on the import of poultry and poultry products from New South Wales and Queensland.

QUARRY BLASTING.

Mr. HUDSON: Over the last year I have received many complaints from residents of Marino about blasting at the Marino quarry. It seems that because of the close proximity of the quarry residents are plagued continually not only by the noise of the continual blasting but also by the dust pall that hangs over the area on certain days. Will the Minister of Agriculture take up with the Minister of Mines the possibility of thoroughly investigating the practices at this quarry when blasting, and particularly whether, by the use of water, the dust menace in the area can be minimized?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Yes.

NURSING HOMES.

Mr. COUMBE: In the daily press last week the Premier was reported as saying that no further subsidies would be considered by the Government for buildings for the aged sick until the 1967-68 financial year. Will he say whether he was correctly reported and, if he was, whether this will mean that such projects now being planned, and some of those ready to be presented to the Government for approval in the normal way to satisfy this very urgent need in the community, will have to be deferred for a further 12 months? My question does not relate in any way to subsidy payments for work already approved: it deals only with new projects.

The SPEAKER: Although I do not intend to disallow the question, I think I said last week that questions asking whether press reports are accurate are regarded by Erskine May as inadmissible. I know it has been the practice to ask such questions, but I bring this to honourable members' attention for future reference.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: To the best of my knowledge a report appeared in the press one day last week. I had made a comprehensive statement to the press, and the press report was self-explanatory. If I had known that this question would be asked I would have had the full report here so that I could give it to the House, but I have not. I can say, however, that two applications were made by the one organization. One of

these had apparently not been properly presented, but the other had been properly presented and certain assistance approved. This will still be honoured, and the other application will be considered when it is presented for approval. To the best of my knowledge, it has not been presented for assistance. The entire commitment that existed prior to the present Government's taking office will be honoured: as the various works are completed the commitments will be honoured. Any other applications will be considered in their turn. I am not in a position to know what amounts will be involved, but if those amounts are more than the Government can meet in any one financial year they will be carried over to the next year. Where we are involved in providing assistance, there will be no repudiation by this Government.

Mr. COUMBE: I thank the Premier for his assurances and information. Is the Premier aware that some payments for work already approved by the Government have been deferred? Is he aware that in December last approval was given by the Chief Secretary for the payment of a subsidy on a \$2 for \$1 basis on the cost of furniture and fittings, amounting to almost \$8,000, which has all been purchased and is now being used by an approved nursing home, and that this home has now been informed that no funds will be available from the Government until the 1966-67 financial year to meet this approved expenditure? The home in question is the Kar-ingal Church of England Home. In view of the Premier's statement that commitments for all approved projects will not be repudiated, will he investigate this matter to see if settlement can be made this financial year so as to avoid acute embarrassment to the home, which purchased this equipment last August in anticipation of receiving a Government subsidy on approved items?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: As this department is not administered by me, all I can say is that inquiries will be made. However, I hasten to assure the honourable member that, if this was not the matter in which there was a complication, I see no reason why there should be a delay. I will inquire and inform the honourable member tomorrow, if possible, or communicate with him later.

RENTAL HOUSES.

Mr. CURREN: Earlier this month I asked the Premier a question regarding the number of current applications and the waiting times for housing trust rental houses in Renmark,

Barmera, Berri, Loxton and Waikerie. Has he a reply?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Housing Trust is currently building houses in the towns mentioned and has contracts let as follows: Renmark 15 houses; Barmera 15 houses; Berri 15 houses; Loxton 20 houses; and Waikerie 10 houses. These houses are being built under the trust's rental-sale programme and, as is usual, preference is being given to those applicants desiring to purchase houses. The trust is prepared to make some of these houses available specifically for rental purposes to assist with the housing of key workers to be recruited by local industry and, in fact, has already made arrangements for this. Additionally, when purchasers' requirements have been satisfied, these single-unit houses would be made available for rental, as well as any vacancies occurring in existing rental houses.

Current rental applications are held as follows: Renmark 25; Barmera 18; Berri 17; Loxton 17; and Waikerie 5. The trust's experience is that a proportion of applications are eventually suspended for various reasons. In some cases applicants purchase houses; some are temporary residents and leave the district. Therefore, it is likely that the effective number of applications would be less than the figures stated. The present waiting time for rental housing in each town, except Waikerie, is in the vicinity of from nine to 12 months and is expected to reduce as houses in present contracts are completed. Most of the applications for rental housing at Waikerie were received comparatively recently and a definite waiting time has not been established.

PORT NOARLUNGA FISHING.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Although there is a prohibition on spear fishing and certain restrictions on netting fish in the area of the Port Noarlunga reef, I understand that the regulations are not being observed. A certain amount of heat has been engendered concerning this matter, and I have been told that some jetty fishermen were trying to crown the underwater swimmers with 1-lb. sinkers. Although I cannot vouch for the accuracy of that statement, I think there is much unrest amongst interested people. Can the Minister of Agriculture say (or ascertain) whether the regulations are being observed?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I was sorry to hear of the crowning ceremony. I will take the matter up with the Director of Fisheries and obtain a report.

PIES AND PASTIES.

Mr. LAWN: Has the Premier a reply to a question I asked just before the adjournment regarding the price of pies and pasties?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: When pies and pasties were reconrolled in September, 1964, the price of pies was reduced by 1d. Following increased prices of meat and potatoes, an increase of 1d. on both pies and pasties was approved in August, 1965. The industry was obliged to carry the higher costs for some months before this increase was granted. The cost of beef, which comprises most of the filling of a pie, is still higher than the cost taken into account when prices were last adjusted. Since then, the industry has also incurred the 1½ per cent marginal wage increase and a £2 (\$4) a ton increase on flour.

With regard to pasties, potato prices have dropped by about 4d. a lb. since last August, but it is expected that prices will now start to rise again. Although prices of both meat and potatoes fluctuate from time to time, it is not desirable to have frequent variations in the prices of pies and pasties. As the present saving on potatoes is offset by the other increased costs outlined, it is considered that a reduction in prices is unwarranted at this juncture.

BLACKWOOD PROPERTY.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My question concerns an area of land at Blackwood. The Premier will recall that about last October he came up to the property of Mr. A. Keith Ashby at Blackwood (a number of other Cabinet Ministers also attended) on the occasion on which a transfer of Mr. Ashby's property at Blackwood was made to the Government for the purposes of the Botanic Garden. This was a very fine gift of land to the Botanic Garden. I do not know the exact acreage, but the value of the property would run into six figures in the old currency and certainly six figures in the new currency. On that occasion the Premier said all the proper things, and it was a very happy ceremony at the time of this most generous gift to the Government. Now Mr. Ashby's agents have received from the Commissioner of Land Tax a demand for the payment, because of the gift, of land tax going back for five years because the land is no longer being used for rural purposes. According to the two letters I have had (I have them here to show to the Premier if he wants to see them), both dated February 22, the amounts of land tax which it is demanded by the Commissioner Mr. Ashby should

pay, because he has given his land to the Government, are \$5,874.10 on one area and \$2,294.05 on another, an amount of about \$8,000 or £4,000 of back land tax demanded from a man who has already made a gift of well over £100,000 to the Government. I ask whether it is the usual policy of the Government to do this sort of thing. I hope that it is not, and I ask the Premier whether he will take up with the Commissioner of Land Tax the question of the remission altogether of this back land tax.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The answer to the latter part of the question is "Yes". However, I think that for the sake of decency if the honourable member had been generous enough to forward a copy of the correspondence (or if the owner of the property had done that) probably this matter could have been satisfactorily adjusted without all this unnecessary comment from the honourable member.

FAR NORTHERN RE-STOCKING.

Mr. CASEY: Because of the good rains in the Far North of the State and the lush feed that has become available in the last few months, cattlemen in that area are trying to move cattle back. As both the New South Wales and Queensland Governments are being compensated by the Commonwealth Government in the form of drought relief, can the Minister of Lands say whether he has had any requests for compensation for the cost of railing stock to the Far North, and whether the Government has approached the Commonwealth Government for assistance for these drought-stricken areas?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: To my knowledge one application has been received for a concession on rail freight of stock. I have not considered this matter but it is being considered by my departmental officers. The matter of assistance from the Commonwealth Government has been discussed with the Director of Lands, and I shall obtain a report for the honourable member.

UNROADWORTHY VEHICLES.

Mrs. STEELE: Has the Premier an answer to my question of January 25 about the dumping of unroadworthy vehicles in South Australia?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Commissioner of Police states:

I have furnished a separate report to the Registrar of Motor Vehicles for his consideration when he advises the Premier on this

matter, and will therefore confine my comments to the percentage of accidents attributed to mechanical defects. For the twelve months ended June 30, 1965, in the 27,038 traffic accidents involving all types of vehicles reported to this department, 232 persons were killed and 9,777 injured. An examination of the causes revealed that 549 of these accidents in which eight persons were killed and 265 injured, or approximately 2 per cent, were the result of defective equipment.

FREE SCHOOL BOOKS.

Mr. RYAN: Several years ago the raising of the school-leaving age from 14 to 15 years created a financial hardship for some families who desired to keep their children at secondary school. I understood that provision had been made for the issue of free school books where such issue was warranted because of the financial circumstances of the parents but, as a result of a recent application to the department, I find that this is not so. Can the Minister of Education say whether his department has considered this matter and whether it has a policy relating to parents in necessitous circumstances who cannot afford to pay for schoolbooks for students attending secondary schools?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: True, in the past there has been no properly defined policy of free books for secondary students where the parents were experiencing financial hardship. However, it has been the practice in primary schools for parents, who claim financial hardship, to complete and sign a departmental form setting out their circumstances and stating their position. The heads of the schools, if they considered the application genuine, would supply free books to those students. Most secondary schools have made different arrangements to assist real cases of hardship. They permit parents to pay for books on the instalment plan; they lend books, which are often not returned; and the school funds bear the cost of books above the Government allowance of \$16 to \$20. I have examined the matter because there have been many queries about this situation, and have decided, with the approval of Cabinet, to introduce to secondary schools the same arrangements that obtain in primary schools. A similar form will be used and the parents in this position will be asked to fill in the form. If the claim is regarded as satisfactory, the books will be provided free, but the money which would otherwise be credited to the parents (either \$16 or \$20) will not be credited because the books will be provided free to the students. These con-

ditions will apply to both Government and independent schools, as has been the case in primary schools in the past.

Mr. HEASLIP: I understand that from the beginning of next year the Government will introduce free school books for all schoolchildren. In the past, where a parent has bought books for a child entering a higher grade the used books have been sold to children coming into the grade which the child has just left, and the condition of the books has decided the amount to be paid for them. With the introduction of free school books these books, which are now held by the parents, will become valueless. Can the Minister of Education say whether his department will purchase these books at a valuation and then issue them to other pupils, thus saving the books from being wasted and reducing the overall cost of the free school book scheme?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Leader asked me to answer a question about the issue of free books and that answer, which was prepared for today, would cover all the points raised by the honourable member. The honourable member has suggested that students would receive the books and that the department should buy them back from the students. That is not intended at all. My answer to the Leader will explain that the books will remain the property of the department.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: If I understood the Minister correctly, I believe he said that in future secondary school students would be able to apply for books in the same way as primary school students apply and that the books would be supplied on the same basis as they are supplied to primary school students. I should like the Minister to comment on two matters. First, I understand that primary schoolchildren will be provided with only their text books and not their exercise books and so on. I understand that at present the sum provided for secondary schools is sufficient to cover all the costs. Secondly, at present the books remain the property of the child. As I understand the new provision, the books will not remain the property of the child but will be returnable to the department. Can the Minister of Education say whether my two surmises are correct?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I do not think that the Leader understood correctly my reply to the member for Port Adelaide. The alteration in regard to books for secondary school students has nothing to do with the free book issue to primary

schools in 1967: it is purely a new administrative measure in connection with hardship cases. At present, parents of primary school students suffering financial hardship fill in a form and the students receive the books issued provided that the headmaster or headmistress is satisfied of the financial hardship. In future, this provision will apply also in secondary schools where, previously, parents who stated that they were suffering financial hardship applied verbally to the headmaster and he had to rely on verbal inquiries as to the financial position of the parents. In future, parents of secondary school students will fill in the same type of form as has been filled in for many years by parents of primary school students. This form will be used as the basis. It is not correct to say that the present allowances (\$16, \$18 and \$20 respectively) are necessarily sufficient. Circumstances vary in different schools and I am having an inquiry made now as to whether these amounts are, in fact, sufficient and, if they are not, as to the extent by which they are insufficient. I am certain that in many cases parents have to find additional sums over and above the sums to which I have referred. The new measure has been introduced particularly to meet hardship cases, and it will be far more effective from the points of view of parents and of headmasters and headmistresses. I am sure it will be a better arrangement all round.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS.

Mr. JENNINGS: As I think it is generally understood that the current session of Parliament is ending, will the Premier give for the benefit of the House some indication of the Government's intentions for the sittings this week?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I shall be seeking leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Prices Act today, and I understand that the Attorney-General is to make a second reading explanation on a Bill to amend the Companies Act. In regard to the Wills Act Amendment Bill, I understand the Attorney-General will be recommending that the Legislative Council's amendments be disagreed to.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Will that be proceeded with?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I think so, as also will the debate on the Bulk Handling of Grain Act Amendment Bill. I hope that the House will agree not to proceed with the other Orders of the Day. Although I understand a conference between both Houses is to

occur, I hope that we shall be able to terminate the present session tomorrow evening at not too late an hour, and that I shall have the assistance of honourable members so that that can be done.

AFFORESTATION.

Mr. BURDON: I was interested to see a statement emanating from Canberra on February 24 in relation to a proposed long-term loan to Australian State Governments for increased forestry plantings of softwoods. As this question is vital to South Australia and, as I believe that we shall soon be running short of land, I believe this is a wise decision. The article to which I refer states:

This proposal envisaged annual plantings of 65,000 acres by the various Governments for the next 35 years and an average of at least 10,000 acres a year by private forest owners. . . . The Forestry Council had recommended the programme of softwood plantings as the best means of increasing local production. It had in mind the spectacular success and promise of exotic pine plantations, particularly *pinus radiata* which had already been established in Australia. Average growth rates several times those in the traditional softwood exporting countries of the northern hemisphere had been recorded.

Can the Minister of Forests report on this matter?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The matter was considered at the Forestry Council held at Bulolo, New Guinea, last year. Naturally, the Government is pleased that this money is to be made available by way of an interest-free loan for 10 years. Increased plantings will naturally lead to an increase in production and returns that will benefit all State Governments concerned. If we continue at our present rate of plantings we may run out of land in six or seven years' time. Although the Government purchased about 300 acres this week, it is difficult to purchase large areas with the finance available. At the Bulolo conference I suggested that this Government receive assistance through this loan for the purchase of land; I believe my suggestion was sympathetically received, and we shall be making a request in due course. I point out that, although suitable land is difficult to obtain, I believe that areas eminently suitable for forestry plantings exist in the South-East and in the hills districts. However, we shall have to await the decision of those responsible for the loan to see how the money will be apportioned. I believe that we have a reasonable claim for assistance, and I trust that we shall be successful.

SOUTH-EAST DRAINAGE.

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to the question I recently asked in relation to South-East drainage proposals?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Investigations are in hand for further Eastern Division proposals which will necessitate reference to the Land Settlement Committee. The proposals are not yet ready for presentation, but it may be possible to have them ready towards the end of this year. The following proposals are under consideration:

(1) an enlargement of Drain B downstream from section 254, hundred of Monbulla (where the drain crosses the Robe-Penola Road), and its extension through the hundred of Coles to the Bakers Range Drain;

(2) a branch drain from Drain B near section 254, hundred of Monbulla southerly through the hundred of Monbulla to the south-west corner of the hundred of Penola;

(3) a branch drain from Drain C near section 209, hundred of Killanoola in a south-easterly direction following an old station drain past Maaoupe Station;

(4) an extension of the Grey-Monbulla Drain westerly to the Bakers Range Drain;

(5) subsidiary drains into the proposed Killanoola Drain in the hundred of Killanoola;

(6) a branch drain in the Trihi area leading westerly into Bakers Range Drain; and

(7) an improvement of the Mount Burr Heath Drain.

PORT PIRIE CENTRE.

Mr. McKEE: Will the Minister of Education obtain a report on when the Port Pirie Occupation Centre for Retarded Children will be ready for occupation and on what consideration has been given to staffing the centre?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to obtain a report for the honourable member.

BULK HANDLING.

Mr. FERGUSON: Recently I asked the Minister of Agriculture about a committee set up to inquire into terminal silos for the bulk handling of grain. Can the Minister say whether a time limit was set for the presentation of the committee's report and, if it was, did the time expire yesterday?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: No time limit was set, but I hoped to have a reply for the honourable member while the House was in session. Last week I received a report from the committee stating that it had procured all the evidence it needed and had heard everyone that wished to tender evidence. It reported that it hoped to furnish a report early in March, and I hope that that report will arrive soon.

POTATOES.

Mr. LANGLEY: During the latter part of last year and early this year the price of potatoes rose to such an extent that it was beyond the means of most families to purchase the quantity of potatoes they required. Since that time the price has fallen considerably from 10c a pound to 4c a pound. Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether the price of potatoes will be stable in future?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: It is difficult, because of seasonal fluctuations, to have a set price for potatoes. Because of interstate competition a differential is fixed between the States to maintain an even supply of potatoes in South Australia. I believe it is important to try to maintain an even supply because, apart from Western Australia, this is the only State with a Potato Board. Therefore, it is necessary to treat this matter as it has been treated. I will take up with the board the matter of the recent fluctuations in price but, at the moment, I am unable to offer any reason for the reduction in price. However, I assure the honourable member that, when fixing a price, the board carefully considers all aspects of the supply of potatoes.

BREAD PRICES.

Mr. BURDON: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question regarding bread prices?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Prices Commissioner has reported that, to avoid a general increase on shop prices, wholesale prices of 2-lb. ordinary and 1½-lb. Vienna loaves were reduced by ½d., with shop prices remaining unaltered. A reduction of ¼d. was also effected on the delivered price of 2-lb. sliced and wrapped bread at Mount Gambier. To offset these losses to bakers, the wholesale price of a 2-lb. sliced and wrapped loaf was lifted by ¼d. and, to make up the 2c margin, the shop price had to be increased by 1d. Shop prices for bread in Mount Gambier are now the same as in Adelaide except for sliced and wrapped loaves, which are 1c higher. In view of the higher production costs in Mount Gambier as compared with Adelaide, this cannot be considered unreasonable.

TEA TREE GULLY LAND.

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to a question I asked on February 16 about preserving a section of land at Tea Tree Gully?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As indicated in the reply given by my predecessor in August

last year, several projects in various parts of the State are being considered for purchase during the present financial year. The Commissioners of the National Park and Wild Life Reserves have been asked to place the requirements on a priority basis, and at the moment the particular reserve mentioned by the honourable member is not on a top priority.

TORDON 50-D.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Some weeks ago I asked the Minister of Agriculture to obtain a report on the cost of Tordon 50-D and the possibility of the price being reduced to enable farmers to use it to control skeleton weed. Has the Minister a reply?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The Director of Agriculture reports:

Further investigations have shown that for the present the price of Tordon 50-D will remain fixed at \$17.90 a gallon. It is expected, however, that with increased use the companies involved will be able to make it available at cheaper rates. This has occurred with hormone herbicides, which were originally marketed at about \$3 a pound active and are now available at \$1 a pound. It should be recognized that Tordon 50-D is still very much in its infancy. Many variations of the actual chemical ingredients are available, and we are not certain which may prove the best for wide-scale use. No recommendations have been made by the Agriculture Department for its broad-scale use on cereal-growing land. At present its use is recommended only to attempt eradication of skeleton weed for small patches where the weed is just becoming established. It will be some months before final recommendations can be made and a toxicity clearance has been obtained. No problems are expected regarding toxicity, but it is considered that it will be wise to await proof from the United States Department of Agriculture. Considering all these aspects, it is considered that there are legitimate reasons for maintaining the present price structure.

TREES.

Mr. LAWN: My question arises out of an article in this morning's *Advertiser* headed "Trees not yet replaced". The first paragraph states:

There has been no attempt by the Education Department to fulfil its promise to plant double the number of trees axed in the West Parklands 18 months ago for Western Teachers College sportsfields.

Has the Minister of Education information on the matter mentioned in this article?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: A contract for the preparation of the oval was let on February 8, 1966, to F. T. and B. I. Thomson, and at the same time a contract was let to Ralph Curry Pty. Ltd., irrigation engineers, to provide the automatic watering system. The con-

tract, which includes the planting of 170 trees and 50 shrubs around the whole perimeter of the park, is expected to be completed by March 31, 1966. The majority of the trees removed, with the approval of the Adelaide City Council and after careful planning by an outside architect and the Public Buildings Department, were mainly substandard trees. Plans were designed to keep the fine stand of elms in the north-east corner and to remove healthy trees only where it was absolutely necessary to make the best possible use of the grounds for sporting purposes. The work did not begin as planned in October, 1965, because of a hitch in connection with the provision of the automatic watering system. It is not true to say that delays (beyond the control of the Education Department) in the development of this park were the reason why the Adelaide City Council rejected a request from the Education Department to lease a further 15 to 20 acres in the West Parklands. The reason given by the Adelaide City Council was that the Education Department had already leased large sections of the parklands and that the council considered that it should lease no more to the department. We asked for this additional parklands area, the offer of which had been rejected by various bodies, because we considered that the Education Department's reputation for care of parklands leased by it was very good. The care with which the Education Department has looked after the North Parklands leased to it for use by the Adelaide Teachers College has always been commented on very favourably by Adelaide City Councillors and, indeed, was no mean factor in getting the Adelaide City Council's decision to lease Park 25 for Western Teachers College.

PREFERENCE TO UNIONISTS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: As my question involves policy, it is directed to the Premier, although it concerns a man employed in a department administered by the Minister of Works. In about August, 1965, I asked the Premier several questions about the policy of the Government of giving preference in employment to unionists. I referred particularly to the Industrial Instruction No. 118, I think it was, which laid down that a non-unionist shall not be engaged on any work to the exclusion of a unionist who is adequately experienced to perform the work. This morning a man who is employed in the Public Buildings Department (and has been, I understand, for about 20 years) came to see me. A non-unionist, he was approached about a month ago by a

representative of a trade union to which he could belong if he desired to join a union and was asked why he was not a unionist and why he would not join, and he gave his reasons. Yesterday he was called in by one of his superior officers and was told that he was one of only four non-unionists in the particular section or department (I am not sure which), and this superior officer told him that he (the superior officer) has been told by the Director that if a unionist, even one not employed in the department at all, were seeking a position then he as a non-unionist would be put off the job if there were no vacancy. This, as I say, has caused great perturbation and upset to this man. I ask the Premier whether it is the policy of the Government that men will actually be put off if they are not unionists, and, if it is not (as I hope it is not), will the Premier take steps to make certain that the misunderstanding that has occurred in the Public Buildings Department is rectified?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: My information is that no person in the Public Buildings Department has been put off because he was a non-unionist. However, in view of the points raised (and I must query some of them from the outset) I will have the matter investigated if the names of the persons concerned are disclosed to the Government confidentially. If the names are not disclosed, nothing will be done.

MILK.

Mr. RYAN: Recently in a question to the Minister of Agriculture I pointed out that people were receiving notices from milkmen that following the introduction of decimal currency they were not paying the full amount for a pint of milk when they tendered 10½d., which is the fixed price, although they had not been notified of a price increase. Has the Minister received a report from the Milk Board on this matter?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The price of bottled milk as fixed by regulations under the Metropolitan Milk Supply Act became 9c a pint as from and including Monday, February 14. Acting on instructions issued by the Decimal Currency Board, the Milk Board advised consumers that payment during the transition period could be made in either of two ways:

1. By tendering 1s. (10c) and receiving change of 1c, or
2. By paying the £ s. d. equivalent of 9c as published in conversion tables, namely 11d.

The exact £ s. d. equivalent of the new price of 9c is 10.8d., compared with the former price of 10.5d. It is apparent, therefore, that there is a slight increase in price in the change to decimal currency. This was unavoidable in the circumstances. I might add that the bulk of this increase of .3d. has gone to the producer.

WEEDS.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I believe the Minister of Lands has a report on a question I asked recently about the danger of weed infestation in the Obelisk Estate and Waterfall Gully Reserve following the recent fire.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Director and staff of the National Park are well aware and view with concern the possible invasion of South African daisy into the recently burnt areas. Unfortunately, pre-germination herbicidal sprays are not practicable as these would undoubtedly affect the regeneration of native plants. The commissioners are taking all practical steps within limits of funds available to control this pest, but ultimate success will depend on all landholders and councils exercising equal concern. The greatest concentration of blackberries in the Cleland Reserve is at the top of the eastern end of Chambers Gully and this was the one portion of the reserve not burnt. Other areas of blackberries which were burnt will be watched, and at a suitable time herbicides will be applied to destroy these clumps.

SOLDIER SETTLEMENT.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to a question I asked recently regarding the problems of soldier settlers at Loxton?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am not yet in a position to say what further stage the Commonwealth Government has reached in its consideration of a suggested Royal Commission on war service land settlement at Loxton. I have made a further inquiry, but no reply is to hand.

MANOORA RAIL CROSSING.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: On February 9 I asked a question regarding the dangerous condition of the Manoora railway crossing. Has the Premier, representing the Minister of Transport, a reply to this question?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The officers of the Highways Department and the Railways Department have not yet submitted their report as to the priorities which

should be allotted to level crossings in respect of installation of warning equipment during the 1966-67 financial year. Accordingly, I am not able, at this juncture, to say whether such equipment will be installed at the level crossing just north of Manoora. Experience has shown that provision of such equipment does not necessarily provide assurance that mishaps will not occur thereafter.

ABATTOIRS.

