HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, September 25, 1974

The SPEAKER (Hon. J. R. Ryan) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

PETITIONS: SPEED LIMIT

Mr. SLATER presented a petition signed by 43 persons, stating that because of conversion to metrics the speed limit of 30 kilometres an hour past school omnibuses and schools was too high and presented an increased threat to the safety of schoolchildren, and praying that the House of Assembly would support legislation to amend the Road Traffic Act to reduce the speed limit to 25 km/h.

Mr. MATHWIN presented a similar petition signed by 26 persons.

Petitions received.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following written answers to questions be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

AGRICULTURE CONFERENCE

In reply to Dr. EASTICK (September 12).

In reply to Mr. GUNN (September 12).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Minister of Agriculture (who, incidentally, initiated the conference) was present at discussions held in Sydney last Monday between representatives of the Australian, South Australian, and Western Australian Governments, the Australian Meat Board, producers, exporters, and unions. On his return from the conference, the Minister reported to me that he considered the full and frank exchange of views by delegates amply justified the meeting, and the discussion resulted in a better appreciation of the situation by all concerned. He feels confident that the representative committee, which was appointed following the conference to pursue the whole question, will be much better informed on all aspects of the matter, and can approach its task in a spirit of mutual understanding and co-operation that should obviate further confrontations.

EMPLOYMENT AGENCIES

In reply to Mr. WRIGHT (July 23).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Under the requirements of the Employees' Registry Offices Act, which is administered by the Labour and Industry Department, a licensee must deposit at the office of the Chief Inspector a printed copy of the scale of fees being charged in respect of the hiring of employees. The legislation does not make provision for any person to examine the charges or decide whether they are reasonable. The employment agent referred to by the honourable member claims that:

1. He took over the business in September, 1972, and since that date has applied the following scale of charges:
   (*a*) Within South Australia—a set fee is charged depending on the net weekly wage.
   (*b*) The Northern Territory—a set fee where the net weekly wage is less than $100, and 50 per cent of the first weeks wage if the net weekly wage exceeds $100.
2. Employers are charged the same fee as employees.
3. Although the rates being charged for jobs in the Northern Territory may seem high, considerable expense is involved in dealing with individual employers and telephone calls.
4. A scale of fees is posted in his office in the waiting room at his premises at 170 North Terrace, Adelaide.

A scale of fees is posted in the waiting room of the firm's office at 170 North Terrace, Adelaide, as required by the Employees' Registry Offices Act, and no breach of that legislation, as it is at present framed, is occurring. I intend asking the Minister of Labour and Industry to report to me on any changes in the legislation that he considers desirable.

REGIONAL GROWTH CENTRES

In reply to Mr. DEAN BROWN (September 12).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In reply to a question asked by the honourable member during the debate on the Appropriation Bill, in addition to the information I gave in the House, I can now give a breakdown of the allocation of $25 000 for the Regional Growth Centres Liaison Group as provided under Treasury line II—Premier and Minister of Development and Mines—Miscellaneous, as follows:

	$
Administration expenses for iron triangle study	10 000
Administration expenses for green triangle study	5 000
Iron triangle infra-structure study now under way	8 000
Contingencies	2 000
Total	25 000

WHEAT PAYMENTS

In reply to Mr. VENNING (August 22).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Agriculture has informed me that the Australian Wheat Board made an estimate earlier this year, and included advice of this in the Chairman's letter to wheatgrowers indicating that, on fair average quality basis, a return of $101 a tonne or $2·75 a bushel could be expected on the 1973-74 pool. The statement added, "growers have only to subtract their individual rail freight cost to arrive at a personal figure". This estimate is still considered by the board to be a reasonable one, notwithstanding unexpected costs arising from strikes and delays on the waterfront. Growers have been paid a first advance of $44·09 a tonne (say, $1·20 a bushel) less rail freight. If our present estimate of the pool result is realised, growers will have an outstanding equity of about $1·55 a bushel remaining in the pool. In accordance with normal practice the board will make progressive payments to growers, having regard to the receipts of proceeds, particularly from export shipments, and consistent with credit funds available to the board for distribution to growers.