Mr. McANANEY: I understand that a quota has been placed on stock killings at the abattoirs at Gepps Cross. I understand that the quota of one new company assisting producers to sell meat direct to butchers has been based on its killings during the last year, and as it is an expanding business the new quota system will unduly affect its killings and sales. Can the Minister of Agriculture ascertain how long this unsatisfactory position will last, and the reason for it?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I shall take the matter up with the Abattoirs Board and get a report for the honourable member.

DEAF CHILDREN.

Mrs. STEELE: I was very pleased to read in the newspaper a week or 10 days ago of the decision of the Minister of Education that a special class for deaf children should be attached to the Underdale High School, thus providing secondary education for these children; also, that the classrooms built at the Brighton Primary School should be used as a speech and hearing centre. I understand about 14 of these children about whom I am concerned are enrolled at this school. I am deeply interested in this question, because I am a member of the advisory panel for deaf and hard-of-hearing children, in addition to being associated with a school which provides education for deaf children. Many of the children attending this school come from areas around Klemzig and Hillcrest and, as the Minister has seen a map that I have also seen, he is aware that there is an extraordinary concentration of deaf and hard-of-hearing children in this area. Can the Minister of Education say whether something cannot be done to establish a speech and hearing centre in this area, and can he indicate the department's current policy and say whether something is expected to be done soon?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: As the honourable member knows, the Superintendent of Primary Schools conducted an exhaustive

inquiry into the question of the treatment of deaf and hard-of-hearing children, and recommendations were made to me. Two of them have been approved and are operating and the remainder are being considered. The question raised by the honourable member is at present being considered. I appreciate the difficulties and hope shortly to make an announcement that will be of great assistance to the parents.

AUBURN-EUDUNDA ROAD.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my question of February 16 about the sealing of a short strip of road between Auburn and Eudunda?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Roads reports that earthworks and sub-base on the unsurfaced portion of the road east of Marrabel are currently in hand. However, it is not expected that the surface course and sealing will be completed until the 1967-68 season.

GILBERT RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my question of February 16 about the completion of work on the bridge over the Gilbert River at Hamley Bridge?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Roads reports that work on the reconstruction of the Gilbert River bridge near Hamley Bridge has not yet commenced, and traffic is still using the old bridge. Tenders for the reconstruction of the bridge will be called in a week or two and it is expected that the work will be completed by about September.

CLOVERCREST SCHOOL.

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question of February 15 about the purchase of land in the Clovercrest area for a new primary school?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Education Department recently purchased a site of about 10 acres situated at the corner of Kelly Road and Wright Road, Clovercrest, as a site for a primary school, but there are no immediate plans for erecting a school on this site. However, planning is proceeding for a new primary and a new infants school at Para Vista and the erection of these will help to reduce the pressure on the Modbury Primary and Infants Schools.

KINDERGARTEN UNION.

Mr. COUMBE: Is the Minister of Education aware that officers of the South Australian Kindergarten Union are urgently and separately seeking additional funds to continue

and expand the union's work which is especially necessary in the newer developing areas of this State? Was an approach made to the Minister last November for an additional \$10,000 to carry on the work, and is it true that the Minister informed the union then that no further funds would be available until the next financial year? If this is so, and in view of the union's present financial position, will the Minister reconsider his earlier statements and re-examine the possibility of a further grant to the union this financial year to enable it to carry on its work?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: What the honourable member said in relation to the approach by the union is correct, and I regret to say that no funds are available for any increased grant this year. We appreciate the work done by this union, but there are many other aspects of education that need finance in greatly increasing amounts. As I have said publicly many times, the Education Department in this State must have further assistance from the Commonwealth Government if it is to meet all the needs of the people of this State.

UMPHERSTON CAVE.

Mr. BURDON: In company with the Minister of Forests, members of the Woods and Forests Department, and members of the Corporation of Mount Gambier, I inspected the Umpherston Cave several months ago. This is an old cave adjacent to the State sawmill, and the Corporation of Mount Gambier is interested in rehabilitating it as a tourist attraction. As I believe discussions between the Minister and members of the corporation were fruitful, can the Minister of Forests comment on the inspection?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I visited this old cave with the member for Mount Gambier and members of the Corporation of Mount Gambier, who requested that this area be dedicated to the council as a tourist attraction. The cave was previously operated as a tourist attraction by two elderly ladies. Impressed with the potential of this cave, I have informed members of the council that we are prepared to let them have this area on a reasonably long lease for a peppercorn rental so that the area may be developed. At the same time, the council asked whether I would make available land on which to plant trees to draw the attention of visitors to what is taking place in our forests. I have not yet agreed to this request, but the matter is being considered. I suggested to the council that the Woods and Forests Department,

in conjunction with the Radiata Pine Association, should erect a building in which could be shown the potential of pine for various furniture and other products. This suggestion, which was well received by the council and by the Woods and Forests Department, is now being considered. This building would assist the people of Mount Gambier in their quest for tourists, because it would be an added attraction to the cave.

SOUTH-EAST ELECTRICITY.

Mr. RCDDA: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about the progress on electricity supplies between Keith and Naracoorte?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The General Manager of the Electricity Trust reports:

The transmission line from Keith to Naracoorte is in two sections. The first section between Keith and Padthaway was completed in June, 1965. The contractor building the second section from Padthaway to Naracoorte has completed about 35 per cent of the work involved in the contract. Progress is satisfactory and it is expected that the line will be completed by the end of April.

ROLLING STOCK.

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked recently concerning rolling stock?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Minister of Transport reports that the 86 standard gauge bogie sheep vans now under tender are for use on the standard gauge railway now under construction between Port Pirie and Broken Hill. The stock carried on this line during 1964-65 was as follows: horses, cattle and calves, 86,083; sheep, 791,458; pigs and other animals, 7,980, totalling 886,521.

EVIDENCE BILL.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I guess the Attorney-General has studied the report of the Commissioner of Police laid on the table of the House earlier this afternoon, and I refer particularly to section 1.1 of the report under the heading "General" which, in the first paragraph, refers to the increase in unsolved crime in this State. The second paragraph then states:

In most instances these crimes can be solved only by investigative procedures which require interrogation of criminal suspects. I therefore earnestly request that careful consideration be given before any restriction is placed on police powers in regard to the interrogation of criminals.

I respectfully remind the Attorney-General that this is one of the matters contained in the

Evidence Act Amendment Bill which has been on the Notice Paper for many months and which, apparently (I take it from the Premier's answer about half an hour ago), is not to be debated either today or tomorrow, but is to be allowed to lapse. Will the Attorney-General say whether it is because of the Commissioner's comments that the Government does not intend to proceed with this matter, or whether some other reason exists for the Government's having introduced a Bill and not now proceeding with it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The matters contained in the Evidence Act Amendment Bill remain Government policy. The reason why the matter may not be debated in this session is that, honourable members opposite having taken so long about other matters, it is doubtful whether we can complete the debate on the measure this session. However, I urge the honourable member to remain ready, because we may well reach it and take it to the end of the second reading debate. If we can do that we can proceed with the measure without re-introduction next session; if we are unable to do that, then it can be re-introduced next session.

PAVING CONTRACTS.

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked on February 9 concerning paving work to be undertaken by B. L. & M. D. Pridham at police stations and schools?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Director, Public Buildings Department, informs me that the contract let to B. L. and M. D. Pridham Proprietary Limited for paving work extends to Yorke Peninsula and covers nine schools and two police stations; two schools only being in the honourable member's district, namely, Kangaroo Flat Primary School and Wasleys Primary School, where it is proposed to re-sheet, patch up and top-dress bitumen paving. The police stations concerned are at Minlaton and Wallaroo. It is proposed to construct a new area of paving at the Minlaton Police Station and to re-sheet and top-dress the existing paving at the Wallaroo Police Station.

SURGICAL AIDS.

Mrs. STEELE: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked towards the end of last year in relation to the exemption from sales tax of various surgical aids?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Commonwealth Treasurer has forwarded me the following letter:

I have now had the opportunity of examining your recent representations regarding the classification for sales tax purposes of certain surgical aids. The Commissioner of Taxation, to whom the matter was referred, has advised me that the sales tax law authorizes the exemption of a wide range of surgical goods which are sold exclusively or principally by manufacturers or distributors of surgical goods and are used exclusively or principally in hospitals or by medical practitioners. Various classes of goods used for general purposes are specifically excluded from the relevant exemption provision. I am advised by the Commissioner that inquiries conducted in connection with this matter have established that the shower chairs, raised toilet chairs and hydraulic lift-ups, specifically mentioned in your letter of December 13, 1965, come within the scope of the above exemption and thereby qualify for exemption from sales tax.

The Commissioner understands from information supplied by his Deputy Commissioner, Adelaide, that a South Australian manufacturer, Both Equipment Proprietary Limited, is particularly interested in this matter. You will be pleased to learn that other items manufactured by this company such as self-help poles, raised toilet seats, a special bath rail and shower stools have also been accepted as qualifying for exemption because they are sold principally to hospitals. However, an adjustable overbed table, being one of the classes of goods specifically excluded from the relevant exemption, does not qualify for exemption and is subject to sales tax at the rate of 2½ per cent. The Commissioner is arranging for suitable advice to be forwarded to Both Equipment Proprietary Limited.

ANTHRAX.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Will the Minister of Agriculture ascertain what steps can be taken to prevent an outbreak in South Australia of anthrax, a serious disease that is causing concern in other States?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Having noticed a recent article on this dangerous disease, officers of my department are fully conscious of the matter and are taking all precautions to ensure that the disease does not enter South Australia. However, I shall obtain a report for the honourable member.

KANGAROO CREEK DAM.

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I recently asked concerning progress on the Kangaroo Creek dam on the Torrens River?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Director and Engineer-in-Chief reports:

No major hitches are anticipated in the design of the Kangaroo Creek dam as now proceeding. The department will be in a position to call tenders for diversion works for the dam in May. This constitutes part of the scheme that has been changed little from the original proposal. It is anticipated that the department will be in a position to call tenders for the main structure in September or October next. On account of the nature of the foundations, it was not possible to proceed with the dam as originally designed, and the new dam has been designed to conform with the now known geological conditions within the foundations. It may, however, be found necessary because of these changes to again refer the matter to the Public Works Committee. If this is found necessary, it will be done about July.

EGG BOARD CHARGES.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my question of February 15 with regard to a charge of 1c a dozen being made over and above the per bird levy?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The circular in question was sent to those producers who hold an authority issued by the board permitting them to make sales of eggs. In the past the board bought and sold eggs at the same price. Prior to the introduction of the bird levy on July 1, 1965, as a result of Commonwealth legislation, all State egg marketing boards relied on a local egg levy to finance their operations. This levy, which varied from time to time, was used to meet losses sustained through the export of surpluses, local marketing and pulping costs as well as administration. The local levy was discontinued by all State boards with the commencement of the bird levy payment by producers. The basis of this Commonwealth levy was that the proceeds would be used to meet the losses experienced by the State boards in the oversea disposal of their surpluses. However, the marketing of eggs and egg products within its borders still remains the responsibility of each State board. With the loss of the local levy, and in the absence of any other source of income of sufficient magnitude, the concept of buying and selling eggs at the same price has become impossible. It is for this reason that the board has now fixed a wholesale selling price for eggs 1c above the price paid to producers. A differential between the buying and selling price of eggs by a board is not new, and has, in fact, been practised by other State egg marketing boards for a number of years.

FREELING SCHOOL.

Mrs. BYRNE: Following an inspection of the Freeling Primary School on December 9,

I wrote to the Minister of Education seeking information as to the department's intentions on the erection of new toilets (which are desirable) at the school. Has the Minister a reply?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: A report from the Public Buildings Department indicates that drawings have been completed and that an estimate of cost is now being prepared. A submission is to be made shortly for approval of funds. The Public Buildings Department expects that tender documents will be completed and tenders called in about four to six weeks from the date funds are approved.

WHARFAGE RATES.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: A regulation increasing the wharfage rates on certain commodities was tabled in this House and in another place. The matter was debated in another place and the Chief Secretary, on behalf of the Government, undertook that one basic commodity would be the subject of an amendment. On this undertaking members in another place did not continue to press for the disallowance of the regulation. Can the Minister of Marine say whether that amendment is being prepared (as some time has elapsed since the debate) and whether, when it is prepared, refunds will be made to those who have paid since the undertaking was given?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I understand that the agreement will be honoured but I was not aware of an agreement on refunds.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: I am talking about refunds of payments made since the undertaking was given.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Provision will be made operative from the day of the agreement, and the preparation of this provision will be made as soon as possible.

TECHNICAL EDUCATION.

Mrs. STEELE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question of last week relating to a technical education week being held in Western Australia and asking whether members of the department had considered holding a similar week in South Australia?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The project referred to by the honourable member is the 1966 technical training year, which is being held in Western Australia this year and is being sponsored by the Western Australian State Government and the Commonwealth Government of Australia. Planning has been proceeding for about four years and includes a Pan Indian Ocean Conference on Technical Education, the holding of many Australian

conferences in Perth during the year, the focusing month by month on fields of technical education and the holding of school and factory visits, the official opening of the Western Australian Institute of Technology and the bringing of technical education to the minds of the people in many other ways. This is obviously a very complicated and large organization. The South Australian Government has not given, nor does it intend to give, for the time being at least, any consideration to such a project. I have much detailed information concerning this technical training year in Western Australia which I shall be pleased to make available to the honourable member.

NAILSWORTH SCHOOLS.

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question of February 17 regarding an investigation into congestion at the Nailsworth schools?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The congestion at the Nailsworth schools site is well known to officers of the Education Department. Late last year the honourable member informed my officers that two houses adjacent to the schools were available for purchase. That information was followed up, but it was found that at the time neither house was on the market for sale. The owners have been advised of our interest should the houses be available for purchase at a later date. The position with respect to other properties adjacent to the schools will be watched and should any land become available consideration will be given to its purchase. The desirability of replacing wooden buildings with multi-storey solid construction buildings is clearly recognized. However, in view of the Education Department's heavy commitments to provide essential new schools and major additions to schools in areas where the population is rapidly expanding, and bearing in mind the amount of finance available, it is not possible for such action at Nailsworth to be taken soon.

VIETNAM.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In the *Australian* of Saturday, February 19, appeared an advertisement headed "Mr. Vice-President Hubert Humphrey", which stated:

Because peace is the right of all men, we call on you to urge the United States of America to bring about peace in Vietnam by stopping the bombing of North Vietnam, calling for a cease-fire, negotiating a peace according to the Geneva Agreement of 1954, and withdrawing all United States military forces as soon as possible.

Under that statement there are a number of signatures, including that of the honourable the Attorney-General, as follows:—Mr. Don Dunstan, M.P., Q.C., S.A. Some other Parliamentarians (including Mr. Clyde Cameron, Senator Cavanagh, and one or two others from this State) signed it, but no other Cabinet Ministers signed. In view of that fact, I ask the Premier, as Leader of the Government, whether the Attorney-General appended his signature to this letter with the knowledge and approval of the Government.

HILLS SEWERAGE.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the Premier is not going to answer my previous question, I have another one.

The SPEAKER: I have asked the honourable member on previous occasions not to comment.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I want to ask something on another subject, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Very well. The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am sorry I did not get an answer to my first question.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is a constant offender in this regard, and I must ask him to desist.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am sorry, Sir. I want to ask a question now on a completely different topic, a quite innocuous one. About 10 days ago there was referred to the Public Works Committee a proposal for sewerage in the southern suburbs: I put it as vaguely as that. However, in the newspaper report of the reference it was stated that this was the first step in the programme of sewerage in the hills areas of my electoral district. Last year the Minister of Works was kind enough to answer one of my questions and to say that on indications then it would be about 10 years before sewerage would be installed in the hills areas. A good deal of comment has arisen in the hills because of the recent report in the newspaper, and hopes have been raised that the reference will speed up the provision of sewerage in the hills. I therefore ask the Minister whether the reference to the Public Works Committee means that the time table of the Government has been revised and whether it will now not be as long a wait as the Minister last year told me to expect.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The honourable member kindly indicated that he would ask a question on this topic, and I have therefore obtained the following report from the Director and Engineer-in-Chief:

The provision of a sewerage scheme for the large area of Blackwood-Belair depends on the completion of a portion of a major scheme of reorganization of the sewerage system of the south-western suburbs. This proposal is now under examination by the Public Works Standing Committee, and evidence will be given next Tuesday, March 8. Subject to the report of the Public Works Standing Committee, it is intended that a sewerage scheme for the Blackwood-Belair area will be included in the departmental long-range works budget to commence in the financial year 1968-69, provided Loan funds are available.

CITY BUILDINGS.

Mr. LAWN (on notice):

1. How many buildings have been erected since July 1, 1924, within the area under the jurisdiction of the Adelaide City Council?
2. How many of these buildings do not comply with regulation 257 of the Second Schedule of the Building Act?
3. Why did the Adelaide City Council permit the Advertiser building to be erected without complying with regulation 257 of the Second Schedule of the Building Act?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The replies are:

1. Altogether, 1,549 building applications for new buildings have been approved by the Adelaide City Council since July 1, 1924.
2. All buildings are required to comply with the Building Act and regulations made thereunder. The Adelaide City Council has no record of any building not complying with regulation 257 of the Second Schedule of the Building Act.
3. Provision for cleaning windows of the Advertiser building was accepted as complying with requirements of the Act. It is similar to many other buildings, both public and private, erected in the metropolitan area.

FLINDERS UNIVERSITY TRANSPORT.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What public transport from the hills districts to the east and from the areas to the north, south and west, at present serves the district in which the Flinders university is situated?
2. Will this be adequate to serve the university?
3. If not, what action does the Government propose to take?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The replies are:

1. The undermentioned bus services, which are licensed by the Municipal Tramways Trust, serve the district in which the Flinders university is situated:

Blackwood-Adelaide *via* Shepherds Hill Road and South Road.
Darlington-Adelaide *via* Sturt Road and South Road.

In addition, services licensed by the Transport Control Board and operating between Adelaide and Christies Beach, Noarlunga, Willunga, Mount Compass, Victor Harbour, Clarendon, Strathalbyn, and Meadows, pass the university site.

2. Sufficient information is not yet available to determine whether existing bus services will meet requirements. The university authorities are obtaining information from those enrolling for courses as to their transport needs and, as a result of information already received in this way, the following arrangements are being made:

Special morning and afternoon buses will be operated between Victoria Square and the university *via* Grote Street, Hilton Road, South Road and Sturt Road.

A special bus will be operated morning and afternoon between Victoria Square and the university *via* Wakefield Street, Hanson Street, Unley Road, Price Avenue, Springbank Road, Goodwood Road, Daws Road and South Road. These buses will proceed into the university grounds and convey students to and from the university buildings.

3. When further details are known about the transport requirements of students, the position will be re-examined to determine whether additional services should be provided.

STATE AID FOR SCHOOLS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): What is the policy of the Government on State aid to independent schools?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: This has been already stated by the Minister of Education to the House.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Is the Government awaiting information before formulating policy of State aid for independent schools?
2. If so, what is the nature of this information and from whom is it expected to come?
3. When does the Government expect to receive this information?
4. Will the Government then be in a position to announce its policy on this matter?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The replies are:

1. No.
2. See 1.
3. See 1.
4. The Government's policy has been announced by the Minister of Education and there is no change. Existing benefits will be

maintained. Free school books for primary schoolchildren will be given next year. The Attorney-General will not take a relationship action before the High Court over section 116 of the Commonwealth Constitution.

OUTER HARBOUR PASSENGER TERMINAL.

The SPEAKER laid on the table Report No. 2 by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on Outer Harbour Passenger Terminal.

Ordered that report be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE: MR. L. C. HUGHES.

Mr. JENNINGS moved:

That two weeks' leave of absence be granted to the honourable member for Wallaroo (Mr. L. C. Hughes) on account of ill health.

Motion carried.

PRICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (WINE GRAPES).

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Prices Act, 1948-1965, and to make certain provisions governing the prices of grapes, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.
I thank members for allowing me to proceed with this Bill. On short notice, I approached the Leader, told him of the purposes of this Bill, and asked whether he would consider passing it today so that it would go to another place. I understand he is prepared to do what he can to assist its passage. The Bill's object is to provide for the fixing of minimum prices for grapes for the 1966 vintage. This action is considered necessary following the inability of winemakers and grapegrowers to reach agreement on prices to be paid. Every effort has been made to assist winemaker and grapegrower representatives to reach agreement. The background and details of the various meetings which have been held are as follows.

The Royal Commission into the Grapegrowing Industry recommended that minimum prices of each variety of grape to be paid to the grape growers by the winemakers for their 1966 vintage should be the subject of negotiations between the two parties, and that a committee be appointed by the Government to conduct these negotiations, the committee to

consist of a person to be appointed as chairman, two persons nominated by the Wine Grape Growers' Council of South Australia, and two persons nominated by the Wine and Brandy Producers' Association of South Australia Incorporated. This committee was duly appointed in January under the chairmanship of the Prices Commissioner.

A meeting of the committee was held on January 25. At this meeting, growers requested increases of an average of \$12.90 a ton in the dry areas and \$17.85 in the irrigated areas. Winemakers offered to pay some increases and some reductions, averaging an increase of 11c a ton in the dry areas and 37c a ton in the irrigated areas. The next meeting was held on January 27. At this meeting winemakers' representatives tabled a letter from the Wine and Brandy Producers' Association stating that, in view of the wide divergence of opinion on grape values between grapegrowers and winemakers, the executive had decided that it would be in the best interests of both growers and makers for grapes to be sold privately by individual negotiation.

A meeting was then called by the Minister of Agriculture on February 3 which the committee attended, and at which it was decided that the committee would meet again on February 4 and the Prices Commissioner, as Chairman of the committee, would suggest reasonable increases for further discussion by members and for reference back by the winemakers' representatives to their executive. Following this meeting, winemakers requested a meeting with the Minister of Agriculture which was held on February 10 and at which it was decided that the Prices Commissioner should act as Chairman of a meeting of eight winemakers and eight grapegrowers on February 16 to discuss the position further.

At this meeting on February 16, which lasted for five hours, neither winemakers nor grapegrowers would budge from their original proposals made on January 25, and no agreement was reached. Following further consideration, winemakers decided that they would offer to pay increased prices amounting to an average increase of \$1.96 a ton in both dry and irrigated areas. This offer was submitted to the Premier on February 22. The next day the Premier held a meeting with grapegrower representatives who refused to agree to the offer on the grounds that it was inadequate. They were requested to submit the minimum prices that they were prepared to agree to for the 1966

vintage and, after further consideration, submitted desired increases amounting to an average of about \$3.50 a ton in the dry areas and \$6.22 a ton in the irrigated areas.

As there appears to be no possibility of agreement being reached between winemakers and grapegrowers for this year's vintage, this legislation is necessary to protect the interests of grapegrowers. The Government will proceed with the price fixing proposals recommended by the Royal Commission. However, it is evident in the event of that mechanism breaking down, the Government must have means to enforce an equitable settlement. This Bill gives power to the Government to fix prices on the recommendations of the Prices Commissioner if other attempts to fix satisfactory grape prices fail.

I deal now with clauses of the Bill itself. Clause 3, which is modelled on section 21 of the principal Act, will enable the Minister to fix and declare minimum prices for the sale or supply of grapes to winemakers and distillers of brandy. Under the principal Act, the Minister is empowered only to fix maximum prices for declared goods and services. The provision for fixation of minimum prices for grapes is contained in new section 22a. New section 22b, which is modelled on section 25 of the principal Act, will make it an offence to sell or supply to winemakers or brandy distillers any grapes below the minimum price. Subsection (2) makes it an offence for winemakers and distillers of brandy to buy or obtain grapes below the minimum price. In both cases the penalty is not less than \$400. Subsections (3), (4), (5) and (6) of new section 22b are machinery provisions designed to ensure the carrying out of the earlier provisions.

New section 22c provides for the variation of agreements for the sale or supply of grapes by the substitution of the minimum price for the price otherwise payable, and those provisions apply to all agreements made this year, thus covering the present year's vintage. New section 22d is modelled on section 31 of the principal Act and provides that any offer to pay prices below the minimum shall be an offence. There has been an omission in drafting which has to be corrected. New section 22e provides:

Sections 22a, 22b, 22c, and 22d shall not apply to or affect the sale or supply of grapes to a society registered or deemed to be registered under the Industrial and Provident Societies Act, 1923-1958, by a member of that society, or any payment made by such a

society to a member of that society for or in respect of grapes supplied to the society by that member.

In other words, it will exempt from the operation of the new provisions the supply of grapes to co-operatives by members thereof. Clause 4 is consequential. Under section 50 of the principal Act the punishment for offences differs according to whether they are prosecuted summarily or upon information. As in the case of summary prosecution, the maximum penalty is \$200 or six months' imprisonment and new sections 22a, 22b and 22d provide for a minimum penalty of \$400 which is necessary to make express provision in this regard. By this legislation the Government is endeavouring to alleviate the position in the industry, bearing in mind the large sums that have been invested in it to settle many ex-servicemen. The Government is offering some protection to growers who, after all, should at least have an opportunity to enjoy a reasonable standard of living as a result of their efforts in the industry.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Leader of the Opposition): The Premier is correct in saying that I have agreed to continue this debate forthwith, for I realize that Parliament is due to rise soon and that, unless the debate continues forthwith, the matter will lapse. This is one of the most important Bills to be introduced, for it will have far-reaching effects on the wine industry, which is vital to the State's economy. I rather regret that it was not introduced (together with other measures) at a more appropriate time, so that members would have been able to consider the matter more fully. Of course, the matter is complicated (and the Premier unfortunately forgot to mention this in his second reading explanation) by the fact that section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution provides that trade and commerce between the States shall be absolutely free and that each industry in South Australia shall compete with industries established and rapidly expanding in Victoria and New South Wales in particular. Every member of the Opposition desires that grapegrowers receive the best possible price for their produce, notwithstanding a certain advertisement published immediately prior to the last election, almost a year ago to the day, which stated that the Liberal Government had not done the right thing by the grapegrowers, and that, in fact, it intended to betray them. It was rather interesting to note in the recent Royal Commission's findings that grapegrowers,

under a Liberal Government, had done significantly better than they had done under another Government.

In fact, the Labor Government's negotiations last year had a tragic effect on growers, for honourable members will see from the report of the Royal Commission that in almost every instance the price paid for grapes under the new Government was far below that paid pursuant to negotiations that had continued (and continued successfully, if I may say so) for five years. It is astounding that negotiations should continue successfully for five years and then, with a change of Government, suddenly and completely break down, to the detriment of the growers and of the industry generally. This Bill arises directly because the present Government's negotiations were merely power negotiations. We all know that after the election the Premier continued negotiations and immediately threatened the industry with a Royal Commission. I can well imagine that members representing winegrowing districts are perturbed at what is happening. If members look at page 12 of the Royal Commission's report they will see that no increase has occurred in any particular price and that, in fact, some prices have fallen by as much as \$10 a ton under a Government that promised electors they would "live better with Labor." Unfortunately, that slogan certainly did not apply to grapegrowers.

This year we again got off to a bad start; the Royal Commission recommended that a committee be appointed, but I am informed that winemaker representatives on the committee did not even receive any terms of reference. Then, I understand, those representatives pointed out that they had no power to commit their members in this matter. I suggest that, once again, we have seen negotiations carried on under the worst possible condition for reaching an agreement, but under the best possible conditions for continuing a disagreement. The Bill, hurriedly prepared, does not deal with any of the problems confronting the industry today. It is obvious that the person who prepared the Bill did not read the Royal Commission's report: the Commission's recommendations were against the provisions in the Bill. The Commission did not suggest that the Prices Commissioner should fix the price of grapes; rather, it suggested that negotiations should take place under a chairman appointed by the Governor. I assumed that the chairman would be a person completely disinterested in this matter. However, the

Government has appointed as chairman the Prices Commissioner, the office previously used in the interests of jacking up prices for the growers.

My Government originally appointed the Prices Commissioner in connection with grape prices in an endeavour to obtain the best prices possible for growers. Under Mr. Murphy, growers received hundreds of thousands of dollars benefit. I have never advocated that he was appointed for any reason other than to secure the rights of growers. Therefore, if there is to be a committee to fix the price of grapes surely it would be only proper to have as chairman a person recommended by both sides as suitable for that position. After all, there are two sides to this matter. In arbitration matters, arbitrators from both sides are appointed and if they cannot agree they call in a third arbitrator. In this case the Government saw fit to appoint as chairman the occupier of an office which has for years been associated with fixing the price of grapes as high as possible. Although I may be open to criticism for my part in this, I believe that on at least one or two occasions the price of grapes was fixed at an uneconomic level considering the rapidly increasing production in the Murrumbidgee area.

For many years South Australia was the principal wine-producing State in the Commonwealth. In the last few years there has been a tendency amongst winemakers to drift away from South Australia and much planting is taking place in the Eastern States, particularly in New South Wales. We saw the rapid emergence of the Hunter River district, and more recently (in the last five years) we have seen the production of the Murrumbidgee irrigation area double. South Australian winemakers have become more and more interested in the New South Wales production because the prices charged in South Australia have been higher than those charged in New South Wales when the freight differential is taken into account. The Royal Commission puts this down at 10c a gallon, which means that the differential in favour of the Murrumbidgee area is about \$14 a ton. The price of grapes in the Murrumbidgee area is not fixed in the same way as the price of grapes is fixed in South Australia. However, to the best of my knowledge, grapes from the Murrumbidgee area cost \$2 a ton more than grapes from South Australia. However, with the freight differential the Murrumbidgee area has an advantage of about \$14 a ton. In other words,

South Australia no longer has a monopoly of the wine industry.

The Royal Commission emphasized the fact that if the industry is to be properly stabilized this can be done only on a Commonwealth basis. If Commonwealth stabilization is not effected, every time a winemaker is placed in a disadvantageous position in South Australia he will be more likely to buy grapes from the other States. We cannot afford to overlook this fact: the production in the Murrumbidgee area has doubled. Previously, the limiting factor of development in the Murrumbidgee area was the shortage of water but, because of the Snowy Mountains scheme, the position has completely altered. Now the Murrumbidgee area will be further extended. At page 6, the report of the Royal Commission states:

Figures obtained from the New South Wales Department of Agriculture indicate the acreage planted to wine grapes in the Murrumbidgee irrigation area has "increased from 4,338 at December, 1961, to 5,368 at December, 1964. Assuming yields of seven tons per acre, the vintage will increase by about 2,000 tons per annum if expansion continues at the present rate." The production of wine grapes in the Murrumbidgee irrigation area has virtually doubled since 1960 to exceed 36,000 tons in 1965.

Those figures speak for themselves. At present the price of grapes in the Murrumbidgee area has not been fixed for this year but is waiting on the South Australian price. It will probably go up this year \$2 on what it was last year. Last year it had a margin in favour of making the wine in New South Wales of about \$12 a ton, so we can see just how careful we have to be in this legislation. The price has been fixed this year in the Mildura area at approximately the same price as we paid in this State last year. Those are the facts. The problems confronting the industry today are over-production, increased stocks in bond, and falling markets. There has been some increase in table wine production, but honourable members know that that does not take nearly as great a tonnage of grapes as do the other types of wine or brandy.

Winemakers in this State over a period of years have honoured an agreement they have made with the Government and have purchased in excess of what they actually required. I found that they were keen negotiators but that when they made an agreement they stuck to it and did their utmost to see that the agreement was effective. As I said, they purchased in excess of their requirements to keep the surpluses off the market. Indeed, I think that

until last year (when no agreement was reached and when there was a surplus of some 4,000 tons, I think) the total surpluses over the 5-year period amounted to only about 1,600 tons. Therefore, the agreement was effective and, I believe, beneficial for the grower.

The real question is what the effect of this legislation will be. I was hopeful that when the Premier gave his second reading explanation (which was quite short for a measure of such importance) he would say that whatever price was determined the Government would support that price in an active manner. I say advisedly that if the Government is not prepared to do that, the price will react very sharply against the industry and against some growers and will, I believe, lead to a chaotic condition.

Two or three features of this Bill give me cause for considerable concern. First, the Bill obviously was very hastily prepared. In fact, since it was brought down here amendments have had to be introduced to exclude from the operations of the Bill the co-operative societies. The Bill as drawn up undoubtedly included those organizations, for the word "price" appeared in the relevant clause, and as it is defined in the principal Act it brought the co-operative societies well and truly into the picture. Therefore, it has been necessary to paste a hurriedly prepared amendment on to the Bill for consideration when we get into Committee. Incidentally, there are one or two drafting weaknesses which I will deal with at the appropriate time.

What is the position regarding these co-operatives and their impact upon the industry? In 1960, when we first started to intervene and to assist the growers in getting a better price for their grapes, one of the great difficulties was that in some instances the winemakers were being gravely undercut by the co-operatives. The co-operatives do not buy the grapes and do not pay for the grapes, except over an extended period. They frequently sell the grapes in bulk to winemakers and spirit makers. In fact, many co-operatives do not have a retail outlet. In other States they sell the grapes in bulk to merchants. We found that one of the things that prevented a better price for grapes was the fact that the co-operatives (and one or two other winemakers were involved, also) were continually cutting prices: the end price of the product was continually being cut. One of the useful things Mr. Murphy did was to get the winemakers together and arrive at some semblance of order in the policy of selling.

Without that semblance of order in selling, how can any winemaker buy grapes under any assurance at all? There is no control whatever on the method by which the co-operatives in the irrigation areas dispose of their grapes. They can sell their products to a winemaker at a lower price than that at which he could possibly buy the grapes and process them himself. Obviously, in those circumstances the winemakers would not be able to operate. I think those co-operatives in the irrigation areas probably take in something of the order of 40 per cent or 50 per cent, so a large volume of grapes is excluded from the Act. Therefore, those co-operatives can undercut, and they have done so in the past.

Mr. Murphy was instrumental in getting a semblance of agreement between the winemakers and the co-operatives on a selling policy that would not hammer the industry down into the dust but would keep it on a relatively profitable basis. That is a weakness in the Bill that I do not know how to overcome. In new section 22a (2) the Government has gone into a rigmarole about what the Minister can do under the Act, but I am not sure what it means, and perhaps neither does the Minister know what it means. One thing the Minister cannot do is to solve the financial problems that arise every year in this industry. The financing of it is an enormous undertaking. The Premier did not say that the Government would finance the co-operative or do other things that may be necessary to enable the prices to be paid. Nothing has been said about finance being available to support the industry, but unless this is available it is futile to fix a price without fixing a time in which the payment for the grapes must be made. At present the resources of winemakers are fully extended to hold the stocks, and unless the price is to be payable at a certain date the whole structure of price fixing falls to the ground. Under the Commonwealth Sugar Concession Act the price is set out and the concession is not obtained unless the price is paid by a certain date.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: That is fixed under the Wine Export Bounty Act.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes, and unless it is fixed here the legislation is rendered futile. I do not believe that the winemakers have the resources to finance the coming vintage on a cash basis, and I have evidence to show that that is the case. I hope the Premier will give much more information when he replies to this debate, and will state categorically that, whatever the price is, the

Government will support the industry by financing the additional price for both the co-operatives and the private firms. Unless that is done a price will be fixed that cannot be paid except for a limited quantity of grapes; and many growers, adversely affected, will sell a comparatively small part of their vintage. There seems to be no question of equalization in this Bill, nor is it possible to effect that. This problem can be dealt with only on a Commonwealth basis, and I was disappointed at the attitude of the Minister of Agriculture in not exerting more pressure at the recent Agricultural Council meeting. There is every reason why the Commonwealth Government should stabilize this industry: it receives enormous revenue from it. No reason exists why grapegrowers should live on a pittance when proper stabilization could be effected by the Commonwealth Government and other State Governments assisting this industry. It is entirely wrong for a Minister to be placed in the position he is by this Bill. The Minister can fix any price anywhere at any time and, in addition, can fix different prices in the same district, and can attach conditions to any price. He becomes the beginning and the end of the industry.

Mr. Shannon: He can fix a sliding price, too.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: That is fundamentally unsound. It may be good Socialism, but it is completely and entirely wrong for the future of this industry. New section 22c alters agreements that have already been entered into, and sets a price payable for grapes that have been sold or where a contract has already been entered into. That is morally wrong.

Mr. Coumbe: This could break an existing agreement.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: No Government can defend that provision; it is morally indefensible. Whatever the merits of the Bill are, I quite frankly say that unless this feature of it is examined before the third reading stage I shall vote against the third reading, notwithstanding the fact that my colleagues and I would do everything possible to help the grapegrowers receive a fair price for their produce. Any legislation that seeks to break an agreement is rotten to the core, and I do not care who hears me say it. Indeed, I will say it in any grapegrowing district. The member for Chaffey can laugh. Suppose, when a price is fixed, the Government has different ideas, and fixes one below that fixed pursuant to an agreement. The honourable member

would not laugh then. He knows that it is an indefensible act to make a retrospective provision of this description that can drive a firm into insolvency. How is such a provision justified when an agreement already exists? Any Government that attempts to do that deserves the immediate censure of the community. I shall attempt to have this provision amended in Committee and, if necessary, divide the House on it. I will not vote for a clause of such a rotten conception as this one. New section 22e, which, like the rest of the Bill, has been hastily prepared, states:

Sections 22a, 22b, 22c and 22d shall not apply to or affect the sale or supply of grapes to a society registered or deemed to be registered under the Industrial and Provident Societies Act, 1923-1958, by a member of that society, or any payment made by such a society to a member of that society for or in respect of grapes supplied to the society by that member. That means that a Loxton grower may have a surplus of grapes but that, because he is not a member of a co-operative, even though he may have a surplus of grapes of the type desired by a co-operative, those grapes cannot be purchased, except for cash. It is obvious from what the Premier has stated today that the Government will not make additional finance available to the co-operatives. We can see no great criticism of South Australian winemakers in the Royal Commission's report. Indeed, it is categorically stated that no undue profits were being made by them and that in some cases losses were being incurred. It was stated that the big problem in the industry related to excessive charges levied by the Commonwealth Government. This is referred to fully at page 32, and I quote:

Although there is considerable variation in costs and returns for production between wine-makers, in general the margin between costs and wholesale prices is not unreasonable. Generally figures obtained from winemakers show that a larger return is received from brandy than bulk wine. . . .

The Royal Commission did not find that wine-makers had used strong-arm tactics with regard to fixing prices. In fact, it found that it was necessary to approach the matter on a national basis, and rather recommended against the type of legislation that we are now considering. Page 14 of the report states:

Growers have also in some cases advocated that the price of grapes be fixed by statutory provisions. It could be that, if prices were fixed by law—

which is what we are at present contemplating—

considerable staff would be needed to check the operation of any regulation made. Such a

fixed price could lead to a reduction in quantities purchased by winemakers and, with growers loath to leave grapes unsold, lead to collusion between parties to evade the regulations.

That was not a recommendation supporting this legislation. Page 21 of the report, dealing with the matter more fully and with price fixing by a grape marketing board, states:

The Commission recognizes that an assured outlet for production would be an advantage to the grower. Consideration in this regard was given to the establishment of a grape marketing board. The Commission does not consider the establishing of such a board justified at the present time. Amongst the factors which influenced the Commission in this regard were:

1. The difficulty in accurately forecasting the grape crop.
2. The necessity for legislation, and difficulty and cost of augmenting decisions.
3. The quantity of grapes grown by wine-makers.
4. Some of the difficulty in disposal could be overcome with the extension of co-operative wineries as recommended in this report.

No reference to that recommendation can be found in the Bill. The report continues:

5. The demand by winemakers for different types of grapes and from various districts.
6. The concentration of the vintage over a comparatively short time would make administration difficult. Considerable staff could be required by a board for a part of the year only.
7. Difficulty in determining allocation as between growers.
8. Trend towards buying bulk wines in lieu of grapes by some winemakers.
9. A major difficulty would be with the disposal of dual purpose varieties. The future demand overseas and locally for these is indeterminate. When dried, the disposal of these varieties is already under a controlling organization.
10. The surpluses have been relatively small. The Commission considers that the cost of a Grape Marketing Board, if to function successfully, would outweigh any advantage gained.

Knowing the members of the Commission, I respect their judgment and integrity, but the fact remains (and this was said in a debate on a similar matter a couple of years ago) that this industry can be properly and effectively protected only on a Commonwealth basis. I believe the Bill is unwise and that if patient negotiation had taken place a satisfactory solution could have been reached as it has been in other years. I do not believe that one can negotiate with people with a big stick in one's hand—not in a democracy in any case. If one has a big stick in one's hand, one only

antagonizes people and no satisfactory agreement can be reached.

A satisfactory agreement is necessary for the successful operation of this industry. Inherently, the interests of grapegrowers and winemakers are the same and there should be no difficulty in getting an agreement if the matter is approached on the proper basis. The Government has seen fit to take the responsibility for the Bill and, although I believe it is unwise, I do not intend to oppose it at this stage. However, unless drastic amendments are made to certain provisions I shall oppose the third reading. I do not believe the Bill will lead to the ultimate well-being of growers. I grow fruit myself and I know that growers generally like to think they have a protected market. However, as the Commission said at the beginning of its report, the problem is one of supply and demand and unless those two factors can be co-ordinated the successful operation of legislation of this type will not be possible. The Minister knows that I have already done my utmost to obtain a reasonable and proper price for growers but I will not lend myself to a provision such as this, which breaks an agreement by way of legislation. This position should not be tolerated and unless the provision concerned is altered I am afraid that the Minister will face considerable opposition to the Bill on third reading. I do not intend to call for a division on the second reading, but I shall wait to see what emerges from Committee before I come to a final judgment.

Mr. CURREN (Chaffey): I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill, which provides something that has been urgently needed in the wine industry for many years. We listened to a remarkable speech by the Leader in which he referred to the Prices Commissioner being brought into the industry. He did not deal with many of the matters that led to the bringing of the Prices Commissioner into the industry. I agree that stability of a kind has been achieved in prices but this has not been to the satisfaction of growers generally. Before the Prices Commissioner was brought into fixing the prices of grapes, many petitions were presented in this House and in another place expressing the dissatisfaction of growers at the conditions obtaining in the industry at that time, particularly in relation to prices and the return received by growers from proprietary winemakers.

The Leader spoke about various recommendations made by the Royal Commission. However, the Bill has not been introduced as a

result of the entire report of the Commission but as a result of an interim report presented by the Commission in December. This report recommended that a price fixing committee, comprising representatives of grapegrowers and winemakers, should be set up. This was done by the Government and negotiations of a kind were carried out by that committee. On one side were the grapegrowers' representatives who were prepared at all times to negotiate and compromise, and on the other side were the winemakers' representatives who came to the meeting with a set of prices which were their starting and finishing prices. They did not alter their original price offer in any way. The report of the Royal Commission has been tabled and is available to all honourable members, and in due course the Government will act on the recommendations contained in that report. I am quite sure that when that action is taken the industry will benefit greatly. The report contains many helpful recommendations, and when they are put into effect the whole industry will feel the benefit.

The Leader made great play regarding the breakdown in negotiations last year between the growers and the winemakers. I point out that if ever politics were played anywhere they were certainly played by the Leader last year with wine grape prices. He took the Prices Commissioner's recommendations along to a political meeting—a campaign meeting—and that is where he announced those recommendations. They were recommendations as a basis for negotiations between winemakers and grapegrowers, and if that is not playing politics with people's income I am not here.

If the yardstick for the price that is to be paid is the winemakers' ability to pay a fair and reasonable price to the growers, I say that we could apply the same argument to many other things. A person could go along to a motor dealer and offer \$1,500 for a new motor car listed at \$2,000 and say that was all he could afford to pay. Where do we go in a situation like that? The winemakers are endeavouring to beat down the price of wine grapes because of their alleged inability to pay a fair and reasonable price that will give the growers a return per acre that will meet cost of production. Those makers claim that they are unable to pay, and that higher prices will operate to the detriment of the industry. However, I maintain that it would be to the everlasting benefit of the industry if winemakers were to pay better prices, for the growers would then be able to increase their efficiency and productivity. They would not

then require such a high price per ton if they were getting a higher return per acre by virtue of a higher tonnage. That is simple logic.

Mr. Quirke: It is simple, but it is not logic.

Mr. CURREN: The grower must get a fair return for his efforts, and without this Bill I cannot see any way of his getting that return. This matter was fully discussed at a meeting held in Berri last night. Members have no doubt noticed that I presented a petition on behalf of 495 wine grapegrowers in the Upper Murray districts. The fact that those signatures were gathered in less than 12 hours will prove that this is a vital matter for growers, whose attitude is that the Government is doing the right thing in introducing this price-fixing legislation.

In his concluding remarks the Leader criticized the provision in the Bill that gives the Minister certain price-fixing powers. He called it a lot of rigmarole. However, if the price is not fixed by legislation the winemakers will have the uncontrolled right to fix their own prices. That fact was made evident in a letter from the Wine and Brandy Producers Association which pointed out that that association considered it best that there be negotiation between individual winemakers and individual growers. There would then be not one price for each variety but possibly 57 different prices for a single variety of grape. The Leader also criticized and joked about the reference to a sliding scale minimum price. However, I point out that the principal Act of 1948, enacted by the previous Government, provides for sliding scale maximum prices.

The proposals put forward by the grape-growers' representatives in their negotiations to obtain a fair and reasonable price have been worked out by the leaders of those organizations on very sound grounds. They are soundly based figures. All the cost of production figures that the growers must obtain to be able to get a living have been worked out on the items that are allotted under the War Service Land Settlement scheme. If those settlers cannot obtain prices that will give them a return per acre of \$430 or \$450 (I am not quite sure of the exact figure) they will not be able to meet their commitments in repaying the debts incurred as a result of being on those fruit blocks. That would be rather a silly position in which to put them. A grower needs a price that will enable him to meet his commitments in repaying all the public money that was spent to settle him on a block. There-

fore, it is like a dog chasing its own tail. It is time the position was rectified. The Prices Act is re-enacted every year and this amendment can only affect the current vintage unless it is re-enacted before the 1967 vintage. The Premier, in his second reading explanation, said that this Bill was the result of the interim report of the Royal Commission; that it intended to do something for the current vintage only, and would hold the position until the full recommendations of the Royal Commission could be implemented.

Mr. Millhouse: Do you expect it will be repealed later this year?

Mr. CURREN: I am able to answer sensible questions.

Mr. Millhouse: It lasts for one year: do you expect it to be repealed?

Mr. CURREN: At the meeting of grape-growers at Berri last night the current vintage was reviewed and discussed thoroughly, and many growers reported that their harvest was far below their previous estimate. Sultanas, which in the past have proved a bugbear and threat to true wine grapes, will be finished by next weekend. The overall estimates of winemakers' requirements were in excess of the overall estimates of the growers, and now the harvest is well below the growers estimates by several thousands of tons, particularly in the Barossa area. It has been claimed that unfair competition exists in the selling of wine, but that is amongst the winemakers. They have to sell the wine retail, and the only way in which a winemaker gets an advantage over another is by buying his grapes more cheaply. He can do that in one of two ways: first, by offering a reduced price, and secondly, by buying on baume. It has been reported to me that several winemakers are buying on baume this year, at \$2.50 a point, which the member for Burra would regard as a cheap rate for first-class wine.

Mr. Quirke: I would not buy that: that is distillation grapes you are talking about, and the sugar is the only thing of any value.

Mr. CURREN: I know one winemaker to the south of the metropolitan area who is buying as many grapes as he can on baume, and they will not be distilled. It is an under-hand way of buying cheap grapes.

Mr. Quirke: If the grower is silly enough to sell it, what can you do?

Mr. CURREN: I support the Bill, and sincerely hope that it will be passed here and in another place so that something valuable can be done for the wine grapegrowing industry to stop it from developing into a peasant

industry, and so that it will become an industry in which anyone can be proud and willing to take a part.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I do not support the second reading. I go further than the Leader in condemning the Bill in principle and in the detail which we have before us. I make it clear that I, like every other member, want to see a fair thing done by all parties in the grapegrowing industry. However, I do not believe that this measure is the way that can be done. It is ironical that this Bill should be introduced at this time. It is just 12 months, all but four days, since the advertisement appeared in the *Advertiser* headed, "Grapegrowers Beware": an advertisement inserted by the Labor Party over the caption "Live Better with Labor". It is just 12 months since that advertisement was inserted and, in that time, twice now the Labor Government has got itself into a screaming mess over the price of wine grapes. Everyone who has read the Royal Commission's report knows that the Government did not do anything to help the grapegrowers after the last election. They were eager to take the job on; the new Premier told the old Premier that he did not want him to handle it as he could handle it himself. We know the story of the 1965 prices in the Royal Commission's report. Now we have gone from bad to worse: for the 1966 vintage there has been an absolute failure to get any agreement. This Bill is the last resort of the Government to try to salvage its position. Everybody in this House knows that only this morning Caucus decided that the Bill would be introduced, and then it is obvious that the decision was taken only after a bitter wrangle over it. I defy any member opposite to say that is not so.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Well, it isn't.

Mr. Clark: It just isn't true.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I bet my bottom dollar it is. I am opposed to this legislation because I think it is absolutely the wrong way to go about trying to remedy the harm the Government has done to the grapegrowers of this State and to put right this problem. I have always been opposed to price control on general principles, and I have made my position known to the House time and time again. I oppose price control because I do not think it works and because I think it is grossly unfair to those who are controlled.

Mr. Jennings: At least you are consistently wrong.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If that is my attitude to price control as we have known it up to

date in this State, I am many times more opposed to this particular form of price control. The Prices Act gives power to the Minister and, under him, to the Prices Commissioner to fix maximum prices for commodities. This Bill attempts to fix minimum prices.

Mr. Hudson: The price will protect the income of growers.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I hope we shall hear a speech in support of this Bill from the member for Glenelg. He is usually muzzled, but—

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: He has had his quota.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Perhaps he will instruct the member for Unley who has had a much lower quota.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections. I ask honourable members to observe Standing Orders relating to interjections.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am opposed to price control where it fixes the maximum price of articles, but I am many more times opposed to an attempt to fix the minimum price of articles, because it just will not work, and yet that is what the Bill provides for. Much has already been said by the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Chaffey about the report of the Royal Commission on grape prices. This suggestion is absolutely contrary to the recommendations of the Commission's report. I shall quote again from page 14 of the report, for it is something apparently on which members opposite, having appointed the Commission, do not want to take any advice, because the report states:

Growers have also in some cases advocated that the price of grapes be fixed by statutory provisions. It could be that, if prices were fixed by law, considerable staff would be needed to check the operation of any regulation made.

One of the difficulties which the present Government has had with the Prices Department is under-staffing. I do not know whether the department will put on more staff.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: There were two growers on the committee.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Of course there were. The report continues:

Such a fixed price could lead to a reduction in quantities purchased by winemakers—

and I venture to say that is what will happen if this Bill becomes law—

and, with growers loath to leave grapes unsold, lead to collusion between parties to evade the regulations.

Of course that, too, will happen, and it will always happen; it has always happened throughout the whole of history when an

attempt has been made to fix minimum prices for any commodity. The Royal Commissioners knew all about the industry. Incidentally, one Royal Commissioner whom I saw in Sydney a few days after the announcement of the appointment of the Commission did not know anything about his appointment—but we shall leave it there. The Government has apparently treated as cavalierly the recommendations of the Commission as it did its appointment. The Commission was not opposed to price control as such because, although I do not agree with it, one of the committee's recommendations on page 36 (which was the seventh of 15 recommendations made) states:

The Commission considers that the retail prices of wine and brandy should be reviewed by the Prices Commissioner.