OAKLANDS ROAD

In reply to Mr. MATHWIN (August 14).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: In reply to a question asked during the debate on the Supply Bill, I now tell the honourable member that, in 1973-74, $40 000 was allocated to the city of Marion for the widening of Oaklands Road. The council elected to commence Zante Grove, which is on the perimeter of the Parkholme complex scheme, and continue westward along Oaklands Road to the Sturt River. Kerb and watertable along this section were constructed at cost to the council. The construction of footpaths is the responsibility of the council, and this work, together with kerbing and watertable, is normally undertaken in conjunction with any road-widening scheme. Further widening of Oaklands Road would be financed by the Highways Department, subject to the availability of funds. However, funds will not be available for this purpose in this financial year, and it is not possible at this stage to determine when

further widening will take place. In the circumstances it is suggested that perhaps the honourable member should contact the city of Marion should he consider some immediate action on the provision of footpaths and kerbing on the specific section of Oaklands Road to which he refers is necessary.

SMITHFIELD HOUSES

In reply to Mr. DUNCAN (September 18).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The Royal Australian Air Force has 34 vacant units in the Smithfield area comprising 16 double units and 18 single units. Maintenance work is in progress on four of these. The R.A.A.F. is paying rent on these vacant dwellings. The average vacancy rate from the R.A.A.F. houses in this area ranges from six to 12 each week, but the present number has built up over the past two months. The longest vacancy is since May, 1974. I should inform the honourable member also that Canberra had been notified of the unusual number of vacant houses, and it replied to the effect that this should be held at least for the time being. It could be that some of the houses will be returned to the trust's general stock of rental houses.

COUNCIL BOUNDARIES

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Minister of Local Government say whether he has recommended to Cabinet that the council boundary redistribution proposals be scrapped? If he has not recommended that, will he say whether he intends to urge such action, in view of the widespread opposition to the changes? The continuing and increasing opposition to the Royal Commission recommendations on council boundaries has caused widespread speculation that the Government would not be so stupid as to proceed with proposals that have raised such anger in so many councils throughout the State. As the Minister doubtless is aware, there has been some support from councils for the proposals, but the overwhelming number of councils has been spontaneous in condemning the changes. The Minister has already stated that he considers that it is an all or nothing proposition and that the Government will not countenance wholesale redrawing of the boundaries. Therefore, as far more people seem to be opposed to the change than are in favour of it, does the Minister intend to scrap the project altogether?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I noted the Leader's comment in today's *News*, arising from speculation in a newspaper report. If that report is read correctly, it will be seen that it is clearly stated there (and I commend the reporter for the way in which he faithfully reported what I said) that the Government is currently considering the implications of the first and second reports of the Royal Commission. The Government also is weighing up the views, both in support of and in opposition to the adoption of the report, that have been expressed by councils, individuals, and groups of people. In due course, the Government will make a decision and then I will announce publicly what it intends in relation to the matter.

Mr. Millhouse: That's not what you've said.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: That is the position as I have stated it here during the past few weeks, when questions have been asked of me. It is the position that I have put when I have been discussing the matter with other people, and it is the position at present.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You were quite definite—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Leader has implied that more people oppose the recommendations of the Commission than support them, but I do not know what is the basis for such a claim.

Mr. Mathwin: You must be deaf.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I think that I am reasonably in touch with local government. In my office, we have had tabulated reports of the attitudes expressed by local government. However, the view of the general public is more important, and in many cases that has been completely ignored. A few meetings have been arranged, including one at Brighton and another at Walkerville. A public opinion poll was conducted at Beachport. One or two other attempts have been made to obtain the view of the general public, but the important point is that at not one meeting held has the case for the Royal Commission and the need for it in the first place been put. I strongly suggest that the Leader might well read a letter to the Editor in today's *News*. Although I do not know the author of this letter, he is an alderman who lives at Para Hills. He says that it is not a question whether we kill Walkerville but whether local government itself is killed; really, the position is as bad as that. In due course, when Cabinet has made its decision, the Leader, along with all other people in South Australia, will be informed.