In advising against the price control of grapes (as the Commission did), the Commission did not give that advice because of opposition to the principle of price control: indeed, in this recommendation the Royal Commissioners show that they favour price control, but not the control the Government intends to introduce. Surely, that is sufficient to damn this measure. Instead of trying to impose control, why does not the Government look at some of the more positive recommendations made by the Royal Commission? They may be recommendations that do not commend themselves as much to the Minister of Agriculture as price control does.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: We'll look at them all right.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Let me remind the Minister of some of the things I hope this Government will examine in due course. On page 23, for example—

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Did you even listen to the second reading explanation?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the Attorney-General, who has been flitting in and out again, had been listening, he would remember what I said, and how I linked my remarks with the second reading explanation. Of course, he may have been listening in the comfort and tranquillity of his room, but one would not think so from his interjection. Page 23 of the Commission's report states:

There are only 86 storekeepers' Australian wine licences in South Australia at the present time. Views have been expressed that the granting of storekeepers' Australian wine licences should be less restricted to enable limited quantities to be purchased with food requirements. This could increase the sales of Australian wine and, together with relaxation of outlets generally, would assist the industry. It is felt that the conditions governing liquor

licences have not kept pace with Australian habits, and are a deterrent to increased sales which are necessary if the grapegrowing industry is to remain buoyant.

That is one positive suggestion made by the Royal Commission, one of which we have heard little from any member of the Government so far, but this is the sort of suggestion that would be far more beneficial to the industry than a futile attempt to fix minimum prices for grapes. Of course, the problems in this industry are universally met in all industries, and have been since the beginning of time. Page 34 of the Commission's report states:

As the general problems of the industry are those of supply and demand, the only courses open are to increase the demand or restrict the supply.

That is commonsense but this Bill will not do that.

Mr. Quirke: It will restrict supply.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, it will do that in one way, because it will drive this industry out of the State. Let me remind members (as I think the Leader did) that in the last five or six years the proportion of wine produced in South Australia has fallen from 76 per cent to 71 per cent. This Bill will undoubtedly hasten that process and will not be in the best interests of anyone in the long run.

As with most hasty legislation, the Bill contains sweeping and entirely undesirable powers. First, we have the attempt to fix minimum prices of wine grapes. The minimum penalty of not less than \$400 in new section 22b shows that the Government is consistent in that it has fixed a minimum and not a maximum penalty for the offence. However, this is not a usual provision. New section 22b provides:

(1) A person shall not sell or supply or offer for sale or to supply to a winemaker or distiller of brandy any grapes at a lower price than the minimum price fixed pursuant to this Act in relation to those grapes. Penalty: Not less than \$400.

(2) A winemaker or distiller of brandy shall not buy or obtain or offer to buy or obtain any grapes at a lower price than the minimum price fixed pursuant to this Act in relation to those grapes. Penalty: Not less than \$400.

Does any member on the Government side seriously suggest that the Royal Commissioners are wrong when they say that this will lead to collusion to evade that sort of thing? Of course it will! What is better for the grower: to get nothing for his grapes or to sell them for less than the price fixed? It is a matter of commonsense and I think all members must admit that. I believe that new section 22b

(5) is undesirable from a legal point of view. I should like to know whether the Attorney-General, as Chief Law Officer of the Crown, is happy with this provision. He is careful of the rights of individuals generally, but I do not think he has been careful in this case. New section 22b (5) provides:

For the purposes of this section any person on whose behalf or at whose place of business any grapes are sold or supplied or offered for sale or supply to a winemaker or distiller of brandy, whether contrary to the instructions of that person or not, shall be deemed to have sold or supplied or offered to sell or supply those grapes unless the court finds that the sale, supply or offering took place without his knowledge . . .

Therefore, if grapes are sold on a person's premises (they do not have to be his grapes) and he knows about it, even if the sale is contrary to his instructions, he is guilty of an offence. That is a most unjust and oppressive provision which is the sort of thing found in a Bill hastily prepared to try to meet a situation such as this. This provision continues: . . . and that he used all due diligence to secure the observance of this section.

I do not know what that means: as far as I can see it has no precise meaning at all. What should a man do to secure the observance of the section?

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: He must not go to sleep.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is better for him if he does because he might not know about it then. This provision is absolutely ridiculous and I am surprised that the Government has introduced it. The Leader has already referred to retrospectivity introduced into the Bill, taking its provisions back two months to January 1 and interfering with and destroying contracts that might have been made between now and then. That too is an entirely undesirable feature of the Bill. I am completely opposed to the jolly thing.

Mr. Clark: Jolly!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I could use stronger language and I would like to, but I will not do so, out of deference to you, Mr. Speaker. The Bill is bad in principle, it is bad in application and it will not do anything to assist the situation which the Government's ham-fistedness has led to develop in the industry. In fact, it will make it worse. That is why I intend to oppose the second reading and every clause of the Bill.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): I intend to support the second reading and, subject to certain alterations being made in Committee,

to support the third reading as well. It may not be consistent for me to do so because I spoke and voted against price control earlier. However, I have been active in primary producer organizations over the last 20 years and I know some endeavour must be made to see that primary producers receive the cost of their production. This is provided in secondary industries, which are protected by tariffs. They receive, I think, 9 per cent margin of profit. Further, workers are protected by the arbitration court. It is like the will of the wisp chasing the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow in that wages have increased some three times in the last 10 or 15 years, although the living standards of workers have increased 30 per cent, and that has been because of the increased efficiency of industry and because of better types of machinery. The living standards of people depend on the amount of production in the country, and artificial controls do not increase the living standard or bring a better result to the people concerned.

I understand the attitude of primary producers in these matters in that they expect the cost of production for what they produce. Although secondary industry is guaranteed a certain margin of profit, this is only on the amount of goods that can be accepted by the market or sold at that price. Secondary industry is not supported to produce in excess of what people are willing to buy. Also, when wages are fixed this does not guarantee that a person will get a job at that wage, unless the Government has created a situation whereby work is available. To get the cost of production for a greater amount of production than the market can cope with is something that still has to be worked out. I do not know how this can be done other than by restricting the amount of production. It is difficult in primary production because of the variation of seasons. If prices are increased it is possible that production will be increased to a large degree. The cost of production for primary producers has increased considerably over the last year because there is now a socialistic Government in office with no interest in keeping costs down or in increasing production. This Government favours distributing the goods already in hand. It does not raise living standards, and it is making it more and more difficult for the primary producer to exist. I think this arises mainly because very few Government members have been interested in the land, and those who

were did not remain on the land because they found the going too tough and they wanted to get into something more protected. I hope the primary producer can be treated as well as are the rest of the community. However, we cannot get very far if we have excess production. We have various stabilization schemes for the primary industries at the present time. The wheat stabilization plan guarantees cost of production for only a certain amount of the production; the wheatgrower has to take a gamble on the world's markets for that which is in excess of the home consumption, plus a certain quantity for export. I suppose this is a move by the Commonwealth Government to increase exports so that we can pay for our imports. In that industry the growers have to take a chance on some of their production being sold on the home markets. This stabilization plan has cost the wheatgrower about \$280,000,000. For a number of years the wheat was sold to the consumer here at a much lower price than the export price, and it was only a few years ago, when the funds the wheatgrowers had created in a stabilization pool were used up, that the Commonwealth Government then had to contribute a certain sum out of general revenue. Immediately the economic writers and many other people in the community began to scream that wheatgrowing should not be encouraged, that we would not be able to sell the wheat. I believe that without that Government contribution public opinion would have defeated the stabilization plan. Since then the wheat has been sold on the world's markets very rapidly, and in fact increased production will probably be necessary in Australia.

None of these schemes can guarantee cost of production of the commodity concerned. The Barley Board sells a certain amount of the barley to the local consumer in Australia at a fixed price, but what is exported is sold at a lower figure. The milk industry receives a guaranteed price for the home consumption market, and that is subsidized by the Commonwealth Government to the extent, I think, of some \$27,000,000, which is, after all, only a consumer subsidy and not assistance to the industry itself, because the cost of production of butter has been worked out at being above what the Australian consumer pays. The Milk Board guarantees the cost of production of the amount that can be sold on the Australian market, but the cost of production cannot be obtained for all that is exported.

In this legislation we are trying to introduce a new principle altogether. Although I

heartily support the idea, I maintain that we will have to see how it can be put into practice. If a certain price is to be paid for grapes, then there are going to be many left on the vines at the end of this year.

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.]

Mr. McANANEY: Earlier, I indicated support for the Bill and said that I was sympathetic to growers in their effort to obtain the cost of production, but I do not think this is a practical way of implementing a stabilization scheme. I would rather get into bed with a porcupine than be mixed up with the administration of this Bill with all its problems. The Government, in a feeble attempt to carry out its election promises, has introduced this Bill, and I hope it will have to deal with the porcupine and not me. If this Bill is to maintain a price to cover the cost of production for an unlimited production there will be trouble, particularly if the goods have to be sold on oversea markets. This may be theoretically correct, but I do not see how it can work in practice. With the milk board in Victoria there is a quota system and a certain price is paid. Each grower here should be given a quota according to his area, his cost of production and the amount with which the home market can cope. However, this system will not work if restricted to South Australia, as it should be Australia-wide.

A grower in my area has 120 tons of palominos. I understand they are used for sweet sherry and there is an over-supply on the market at present. The demand for dry reds has increased recently. If winemakers buy these grapes at a fixed price (and they have the right not to buy them, and cannot be criticized for that), the man with the palominos will sell few grapes, but those with grapes that are required will be able to sell them all. This legislation may ruin some growers as the whole idea is impracticable. Black grapes will probably be sold this year as they are in short supply with an increasing demand. Recently, a photograph appeared in a newspaper of a chap at Renmark who said he had 45 acres of sultanas and would sell them at \$24 a ton rather than dry them. He would make more money by drying them, so why should they be included in any guaranteed price for sultanas? The Leader said that production in New South Wales had increased from 20,000 to 40,000 tons and at present that State sold a quarter of Australia's total wine production. This proportion will increase rapidly if the price is increased here. New South

Wales provides 60 per cent of the consumption in that State, so that in a few years it will be able to provide for the whole of the State's consumption, even with a freight differential of about 10c a gallon.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: That is \$14 a ton.

Mr. McANANEY: Wine from the irrigated areas of New South Wales is sold for 60c a gallon, so that the price would be 50c a gallon in South Australia.

Mr. Casey: Do you think 10 o'clock closing will affect the position in New South Wales?

Mr. McANANEY: I have considered that point in Victoria, and apparently the consumption has not increased since the introduction of 10 o'clock closing. People now go to suburban hotels in the evening rather than indulge in the six o'clock swill in the city. I am sure that the consumption of wine will not be increased by 10 o'clock closing. I went to the Lido Restaurant in Melbourne and was charged \$2 for a small bottle of riesling, and another brand cost \$2.50. Perhaps more wine would be drunk if the price were reduced. Brandy consumption was increasing until the Commonwealth Government increased the excise. There are 4,000,000 gallons of brandy on hand at present and the consumption is not much more than 1,000,000 gallons a year. Co-operatives at present are producing 25 per cent of the wine in this State but they have no co-ordinated selling policy. They compete amongst themselves, and perhaps if the Government could finance more co-operatives to enable them to increase their bulk installation and introduce a co-ordinated selling policy, the industry would benefit. However, the Government is not prepared to advance money to solve the problem, but suggests a scheme that may be theoretically sound but will be difficult to implement in practice. The export side of the industry must be considered. At present we export at a loss to sell on overseas markets. The Emu Wine Company Pty. Ltd. sells 80 per cent of the Australian export to England and 90 per cent to Canada. This company sells on a label, particularly in Canada, and if its costs are increased it can obtain wine from Cyprus, put it into an Emu bottle, and sell it in Canada. Our market in Canada is on a quota system, but if we lose it we will never get it back, and this market is important to Australia. Many difficulties will be obvious in implementing this legislation, although the idea of assisting growers is excellent. I shall go so far as to support the Bill's second reading, and possibly its third

reading if certain amendments are made in the Committee stage. However, to solve the problem we must do much more than simply make this sort of impracticable suggestion. The provisions concerning co-operatives are good. Last year one of the river co-operatives paid \$14 or \$16 in bonuses to growers, and a Barossa co-operative paid considerably more, although I understand this was mainly through the sale of pearl wines that were produced and readily sold. Retrospectivity to January 1 has been suggested because of agreements already made, but I strongly oppose that in principle. How many agreements relating to fixed prices have been entered into between growers and winemakers? How many winemakers have received a definite contract this year for the sale of their wines? One winemaker in particular apparently takes in grapes but has not paid for any for 18 months. If pressure were placed on him for payment the grower might be paid, but might not be able to deliver his grapes to the same winemaker the following year. The grower has to accept the winemaker's terms even though that seems a foolish practice.

I do not think New South Wales will participate in an Australia-wide scheme. Indeed, we had some experience in this when trying to establish an Australia-wide egg-marketing scheme when New South Wales was the only State to hold out. However, immediately it found that such a scheme would be to its advantage, it waved the big stick and told South Australia that if we did not participate we would find eggs from New South Wales coming on to our market at 10c a dozen. I sympathize with the growers' problems, but whether a practical solution will be obtained, I do not know. However, growers should be allowed to take certain risks, although I point out that by sticking out their necks they may ruin the industry in this State which could consequently affect every citizen. I am sure the Government will realize its error, but we may eventually be able to evolve a more practical solution to growers' problems.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER (Angas): This Bill has far-reaching provisions, and I should be reluctant to support it if I were certain it would place in jeopardy important industries that have contributed so much to the economy of this State and the Commonwealth. Naturally, I refer to the grapegrowing and wine-making industries. However, before the Bill was introduced I contacted the President of the Barossa Grapegrowers Association and also

the Wine Grapegrowers Council of South Australia, and I am assured that the members of both organizations (and I point out that the Barossa organization is affiliated to the council) support legislation of the type that has been introduced. The members of these organizations comprise about 80 per cent of South Australia's grapegrowers. In South Australia there are 59,000 acres of vineyards and 3,300 growers of vines. Included in the acreage is the area planted with drying grapes as well as wine grapes.

The industry employs 1,400 people in wineries in South Australia, to whom are paid annually about \$2,802,000 in salaries and wages. This State produces 71 per cent of the wine produced in the Commonwealth and 90 per cent of the brandy. According to the Royal Commission's report the capital value of the assets of the wineries is \$22,000,000. I am not particularly happy with the legislation, first, because the report contains no recommendation that any legislation for the fixing of grape prices be introduced. Page 14 of the Commission's report states:

It is felt that the sale of grapes, as with other commodities, could be the subject of contracts between winemakers and growers and therefore legally enforceable. Growers have also in some cases advocated that the price of grapes be fixed by statutory provisions. It could be that, if prices were fixed by law, considerable staff would be needed to check the operation of any regulation made. Such a fixed price could lead to a reduction in quantities purchased by winemakers and, with growers loath to leave grapes unsold, lead to collusion between parties to evade the regulations.

Although the Bill provides for penalties for any breach, I am doubtful whether adequate staff will be available effectively to police the legislation, and no doubt evasions will occur. After all, a winemaker cannot be compelled to purchase grapes. I recall the Premier saying on several occasions, in reply to questions concerning the grape industry, that winemakers cannot be compelled by legislation to buy grapes. If they are not prepared to buy under the prices fixed then that is the time when difficulty could arise and there could be surpluses. The question then arises as to what will happen if there are such surpluses. We had this position last year. Assuming there is a buyers' resistance and that the winemaker is not prepared to take all the grapes offering, can the Premier say what the Government intends to do about the surplus grapes? Is it intended to make available finance through the State Bank for the processing of any surplus grapes as was done last year? Is it

intended to make available finance to co-operatives to increase their grape intake availability as has been recommended in the report of the Royal Commission? Those are questions that should be answered by the Premier when he replies. The Commission makes no reference to price fixation but, at page 36 of the report, it states:

Firm contracts should be entered into between winemaker and grower in so far as crop forecasting allows.

However, no reference is made anywhere in the Commission's recommendations to the introduction of legislation, and I should have liked to see other action taken to implement the recommendation of the Commission as far as possible rather than to have the matter dealt with in this way.

I am also unhappy about the Bill because the reaction to it by winemakers may be such that ultimately this will be to the detriment of grapegrowers. What is there to prevent winemakers, if prices are not satisfactory to them, from extending their activities to New South Wales or Victoria? On page 7, the report of the Commission states:

One very large Australian winemaking firm has advised that, to supply New South Wales and eastern markets, they have extended their buying in the Murrumbidgee irrigation area to the exclusion of South Australia, and that this policy will continue.

That means that one winemaker has extended his operations in another State, and there could be others. Ultimately we could lose a valuable portion of the winemaking industry in South Australia as a result of some of the activities of winemakers being shifted to the Eastern States, particularly to the Murrumbidgee area. After all, the chief wine markets are in the Eastern States and that is made patently clear by the table included on page 9 of the report, which shows that in 1964-65 South Australia exported to New South Wales 1,611,600 gallons of fortified wine and to Victoria 1,307,400 gallons. In the same year we exported 1,454,000 gallons of unfortified wine to New South Wales and 1,053,400 gallons to Victoria.

The same position applies with regard to brandy. South Australia is the major brandy producer in the Commonwealth, and in 1964-65 its interstate sales of brandy were 683,500 gallons out of a total sale of 953,700 gallons. It is also clear from the information provided in the table on page 7 of the report that there has been a considerable increase in the production of wine and brandy in both New South Wales and Victoria. In the year 1959-60, the

production of wine in New South Wales was 3,834,507 gallons and in 1964-65 it was 6,500,000 gallons—in other words, nearly double. The production of wine in Victoria in 1959-60 was 2,146,676 gallons and in 1964-65 it was 3,800,000 gallons—again about a 75 per cent increase. However, in South Australia, in 1959-60 the total production was 21,576,000 gallons and in 1964-65 it was 27,762,000 gallons. A similar increase is noticeable in the brandy production of the two Eastern States. In 1959-60 New South Wales and Victoria had a combined production of brandy of 70,552 gallons and in 1964-65 that total had risen to 149,612 gallons, which shows that production has doubled. In referring to these matters, the Royal Commission stated:

Figures obtained from the New South Wales Department of Agriculture indicate the acreage planted to wine grapes in the Murrumbidgee irrigation area has "increased from 4,338 at December, 1961, to 5,368 at December, 1964. Assuming yields of seven tons per acre, the vintage will increase by about 2,000 tons per annum if expansion continues at the present rate." The production of wine grapes in the Murrumbidgee irrigation area has virtually doubled since 1960 to exceed 36,000 tons in 1964. . . . It is pertinent to mention at this stage that the substantial increase in production in the Murrumbidgee irrigation area cannot fail to adversely affect the sale of wine from South Australia unless markets generally increase at a greater rate than at present. Wineries have been established in the Murrumbidgee irrigation area, and in view of the location of the area in relation to the extensive markets in eastern Australia, production from these areas gives winemakers a freight advantage which has been estimated at about 10c per gallon.

That is about \$15 a ton of grapes. That being the position, I think the time may come when the wineries that are favourably situated in the Eastern States will be all out to capture the very lucrative markets that exist there, particularly in the capital cities. Indeed, the time may come when there will be an increase of winery activities in those areas. As I said earlier, it is already patent that one large South Australian winery is extending its buying activities to the Murrumbidgee area. If that increased activity eventuated, it would be to the detriment of the wine industry and also (I say this advisedly) to the grape-growing industry in South Australia, unless we could find other markets for the wine made in this State.

From 1960 to 1964 we had in this State some stability in the viticultural and winemaking industries because the prices that obtained were prices agreed upon by both the winemakers

and the grapegrowers. I, representing a viticultural district, would like to pay tribute to the then Prices Commissioner (Mr. Murphy) and the then Premier (Sir Thomas Playford) for the diplomatic manner in which the negotiations between the winemakers and the grapegrowers were conducted, negotiations which throughout that period were successful and resulted in a price that was approved of by both parties. I regret very much that negotiations in respect of last year's vintage and the present vintage broke down and that nothing eventuated that was satisfactory to both parties. Earlier we did have a period of stability.

It may be said that price fixing by legislation is nothing new, because there was indeed price fixing back in the 1920's under Commonwealth legislation. I refer to the Wine Export Bounty Act. Many honourable members will recall that after the First World War and following on the planting of vineyards in the Murray areas there was a surplus of doradillo grapes. In about 1923 or 1924 great difficulty was experienced in selling those grapes. Action was taken then, I believe by the Government of the day in co-operation with the Commonwealth Government and, as a result of negotiations, the Wine Export Bounty Act was introduced, I think in 1924 or 1925. The legislation had two projects in view: first, to protect the interests of growers by the fixing of minimum prices for grapes, and, secondly, to encourage export trade in wine by the payment of a bounty of 40c a gallon for fortified wine. That legislation was of an entirely different character from the legislation before this Chamber, because it had (if I may use the expression) a bilateral advantage: it had an advantage to the grower and it had an advantage to the winemaker. Pursuant to that legislation, a bounty was paid to the winemaker in respect of fortified wines exported overseas, but it was paid only if the Commonwealth Minister could be satisfied that the growers had been paid the minimum prices fixed by him for the grapes delivered to the winery that engaged in the export of those wines.

The effect of that legislation was phenomenal. In 1924-1925 (that is, before it actually became effective), Australia had an export trade of 142,000 gallons. That quantity, after the legislation had operated for one year, had increased to 1,085,500 gallons in 1925-1926. In 1932-33 the export trade in wine had increased to 2,628,900 gallons, and by 1939-40 (the last year before the war) it had risen

to 3,619,000 gallons. There we had, as I said, both parties obtaining an advantage or a benefit out of the legislation and, of course, the winemaker, receiving a bounty for his wine of 40c a gallon, was able to find an export market and was able to compete successfully with other countries that exported wine to Great Britain.

That legislation was discontinued in about 1947, I think following investigation by the Tariff Board, which found that in view of the healthy state of the industry there was no justification for the continuance of the bounty. However, we must remember that in the immediate post-war years there was a considerable increase within Australia in the consumption of wine, and no great export trade in wine was sought because the local market, which is the best one, was sufficient to absorb most of the wine produced. However, the position has again been reached when there has been over-production and when wine cellars have been filled to capacity, and this may well be an appropriate time for representations to be made by the Government to the Commonwealth authorities, perhaps for financial assistance or for the payment of a bounty on export wine.

I consider that if representations of this nature were successful, additional avenues for export of wine from Australia could be found. After all, we must bear in mind that the Commonwealth benefits considerably financially from the viticultural and winemaking industries in Australia, and particularly in South Australia. I refer to page 17 of the Royal Commission's report, from which it will be seen that the Commonwealth revenue derived from excise duties during each of the years 1959-60 to 1964-65 was over \$4,000,000. In 1964-65 the excise duty from the wine industry was \$5,819,928, and in addition to the excise revenue the Commonwealth Government benefited from the sales tax of 12½ per cent payable on brandy and spirits. The report of the Royal Commission states:

For each ton of grapes made into brandy, the grower receives \$40-\$50 a ton. On the new rate of duty the Commonwealth Government would receive \$280 when cleared from bond, for each ton made into brandy, plus 12½ per cent sales tax on sales. It is apparent that the duties on brandy and wine spirit have a marked effect on the industry in the main grapegrowing State, South Australia.

Mr. Quirke: That has to be held for a minimum of two years before you get anything on it.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: These figures and the amount the Commonwealth Government derives from the industry could be used to prepare a strong case for receiving assistance for this industry. Action should be taken promptly and immediately. The Leader considered that any stabilization should be on an Australia-wide basis, and I agree. When speaking on the wine and grapegrowing industries last year I made it clear that if there were to be any stabilization plan it should be done on an Australia-wide basis, because in the Murrumbidgee area the grapegrowing activities have increased so much that it is essential that New South Wales and Victoria should be parties to a Commonwealth-wide stabilization scheme. I understand that in the 1930's a conference was held between the Commonwealth and State Governments which considered the co-ordinating of State and Commonwealth powers in the wine industry. Indeed South Australia subsequently prepared draft legislation, but New South Wales would not agree and the whole scheme broke down. I do not oppose the second reading of the Bill, particularly as the Barossa Grape-growers Association of which a large number of grapegrowers in my district are members, support it.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra): I support the measure. First, it will bring absolute chaos to the wine industry; and secondly, it will give a much-needed lesson to growers and winery proprietors. It cannot fail to cause absolute chaos in the industry, and it is because of the lesson that is needed that I intend to support it. I have good grounds for speaking this way because my association with the wine industry, both as a grower and as the managing director of a proprietary winery, goes back 40 years. I can remember the time when growers received \$3 a ton for grapes delivered and had to wait all day with horse teams until trucks were available to transport the grapes to Adelaide. One never received anything that would give one the cost of production in those days. There is nothing new in what we have now: it is as old as the industry itself. Out of that system came the formation of the co-operative companies, some earlier than others. The co-operative companies through the years have meant that stability of the wine industry. It has been a precarious stability, but it has maintained a fairly even standard.

Now, the big proprietary wineries are standing out against the price asked by the growers. They have good reason for so doing, because what the grower is asking is more than he is

entitled to ask; but he thinks that the proprietary wine company has a pot of gold at the bottom of the rainbow and that legislation can be introduced which states that the company shall pay this price if it wants the grapes, under penalty of \$400. They are not all in the position to pay that, as I know from my personal knowledge. To pit the grower against the winemaker and *vice versa* is the tragedy of this. There has been too much bull-headed nonsense about this and too much politics associated with it. The politics associated with it say that the growers have had in their thick skulls (and there are plenty of thick skulls among the winemakers, too) that, for the salvation of the industry and of their properties, the Government will bring in price fixing. This is going to be the Achilles heel that will kill the grower if this legislation is passed: mortification will set in around his ankles and if his feet are cut off he will be progressively cut down until he is finished. The winemakers do not have to pay this price and if it is insisted upon they will not take the grapes.

Mr. Curren: Will they go out of business?

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes, for this year, and the honourable member will be out for five years. I have absolute authority for saying that, and they are in the position to do it. There is not a winery that has not got the capacity to remain for one year without further intake. They can do it. Whether they are right or wrong in doing it I am not arguing, but this legislation cannot be forced down their necks. The grower will not benefit a damn from it, either. I defy anybody here to say how he can benefit from it. By inserting a compulsory clause who can force somebody to pay so much for shiraz, so much for pedros and so much for something else?

Mr. Casey: Nobody!

Mr. QUIRKE: No, and then the whole thing falls flat on its face. This is political bunk, and the grower will get it in the neck. It is not too late to remedy the situation. I think a sensible approach on entirely different grounds would resolve the position to the benefit of both the winemaker and the grower. It is impossible to get two people like two billy goats on a narrow bridge, head on with neither one giving way to the other, to come to a mutual agreement. There must be a reconciliation between the man who supplies the materials for the winemakers' product and the man who converts them into wine. They have mutual interests, but this legislation is an antagonism that will drive them further and further apart. Nothing can be achieved except

chaos and disruption that will be against both parties' interests, and certainly against the interests of a large section of the community.

Last year the winery of which I was formerly in charge paid an average price by June 30 for all grapes of \$50 a ton; the profits that will accrue will still go to the grower, and at present many thousands of dollars have accrued to the grower and are awaiting distribution. This happens year after year. The costs of processing last year's harvest, including wages and salaries, interest, depreciation, and working and sundry expenses (which are too numerous to mention) amounted to \$30 a ton. The total cost of those grapes is \$80 a ton, and 57c a gallon, based on 140 gallons to the ton. This compares with prices requested by the growers this year of \$98 a ton for dry area riesling, which is 70c a gallon for grapes alone, based on the same 140 gallons to the ton. Bearing in mind that it was 57c a gallon at the end of 12 months in that winery last year, the figure now to be asked is 70c a gallon exclusive of any expenses. I admit that if prices increase a grower naturally expects to be able to meet them, and looks for something more.

In this case only the grower is expected to recoup his costs, the winemaker apparently having unlimited money at his disposal, anyway. This whole problem requires the closest collaboration between the two sections of the industry to recover costs. The winemaker can recover costs through prices for the finished wine, but if that becomes too high, I point out that competition in the industry is so great that it all comes back to a static position that does not allow for any increase. I suggest here and now that the Bill be thrown out the door and that we do no more about the matter. Indeed, that will reflect greater credit on the Government and do much more good for the winemaker and for the grower. This Bill will do nothing but cut the feet off the growers and antagonize other sections of the industry. I maintain that the position can be resolved by a careful and genuine approach on behalf of the growers, without bringing politics into it. Never mind about living better with Labor! The Government is reaping a whirlwind, and this legislation is the whirlwind. I will vote for it because it will intensify the chaos that has beset the wine industry before a sensible approach can be adopted. I point out, however, that the Bill must be amended. I have had 40 years' experience with a co-operative winery that originally used grapes as its capital in order to promote itself.

It was years before any real profits were made. The fathers of people in it now have still not got the money as it was lost in the dim mists of antiquity. However, today that same winery pays \$50 a ton for every ton of grapes it gets, and it pays by June 30, as it did last year. It still makes bonus payments, too. It has a subsidiary company in New South Wales that markets over 250,000 gallons of its wine and wine from other makers as well. This company does not make sufficient wine to cope with the market in New South Wales that has been built up by the sale of good products. The wine is sold at a fair and reasonable price. It is not a cheap wine and, as a good wine, it is sold at a reasonable price. It is sold against all the competition of the wine industry throughout Australia. So, do not tell me I do not know what I am talking about—I do. Nobody here knows more about it than I do. On the basis of my personal knowledge, I say that this legislation will kill the industry.

Mr. Hudson: How do the prices your company pays for grapes compare with the prices paid by other winemakers?

Mr. QUIRKE: I will not enter into that. Our prices are good and reasonable, and nobody pays better. The other winemaker in the district pays the same price as we do, but sometimes he pays in two payments whereas we make it in one.

Mr. Hudson: Is that a co-operative, too?

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes, these are co-operative wineries. We have co-operatives in Clare, and each winery has built its own outlet. There are no surplus grapes. In the winery of which I was in charge we bought large quantities of grapes from the river districts in order to supplement our supplies. The growers have asked for the Bill to be introduced, as they indicated in a petition presented before the House. However, I will not vote for it without saying that this Bill, which they look upon as their salvation, will kick them to death, and I say this advisedly. I think it would be better if the Bill were dumped and we started again by getting both parties together. I would assist (and I know others who would do so) to bring these two forces together so that we could arrive at an amicable understanding and at a price for grapes that would meet the wishes of both parties. I think the winemakers can increase their price a bit.

Mr. Curren: A fair bit.

Mr. QUIRKE: It is no use saying that. What the devil is a fair bit? A fair price is a different thing.

Mr. Curren: What is your definition of "a bit"?

Mr. QUIRKE: I would make it a fair price and I would be prepared to announce what I thought was fair.

Mr. Curren: Fair to whom?

Mr. QUIRKE: Fair to both parties. The member for Chaffey thinks there is only one party entitled to a fair deal and that is the grower. That is a political idea and it is entirely wrong. If you enter into a deal with two parties it must be fair to both: it must be fair to the winemaker as well as to the grower. The petition referred to the proved cost of production. However, the costs of production quoted do not prove anything. The price asked for riesling, which is a high-priced grape devoted to the manufacture of high-quality table wines, is \$98 a ton for the non-irrigated areas. How many tons an acre of riesling grapes could be produced in a non-irrigated area? Does anybody know?

Mr. McKee: Have a guess.

Mr. QUIRKE: I know the answer, but I want to see whether anyone from the Government that is introducing the Bill knows.

Mr. Curren: The statistical average is one ton an acre.

Mr. QUIRKE: Rubbish! That is how good those statistics are. I can take the honourable member to places in the non-irrigated area of the Clare district that will produce five tons to the acre. However, I shall use the figure of three tons for my argument. On the river a man could produce 10 tons an acre.

Mr. Curren: Not of riesling grapes.

Mr. QUIRKE: He would get 9½ tons. The winery to which I have referred at Clare buys grapes from the river. We have shareholders of our company from Barmera and Waikerie, and they are completely dissatisfied with the position there. Every ton of grapes we take from the river comes from a shareholder of our winery and these men produce 10 tons to the acre. At \$98 a ton the return would be \$980 an acre gross. If 3 tons of grapes an acre was produced in a non-irrigated district the return would be \$294 an acre. However, the margin between the two prices suggested is \$8. It is impossible to finance that low production on a non-irrigated area at such a colossal impost. In the river districts the costs are entirely different.

Mr. Curren: They get free irrigation.

Mr. QUIRKE: The irrigation is taken up in the magnitude of the yield. All these factors, irrespective of whether they are completely accurate, are important. The only thing that

induces me to mention them is that I think this legislation is hopeless and useless and is the product of the failure that took place to reconcile these two parties. Therefore, a side has been taken. One side is going to be given fair treatment and the other side is going to be given no treatment at all except bad treatment. This is not the type of legislation that should come before the Parliament, and yet the growers have asked for it. They deserve what they get out of this.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You say the legislation is crook?

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Why don't you throw it out?

Mr. QUIRKE: No, I will seek some amendments. People have been led up the garden path, and it is necessary to prove that to those people. Other steps can be taken, and if this thing can be held in abeyance I will contribute to taking them.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: It is too late.

Mr. QUIRKE: It is never too late to throw out an abortion of a thing like this.

Mr. Curren: Why didn't you take steps 12 or 18 months ago when you were in Government?

Mr. QUIRKE: It was not necessary then. It was the Labor Government at the last election that brought all this about and messed up the whole show. If ever there was anything more rampant with political bias than a certain advertisement, which was completely without foundation, I should like to see it. The Government's idea was to do anything to win the seat. The honourable member for Chaffey can see that that seat is now in jeopardy. I have told the honourable member that after the next election he is going to lose the seat. Some growers presented a petition here today, but I point out that they are only the misguided ones on the river—

Mr. Hudson: If you oppose the Bill you should vote against it.

Mr. QUIRKE: I am not going to vote against it to ease the honourable member's burden, but he could take a leaf out of my book and vote against it. He is going to vote for it because he does not know anything about it, and I am going to vote for it because I know all about it and know what is going to happen to the growers. It is about time we brought the whole thing up with a round turn, and I am prepared to do that. If this thing can be delayed I promise here and now that I will try to do something about this.

Mr. McKee: You have had plenty of opportunities.

Mr. QUIRKE: I have had no opportunity at all. It is only when this thing has gone bad under the administration of the Government that I would like to take the job out of its hands and make a decent job of it. If the Government passes this it will lose the honourable member for Chaffey and the honourable member for Barossa; it could even lose the honourable member for Semaphore, because the winemakers will increase the price of the product and he will be gone because he voted for it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections.

Mr. QUIRKE: I advised the member for Semaphore the other day that he could make wine in his backyard out of his own grapes and he would not be penalized by the law. If he cannot make it I will show him how to do it. This legislation is bad because of its effect on the wine industry. It could be good, for the very ill that will be born of it might result in some sort of co-operative action between the two contending factions today. If it is amended as I think it should be, I will support it, for this is a challenge to me. I shall have two bob each way. I have spoken against the growers and also against the winemakers, and I have brought both of them into line. They remind me of two bull-headed rams on a narrow bridge, neither one giving way. This is the sort of situation in which we must have some sort of conciliation, otherwise we will not get anywhere. While we do not have that conciliation and while we cannot arrive at some sort of understanding between them, everyone in the industry will suffer; they will suffer badly under this. With those few words of wisdom, I indicate that if the Bill is amended so as to take out some of the fouler clauses, I shall support it. However, if they remain in the Bill, I shall oppose it.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT (Ridley): The honourable member for Burra has said he is going to have "two bob" each way, but I think it is time we had "two bob on the nose". This legislation is really emergency legislation. This is not the first time we have dealt with this problem, because it has been a continuing problem for some time. The honourable member for Angas (Hon. B. H. Teusner) dealt with the early history of this trouble. I was associated with the problem in 1933, when the Commonwealth Minister for Customs was the Hon. Thomas White. We had a big meeting

of growers at Glossop on the River Murray to try to deal with the problem of helping the growers out of the morass they were in. The result of that was a continuation of the Wine Export Bounty Act, referred to earlier by the member for Angas. This is the direction in which we have to go, but we cannot do that sort of thing in five minutes. This Parliament tonight is faced with an emergency in respect of the present vintage. Do we throw this Bill out? If we do that, we have nothing whatever to offer the growers for the result of the vintage they will be harvesting within the next few days. Consequently this legislation is only a prop to overcome the emergency.

We had the growers and the winemakers together at a conference table to try to reach agreement on prices, and that is the sort of thing that has been going on for far too long. This method of trying to solve the problems of the grapegrowers is not good enough. However, we must do something to assist them. What is wanted for the wine industry is a long-term policy. It is no use getting the winemakers and the growers together year after year to try to solve this problem, because we will not completely solve it then. I believe it is beyond the scope of this Parliament to come up with the answer for complete stability in the industry, for we must face the fact that this State has not the resources to provide a wine bounty. However, I believe (and this was substantiated by the evidence I gave before the Royal Commission) that we should consider getting the Government to take up with the Commonwealth Government the possibility of returning to the Wine Export Bounty Act. The member for Angas has given figures showing an increase from a small quantity to 3,500,000 gallons exported to the United Kingdom because of the 40c bounty. This is the approach needed in this industry. If we do not do this we will be faced with this impasse every year without result. As I was not present at the conference, I cannot say whether the winemakers were obstinate or whether the growers were too stubborn and would not listen to reason.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: I was there, and I shall say it.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: An attempt was made to reach agreement but it failed. Now Parliament has the problem for the present vintage, and we all realize that this is urgent legislation. Normally no member likes to deal with legislation without testing the reaction of the people concerned, but this legislation is

urgent, and provides that if winemakers purchase grapes they shall pay a minimum price. I cannot agree with the member for Burra because, although he has a great knowledge of the industry, he is speaking from a co-operative point of view in a non-irrigated area where the problem is different from that on the river. I must consider it from the growers' point of view. Many are soldier settlers, have annual commitments to meet, and cannot exist on some of the prices offered for the respective categories by the winemakers. The Bureau of Agricultural Economics considered the cost of production of grapes, and the grapegrowers used the figures in their negotiations with the winemakers. That was a fair basis, but the winemaker has his particular problem of an increased price a ton on the processing of the wine. He has to make a profit or go out of business. We are faced with this problem, but I believe we have to consider it on a Commonwealth-wide stabilization basis. Where do we start?

This legislation is not the correct way to obtain a Commonwealth-wide scheme, but it indicates that one Parliament is prepared to take drastic action to overcome the emergency. The Minister should take the question to the Australian Agricultural Council in order to have the New South Wales and Victorian Governments' agreeing on an approach to the Commonwealth Government to re-enact the wine bounty legislation of 40c a gallon. That would help to solve the winemaker's problem of meeting the increased cost of production and of making his profit, and at the same time being able to pay the grapegrowers an adequate price in accordance with the figures of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. All we can do now is to pass this legislation in order to see what the result will be. I am sure it will not have the drastic effect as stated by the member for Burra. He was romancing when he said it would spell the death knell of the industry. This legislation does not compel a winemaker to take the grapes, but if he wants the grapes he has to pay a minimum price as stated by the Prices Commissioner. If he cannot pay the price he does not have the grapes: there is no compulsion about it. Opposing interests have been given the opportunity to solve the problem and, having failed, it is up to the Government to do something. The Prices Commissioner will fix a minimum price; and that is not new to this industry and winemakers will carry on as they have carried on before.

Now that agreement has not been reached this legislation provides a statutory control with the authority in the Prices Commissioner to fix a minimum price. In the interests of the growers we have to do something and this is a start. We cannot leave growers out on a limb when they are picking grapes now, probably tonight, in my district. I believe the Royal Commission made some valuable recommendations. It said, in effect, and this is one of the key things to solving the industry's problems, that a statistical survey of what the industry produces should be made, and one of its recommendations was for the appointment of an extension officer. These are the first things to do to try to solve the problems in the industry. That having been done, costs should be considered. The Minister must take this problem to the Australian Agricultural Council and obtain the support of New South Wales and Victoria in order to get the Commonwealth Government to favourably consider the 40c bounty.

The Commonwealth Government receives nearly \$6,000,000 from this industry, so it can afford to pay a bounty. Some years ago, when the brandy industry was in trouble, we went to the Commonwealth Treasurer (Sir Arthur Fadden) and said we wanted him to reduce the excise on brandy so that there would be more consumption, as this would assist the industry. I recall Sir Arthur Fadden saying, "What will happen to the revenue if the excise is reduced? The Commonwealth Government has to have money." We replied, "By a reduction in the price, there could be a greater consumption of brandy and your revenue may be increased." That is, in fact, what happened and because of a lower duty the revenue was more than doubled. That could well happen in regard to the wine bounty.

I do not like the retrospective provision because of its effect on existing contracts. Once this legislation is passed and receives publicity in the press (before actually being proclaimed in Executive Council), and once the Prices Commissioner fixes the minimum price, bearing in mind that a penalty of \$400 can be imposed in the case of any breach, if the retrospective provision is deleted this legislation could have no effect whatsoever. We could find, too, that some winemakers who had already made contacts in relation to grapes that had been purchased and processed would be in real difficulties if forced to pay a fixed minimum price back to January 1. I frankly admit that, despite the fact that I have thought about the matter all afternoon, I can-

not offer a practical solution. As in all legislation of this type, section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution rears its ugly head. Indeed winemakers could bring grapes across the border from the Murray irrigation area, without this legislation's having any effect. Naturally, if a State law conflicts with Commonwealth law, the latter prevails. Personally, I doubt whether winemakers will completely ignore the measure and obtain grapes from across the border. Indeed, I pay a tribute to many of them for the way in which they have supported local growers over the years. In fact, a proprietary winery in my district kept faith with its growers two years ago to the extent of taking 25,000 tons more from the Waikerie district than it was obliged to. Although many winemakers may object to this legislation, it is after all, an emergency measure. Naturally, if complete agreement were reached between the parties concerned the legislation would not be necessary, but a certain amount of distrust exists among winemakers, some of whom bargain with the growers. Surely, a minimum price will assist in that regard.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: It will help the genuine winemaker.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Yes. This is a safeguard measure, and I can see no alternative but for it to pass as quickly as possible, so that we can see what will happen. An increase of 10c for a bottle of wine in which varieties such as the doradillo grape have been used will increase the price a ton by only \$6. Surely, it is not asking too much to give an additional \$2 to the grower. The Royal Commissioners advocate the issuing of storekeepers' licences and the expanding of markets to allow a greater consumption. Naturally, the Government has not had time to examine that aspect, for the report came to hand only on January 28. Although the Commissioners' report recommends that winemakers and growers get together over the problem, it does not come up with a practical solution. I advised the Commission to consider recommending the introduction of legislation establishing a sultana regulating board. It is perfectly true to say that many winemakers buy sultanas because of the cheaper price. Some gave evidence to the Commission to the effect that they must have sultanas for blending purposes to make certain types of wine. Strangely enough a quantity of sultanas taken by the distilleries could have been dried and the growers could have got a better price if the distilleries had not taken these sultanas. Then we would have had no need last year to deal with the grape

surplus problem. Too many sultanas that could be dried are going into distilleries. Why not consider a sultana board? We would have to get statistics right and find out what winemakers wanted. Then growers in certain areas could arrange to supply a certain tonnage of sultanas to the makers. The Commission was not prepared to recommend a sultana board, but I do not know why: I believe that is the first step in overcoming the problem. Sultanas can be dried, and they are not a proper distillery grape. I admit that some winemakers like to use them for blending purposes but they could get them under quota. While distillers can buy large quantities of sultanas they will obviously buy less grapes of the wine type that cannot be dried. Surely that is one of the steps that Parliament must consider.

I strongly advocate that the Government takes further action and approaches the Commonwealth Government so that the industry can be stabilized on a Commonwealth basis. The industry has been in trouble too long, and it always will be unless there is Commonwealth legislation to stabilize it. Although the Bill is an unavoidable step it is not the complete answer: it is only an emergency move. A Commonwealth stabilization scheme would provide prosperity to the wine industry in the same way as similar schemes have provided prosperity to other primary industries.

Mr. HUDSON (Glenelg): I support the Bill and congratulate the member for Ridley on the remarks he made in support of it. I think all members will agree that the Bill was introduced to meet a particular situation and that many more steps will be necessary before the wine industry in South Australia is placed on a firm footing. I do not believe for one moment that much attention should be paid to the Cassandra-like attitudes of the member for Burra, in particular, and also of the Leader of the Opposition. If this legislation is administered sensibly I cannot see how any of the troubles predicted by the member for Burra would be likely to eventuate. The approach recommended by the Royal Commission was that a committee consisting of a chairman, two members from the Wine and Brandy Producers Association and two members from the South Australian Grapegrowers Council should be established. This committee was intended as a conciliating body and as a means of bringing grapegrowers and wine and brandy producers together to reach a common agreement that would then be accepted by all concerned.

The trouble is that a one-sided situation exists in the wine industry, with a greater part of the bargaining power lying with the winemakers, and grapegrowers, on the other hand, being in a relatively poor bargaining position. In these circumstances (and this applies in industrial relations just as much as it applies in this situation) conciliation is difficult to work unless there is some other means of enforcing a result, and conciliation fails unless the parties to the conciliation procedure know that unless they reach an agreement some other means will be found to impose an agreement on them. To my mind the Royal Commission's recommendation amounts to imposing conciliation on this industry without any procedure for compulsory arbitration should the parties to the dispute be unable to reach an agreement. I believe that is what the Bill attempts to do. It establishes the Prices Commissioner as an authority to fix the minimum price for grapes, and obviously this will apply for this particular vintage. The Prices Commissioner, in making his fixation, must clearly pay attention to the needs of both parties. He must pay attention to the costs of the grapegrowers on the one hand, but in order to protect the longer run interests of the grapegrowers he must clearly consider the capacity of the winemakers to pay. I am sure the Prices Commissioner, in making any recommendation to the Minister in this matter, will pay attention to that particular problem. No responsible officer of the Government or Minister is going to try to enforce a set of prices on the industry that would produce the kind of disastrous results predicted by the member for Burra and by the Leader of the Opposition. That need not be the case.

However, it is also clear that the winemakers can afford to pay a higher price than they were prepared to consider when the committee met. While the committee was doing its work, the winemakers sat pat and said they would pay only a few cents a ton extra and no more than that. It was only the threat of this legislation that produced a better offer. It is clear that although the Prices Commissioner may not recommend a price that will immediately meet the needs of grapegrowers (that may be possible over a longer period of time), he can recommend prices that are feasible for winemakers to pay and yet which will enable grapegrowers to have a better deal than they have had in years gone by. As I listened to the Leader and the member for Burra, in particular, I thought that this kind of debate and the kinds

of argument they used could well have been used in this House 70 years ago when a measure for compulsory arbitration of industrial disputes between employer and employee was first introduced. What they said could have been said then: a minimum wage would put employers out of business and they would have to go to other States. It could have been said that they would not pay; that they would just sell off the stocks of the products they had and refuse to pay the higher wage. We know that these Cassandra-like utterances of that time have proved to be incorrect, and I am sure that the Cassandra-like utterances we have heard today from one or two members will also prove to be incorrect.

I should like also, Mr. Speaker, to refer to the retrospectivity clause in the Bill. I think this retrospectivity is necessary. I believe that one of the problems in the industry at present is that neither the winemakers nor the grapegrowers can guarantee performance of all their members. One of the problems about a gentlemen's agreement, or any sort of agreement which does not have any force of law behind it, is that one party may not honour the agreement. As the member for Ridley pointed out, the Wine and Brandy Producers Association is fearful that one or two of its members will not honour an agreement and will try to get grapes for a lower price, and on the other hand one or two grapegrowers, in order to get rid of their grapes or to get immediate cash, also may not honour an agreement.

I think this legislation, providing as it does an arbitration back-stop, as it were, to the conciliation procedure suggested by the Royal Commission's report, will enable in future the committee that has been established following on the report of the Royal Commission to work in a much better atmosphere, because the Wine and Brandy Producers Association particularly will know that if it is not prepared to be reasonable in negotiations that take place with the grapegrowers, the power rests with the Government to enforce a solution compulsorily under this legislation. I hope that with the introduction of this legislation providing this back-stop to any negotiations that take place in future between the winemakers and the grapegrowers it will be possible, contrary to the opinion of the honourable member for Burra, for the winemakers and the growers to settle down to develop their relations with one another in a more amicable fashion than they have in the past. I do not believe that what the member for Burra says is anywhere near

the truth. I think it is trying to suggest that the kind of conciliation and arbitration procedures that we lay down for industrial disputes between employer and employee are inadequate and can only lead to disaster.

Let me make this final point: the contrast that I have drawn between the determination of the price of grapes on the one hand and the determination of wage rates, either as a result of conciliation with an agreement registered in an award by the court or a determination by compulsory arbitration, is in fact a very good analogy. The wage rate determines the standard of living of the ordinary working man, while the price of grapes determines in a very essential way the standard of living of the ordinary grapegrower. It determines not only his standard of living but his ability to improve his productive efficiency. If he does not get an adequate return then he is not in a financial position to re-invest within his own property should he desire to do that, and of course ultimately, if the ordinary grapegrower is not able, because he has not got the finance, to improve his own property and improve his own efficiency, then this must detract from the long-run performance not only of the grapegrower himself but of the wine industry as a whole.

I am firmly of the view that, while it may appear not to be in the short-run interests of winemakers to pay higher prices for grapes, if by means of higher prices for grapes we are able to develop over a longer period of time a greater co-operative atmosphere between grapegrowers and winemakers, and if we are able to protect the grower so that he not only gets a decent income but is able to provide the finance whereby he can properly develop his property, then something that the winemakers have seen as not being in their short-term interests will prove in the longer run to be very much in their interests and will help in the overall stabilization of the wine industry.

In conclusion, I say that no-one can regard this legislation as a panacea for all the troubles and difficulties that are likely to arise in this industry over the next few years. Many other measures are necessary as well, and much is needed to be done to promote the sale of wine, particularly the export of wine. I think it is in the export field that the performance of the winemakers has been particularly poor in the past. I firmly believe that there is an opportunity for sales promotion of Australian wine overseas, and that the right approach can produce very profitable results for all concerned. I support the Bill.

Mrs. STEELE (Burnside): The time was, and not very long ago either, when the lower slopes of the hillside areas of my district, stretching from Stonyfell to the banks of the River Torrens, were covered with vineyards. These, of course, in the last 10 or 15 years have been replaced by great building activity, and the picturesque terracing of the hillslopes is now just a thing of memory and definitely one of the past. However, though the vineyards have gone there still remain in the Magill-Stonyfell areas four large wineries—Stonyfell, Penfolds, Aldana and Romalo. Therefore, for the very reason that both the grapegrowers and the wine producers are essential partners in any agreement that is arrived at by way of negotiation or legislation to stabilize the industry, I have an interest in this Bill.

I believe that probably the Government introduced this legislation in all sincerity. There may have been divided opinions on it, but at least it came into this House as a measure presented by the Government. However, I believe that the legislation was born of desperation in trying to resolve the situation which the Government has largely brought about itself by events last year. In the years from 1960 to 1964 inclusive there had each year taken place negotiations between the grapegrowers and the wine and brandy producers, under the chairmanship of the Premier of the day. These conferences, even though they may have been protracted, always arrived at a satisfactory price, and negotiations were concluded and everybody seemed happy. In fact, arrangements had been made just following the elections of last year for the then Premier to have his customary meeting with the two organizations concerned. Then, of course, some days prior to the election on March 6, that fateful day for South Australia—

Mr. Langley: It was a great day.