Mr. COUMBE: The Minister said that information he had received was being tabulated. Can he say whether he has received any opinion from the general public, as he referred strongly to the need for this? Does the public support or oppose the findings of the Royal Commission? When is he likely to decide whether the recommendations will be acted on? I point out that about a month ago the Minister was vehement about wanting to introduce legislation as expeditiously as possible.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the honourable member looks at the reply to the first question (which I think he asked) about this matter, he will find that I said then exactly what I am saying now. Regarding the time factor, it is not a matter of when I make a decision: it is a matter of when the Government makes a decision. Some material must be gathered together. I would certainly not ask members of Cabinet to make a decision until I was able to document the whole matter for them, presenting it to them in a proper manner.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members know what is required of them during Question Time. Unless they are willing to abide by the provisions of Standing Orders, those provisions will be implemented immediately. The honourable Minister of Local Government.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: As I have said, information is currently being documented that will then be presented to Cabinet for its consideration. I have received numerous letters and other representations supporting and opposing the recommendations. I can say definitely to the member for Torrens that, from local government itself, it is fairly apparent (although I do not have final figures at this stage) that more councils will support the adoption of the recommendations than oppose it. I remind the honourable member that it was only after the Government got the opinion of councils that it launched the Royal Commission at all. I do not know what is humorous about that, but it seems to have made the member for Torrens—

Mr. Coumbe: Councils have had second thoughts on it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Torrens is out of order.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Obviously my remarks are amusing the honourable member, but I remind him

that 58 per cent of councils came out with a clear "Yes, we want an investigation into and a revision of boundaries." If local government has now changed its mind, that is another factor that has to be and will be taken into account when the matter goes before Cabinet.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. MAX BROWN: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry ask the Commonwealth Minister for Labor and Immigration (Mr. Cameron) to initiate a complete feasibility study, in the northern cities of Port Pirie, Port Augusta and Whyalla, of the numbers of unemployed, the types of worker available, and the type of employment necessary to absorb that unemployment? In addition, will he ask whether the Commonwealth Government will consider subsidising or starting within the three cities an industry capable of using the unemployed in question? The Minister would be well aware that, where there is heavy decentralised industry, unemployment takes place, particularly of young girls and certain types of unskilled labour. I believe that Commonwealth Governments of all political colours in the past have subsidised the use of available labour by providing unemployment benefits and by making available certain financial assistance for councils. To my mind, Governments should examine more closely the possibilities of setting up decentralised industries, even under subsidy, that would be productive to some degree at least. I further believe that, with the possible development of the Redcliff petro-chemical project, this type of perpetual unemployment in the northern cities will continue, if not increase.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I shall be pleased to take up the matter with my Commonwealth colleague.

WATER POLLUTION

Mr. BECKER: In the absence of the Minister of Environment and Conservation, I direct my question to the Minister of Works, because I believe it is covered by his portfolio. Can the Minister say what further positive action the Government intends to take to protect and preserve our environment and to control water pollution? I refer to recent press statements concerning our environment and, in particular, to one headed "Hallett Cove ravaged, the Hills eaten away, the Plains raped, the parks threatened". For over four years, as members know, I have complained about the condition of the Patawalonga Basin and about the pollution that flows into it, some of it flowing out to sea. I have complained about the desecration of part of the sandhills at West Beach, particularly where a car park has been built for use by members of a yacht club. Much pollution flows down our rivers, through the Patawalonga, and out to sea. In view of the statements that have been made recently in the press, I ask the Minister to say what further positive action the Government intends to take to control water pollution and protect our environment generally.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I believe it can be correctly claimed that the present Dunstan Government has done more since coming to office to control the pollution about which the honourable member complains than all the previous Governments collectively.

Mr. Jennings: All put together.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes. Indeed, only recently the Premier, in replying to a question about planning and development, pointed out that no real teeth were contained in any legislation concerning the planning and development of parts of South Australia until his Government did something about it, and the honourable member must be aware of that. The honourable member asks, "What are we going to do in the future?" However, I draw his attention to the fact that the actions we have taken in the relatively near past will protect the future; the honourable member cannot dispute that. He has referred to the Patawalonga, and I have told him constantly that this is the responsibility of the Glenelg council, but he seems to come back regularly to the Government and say, "What is the Government going to do about it?" So, I refer him to the council if he wants a reply to his question. If the council complains about what is going down Sturt River and the problems this creates for the council, the council can come to the Government. Regarding the Government's future actions, I am confident that the things this Government has done, particularly as regards the legislation it has introduced, will protect the future sufficiently. However, if there is a need to do more, this Government will certainly do it; there is no question about that. The least we should do is give the legislation now on the Statute Book time to work, and the honourable member would appreciate that.

Mr. CHAPMAN: During a television interview last evening, the Minister of Works described the Murray River as a sewer. Was that remark a slip of the tongue or was that the Minister's official description of South Australia's most important source of water supply? Bearing in mind that the Oxford dictionary meaning of "sewer" is "a public drainage for excrementitious matter", I ask the Minister this question.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member has no doubt asked this question because of the remarks made by His Excellency the Governor on Monday, when, in opening the National Parks Convention, he referred to the Torrens River as a sewer. If one looks at the meaning of the word "sewer", one could see that any natural water course could, in fact, be described technically as a sewer. That is because into it can drain matter that it transports away from that area, and in fact the word "sewer" could be used. However, that is not the understanding that the people generally in this State or anywhere else in Australia have. When we hear the word "sewer" mentioned, we naturally think of a man-made drain or pipe that transports human waste, unhealthy waste of some other kind, effluent, or something like that. Therefore, I do not disagree with His Excellency, because, technically, he could be correct in describing the Torrens River as a sewer. As I have pointed out, leaves from plane trees and any other trees in the streets of Adelaide could blow into the river.

Dr. Eastick: And there are the birds.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: That is correct, and dogs can be the cause of matter washing into the Torrens River, so in that sense the river could be described as a sewer. However, as people generally understand the word, it could not be so described.

Mr. Chapman: You described the Murray River as a sewer.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I said that the Murray River more or less could be described as a sewer for the same reason, because many things drain into it.

Dr. Eastick: There's salt.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: We have salinity and such things. Naturally, we do not think of the river as being a sewer, and we should not do so, but I was using the word in a technical sense. I hope the honourable member appreciates that, and I am pleased that he has given me the opportunity to clear up any misunderstanding that has arisen from my use of the word. I used the word strictly in the sense that I have stated.

PREMIER'S FINANCIAL INTERESTS

Mr. OLSON: Will the Premier say whether he has any interest, financial or otherwise, in R.D.C. Constructions Proprietary Limited or in any companies under that firm's control? Strong rumours, believed to be emanating from insurance companies and land agents, are circulating in Port Adelaide and adjoining areas to the effect that the initials "R.D.C." have been formulated to denote the name "Dunstan", with the implication that the Premier has the controlling interest in that firm. As members know that the honourable gentleman's principles are beyond reproach and that he is far removed from entering into any such transactions, I ask the Premier to assure the House that any such rumours have been formulated for the sole purpose of discrediting his good name for political purposes.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am a little tired of the nonsense that seems to be formulated from time to time and the malicious rumours about my personal interests. I have no interest in R.D.C. Constructions Proprietary Limited. I understand that R.D.C. stands for Realty Development Corporation: those initials do not incorporate the name "Dunstan" or indicate any interest on my part. I have no interest, nor have I ever had any personal or financial interest whatever, in that company. In fact, I have no business interests and I own only two shares. One is a non-profitmaking share I hold, for sentimental family reasons, as a shareholder in Mutual Hospitals Association Limited. My great uncle by marriage was one of the association's founding shareholders. The share pays no dividend, but it gives me the right to attend the annual meeting and to vote.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Which you don't worry about, anyway?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, I don't go. I also have a $2 share in Trades Union Hire Purchase Co-operative Limited, which once paid me a dividend of 10c in stamps. That is the total sum of my business interests, although I assure the honourable member that no doubt it would be pleasant financially to have an interest in R.D.C. Constructions Proprietary Limited or in some other of the R.D.C. companies. However, I am not in that beneficial position, and I never shall be.