Mrs. STEELE: I repeat that it was a fateful day. This advertisement, to which reference has been made today, appeared in the morning newspaper of March 5. It was born of the desire to strengthen the position of candidates in seats critical to the Australian Labor Party which thought it was the type of propaganda that would suggest that the A.L.P. could provide a solution to the ills and problems of the grapegrowers. Events have not turned out exactly as the present Government would have liked. On the Monday following the election, a meeting was to have been held but when the Labor Party realized that it had won a mandate to govern in South Australia it asked

the then Government if it would carry on as a caretaker Government for a few days. However, the Premier took out of the hands of the negotiator, who over the years had proved particularly successful in his association with these two bodies, the responsibility of meeting with the wine and brandy makers and the grapegrowers. We now know the chaos that resulted. Having had long experience, the Leader knew the personalities of the people involved (and this is important when one is negotiating), and he was thoroughly conversant with the industry—an industry about which the Premier has said he knew little.

The new Government took over, and the difficulties of this industry precipitated themselves. We remember the concern at the surplus of grapes and the arrangements hastily made by the Government to make finance available from the State Bank to process the surplus. Following that, the Government set up a Royal Commission that has produced its report to which many people have referred today. Because of the nature of the members of that Commission and the fact that they are regarded as astute men, we know that the report presented to Parliament was one which we would expect from them. However, in no place did it advise that legislation should be introduced to set up a price-fixing apparatus to resolve the problems of this industry.

Mr. Coumbe: Where did the Government get the idea?

Mrs. STEELE: It certainly was not referred to in the report. We have to realize that most of the winemaking firms in South Australia are family concerns and that these people in the last century were pioneers of an industry that has brought much wealth to this State. I understand that we produce about 70 per cent of wine produced in Australia. Because these are in many instances family concerns over the years generations are affected and more and more families have to be supported by the production of these wineries. We have to remember, too, that many have shareholders to satisfy and no-one is in business these days for sentiment: it is a matter of hard bargaining when it comes to what a person wants to buy and what the other wants to sell. Because of these responsibilities to their families and to shareholders, many people depend on the ability and good methods used by the people making wine to be able to sell it at competitive prices, and the question of competitive prices is getting more and more difficult to meet every day.

An old adage states that you can take a horse to water but you cannot make it drink. This legislation can be introduced, but it cannot make people buy grapes if they do not want to, and coercion will not succeed. Two of the biggest firms operating in this State, which originated here in the early days, are expanding and consolidating their holdings and industries in adjoining Eastern States, and legislation of this type will hasten the day when other wine-producing firms follow their example. The member for Mitcham spoke about the decrease in wine production in South Australia which has definitely been to the advantage of other States and of the members of the wine industry in those States. Wine grapegrowers have been led up the garden path by this Government because the people who stand to lose from this legislation are the growers. The member for Glenelg said that this legislation could not be considered to be the panacea for all ills and disabilities under which growers are labouring at present, but the Bill increases the risk in which they stand rather than lessens it. It was put to me this afternoon, "What would happen if one big firm decided it will buy the minimum quantity of grapes from growers this season and depend on the reserves which it had to carry it over until next season?" I suggest by the time the next season comes that growers will be clamouring for negotiation to arrive at an agreed price to cover the loss of sales for the current season, and to meet their fear of history repeating itself next season.

This legislation is not in the best interests of growers: it will not give them the quantity of sales they want nor will it guarantee their future security. On the other hand it may drive the wine and brandy producers, who are essential to the growth and security of grapegrowers in this State, across the border into the Eastern States. The existence and future well-being of these bodies depends on collaboration and co-operation with each other, but this will not be achieved by this legislation. This Bill will need much amending before I shall be satisfied that it achieves the purpose for which the Government introduced it, namely, the stability of the wine industry as it affects both the grower and the wine and brandy manufacturer. Their futures are irrevocably bound up, and the industry as a whole can only have stability when both sides negotiate. I believe that no amount of legislation will achieve the relationships that are necessary for growth and stability in the wine industry.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide): I support the Bill and say at the outset that I was interested to listen to the statements of members opposite. They are following the procedure some of their colleagues have followed in years gone by, a procedure that I attributed to their Leader prior to the last adjournment, namely one of "two bob each way". They desire to be able to say to the grapegrowers that this is what they said when they opposed the Bill, and when they meet those in favour of the Bill they will want to say they voted for it. The Bill is drafted as the member for Angas desired, but it has to be amended to suit the one-time, now deposed, master. The member for Burnside spoke about the proved negotiator on grape prices, but grapegrowers have never been satisfied with the proved negotiator. The Liberal Party tossed Bill Macgillivray out and put in Mr. King, but the proved negotiator failed, and Mr. King was put out and the present member for Chaffey elected. His electors are happy with the Bill. A petition was presented in the House today and signed as recently as last night, disowning the proved negotiator. Those petitioners want the present Premier and the present Bill.

We all know the political history of the member for Burra: he stood as an Independent and lost and, realizing that he would have to become a Party man he joined the Australian Labor Party, won a seat, and then left the Party to become an Independent. Then he joined the out-going Government Party. Churchill once said of a member of Parliament resembling the member I have just described that he was the only rat he knew that swam towards a sinking ship, and the member for Burra certainly sank that ship. If he and others who spoke this afternoon and this evening approached this Bill with an open mind instead of an open mouth they would have done much better. As usual, the Leader commenced with the customary threat; first of all he described this as a bad Bill.

Mr. Langley: Badly drafted!

Mr. LAWN: Yes. Over the last couple of years the Leader has shown that his memory is not as good as it was in 1950 when I came into the House. However, I shall leave the Leader's memory for the Minister of Agriculture to deal with. The Leader said that if the Bill was not improved in Committee he would oppose the third reading. A petition was also presented in another place today by colleagues of the members opposite.

Mr. McAnaney: Why didn't you drop the Road and Railway Transport Act Amendment Bill when you had a petition?

Mr. Jennings: That is completely irrelevant. You don't know what you are talking about.

Mr. LAWN: How stupid can some people be! Following the presentation of his petition today, an honourable member in another place asked the Leader of the Government what action the Government would take to give effect to the prayer contained in the petition. The Minister in charge of the Government in that place said a Bill was being introduced today to give effect to that prayer. I point out, however, that colleagues of honourable members opposite who presented a petition in another place and then asked what the Government intended to do in regard to the prayer contained in the petition were happy with the reply they received. Unfortunately, the Opposition is merely delaying the matter.

Mr. Hurst: Are they unanimous about it?

Mr. LAWN: They are not happy with it. The Bill is against their principles and opposed by their principals. They have members representing grapegrowers, namely, the members for Angas, Alexandra, Stirling—

The Hon. Frank Walsh: The member for Burnside!

Mr. LAWN: I should like to send a copy of her speech to some grapegrowers.

Mr. Coumbe: There are plenty of grapegrowers in the district of Adelaide!

Mr. LAWN: Members opposite speak against the Bill but they will vote for it. The member for Stirling said it was a bad Bill and that no porcupine would want to get into bed with it, but I am prepared to bet a dollar to nothing that no self-respecting porcupine would want to get into bed with the member for Stirling, despite his many pricks.

Mr. Clark: You've got a point there.

Mr. LAWN: More than one. Members opposite say the Bill will drive winemakers out of the State and the growers out of business. The member for Burra went so far as to say the Bill would kill the industry. I have heard similar statements made in respect of other industries many long years ago. In 1929 I was concerned with an application before the Commonwealth Arbitration Court for a 44-hour working week for employees in the motor body building industry. That industry was conducted on a small scale compared with the industry today. The late Sir Edward Holden gave evidence in the Adelaide Supreme Court to the effect that competition from overseas

including England and America was so keen that a featherweight would turn the scale. Not only have we achieved a 44-hour week in that industry, but we are now enjoying a 40-hour week. We have annual leave, long service leave, and sick leave, which we did not have then, and not only is the motor body building industry flourishing but it is building 80 per cent to 90 per cent of a complete motor car.

Mr. Ryan: What is its profit?

Mr. LAWN: The profit has increased, too. The British Motor Corporation has since come to Australia; it was not producing cars in Australia in those days. The Rootes Group came to Australia and produced cars, and now the Japanese are in the market. It is obvious these provisions did not drive the motor-building industry out of Australia as predicted by Sir Edward Holden. What has been said by members opposite in this debate was what Sir Edward Holden said to the Arbitration Court in 1929. I want to refer to a Bill introduced by Lord Shaftesbury who was born Anthony Ashley Cooper and became the Seventh Earl of Shaftesbury.

Mr. McKee: What were his politics?

Mr. LAWN: Irrespective of his politics, he is high in my estimation. He introduced the Bill to limit the hours of junior miners in coal mines to 10 hours a day. How would members opposite like to see their children four and five years of age working in coal mines?

Mr. Rodda: What has this got to do with the Bill?

Mr. LAWN: It is to do with a claim made by members opposite that every improvement given to a section of industry will drive that industry out of the State. Sir Edward Holden said that wharfage dues and concessions would drive the motor-body building industry out of the country. Lord Shaftesbury introduced a Bill to limit the hours of junior coal miners to 10 hours a day and it was defeated. During the discussion a statement was made that competition between Europe and the British Isles was so keen that a featherweight would turn the scales. Sir Edward Holden repeated that sentiment. Lord Shaftesbury's struggle to improve conditions continued. In the Dictionary of National Biography he is quoted as saying:

Here, too, the evils brought to light, especially with respect to women and children, were appalling. Many women were found to be working in dismal underground situations, in such a way as tended to degrade them to the level of brutes. Children, sometimes not over four or five years of age, were found

toiling in the dark, in some cases so long as 18 hours a day, dragged from bed at 4 in the morning, and so utterly wearied out that instruction, either on week days or Sundays, was utterly out of the question. Often they were attached by chain and girdle to trucks which they had to drag on all fours through the workings to the shaft. The opposition were struck dumb by these revelations. An Act was passed in 1842 under Ashley's care abolishing the system of apprenticeship, which had led to fearful abuses, and excluding women, and boys under 13, from employment underground.

He failed to reduce their working hours to 10 hours a day but he continued fighting. He wanted to improve the conditions of women and children in mines. Here we have a situation where a group of our people are in a somewhat similar situation. They have somebody telling them what they will receive for their production. These growers are decent humanitarian people. The Opposition hopes that grapegrowers will employ cheap labour so that winemakers can get cheap grapes and sell them at a large profit. The Opposition represents the winemakers and is not interested in the grapegrowers at all. It is interested in winemakers who are well able to look after themselves and can afford every penny for which the grapegrowers have asked. I understand that the grapegrowers will be satisfied if they get what they want over a period of three years. The winemakers saw to it as recently as November last that they could pay every penny for which the grapegrowers ask. In the *Sunday Mail* of November 21 appeared an article under the heading, "Some Wines to be Dearer". In the *Sunday Mail* of November 28 appeared an article headed, "The Wines That Will Cost More", which stated:

Retail prices for the higher-priced wines in South Australia have in most cases increased. The secretary of the Australian Hotels Association, Mr. W. F. Connelly, said that some merchants in adjustments for decimal currency had increased the prices for some wines.

Not far from where I am standing people are concerned with an adjustment for decimal currency but it is only for 1c. The winemakers' adjustment to meet decimal currency is about 10c a bottle and at 840 bottles to a ton of grapes that is \$84 a ton. The winemakers adjusted their prices last November. The adjustment was 2c for some bottles, 8c for others, 5c for others, and one line was reduced by 1c. However, in most lines the price increased by as much as 10c and as much as \$84 a ton to meet the changeover to decimal currency, and yet the winemakers say they cannot afford to pay \$6 a ton to grapegrowers.

The Leader ridiculed the Bill because he said it contained a threat in that when the parties met under a chairman the threat was that the chairman would determine the matter. Other members opposite carried on that line of argument. The member for Burra said it would be like having two billy goats at the hearing. I suppose that a few years ago he would have described ship owners' and seamen's representatives as billy goats—or would he have said that only the seaman was a billy goat? I suppose he would say that the coalminers and the owners of the coalmines were billy goats, and that the waterside workers and the stevedoring companies were billy goats. Nothing different will happen under this legislation from what happens under the Industrial Code that was passed by the previous Government. Parties are called together by a chairman who presides and tries to get them to negotiate and effect an agreement, and if they do not do so he gives a decision. It is done every day in the week, every week in the year. I appeared for years in the Commonwealth Arbitration Court, and on any application, either ours or the employers', we either asked to go into conference or were ordered to go into conference. When we could not settle our agreements, a decision had to be given.

The present Industrial Code in South Australia was passed by the previous Government, and if it had not liked any part of it it could have amended it. That Code provides for wages boards. If the parties cannot agree, the chairman makes the decision. If it is good enough elsewhere, what is wrong with it in this Bill? Yet the Opposition attempts to ridicule the Bill by saying that it is like calling two billy goats together. The honourable member for Burra even went so far as to say it was like two rams meeting head-on on a narrow bridge. Could that description not apply to some of the industrial disputes we have had throughout the Commonwealth over the years? How could these disputes be settled other than by an arbitrator, someone acting as the chairman? These things do not give any justification for ridiculing this Bill, for this legislation is in line with the general principles of arbitration throughout Australia. In this case the Prices Commissioner will make the decision.

The honourable member for Burnside said that the winemakers have to look after their families and their shareholders. The honourable member for Chaffey this afternoon briefly referred to the things that a grapegrower has to buy. The member for Burnside wants the winemakers to

be given *carte blanche* to pay whatever price they are willing to pay, and at the same time to sell their wine at an increased price of \$84 a ton, and, if that is not sufficient to meet their families' requirements and their shareholders' wishes, to increase the price of wine further without any control. I suppose the grapegrowers want to buy clothes, for they cannot be expected to run around naked. I suppose also they must have a motor car. If not, they at least need machinery to work their blocks, and they need to buy superphosphate. What is the position of the grapegrower when he goes to buy these things? Would it be all right for him to say, "Well, I cannot afford to pay that price"? That is what members opposite are arguing now on behalf of the winemakers, and they say we should accept the winemakers' statement. When I want to buy anything I find that when I say I cannot afford to pay the price the dealer tells me that that is the price and I have to pay it. That also applies to the grapegrower. Other people who sell their labour (apart from the rural employees, who have been kept out of the Arbitration Court by the Party opposite), can go to a court and get a fair wage for the sale of their labour. This Bill simply gives the grapegrowers the right to get a fair price from an independent arbitrator for their labour and a fair return on the capital they have invested. Members opposite have always stressed this question of a fair return on capital invested. Although those growers do not have to give minimum award conditions to their employees, they have voluntarily agreed to give their employees the recognized standards of conditions and wages, because the Party opposite has refused to allow those employees to go to the State Arbitration Court for an award. The growers are now asking this Parliament for a decent standard of living for themselves. This can only be obtained, if negotiations fail, by arbitration. This is all this Bill means.

Finally, I wish to say that listening to the honourable member for Burra it seemed to me that his hatred for the Australian Labor Party took control of him this afternoon and clouded out his reason. He could not approach the Bill with an open mind. His hatred for the Labor Party was such that he said that even though he opposed the Bill he would vote for it and destroy all the grapegrowers in the process, according to him, so as to achieve his object of defeating the honourable members for Chaffey, Barossa and Semaphore. Having gone as far as Semaphore, I thought he might

have included the member for Adelaide and the member for Unley.

Mr. Langley: He left me out this time.

Mr. LAWN: I think his hatred took such possession of him that he lost control of his thinking and he stopped when he got as far as Semaphore. He was just carried away by his hatred for my Party. We all know what he thinks about the Labor Party, and we all know what he has said about any Party.

Mr. McKee: It is just sour grapes.

Mr. LAWN: It sounded to me as though it was sour gripe rather than sour grapes.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga): I think I must speak briefly after the hysterical outburst we have just heard from the member for Adelaide. In the whole of my experience I have never seen a more obviously stage-managed piece of legislation introduced into Parliament. We even had very appropriately presented a petition on the eve of the introduction of the Bill. It was very well managed, and it gave an aura of respectability immediately to the Bill. Quite obviously, this Bill could have been introduced, and perhaps should have been introduced, a little earlier in the session. We should not now be dealing with this legislation, which seems to have assumed major importance.

Mr. Curren: It should have been introduced 15 years ago.

Mr. SHANNON: It could have been introduced earlier this session and the member for Chaffey is aware of that. This has all the appearance of face-saving by the Government to cover its lack of success in the negotiations with the parties over the last 12 months or so. The Government faced a difficult problem: we had it, too. This helped the member for Chaffey hold his seat. The things said about the Playford Administration on the eve of the last election and the scurrilous article that appeared with the most telling cartoon, but false in every particular, saved the member for Chaffey and defeated the previous member for Barossa. In dealing with these problems negotiations with the parties will achieve much more than force can achieve. If this Bill becomes law it may be used as a threat to the parties who did not come to reasonable compromise on prices. To liken this legislation to the dark ages is laughable. Had the member for Adelaide wished to quote from history and to link it with this legislation, the strange use to which wine had been put through the ages could have been appropriately quoted.

It is recorded that the Duke of Clarence was brought before the House and charged

and found guilty of conspiring to unseat Richard the Third from the throne. He was condemned to death and incarcerated in the Tower of London. Certain people were engaged to carry out the sentence surreptitiously so that there would be no public outcry, and history suggests he finished up in a keg of malmsey juice. That would be an appropriate end to some of the speeches I have listened to tonight. I doubt whether this legislation will be the answer to the problem. I support the Leader's remarks about the breaking of a contract which this Bill does for those who have harvested and delivered their grapes to a winery. There could be a reduction in the price agreed on, but I am sure we could not expect the grower to return to the winery that portion of his crop proceeds in excess of the price later fixed.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: It would be unlikely.

Mr. SHANNON: This can only work if the price fixed is more than the amount paid under that agreement. The winery will have to pay the additional price, and I am sure that will not break the vigneron. In the interests of South Australia we should not have a winery that was not making a profit. South Australia has successfully pioneered this industry, and in many ways that is a feather in the cap of both the grower and the winemaker.

Mr. Curren: It does not matter whether the grower makes a profit or a living!

Mr. SHANNON: The honourable member is talking to his constituents at the moment. I have no axe to grind. There are a few growers around Happy Valley and they are commonsense people. I have had no approaches from them, but undoubtedly every grower knows that he cannot get a price for his grapes that will deny the winemaking industry a margin of profit. It seems that negotiations between the parties would have been more effective without legislation. The member for Adelaide suggested that wineries were making \$84 a ton extra because of the change to decimal currency. There is no mention of that in the Royal Commission's report. It is strange that the Commissioners should have missed that alarming point, and that makes me doubt what I hear from the member for Adelaide. I am sure that such a steep increase would not be overlooked by the Commissioners. If it were, there might be other important things that the Commission overlooked, but I do not agree with that. The Commissioners, honest and knowledgeable, brought down a good and fair statement of the case as they found it. I am con-

cerned about arrangements arbitrarily forced on people. No-one can be made to buy raw material at a price beyond his capacity to make a profit. An industry cannot be forced to pay for a product a sum greater than the profit to be made. Despite what the member for Adelaide said about the member for Burra, who has apparently been criticized for his honesty, I can only say that a member of the Labor Party in the Commonwealth sphere may soon be joining another Party because of his honesty. Members opposite are not allowed to express a personal opinion.

Mr. Casey: Don't believe everything you read in the paper.

Mr. SHANNON: I have no doubt that many statements in the press are exaggerated, but I know that it pays members opposite to keep to the dotted line. Too much money is invested in the South Australian wine industry for anything drastic to happen, but if no mutual agreement is reached on the prices paid by the wineries to the growers an expansion in the industry will occur in other States where this form of control does not apply. The Eastern States have a tremendous advantage that we do not have in being close to the major local markets. I believe that will influence a policy that may finally whittle South Australia's wine industry down to one of secondary position, despite our proud record to date of being the leaders in the wine industry almost since the inception of the State.

Indeed, I believe that some of the first South Australian settlers who went to the district of the member for Angas brought their own cuttings from Europe to start their vineyards. We should try to protect this industry, but by tackling it like a bull at a gate the industry may suffer. I am afraid that the results of this approach may be more barren than the results that have occurred from the last 12 months of negotiations. The member for Adelaide said that the Prices Commissioner would fix prices but I notice that the Bill provides that the Minister shall do that, he being the final arbiter.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: On the recommendation of the Prices Commissioner!

Mr. SHANNON: It does not say that. The Minister of Lands is saying that any sensible Minister would seek advice, with which I agree, but I am saying that the member for Adelaide misread his Bill. From my experience in Parliament I have known Ministers who have become dictatorial and who thought without consulting anybody that they knew all the answers. This Bill, in effect, provides for that

to happen. I do not say that I will not trust anybody, for I trust everybody unless and until I find that I cannot. If the Government intends to have expert advice on certain matters it is wise to include a provision to that effect in the legislation it introduces, so that everybody knows what is intended. It is obvious that, with the support of the Party introducing the Bill, together with that of members on this side of the House representing grapegrowers, the Government will have no trouble in carrying the Bill, but I am not particularly enamoured of it because I fear that the Government may rue the day that it accepted the responsibilities placed on it by this legislation. I issue a warning here: the Government should not forget that both sides of this industry will be on its back, and pity help it if it cannot satisfy both parties.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS (Minister of Agriculture): I have listened with interest to the various speakers to the Bill and to the various ways this subject has been tackled, including lengthy discussions on the ways in which to make wine. The member for Onkaparinga and the Leader of the Opposition have said that they thought the Bill was introduced too late in the session, but I say it is too early. If everything had worked out the way we desired, the Bill would not have been introduced at all. I think this is the commonsense approach. I think there has been some confusion as to the Royal Commission because we have heard much about what should be done about the recommendations of the Commission. Up to this stage the Government has dealt with the Commission's interim report and not the final report as we now have it. The interim report was to deal with this vintage and we have worked to that stage only. I can assure honourable members and all those interested in the industry that the Commission's recommendations will be considered soon. The fact that we are now dealing with the Commission's recommendation in its interim report has been disregarded by members opposite. The interim report did not provide that an independent chairman should be appointed; that is provided in the final report. The interim report states:

We are of the opinion that the minimum prices of each variety of grape to be paid to the growers by the winemakers for the 1966 vintage should be the subject of negotiations between the two parties. We consider that action should be taken immediately to appoint a committee to conduct these negotiations. It is recommended that the committee should consist of the following persons:

(a) a person to be appointed by Your Excellency who shall be chairman.

There is no mention of an independent chairman there. The report continues:

(b) two persons appointed by Your Excellency who should be nominated by the Wine Grape Growers Council of South Australia.

(c) two persons appointed by Your Excellency who should be nominated by the Wine and Brandy Producers Association of South Australia, Incorporated.

Such decision as it reached by the committee shall be binding on grapegrowers and winemakers.

This is where the negotiations broke down. It was obvious from the first discussion that the wine and brandy producers were not prepared to accept the final words of the interim report of the Commission. It was stated by one member representing the wine and brandy producers that this would be making out a blank cheque to the industry and that they would be, in effect, compelling other people who were not in their association to pay the prices that would be fixed. However, I remind honourable members that the former Government appointed the Prices Commissioner to do this without any consultation with either of the two bodies. He brought down prices that were accepted by the industry and honoured by it.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Does the Minister suggest that we did not consult with either of the parties?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I am not suggesting that at all.

Mr. Millhouse: That is what you said.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I said that, as was suggested in the Commission's report, they were not consulted with the Prices Commissioner in conference. That is the text of the interim report. When the Government set up the committee, press statements were issued and the committee's purpose was explained. Honourable members opposite said that people concerned did not know the terms of reference of the committee. Apparently everybody else in the State but the people concerned seemed to know, and that seems odd to me.

I shall trace the history of the negotiations. I was happy to go along with these negotiations and I discussed the matter with the Leader, whose advice I valued. As I said before, had we been able to receive co-operation there would have been no need whatever for the Bill, which is only as a last resort. When the two sides first met they brought down rather wide prices and it was agreed that they should talk about it and come back again. When they came

back on the second occasion the wine and brandy producers' representatives said that they would go no further. They said they would conduct negotiations on a private basis, but this was against the recommendation in the interim report. I was then invited to discuss the matter with the five gentlemen concerned. I battled there for 2½ hours until my patience was sorely tried. I endeavoured to get the wine and brandy producers to further discuss matters. I went so far as to ask them to come back and discuss the matter again after the Prices Commissioner had recommended a certain price. I explained they did not have to accept it as binding but they could take it back to the various committees and discuss it and then have a further meeting on it. Every effort was made to have the discussions take place. One representative of the Wine and Brandy Producers Association was not happy about the situation but the other representative prevailed on him and said that such a price would not be binding in any event and would be of assistance. The Prices Commissioner then suggested various prices. Although the grapegrowers council representatives were not happy with the Prices Commissioner's prices they said that they were prepared to accept them for this year, but the wine and brandy producers were not prepared to accept them and said so. They were not prepared to go any further than their suggested increase of 11c for dry areas and 34c for irrigated areas. We were then back where we had started. I recommended at this stage, because I felt they were not prepared to negotiate and that negotiations had failed completely, that I was prepared to recommend to Cabinet that notice should be given on February 17 that legislation would be introduced into this House. It is rather remarkable that this was instrumental in bringing the wine and brandy producers back to the Premier offering an increase of \$1.95 a ton, which was considerably above what they had offered before. It seemed odd to me that notice had to be given of the Bill before they were prepared to negotiate at all.