ABDUCTION FILM

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Will the Premier ensure that finance is made available to the South Australian Film Corporation to produce a South Australian film on child abduction and molesting? A friend of mine recently attended a lecture at a kindergarten at which two films on child abduction were shown. The lecture was given by a member of the South Australian Police Force. The two films shown were both produced overseas, one in England and one in the United States of America. I understand that both films and the lecture were designed to be shown and given to children. It seems rather strange that locally made films on this important subject are not available. I refer in particular to the uniform of the policeman; in the British film the policeman wore a typically "Bobby" hat and no Australian child could in any way relate that uniform to a policeman. Because of the importance of this matter to the State and to the security of our children, I ask the Premier to give top priority to the provision of funds so that the South Australian Film Corporation may produce such a film.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know whether such a film has been requested by the Government departments concerned. A fund is being established and the line has already been passed for this purpose. In future there will be a fund for Government-ordered films which will appreciate as Government funding normally does on a line with the general appreciation of Government departments. Departments may then apply for their share of that money according to their needs, and their priorities in need will be assessed. The Government has already adopted this course with some corporations. For instance, Australian Mineral Development Laboratories has been allocated a certain amount of Government finance each year and the departments apply for their share of that money for special work that needs to be done for them. The process of assessment is proceeding at the moment. I do not remember an order being made for a film such as the honourable member has mentioned, but I will inquire about it.

LIBYAN CONTRACT

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Premier say what action, if any, the Government intends to take following the apparent breaking, on September 14, as I have been told, by the Libyan Government of the agreement providing for agricultural development in that country? This morning I have been told (and I see that this is reported in the newspaper also) that Horwood Bagshaw Limited, the agricultural machinery manufacturer, has had to put off, or give one weeks notice to, 120 workers, because of the loss of a contract with Libya worth $1 100 000 for the supply of seed-drilling machinery. I take it that this contract is part of the arrangement that the South Australian Government announced, with much self-congratulation, in the *Sunday Mail* of June 16, under the heading "S.A.—Libya pact". That report states:

The South Australian Government has signed an agreement to help Libya spend $1 000 000 000 on agricultural development.

The department went on to state that experts from South Australia had been to Libya, that advice had been given, and that the Premier had signed an agreement with the Agricultural Development Minister in that country. The report also states:

It is a triumph for officers of the South Australian Agriculture Department to have been to Libya and brought the Republic and this State together in the project.

Reference was then made to John Shearer and Horwood Bagshaw. Some weeks later, doubt was cast on the ability of shipping services to cope with the contract, and now we have had the report that the Libyan Government has told Horwood Bagshaw, anyway, that that company can go hopping, that Libya can get the material more cheaply elsewhere, and that that country is going elsewhere. I need not say (I am not allowed to go on and say it) that this is a serious blow to a long-established South Australian company and to employment in this State. As the Government was willing to take so much credit a few months ago for the arrangements that had been made, I now ask what action the Government intends to take, as things seem to have gone wrong.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There has been no breach of the agreement between this Government and the Republic of Libya. The agreement, which provided that we would supply experts to Libya for that country's dry lands agriculture programme and advise the Libyan Government in carrying out this programme, is proceeding.

Mr. Millhouse: Will you table the agreement?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am perfectly willing to do that.

Mr. Millhouse: Then I'll look for it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member is being as juvenile as usual. I shall be pleased to table the agreement with the Libyan Government. It did not provide for a contract with Horwood Bagshaw Limited. The contracts with Horwood Bagshaw and Shearers were made separately. They were not negotiated by the South Australian Government, and there are contracts that remain with South Australian companies in relation to the dry lands agricultural programme. However, when orders have been placed with Horwood Bagshaw, that company has pursued them. Unfortunately, it was eventually shown that a lower quote for the same sort of equipment could be obtained by the Libyan Government elsewhere, and that is what has transpired; but that was not part of the agreement with the State of South Australia. There is nothing that South Australia should do to accuse the Libyan Government on that score. We were pleased to provide every opportunity for companies in South Australia to take advantage, if they could, commercially of the arrangements that we had achieved with the Libyan Government.