Earlier in the debate the Leader and the member for Mitcham referred to the fact that an advertisement had been inserted in a newspaper prior to the last State election. I did not see the advertisement until after the election but when I saw it I was appalled. That advertisement was a mistake by our Party. I think we did wrong and that we lost votes over it because people are fair whether they live in Chaffey or anywhere else. Something

else that was not appreciated was that whereas the Prices Commissioner had in the past brought down recommendations these were referred to the industry on a confidential basis before any information was revealed to the press at all on what the suggested prices were. However, in 1965, this was not the case because in his election speech the Leader revealed prices to the public before he revealed them to the industry itself. This was not appreciated by the winemakers, and they told me so. The Leader said that the prices broke down because we came into Government, and that this was "Living Better with Labor". When I discussed this matter with six representatives of the Wine and Brandy Producers Association this very point was brought up, and they said that 1965 was the year they had decided to stop any further price fixation by the Prices Commissioner. They said that they did not believe in the Commissioner's way of reckoning, that it was affecting the industry, and that the snowballing effect of increased prices was not the right way to approach the problem. They said that the approach should be on a different basis. I think they had some merit in their suggestions on this, and that it was something that could well have been looked at. I said, "So you waited for a Labor Government to come in to do it", and the six of them came in at once and said, "That is not so; we would have done it whatever Government was in." I accept that statement from them, because I believe the six of them would not have come in with one voice had this not been so.

The Leader said this afternoon that this was brought about by a change of Government, and that we were the cause of a price increase not prevailing last year. That is totally wrong, and I guarantee that if the Leader checked now with the wine and brandy producers they would confirm that it would have been done regardless of what Government was in office.

The Leader also referred to the question of the independent chairman. It was my opinion that the right man to be chairman on this occasion was the Chairman of the Royal Commission (Mr. Jeffery). I know that the Wine and Brandy Producers Association's members have claimed that they did not want the Prices Commissioner as chairman. However, at that stage the Royal Commission had not completed its findings, and the Chairman thought it would be wrong for him to be chairman of that interim committee. He himself suggested that Mr. Baker, the Prices

Commissioner, should be chairman, and we accepted that suggestion. I consider that Mr. Baker has done an excellent job. As chairman, he has been particularly tolerant in his attitude, and I think he was in all respects fair in the bases of the prices he brought down for this vintage.

Some reference was made by the Leader to the fact that there had been little surplus over many years. I think he mentioned a total figure of 1,600 tons. To my knowledge, 1,500 tons was processed by the previous Government in 1964, and if ever a mistake was made in this industry it was made right then in processing any grapes at all, because the following year when we came in we had no option but to take 3,500 tons. Here again, it was a mistake (I say that sincerely) for any pool to have been set up by either Government. No Government should be expected to enter into the pooling of grapes for making wine, and if this had not been started in the first place by the previous Government we would never have taken another 3,500 tons last year. I believe this 1,500 tons started an emergency pool for winemakers to draw on. This was increased to 3,500 tons last year, and had it been allowed to go on it would not have been long before the State Government was processing all the grapes in South Australia and the winemakers would be drawing on the grapes as they wanted them. That is entirely wrong, and how stupid it was of the previous Government to start it.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: I did not hear anyone protesting from the then Opposition.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I would have protested had I known the repercussions that would follow.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: It led to the establishment of a permanent co-operative, and that was agreed by the Royal Commission to be necessary.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I think the Royal Commission's report supports co-operatives, but I think the pooling in this instance was far from warranted and most unwise.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: It led to the formation of a co-operative.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Mr. Speaker, the Leader this afternoon referred to the fact that I had recently gone to the Agricultural Council, and that is true. Apparently he has some information from inside the Agricultural Council that I was unaware was available to people, because he said in effect that I had made very little effort on behalf of the wine-

makers in South Australia to bring this matter under Commonwealth control. I agree that Commonwealth legislation would be the ideal thing. The member for Ridley and others referred to this question today. However, let me say that this is something that has not come about in the last 12 months: this has been wanted for several years. I have been to only two Agricultural Council meetings. I do not know what was discussed by the previous Minister of Agriculture at the council, but I know that the only opportunity given to me at the last meeting to discuss this was in what is termed the address in reply which follows the speech by the Minister for Primary Industry, when he gives his report on what is expected of the industry for the next 12 months and a summary of the former 12 months. Each Minister is then given the opportunity to discuss the problems of his State, and this very problem was the major item that I brought up. I said that I believed the industry should be under Commonwealth control, that we had appointed a Royal Commission, and that therefore it would have been wrong of me to put this on the agenda while the Royal Commission was still carrying out its investigations. I pointed this out forcibly to the Agricultural Council, and I defy anyone to say otherwise. I told the council that it was not a new problem but that it had been going on for a number of years. I said I thought there was only one solution and that was Commonwealth statutory control so that the industry throughout Australia would be maintained. Therefore, I say sincerely that the Leader was well wide of the mark when he said that I did not make representations on behalf of the State for Commonwealth control.

Both the Leader and the honourable member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) criticized the drafting of this Bill. In fact, the Leader said that some of the things contained in the Bill were not only totally unwarranted, but, in effect, rather ridiculous. He referred particularly to the provision regarding sliding scale minimum prices, and he said, as if in ridicule, "What sort of wording for a Bill is this?" I remind him that he introduced the original Act and that is his identical wording except that the word "maximum" has been replaced by the word "minimum". If he thinks this is ridiculous he should think back to the time when he introduced the earlier legislation. The member for Onkaparinga said that the Minister would be fixing the prices. Again, this is something that runs right through the parent Act. The Minister is responsible, but it is the Prices

Commissioner who brings down the recommendation. I assure the House that that will still be the case. We have had this discussion about retrospectivity. The Leader of the Opposition said this was crook, but the retrospectivity clause was suggested by the member for Angas.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: No!

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: On February 17, 1966, the member for Angas asked the following question:

As the 1966 grape harvesting commenced some time ago, does the Government intend to introduce legislation the effect of which will be retrospective to the beginning of this year's vintage?

This was interpreted by me as being required by the member for Angas, but if this clause is removed it will not upset me or the Government. We considered that it was wanted by people in the district of the member for Angas, and others as well. However, the member for Chaffey said that it does not matter and I shall be happy to have it removed. According to the member for Onkaparinga, the petition tabled today was timely, but it has been the thought of the grapegrowers' council for some time and the Royal Commission referred to it in its report. The petition would probably have been presented earlier had it been warranted. The council was anxious to ensure that legislation was introduced to bring some degree of prosperity to the industry, and this petition, tabled in both Houses, draws the attention of members to the thoughts of the council about it.

I support this legislation with some regret, but it is evident, in the time I have been associated with the negotiations, that it is necessary. Had the Wine and Brandy Producers Association agreed to the prices recommended by the Prices Commissioner, the grapegrowers would have accepted them, but its prices were below those recommended by the Prices Commissioner and the growers considered they were not sufficient. There is not much difference between what the Wine and Brandy Producers Association suggested to the Premier and what the Prices Commissioner recommended. In non-irrigation areas, for doradillos, with a tonnage of 7,610, the Prices Commissioner recommended \$54 and the winemakers offered \$53.50. For gordos, with 1,021 tons, the Prices Commissioner recommended \$56.50 and the winemakers offered \$54.50. For grenache, with 14,531 tons, the Prices Commissioner recommended \$57 and the winemakers offered \$54.50. For shiraz, with 8,159 tons, the Prices Commissioner recommended \$52 and the winemakers offered \$54.

For pedros, the Prices Commissioner recommended \$52 and the winemakers offered \$54. In irrigated areas, for doradillos, with 20,459 tons, the Prices Commissioner recommended \$45 and the winemakers offered \$42. For muscat gordos, with 29,455 tons, the Prices Commissioner recommended \$45 and the winemakers offered \$42. For grenache with 9,589 tons, the Prices Commissioner recommended \$47 and the winemakers offered \$45. This is on the 1965 vintage, which is far in excess of this year's vintage.

In the dry areas the difference would have been about \$120,000 and in the irrigated areas it would have been \$190,000, a total of \$310,000. Nearly 50 per cent was taken last year into the co-operatives, so that this amount can be halved and reduced to about \$180,000. From this amount about \$50,000 would be saved in taxation by the winemakers, so that the final difference would be about \$130,000 divided among 50 wineries, representing a little over \$2,000 each. This is close to the recommendation by the Prices Commissioner and the offer by the winemakers. Negotiations should not have broken down, as the overall difference is not great. However, the winemakers refused to discuss it further although the growers were prepared to accept the prices recommended by the Prices Commissioner for this year's vintage. We are concerned with this year's vintage because of the immediate necessity. For the next vintage we have the advantage of the report of the Royal Commission. An officer of my department is prepared to ensure that an extension officer is made available to the committee. This committee will be different in that there will be nominated representatives from the winemakers and from the grapegrowers with an independent chairman, and in co-operation with the extension officer, who will consider the economics of the industry, much would have been done if we could have this year. However, now it is necessary to introduce this legislation. I recommended the Bill to the Government as a last resort. It provides that the Minister may fix and declare the minimum price at which grapes may be sold or supplied to a winemaker or distiller of brandy. Obviously, negotiations can continue for another year and, provided both sides can get together, I believe that is the right way for any industry to function. One side is dependent on the other, and the sooner the people concerned realize that fact the better it will be for everybody.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): I think every honourable member, as well as

appreciating the problems confronting individual growers, understands the general structure of the industry, and is aware of the uncertainties that exist in regard to prices. In many cases the price structure cannot be altered and it stands to reason that growers are anxious to establish a stable system of price fixation. It is evident that growers are at present at loggerheads with the wine and brandy producers. Unfortunately, there is a serious disagreement as to how stability should be achieved but, in any event, I believe that the Government is making a mistake, for this legislation will have a bad effect on the industry generally. The problem basically arises from a failure to negotiate, and here and now I blame the Government largely for that failure. We have just heard the Minister of Agriculture admit (and this is the first admission we have heard) that that infamous advertisement on page 2 of the *Advertiser* was a mistake and that he was appalled when he saw it. I readily accept that statement, but it is a bad state of affairs that we should have to wait 12 months for such an admission. It was the second advertisement of its kind that was allowed to be published during the election campaign, but that advertisement really began the troubles confronting the new Government.

We all know how the grape prices recommended last year did not fully eventuate and how payments for some varieties of the most widely produced grapes in the 1965 vintage were considerably reduced below those of the 1964 vintage, following the new Government's accession to office. This Government followed the previous Government's practice in attempting to alleviate the problem in the industry by authorizing an emergency crushing pool, and I was interested and surprised to hear the Minister criticizing that procedure. Everybody knows that Government assistance in that regard is not to be encouraged but, in fact, it met a real emergency at the time. Indeed, I pay full tribute to the former Prices Commissioner (Mr. Murphy) for the part he played in that regard, as well as to the former Premier, for that action relieved the situation at the time and received not one word of protest from the then Opposition. As a matter of fact, and as the Leader has said, this emergency crushing led to the formation of a new co-operative at McLaren Vale which is now functioning well on a permanent basis.

By publishing the advertisement to which I have referred and by taking other action during the election campaign, the Government actually found itself holding a wolf by the

ears, without knowing how to let go. When it failed to have the desired prices paid for certain varieties in the 1965 vintage, the Government appointed a Royal Commission into the wine industry, and presented it with a difficult task indeed. I believe the Commission did a magnificent job under the most difficult circumstances but, unfortunately, its report has not received sufficient attention in this debate. At page 14 of its report the Commission recommends against the statutory fixing of wine grape prices. In its interim report the Commission suggested that a committee represented by both sides of the industry be appointed, but that report was subsequently abandoned by the Government. Following the difficulties encountered with the prices negotiating committee, the Premier began to negotiate with the representatives of both sides of the industry direct. Can anyone wonder that mistakes in these negotiations have been made, when one hears of the approach to this committee? In its interim report the Commission recommended that a committee be appointed to fix prices and that it comprise two persons representing growers, two representing wine and brandy producers and a person appointed by the Governor as chairman, such decisions as are reached by the committee being binding on grapegrowers and winemakers. However, as a result of that, the Premier made the following approach to the winemakers by way of a letter dated December 17:

I desire to advise that the Royal Commission into the grapegrowing industry has not yet completed its inquiry but because of the close proximity of the 1966 vintage, the Commission has submitted an interim report concerning that matter. The Commission has recommended that the price of each variety of grape to be paid to the grapegrowers by the winemakers for the 1966 vintage should be the subject of negotiations between the two parties. The Commission has recommended that the committee be appointed to conduct these negotiations. The committee will consist of:

- (a) A person to be appointed by His Excellency the Governor as Chairman;
- (b) Two persons appointed by the Governor who shall be nominated by the Wine Grapegrowers Council of South Australia;
- (c) Two persons appointed by the Governor who shall be nominated by the Wine and Brandy Producers Association of South Australia, Inc.

The Government has considered this interim report and proposes to act in accordance with the recommendations. I shall therefore be pleased to receive from you the names of the nominees for appointment to the committee.

These nominations should reach me not later than January 7, 1966. (Signed) Frank Walsh.

I want members to know that the letter did not state that the decision of the committee should be binding on the two parties. If there were a deadlock the chairman was to have a right to determine it and the decision was to be binding on the two parties. In the letter to the wine and brandy producers the Premier omitted to make that important point. The wine and brandy producers lost no time in replying (they wrote on December 23) and saying that they had much pleasure in nominating their representatives. It was not until much later that they began to hear something about the added terms of reference that were not mentioned in the letter, and they made further inquiries. It was well into January, after the committee was appointed, that the wine and brandy producers learned that one of the recommendations of the Commission, which they were expected to agree to, was the clause about the decision being binding upon the parties. The growers knew about this all along. I do not have a copy of the letter written to the grapegrowers organization but I understand that it was made clear in that letter, or in some other way, that the decision was binding on the two parties. Why was it omitted in the letter to one party and included in the other? Why did one party know about it when they appointed their representatives while the other party did not? To my mind that was a monumental blunder and it put the negotiations behind the mark; I do not think they ever recovered from that bad beginning. They are the circumstances of the appointment of the committee, and can one wonder that there was a little ill feeling early in the negotiations?

I wish to refer to the full report of the Commission and to its recommendations. Although this report has been available for a few weeks now we heard about one of the items recommended for the first time tonight. Recommendation No. 1 of the Commission is that the general problems of the industry are those of supply and demand and the only courses open are to increase the demand or restrict the supply. Recommendation No. 2 is that there should be more co-operation within the industry. Recommendation No. 3 is interesting and important and states that there is inadequate uniformity in policy with the irrigated area co-operatives on many aspects, including marketing, and advocates action to bring about closer co-ordination.

Recommendation No. 4 deals with the lack of reliable advice on plantings and the Commission proposes a grapegrowing industry advisory committee. In recommendation No. 5 the Commission suggests the appointment of an economic extension officer, and the Minister has told us that this will be done. Recommendation No. 6 deals with the formation of a price-negotiating committee. We know about that. In recommendation No. 7 the Commission considers that the retail prices of wine and brandy should be reviewed by the Prices Commissioner. Recommendation No. 8 deals with the desirability of firm contracts between winemakers and growers. Recommendation No. 9 deplors the lag in payments after delivery and the Commission considers that the grower should receive at least 50 per cent of the payment for his deliveries by the end of June and the balance by the end of September of the same vintage year.

In recommendation No. 10 the Commission suggests that the co-operative organizations should be encouraged financially and otherwise to increase intake availability. The despised crushing of this emergency pool led directly to the formation of a new co-operative. I wonder why the Minister was so critical of that action. Recommendation No. 11 states that to assist with increased sales and to enable limited quantities of wine to be purchased with food requirements the granting of storekeepers' Australian wine licences should be less restricted. Recommendation No. 12 states that, in effect, we should ask the Commonwealth Government to assist in promotion. In recommendation No. 13 the Commission states that it does not recommend the establishment of a sultana board but that the price of sultanas and other dual-purpose grapes should receive special consideration by the price negotiating committee. In recommendation No. 14 the Commission states that it does not recommend the establishment of a grape marketing board, and in recommendation No. 15 the Commission does not favour a return to the baume method of payment.

What recommendations of the Royal Commission have been observed to date? All we know is that an economic extension officer is to be appointed. The interim report of the Royal Commission has been completely disregarded. It was disregarded by the Premier who negotiated with representatives of both sides of the industry. After the committee was set up he started to negotiate with eight representatives from both sides. The Commission goes out of its way to say that it does not favour

the statutory control of grape prices that has been taken up. I do not wish to deal at great length with the dangers of this legislation. I do not believe it has a good future and I believe it can do harm to the industry in South Australia which, at present, leads Australia. Obviously this is a matter that should be the subject of Commonwealth negotiation. No-one will dispute that and both bodies concerned will agree to it. To be effective, legislation must be on a Commonwealth basis, and introducing legislation in this State alone may well jeopardize the future of the industry here. This legislation may produce many consequences, although nobody knows whether it will. We have been told what effects it will have, but everybody has been guessing. Possibly winemakers will not buy grapes, or they will not buy the quantities they are expected to buy.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: They will not buy unpopular varieties.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: They may pick and choose or limit their purchases. We should know something about this before this legislation is passed. They may buy grape juice from other States, and in the long run the industry may be sent in an easterly direction. We believe in decentralization, about which there has been much discussion in this House. Committees have been formed to investigate decentralization and debates have dealt with this matter over and over again. The winemaking industry is a good example of decentralization, as it employs about 1,400 men in the cellars. We are not sure what effects the Bill will have on this industry. We may or may not harm it, but nobody knows for certain.

The Royal Commission mentioned the possibility of collusion between some growers and winemakers. I think that is possible, though not probable, because the winemakers are small in number and are not likely in this way to attract the odd grower who is desperate to get rid of his grapes. However, other people who are not winemakers buy small quantities of grapes (I am referring to home winemakers), and it will be interesting to see whether this will be policed.

The penalty of not less than \$400 provided in the Bill is extraordinary. Nearly always legislation provides for a maximum penalty, and we often argue in this House about penalties. Recently we were saying that the maximum penalty for leaving out traffic indicators on motor vehicles was too great, but the penalty provided in this Bill is the minimum, and I

do not know why this is so. If a person is convicted of a minor breach the court will have no discretion to reduce the penalty, and having a minimum penalty of \$400 will make any magistrate think deeply about the consequences before he convicts.

There may be a big surplus of grapes, although it is not expected that there will be if the buying goes on as in the past. However, if there is a big surplus, there may be considerable trouble. I understand that the Government is dead against helping to crush any grapes as an emergency measure, so there could be a very great difficulty. Co-operatives are exempted from the provisions of the Bill, but this applies to members only, and if any co-operative needs to buy grapes from a non-member it must pay the full price.

I think the retrospectivity of the legislation is most distasteful. This has been rather weakly defended, and I hope that in Committee something will be done to alter it. Retrospectivity is most obnoxious when it upsets contracts that have been carefully considered by both parties. The Royal Commission complained that too many people entered into contracts and that some growers who sent in grapes did not trouble to find out what they were paid. Some people have entered into final contracts, which were prudently made early. These people will be affected by the Bill, and I think this provision is obnoxious.

We are wide open to competition from other States. As the Minister will know from the Agricultural Council, there is always a strong tendency for the Eastern States, which have more irrigation water and land, to want to plant more vines. Agreements on vine plantings have never succeeded, and if this legislation results in an increased interest by winemakers in the Eastern States it will result in increased competition brought about by more grapes being grown in those States. Winemakers will be able to increase their own plantings, although I do not know whether they will do so. If I am wrong and, as the Government hopes, the industry is given a really good boost by the Bill, there will be heavy increases in plantings by growers, and this again will cause troubles.

The member for Adelaide said, "Look how industry has settled down now that motor cars are being produced by men on award rates." Apparently he is unconscious of the precarious position of the wine industry, the products of which cannot be fully absorbed in this country. It must have an export market, and it cannot be helped by tariffs in the same

way as secondary industry is helped. Export markets must be fought for against strong competition by countries that are more experienced and more famous in the public eye. I contradict the member for Glenelg, who said that the industry had not done a good job in relation to exports.

Mr. Langley: Have you heard the names of some of the wines in England?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I have heard of a few. I ask the honourable member not to interrupt me unless he has something to say that is useful or relevant. The Wine Board, although under the greatest handicap, has been concentrating on the export markets. It has proved extremely difficult not only to break into these markets but to hold the present ones. Other countries have tremendous advantages.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: You should get the member for Glenelg to help; he's on the ball.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Yes, he would know. I get tired of hearing people who come back from overseas and say, "Australian wines are badly marketed; I went into a shop and I could not get Australian wine." It is easy to criticize, but the fact is that the quantities we can clear on the United Kingdom market are not great enough to give us very much scope for improvement. Unless our winemakers wish to lump all their wines under the one label (and they do not wish that), they cannot supply the market in big enough quantity with individual labels. They do so in certain instances, particularly in Canada. To my mind, the Wine Board is doing a good job under great difficulties. I think it is always open for constructive advice. In fact, my impression of the industry generally in relation to its marketing is that it is always ready to listen to constructive advice. However, it gets very tired of hearing destructive criticism.

I believe that the industry is not going to prosper as a result of this legislation. I think negotiations could have been carried out much better if they had been persisted in a little longer. I blame the Government very largely in the beginning. I have here a few newspaper cuttings which I should like to quote. One states that the honourable Mr. Bywaters criticized Mr. Martin, alleging that he personally had been the main obstacle in settling this unhappy situation between the growers and the winemakers. I do not know whether that warrants a personal criticism like that, but at any rate that criticism was made. There we

see the Minister of Agriculture having a shot at one of the representatives of the wine and brandy producers. He may have just been doing his job. That is one side of it. On the other hand, we have the Premier having a shot at the President of the Wine Grapegrowers Council (Mr. S. A. Dyer), who issued a statement giving reasons why the growers were unable to accept the prices presented. The Premier said:

As Mr. Dyer has seen fit to make public information which I believed was in the discussion stages, I will at least honour an obligation to the Wine and Brandy Producers Association and place all the facts before Cabinet today. These comments may or may not have been right, but they do not sound to me like skilful negotiating. They sound like all sorts of other things, and they are not settling a question. I believe this question could be settled if it was persisted in a little longer, and I think after the announcement that legislation was to be introduced was not the right time to expect a happy solution. The Government cannot threaten people in one way and then say, "Now come on, just let's be reasonable and argue it out together" at the same time. It has to do one thing or the other. Once the Government made that threat, negotiations naturally became very difficult. The question is: how can we get negotiations to succeed when one party is promised that it will get a Bill to suit it, in effect, and the other party is told that it will get a Bill that will make it do something it does not want to do?

I think it has been a failure in negotiation, and I am sorry that the Government did not persist in this matter. Although this legislation is contained in the Prices Act, it has all the marks of being permanent, and if it is permanent many of the fears that have been expressed here tonight may well be realized. I hope they are not, and that the legislation is successful. I believe that many people in the State pin their faith on this legislation and that they think it will help them. On the other hand, there are so many uncertainties at present that we should not jump into it in the way we are doing without making further attempts to settle this argument.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): First, I express my appreciation of the discussion that has taken place. The member for Onkaparinga said it was somewhat unfortunate that the Bill was being introduced on this occasion, and he went on to say that the history of this matter since March, 1965, had caused dissatisfaction. I point out that

the Royal Commission was appointed on July 13, 1965, to inquire into all aspects of the grapegrowing industry, the problems associated therewith, and matters incidental thereto. The report of the Commission states:

In an interim report to you dated December 15, 1965, the Commission advised as follows: We have not yet completed our inquiries, particularly with regard to the costs of production of the various types of grape in the various districts and the cost of wine making. We anticipate that our complete report will be submitted to you in approximately the middle of the month of January, 1966.

I make no apology for appointing the Royal Commission. However, I remind the House that when we came in as a Government we were left a certain legacy. In 1960, price fixing of wine grapes was commenced by the Prices Commissioner, who has resigned his position since we have been in Government. The honourable member for Alexandra will recall that we were handed down a legacy.

Mr. McKee: He remembers; that is why he is over there now.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: A co-operative was formed, I believe in the Morphett Vale district. Although the prices were fixed from 1960 onwards, I do not know whether the previous Government in 1964 was really concerned in accepting the prices recommended because it found itself then with a 1,500-ton surplus of grapes. It then formed an emergency co-operative, thereby establishing a precedent in this matter. The previous Government could not arrive at an agreement with the people concerned, and on our assumption of office we inherited that legacy. We found ourselves with a surplus of 3,500 tons of grapes immediately on taking office. The member for Alexandra said that I intervened in this matter: I did, and I make no apology for that. After the Royal Commission had recommended that two representatives of each organization be appointed, as well as a chairman, the Chairman of the Royal Commission was unable to handle the position because he had not completed the Commission's final report. Had he been able to act as chairman of the committee, I would have asked him to act in that capacity. I knew that the Prices Commissioner had had long experience and association with the grape and wine industries of this State.

However, had the President of the Wine and Brandy Producers Association shown more appreciation we would have gone further than we have. I prevailed on the Minister of Agriculture to see whether he could find a solution to the matter but conferences did not get anywhere. Would the member for

Alexandra, with his experience as a Minister, have declined the invitation given to me that I should intervene? These people individually do not mean anything to me, but I have much respect for the Wine and Brandy Producers Association. I should be the last person to turn a deaf ear to those who make representation to me, and I would hear them again tomorrow if necessary. I told those who waited on me when they offered \$1.95 a ton overall that I would report to the grapegrowers' organization. I do not make any apology for what the member for Alexandra read out, because it is true. I promised these people that after I had discussed the matter we would see how far we could negotiate. I make no apology for having intervened when the opportunity presented itself, because I did it in the interests of the State and of this industry. If others had not refused every representation, particularly the President, we would have got much further and would not be here now discussing this matter. The same people who are going to crush grapes this year proved what they could do last year. They offered a buyer's resistance and that is why we had 3,500 tons of grapes surplus: they will do the same thing again if it suits them.