FISH MARKETING

Mr. RODDA: In the absence of the Minister of Fisheries, I ask the Premier what action is being taken on behalf of all the fishermen in this State, whose livelihood depends on an expanded market beyond the boundaries of this State, regarding their industry and the announcement by the Victorian Minister of Health. The fishing industry in this State is worth a record $14 600 000 a year and is expanding. We pay a tribute to the Government for what it has done for the industry, but some fishermen have expressed to me concern about what will result from the announcement regarding the high mercury content. As there seem to be divergent views about the reason for the action being taken by Victoria, I ask what action is being taken on behalf of fishermen in this State to offset the loss of this outlet for their product.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: This State has not adopted the position that Victoria has adopted in relation to the mercury content in fish. Although we have been willing to reduce the previous regulated limit for mercury content in fish, we have not gone to the lengths to which Victoria has gone, and we doubt that it is necessary to do so. I understand that university studies in that State show that the mercury content in people who have eaten fish has so far got nowhere near the danger level. We very much doubt that the figure recommended by the medical council and the World Health Organization originally is a reasonable figure; it is much contested by countries such as Russia, Japan and Canada. Although in South Australia we can say that we will not impose the kinds of limitation that have been imposed in Victoria and that we do not see the situation as being alarmist in the way that has been suggested by the Victorian Minister, we cannot in South Australia determine what happens in Victoria in relation to Government regulations. We have tried to maintain a position with regard to our own fishermen that appears to us to be reasonable and to safeguard public health. We have communicated our views previously to Victoria. There has been much publicity about the fact that Mr. Hamer is supposed to have written to me but, if he has, I have not seen the letter. We will naturally continue to make representations on the matter in order to get our fish properly saleable. In several other cases, we have made representations to Victoria about regulations imposed by that State in relation to our produce. In fact, only two days ago I had a letter of thanks from the tomato-growers of South Australia for the help this Government had given them in relation to Victorian regulations on their produce. We will continue to take this course in relation to our own fishermen.

SOCIAL WORKERS

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Minister of Community Welfare say what are the Government's proposals for the reorganisation of welfare activities in South Australia, and for what reasons, and when, these changes will be made? The executive and membership of the Institute of Social Welfare have expressed to me, and publicly, their extreme concern at the rumours circulating regarding the employment of social workers in this State by the Community Welfare Department as sole employer. I refer the Minister to the *Institute of Social Welfare News* (pages 3 and 4 of the July, 1974, issue) in which these uncertainties are ventilated and in which it is said clearly that the rumours are doing nothing to promote a co-operative approach to social problems in this State and are counter-productive. It is believed by social workers in South Australia that there is a real likelihood that the Community Welfare Department will become the sole employer of social workers, who will therefore be subject to direction by the department, which will have the sole discretion to establish priorities in social welfare. Already, in reply to a previous question, the Minister has discussed the probable overlap of the Australian Assistance Plan on the activities of the Community Welfare Department. Generally speaking, it is believed that this concern is showing up in the standard of work being performed by social workers in South Australia at present. The article to which I have referred states:

> It may be relevant to mention the difficulties if a department which is already working beyond capacity takes on responsibilities in a new area.

With these people, I believe that the Government has a responsibility as soon as possible to state clearly its intention regarding the future of social workers and their employment in this State, so that they may get on with the job for which they are trained and needed.

The Hon. L. J. KING: Although I have listened with great care to the honourable member, I have to admit that I have not the slightest idea of what he has been talking about. I should have thought that, had the Institute of Social Welfare heard any rumours and wanted them dispelled, it might take the precaution of coming to me in addition to going to the honourable member. Indeed, it did not, and this is the first I have heard about the matter. I do not know what can possibly be meant by saying that there is a rumour that the Community Welfare Department will become the sole employer of social workers in South Australia. What does that mean? How could the department become the sole employer of social workers?

Dr. Tonkin: I'm asking you.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I just do not know what the question is all about. I would very much like to see a situation in which the State Government was able to afford greater sums than it has at present to employ social workers. Certainly, there is scope for expansion of Community Welfare Department services to the community by means of employing social workers. The fact is that, in addition to the financial problems that are always with us, we have much competition in the social worker market. Indeed, last year we had to go abroad to try to recruit social workers. The Australian Assistance Plan, which provides for regional councils, will itself be in the market to employ social workers; a variety of voluntary organisations employs social workers; and other State Government

departments employ them, not to mention local government and a whole variety of other agencies. I do not know what this is all about. If the honourable member cares to give me more information regarding the rumour, I shall see whether I can be more specific in dispelling it, but at the moment I just do not understand it.

TEXTILE INDUSTRIES

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Premier say what representations he intends to make to the Commonwealth Government on behalf of South Australian textile industries that have been adversely affected by tariff cuts introduced earlier by the Commonwealth Government? A report published two days ago, I think, in the *Advertiser* states that the Commonwealth Government is making $5 000 000 available to help industries that have been adversely affected by the decision to cut the tariff on textiles. Another newspaper report of a couple of days ago states that two textile industries in South Australia have been retrenching staff. One of these firms, which operates Onkaparinga woollen mills in my district, is reported to have retrenched 50 staff. The report states that the union representative employed at Lobethal attributes the dismissals to the Commonwealth Government's decision to reduce the tariff on textiles with the result that orders with this firm have fallen off. Does the Premier intend to make representations to the Commonwealth Government on behalf of affected South Australian industries, as it has been indicated that money for this purpose will be available, especially in the case of country industries?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Naturally, the Development Division follows matters of this kind. I will get a report from the Minister of Development and Mines concerning the matter and let the honourable member have it.

COUNCIL FUNDS

Mr. BOUNDY: Can the Minister of Local Government say whether the Government will set up a South Australian local government grants commission to administer the allocation of funds to councils from Commonwealth and State sources to ensure the accountability of the Commonwealth Minister for Transport to his South Australian counterpart, and as a means of ensuring equitable distribution of the funds so allocated? A report in the *News* this afternoon refers to the uncertainty of the future of the two reports on local government areas in this State, and members of councils have expressed concern that the discriminatory allocation of funds could be used to force amalgamations by inequitable distribution of funds between councils, and so weed some of them out. There have been occasions recently when the Minister in this place has been by-passed by his Commonwealth colleague. The establishment of a State local government grants commission would help the Minister to know what his Commonwealth colleague was doing for local government in this State.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Several points have been raised by the honourable member but, first, so that he will not become too confused, as I think some of his colleagues are, I refer to the reply I gave to the Leader on council boundaries and the Royal Commission.

Mr. Millhouse: You are the one that is confused.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the member for Goyder and his little whippersnapper supporter alongside him attended to the business of the House, they would have read in *Hansard* at page 956 a reply to a Question on Notice from the member for Bragg to the Premier, in which the statement was made then, and I am simply repeating it today. If the honourable member attended the House instead of playing chocolate soldiers, he would know—

Mr. Millhouse: You have said several times—

The SPEAKER: Order! In accordance with Standing Order 169, I warn the honourable member for Mitcham, who has persistently interjected. He is out of order, and I name him for the first time today. The honourable Minister of Local Government.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Concerning the establishment of a State grants commission (I think that was the title used by the honourable member), or the establishment of a body to distribute funds, obviously the honourable member's colleague has drafted the question for him, but what his colleague has not done is give him the facts associated with this matter. First, the Australian Government made plain to councils and to State Governments that it was willing to make funds available to councils on the basis of distribution by the Australian Government. This distribution will not be in the hands of the Government of this State or of any other State. That point has been made abundantly clear. What useful purpose could be served by establishing a body to distribute this money is beyond my comprehension. The distribution of grants from the Highways Fund is determined in accordance with provisions of the Highways Act and finally with the assent of the Minister in charge. That practice has been followed satisfactorily in the past and, to me, it has been followed satisfactorily this year, although, apparently, not to the complete satisfaction of all councils. Understandably, some are disappointed and some have problems as a result of this action, but the important point that comes through loud and clear is one that I have made consistently: councils should be able to stand on their own feet and not have to rely on grants from others.