I opened the Angaston Show in the Barossa Valley last Saturday. I am not an authority on vines and thought the grape harvest had finished because of the conditions of the vines. However, on closer inspection I saw grapes still on them. People informed me that they expected a 40 per cent reduction in tonnage compared with last year and others confirmed this estimate. They indicated there had been a reduction of 6in. in the average rainfall, and some of the vines seemed to have been frost bitten as they were blackened. Will these people now be satisfied to accept what was offered by the Wine and Brandy Producers Association in the first instance? Would they say they were adequately compensated by a price difference of about 20c to 30c a ton compared with last year? I consider that the industry in the dry areas is in a precarious position.

If we take notice of what is done in other countries we may be able to sell more of our products overseas. Those people who have been the guests of the Government at various functions, including representatives of the Opposition, have commented favourably on the quality of our wines. Wines can be produced, but without a market something is definitely wrong. When this Government assumed office in March, 1965, the grape harvest seemed to

be at its peak, but there was no real harmony within the industry about prices. The position concerned me then as it does today. The Royal Commission was unable to complete its findings until January this year and, because of that, there was no real price fixation at a time when some grapes were ready for harvesting. It has been recommended that prices be fixed not later than January of any year and, if regard is to be had to the cost of production of grapes in this State, growers will want to know early what to expect regarding price.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Are you prepared to take up the matter of retrospectivity?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I will come to that in good time. When the Government is able to accept all the recommendations in this report, it will make representations in order to ascertain what the Commonwealth Government is going to do regarding the industry. The Government will not finance the processing of even one ton of surplus grapes from the current vintage, if there is a surplus. I may say, in fairness to the growers, that the producers purchase wine from the co-operatives at anything between 60c and 80c a gallon.

Mr. Quirke: It will not sell it at 60c.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: If my statement is correct, I believe that it is blended with the wine produced by the proprietaries and that the blended wine is sold at up to \$1.30c a bottle. The retailer must also make a profit, so the wine is expensive on the retail market.

Mr. Quirke: That is wrong.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Has the honourable member ever seen this list?

Mr. Quirke: Whose list is that? It is not a winemaker's list.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Prices of from \$1 to \$1.30 are charged for each bottle of wine.

Mr. Quirke: Not from the winemaker.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The authority again!

Mr. Quirke: That must be a hotel list.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask honourable members to refrain from interjecting and to give the floor to the Premier.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I am not here to advertise any particular winery, but I remind the honourable member that he can peruse the list himself and ascertain the name. He will then know whether it is a winery or something else, but I say that it is a winery. I am speaking about fortified wines. The growers are perturbed when they see these

prices charged for a commodity for which they are not receiving an adequate return.

Is it any wonder that I am concerned from the point of view of the State when I must go to the Commonwealth Government? The position was all right until the last increase. Would not one expect buyers' resistance when an increase of 60c is imposed? It seems that in this industry we have a milking cow for the Commonwealth. The whole structure of the prices legislation provides a safeguard in case merchants act unreasonably and I think the Leader of the Opposition will agree that, when his Government was in office, there were many cases where a prices order was not made but the threat that one would be made produced a reasonable attitude on the part of the people concerned. If a co-operative has to receive grapes from any grower who is not—

Mr. Quirke: This is sheer misrepresentation.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: It is not, and I object to that.

Mr. Quirke: I challenge you now.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Mr. Deputy Speaker—

[Midnight.]

Mr. Quirke: I won't stand for it. It is direct misrepresentation.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I advise the honourable member for Burra that his interjections are out of order. It is too late to make a challenge. He should have made it during the remarks on the particular matter.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: If the honourable member for Burra is such an authority on this, it is strange that he cannot reason even after coming across the floor to me to obtain some figures, which I believe to be correct. There is none of my figuring in it.

Mr. Quirke: But you don't understand it.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I have listened long enough to the honourable member now. I do not think any member on this side of the House or anyone else understood him in this debate, or is likely to understand him. Before I was so rudely interrupted, I was about to say that co-operatives which were to receive grapes from a grower who was not a member of a co-operative would find the necessary money to pay for the grapes under this legislation. That is correct. The co-operative pays the dividend to a number of people but not to non-members. There are some seven co-operatives, I believe, outside the emergency co-operative. About 50 proprietary wineries are concerned in this. I was asked a question. If members turn to the Bill, they will see that new section 22c (2) provides:

This section applies to agreements made after the first day of January, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-six whether made before or after the commencement of the Prices Act Amendment Act, 1966.

In Committee I shall seek leave to strike out "first day of January, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-six whether made before or after the". The subsection will then read:

This section applies to agreements made after the commencement of the Prices Act Amendment Act, 1966.

I thank the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues for permitting this debate to continue during Tuesday and into Wednesday. I hope we shall not be delayed too long on Wednesday getting this Bill ready for another place.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Enactment of sections 22a to 22d of principal Act."

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Mr. Chairman, I ask your direction in this matter. This clause enacts a number of new sections. Do you propose to take them *serialim*?

The CHAIRMAN: I will not take them *serialim*.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Then can I speak to the clause?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have some amendments to this clause. I move:

In new section 22b (1) to strike out "Penalty: Not less than Four hundred dollars."

The penalties laid down in this clause are minimum penalties of not less than \$400. This seems to me unnecessarily savage. We have here a clause that cannot possibly work; then we add insult to injury by inserting a penalty which is a minimum penalty, with no maximum penalty at all. That seems entirely wrong. The penalty under this clause could be anything at all; there is no maximum penalty and I cannot for the life of me see why we need to enact any special penalty clause at all. I remind the Committee that under section 50 of the Prices Act a penalty of a fine not exceeding \$200 or imprisonment for a term not exceeding six months is laid down for any breach of the Act. I see no reason to depart from that in this case and to enact a particularly savage penalty for what is a new offence. Therefore, the import of all my amendments as I have handed them in (there are three to this clause and there is another one to clause 4) is to strike out the special penalties in this

Bill so that in fact the penalties for breaches will be the penalties laid down in section 50 of the Act, which I have just mentioned.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (14).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Ferguson, Hall, McAnaney, Millhouse (teller), Nankivell, Sir Thomas Playford, Messrs. Quirke, Rodda, and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, and Mr. Teusner.

Noes (19).—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hudson, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Loveday, McKee, Ryan, Stott, and Walsh (teller).

Pair.—Aye—Mr. Pearson. No—Mr. Hughes.

Majority of 5 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negated.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the honourable member intend to proceed with his second amendment?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, not as the Committee is against me, but for the delectation of honourable members opposite I point out that subsection (3) provides that in addition to that penalty the court may order the defendant to pay to the seller the difference between the price at which the grapes were sold and the minimum price fixed pursuant to the Act. This is one of the most savage provisions that can be imposed on anyone, and it is for something which up until now has never been an offence. I think it is an absolute scandal, but I do not propose to press the matter.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

In new section 22c (2) to strike out "first day of January, One thousand nine hundred and sixty-six whether made before or after the".

I ask the Committee to accept the amendment.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Leader of the Opposition): Before dealing with that amendment, I should like to draw the Committee's attention to subsection (4)—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Leader is out of order. There is an amendment before the Chair, and the discussion at the present moment must concern itself with the amendment. That does not preclude the Leader from directing any remarks to the whole of the clause later.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: With all due respect to your ruling, the other night I was refused the right to speak on a clause after an amendment had been moved, although

the amendment had been negatived. I have every right—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have never refused any honourable member the right to speak on a clause before a clause is put, but a member cannot go back earlier than the line in respect of which an amendment is moved. I ask the Leader to refer to the amendment. He can still refer to the other matter if he wishes, before the clause is put, but at the moment I ask that the discussion be concerned with the amendment before the Committee.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I do not agree with your ruling, Mr. Chairman, but at this particular hour I shall not trouble to ask to move that your ruling be disagreed to. There is nothing to stop me from discussing the clause, the implications of the clause, and the implications of the amendment to the clause. I had the experience the other day of being sat down when I had every right to speak. The Premier's amendment is an improvement to the Bill as it at present stands but nevertheless we alter by law agreements that have been made. The amendment simply excludes agreements made between January and the date on which the Act passes, but the provision still alters by law an agreement that has been made. Section 22b applies to agreements made after the first day of January or after the passing of the Bill. What will be the position with regard to agreements already made? I do not think the Premier's amendment removes the retrospectivity aspect. I ask the Premier to have another look at his amendment because I do not think it carries out his intention. I think his amendment is designed to provide that the Bill shall apply to transactions that take place after the Bill is passed.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Attorney-General): The subsection does not go as far as the section in the principal Act, which was introduced by the Leader when he was in Government. Section 26 of the Act provides:

(1) Where the maximum price or rate fixed by or pursuant to this Act for any goods or services is less than the price or rate fixed by any agreement for the sale or supply of such goods or services, that agreement shall in relation to goods or services sold or supplied while that maximum rate or price is in force be deemed to be varied by the substitution of that maximum price or rate for the rate otherwise payable under the agreement.

(2) This section applies to agreements made before or after the commencement of this Act.

Mr. Coumbe: That refers to the maximum price.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In this case we are enforcing the minimum price but the effect is the same: that there is an enforcement by legislation of any agreement made. In the section introduced by the Leader provision was made for complete retrospectivity. In this case we are providing that it shall not be retrospective for agreements already made but shall be from the passing of the Bill, after which people will make agreements at their peril if they choose to make agreements that are at an unfairly low price. The Bill simply could not operate if this provision were not in it. People could then make agreements at any time and contract out of the Bill. We cannot have price-fixing legislation, whether fixing maximum or minimum prices, if people can contract out of the provision. This is the only way this provision can operate.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am intrigued by the Attorney-General's statement. He referred to the principal Act but he forgot the facts of life in that when the Act was passed the State Government was taking over control from the Commonwealth Government which had been dealing with price control since 1939. The provisions in our Act were to ensure a continuity of staff and records from the Commonwealth control. Incidentally, that was a provision fixing a price in the interests of the consumer and not fixing a price that somebody must necessarily pay, as this Bill provides. Supposing that a wine-maker and grapegrower had entered into a properly established agreement for the purchase of a certain tonnage of grapes, that that agreement was made last week, and that some of the grapes had been delivered and some not delivered: will the Attorney-General tell me the position in regard to that agreement? Under the provision, is that agreement to be wiped out; will it apply to only the grapes delivered before the passing of the Bill; or what will be the position?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the agreement were made before the passing of the Bill, whether an executed or executory agreement, it would still be an agreement made before the passing of the Bill and in that case it would be exempt.

The CHAIRMAN: Before putting the amendment to the Committee I wish to refer to the query raised by the Leader. He accused me of having stopped him from speaking to a clause in a previous

debate. I have remembered that occasion and the Leader is confusing the position. At that time he was attempting to move an amendment to a line of a clause which came before a line on which an amendment had already been dealt with. With regard to the ruling I gave a few moments ago, I refer honourable members to Standing Order No. 420, which provides:

In Committee members may speak more than once to the same question, but debate shall be confined to the motion, clause, or amendment before the Committee.

There is an amendment before the Committee, which I now intend to put. The Premier has moved—

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I now wish to ask a question about new section 22b (4).

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Leader is out of order. I ask him to take his seat and I intend to put the amendment.

Mr. SHANNON: Ever since I have been a member of this Parliament it has been the custom that where an amendment has been moved and an amendment to an earlier part of the same clause has been suggested, the mover of the amendment has been happy to allow the member wishing to move the prior amendment to do so.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I point out to the member for Onkaparinga that the Leader has not moved an amendment: there has only been discussion.

Mr. SHANNON: At the moment, the Leader—

The CHAIRMAN: Wishes to debate the matter.

Mr. SHANNON: He has not had an opportunity to do so. If the Premier displays the usual courtesy, he will allow an earlier amendment to be moved before his amendment is dealt with.

The CHAIRMAN: I pointed out to the Leader that he could refer at a later stage to the matter to which he wishes to refer, but that he could not move an amendment on an earlier line. He has not said that he wishes to move an amendment. The member for Onkaparinga is the only member to suggest that.

Mr. SHANNON: I understood that the Leader said he wanted to move an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: The Premier has moved—

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Mr. Chairman, are you ruling that I am not in

order at this stage in asking a question on new section 22b (4) on page 2?

The CHAIRMAN: I am ruling that page 2 of the Bill cannot be discussed at this stage. The amendment must be discussed and put. I am not ruling that the Leader will be out of order in discussing page 2 later, before the clause is put. I will now put the amendment moved by the Premier.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I ask the Premier to withdraw his amendment so that I can move a prior amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: The matter is up to the Premier.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I have no objection to the discussion on my amendment being adjourned if the Leader has an amendment to move. I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Leave granted; amendment withdrawn.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Had this amendment not been withdrawn, under a ruling you gave the other day, Mr. Chairman, I could not have gone back to move an amendment to new section 22b (4). I move:

In new section 22b to strike out subsection (4).

This is not a suitable matter for a *prima facie* evidence provision, because the price at which grapes are sold or supplied is the direct basis of a charge, and obviously the prosecution should be able to prove this to the court. Under this provision, all the Prices Commissioner has to do is say that the price paid was not the proper price, and the defendant then has to prove the price he paid. Under this provision a person would be fined the minimum of \$400 before having a chance to open his mouth.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I support the Leader, and I shall not be impressed by anything the Attorney-General has to say because, as I have always opposed the Prices Act, I oppose every clause of this Bill. A *prima facie* provision, if we are to tolerate it at all (and unfortunately usage in this Parliament over the years has been to tolerate it) is in relation to something that does not go to the root of a prosecution for an offence. However, the part of the matter that is to be the subject of a certificate under this new subsection is one of the vital things that will have to be proved in a prosecution.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Then why didn't your Government strike it out of the principal Act?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have always opposed the principal Act, and just because this provision is in the principal Act is not a reason why I should support it. The prices at which grapes are actually sold is one of the vital things that will have to be proved in any prosecution, and it is absolutely wrong, completely unfair and quite unnecessary to get around this point in this slovenly way. I do not know whether the Government contemplates prosecution after prosecution, but I hope it does not.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: It would be profitable!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It certainly would be profitable, but I hope it will not happen. Where is the hardship? Will this be difficult to prove or will it cause inconvenience? Will there be so many of these prosecutions that the Government thinks its officers will be inconvenienced too much by having to give oral evidence? The whole thing is absolutely absurd. I think it has been put in without too much thought being given to it by the Government.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I draw the honourable member's attention to section 25 of the principal Act, which was introduced by the present Leader of the Opposition and supported by him year after year from 1948 until last year. That section provides:

A person shall not sell or offer for sale any declared goods at a greater price than the maximum price fixed by or pursuant to this Act in relation to those goods.

It goes on to mention services and the like, and is similar to new section 22b (1), which provides:

A person shall not sell or supply or offer for sale or to supply to a winemaker or distiller of brandy any grapes at a lower price than the minimum price fixed pursuant to this Act in relation to those grapes.

There is no difference in essentials between those provisions. Section 25 (3) of the principal Act provides:

A certificate by the Commissioner specifying the difference between the maximum price or rate so fixed in relation to any goods or services and the price at which the goods or services were sold or supplied shall, for purposes of this section, be *prima facie* evidence of the matters stated therein.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It is refreshing to hear the Attorney-General on one occasion saying that we are going to live better with Labor and on another occasion, when in difficulty, pointing to something that we have done when in office. The facts are not the same. Under the principal Act the

price at which the commodity was sold had to be proved. For instance, an inspector had to buy some steak, have a witness to the purchase, and then prove the price. There was no *prima facie* evidence of the price, but that is what is involved here. Even if a similar provision is in the original Act, I think it is not a desirable provision. One cannot blame a Government for an ineffective Opposition.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I think this provision must remain. Section 25 of the principal Act deals with maximum prices, whereas this provision deals with minimum prices. Therefore, the same conditions do not apply.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (14).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Ferguson, Hall, McAnaney, Millhouse, and Nankivell, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Messrs. Quirke, Rodda, and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, and Mr. Teusner.

Noes (19).—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hudson, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Loveday, McKee, Ryan, Stott, and Walsh (teller).

Pair.—Aye—Mr. Pearson. No—Mr. Hughes.

Majority of 5 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negated.

The CHAIRMAN: Does any member of the Committee wish to move an amendment to an earlier line than the one on which the Premier has foreshadowed an amendment?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. I move:

In new section 22b to strike out subsection (5).

If subsection (4), which we have just dealt with, is a matter of formality, this subsection (5) is a matter of substance and one which throws a very heavy onus indeed on the defendant. I defy the Attorney-General to find any provision like this in any other Act, let alone the Prices Act. Subsection (5) states:

For the purposes of this section any person on whose behalf or at whose place of business any grapes are sold or supplied or offered for sale or supply to a wine maker or distiller of brandy, whether contrary to the instructions of that person or not, shall be deemed to have sold or supplied or offered to sell or supply those grapes unless the court finds that the sale, supply or offering took place without his knowledge and that he used all due diligence to secure the observance of this section.

That is a very heavy onus indeed upon people. I can remember when the Attorney-General prided himself (as he apparently does not now) upon his defence of the liberties of the

individual. Indeed, I must say that we have heard something of this during this session. If he prides himself on a subsection like this, he has certainly forgotten his previous convictions on this matter. How would a person get out of a charge under this subsection? He would not only have to prove his point about any instructions. The fact that he instructed an officer or an employee not to do it would not help him, because an offence is committed whether it is done contrary to his instructions or not. He would have to prove that it took place without his knowledge and that (this is the onus that I do not know how he would discharge) he used all due diligence to secure the observance of the subsection. This is an almost impossibly heavy onus to put upon a person. He will be deemed to have sold or supplied these things unless he can prove that he did not.

I know the Government is in a grave difficulty over this matter, but why it should so complacently cast an onus like this upon individuals in this State I do not know, and I think it ill behoves this Committee to allow something like this to go through. If we are going to have offences of this nature, surely to goodness they are sufficiently grave to warrant strict proof to cut out a thing like this, which is a short cut to proof. Why should not all elements be proved, as in a normal offence? Why is it necessary to do this? This is thoroughly bad because it is thoroughly unfair and unjust, and I ask the Committee not to accept it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: A few moments ago the honourable member saw fit to defy me to find in the Prices Act or elsewhere a similar subsection. I accept his defiance, and draw his attention to section 25 (4) of the principal Act, which provides:

For the purposes of this section, any person on whose behalf or at whose place of business any declared goods or services are sold or supplied, or offered for sale or supply, whether contrary to the instructions of that person or not, shall be deemed to have sold or supplied or offered to sell or supply those goods or services unless the court finds that the sale, supply or offering took place without his knowledge, and that he used all due diligence to secure the observance of this section.

That was the apparently sloppy draftsmanship, to which the honourable member just referred, of Sir Edgar Bean! The honourable member has thundered in the Committee about how undesirable such a subsection is, and he has maintained that this is departing from the principles of strict proof. This is placing an onus on the owner of a business to see that his employees carry out the terms of the

Prices Act. It is at his peril that his employees disobey his instructions. However, he is given a defence if he can show he used due diligence to see that they would carry out his instructions. This is not a departure from the ordinary principle of proof and has been in the Act since 1948.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Whether that is so or not, it is thoroughly bad and is something to which I have not given my assent, nor will I do so.

Mr. SHANNON: The Prices Act deals with a much wider range of goods and services than grapes and wineries. There is no need to place this onus on the wineries and grapegrowers. They are in a different category from people who work behind a counter. If we have a spate of prosecutions under this section I think Gough Whitlam has something.

Amendment negatived.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH moved:

In new section 22c (2) to strike out "first day of January, One thousand nine hundred and sixty-six whether made before or after the".

Amendment carried.

Mr. HALL: The Premier used the words "force would be used" to see that the price was paid by the winemakers for grapes. No-one has said that winemakers must buy the grapes and apparently the Government is relying on a short-fall of production this year. The Premier said he would not finance one ton of surplus grapes. If there is a surplus, the winemakers decide not to buy, and the Government does not finance the processing of any of the surplus, what happens to it?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I said that the Government would not finance any emergency co-operative for the purpose of processing surplus grapes, similar to last year. I cannot forecast whether there will be a shortage or a surplus.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I draw the Premier's attention to new section 22e. I understand that this provision exempts co-operative wineries from the provisions of the Act, but only with respect to their own members. Why is a co-operative winery that has the facilities and desires to take grapes that may be necessary for blending excluded from doing so? The Bill, after exempting co-operatives, curtails co-operatives to the extent that a grower is paid when the grapes are sold. Over the years, the returns from the co-operatives have been rather above the controlled price. I do not think that even the Attorney-General can find in the principal

Act a provision that prevents anyone from doing something that is desirable.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Government has never objected to persons joining a co-operative. It has said that, if a co-operative desires to purchase grapes from a non-member, it has no alternative but to pay the amount that will be fixed under the Act. In the first instance, we have excluded co-operatives from price fixation. If a grower wants to sell his grapes to the co-operative and the co-operative wants to buy them, there is no alternative but to treat the co-operative as a proprietary. If, at the expiration of a particular vintage, the co-operative is in a position to make certain payments to its members, the members must benefit, because a certain amount will have been paid out already.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The explanation does not meet the problem. I did not suggest that the Government was forcing persons to join a co-operative. However, everyone knows that co-operatives have not the money to enable them to buy grapes outright, as they would have to do under this provision. The co-operatives pay for grapes over a period of years as they sell their products. The returns have been satisfactory and the Royal Commission has expressed nothing but approval of co-operatives and their methods of trading. The Commission has recommended that more co-operatives be established. In those circumstances, why is it necessary to exclude a grower from having his grapes processed by a co-operative that is willing to pay him in accordance with the usual procedure? The co-operative cannot take the grapes now unless it pays the full price.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That's not right. Where do you find that?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The definition of "price" in the principal Act includes "any consideration whatsoever", and is as wide as the heavens. However, if clause 22b is restricted to members, a co-operative will not be able to accept grapes at other than the full price determined by the Minister.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It is not necessary to pay straight away.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: That is an interesting observation. If the prices that will be determined are not prices that will have to be paid straight away, the great enthusiasm of some people for this Bill will speedily depart. If the loophole is that a person must not be paid less than the price fixed but that it is not necessary to pay him

straight away, the effectiveness of the Bill will be negligible. I have always considered that a price fixed must be paid in a reasonable time.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: The Commission recommended that half be paid by June 30.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes. That provision has been operating. Co-operatives pay for their vintages over a period of five years normally, unless they happen to sell them completely before the end of that period; but I still do not know why they should not have the right to buy grapes under the normal conditions under which they take them from anyone if they so desire. Why do we have to stop them?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: When I replied to the Leader of the Opposition a moment ago, I was under the impression that we had made a provision to exclude certain co-operatives. I do not know how the Leader can interpret that as meaning that a co-operative can please itself whether it takes its grapes from its own members or denies those members the right to take the grapes in and takes them from non-members. We are not denying the co-operative the right to deal with any persons. All we say is that, under the terms fixed by the Prices Commissioner when this legislation comes into force, the co-operatives will be responsible for payment to non-members if they take from them any grapes for processing. We have not said it must be cash on the knocker, but at least they will pay within a reasonable period for the grapes they take. It is still up to the grower to decide whether he will accept the terms offered. My next point is that this Government has no objections to growers being members of a co-operative. The Leader of the Opposition would be well advised to accept the Bill as it is.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: We seem to have got into an argument about what is a co-operative and what is a merchant. Under their articles of association it would be impossible for some Upper Murray co-operatives to become merchants. A co-operative is a co-operative, not a merchant. Therefore, under the provisions of this Bill, a co-operative must be excluded, because it does not offer or accept grapes for sale. A grower delivers his grapes to a co-operative and accepts payment over a period of years. There is no contract for sale under a co-operative. The question of a contract for sale does not apply to co-operatives. Whether a co-operative can take grapes from a non-member and pay him cash for them I should like to know more about.

Mr. QUIRKE: Nearly every co-operative company has to abide by this. It does not pay company tax provided it does not take more than 10 per cent of its total intake from non-members. If it takes more than 10 per cent from non-members, it can be taxable for the whole of its intake; so the co-operatives see to it that they do not take more than 10 per cent. Non-members can supply grapes provided they abide by the general conditions, one of which is that they pay as the others do. The usual method is that the co-operatives tell their growers, "We will take this year 10,000 or 15,000 tons of grapes in these proportions", and they will give each member his quota. He may have 100 tons of grapes in his quota but has to sell 50 tons wherever he can. That applies to all co-operatives on the river. A company whose profits are taxable may be run in conjunction with a co-operative organization and allowed to buy grapes from outsiders and to pay whatever price is agreed on. Such a company does not have to abide by the co-operative's rules, although it generally does. I cannot imagine such a company buying grapes under these conditions. Indeed, it would be foolish to do so.

Mr. SHANNON: Some growers will probably be denied an outlet for at least some of their surplus grapes that a co-operative could rightly take. I think a grapegrower will be interested in getting rid of his surplus grapes through a co-operative if he can do so and I agree that all the words after "1958" should be struck out.

Clause as amended passed.

Clause 4—"Offences."

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I move:

In paragraph (a) to strike out "22a".

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: What is the purpose of this?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: It is irrelevant.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It is not a penalty provision.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: It is simply a drafting amendment.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH moved:

In new subsection (4) to strike out "22a"; and to strike out "22c" and insert "22d".

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

PHYSIOTHERAPISTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the House of Assembly's amendments.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (GENERAL).

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the House of Assembly's amendments Nos. 1 to 4 without amendment, that it had agreed to amendment No. 6 with the amendments indicated, and that it had disagreed to amendment No. 5.

ELECTRICAL WORKERS AND CON-TRACTORS LICENSING BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

SOUTH-WESTERN SUBURBS (SUPPLEMENTARY) DRAINAGE BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 1.35 a.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, March 2, at 2 p.m.