RENTAL HOUSING

Mr. ARNOLD: Can the Minister of Development and Mines, as Minister responsible for housing, say whether the Government will take action to relieve the growing housing problem in South Australia by increasing the rate at which rental houses will be made available to the public through the Housing Trust? In recent times more and more people have spoken to me seeking assistance in their representations to the trust for rental housing. The problem seems to be that many people are finding themselves in the position of not being able to purchase a house because of escalating building costs and general inflationary trends, and the only hope they have of obtaining suitable accommodation or having their housing needs met is by being granted a trust rental house. In these circumstances, has the Government a policy of increasing the output of rental housing in South Australia and thus relieving this desperate situation?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The short reply to the question is "Yes". However, I point out for the benefit of all members that the Housing Trust over-spent on the allocation it received under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement last year. A meeting of Commonwealth and State Housing Ministers is to be held on October 11, at which we no doubt will all be asking for a substantial increase on the amount granted this financial year under that agreement. I am sure that we all expect to be able to spend it because we would be able to spend more than our present allocation. Concerning the ability to translate money into houses quickly, I point out, particularly for the benefit of the honourable member who represents a country district, that in country areas the trust in the previous 12 months has undertaken home park development, there being a small example of this

in the honourable member's district, at Waikerie, which I have inspected. This development is a means whereby it is possible, in part, to make good the backlog of such applications in country areas. I hope the community generally, and Opposition members in particular, will support this programme of home park development. In a few days I will table the annual report of the Housing Trust and that will give members a fairly detailed report on this development. I refer especially to that project because there was a rather infamous incident, with which some Opposition members were concerned, whereby a proposal for a home park development in the northern part of the metropolitan area, in the Salisbury district, was withdrawn because of pressure largely from the council in that area. Generally, I think people now have a more enlightened attitude toward pre-made housing and home park development. If this attitude is to continue, we shall be well on the way to doing something about the existing admitted serious backlog.

ROAD SIGN

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Health to investigate the need to install a "give way" sign at the exit of the Modbury Hospital public car park leading to Smart Road, Modbury? A "give way" sign has been erected, in the interests of safety, on the road from the Tea Tree Plaza car park (and that is opposite the hospital) where the road enters Smart Road. It has been suggested to me that it would be desirable to have a similar sign placed on Modbury Hospital property for the same reason.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will refer the matter to my colleague.

WATER ALLOCATION

Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I move:

That, in the opinion of this House, provision should be made by regulation under the Control of Waters Act, 1919-1925, to enable divertees to pump water from the Murray River in excess of their allocation in periods of free flow.

The matter of water diversion has been of much concern to me for many years. In fact, when I became a member of this House in 1968, it had been apparent for many years that the availability of water in South Australia from the Murray River was far in excess of that which divertees were allowed to use under the regulations pursuant to the Control of Waters Act. Under that Act, regulations are made to regulate the use of water from the Murray River for all purposes. As members know, the availability of water to South Australia is controlled by the River Murray Waters Act, under which South Australia at present receives a total allocation of 1 542 420 megalitres of water annually.

This allocation is divided into the 12 months of the year; the monthly allocation to the State increases to a high figure in the summer months and falls off to a low figure in the winter months. However, when the Dartmouth dam comes into operation the River Murray Waters Act provides that the allocation of water to South Australia will be increased from 1 542 420 Ml to 1 845 000 Ml annually. This will considerably increase the volume of divertible water available to South Australia. Once again, the allocation will be divided into the 12 months of the year and South Australia will receive its water allocation on a monthly basis in periods of free flow. The purpose of my motion is to enable divertees to make far greater use of the water flowing in the Murray River in South Australia during periods of free flow.

If we look at the past history of this matter we find that in most years there is a free flow of water in South Australia and, in fact, much of this water has had to flow through South Australia and out to sea. If divertees used in excess of their allocation they sometimes suffered heavy penalties. In March this year the Liberal Party announced its policy on the diversion of water from the Murray River. The policy provides that divertees will be able to use more than their allocation in periods of free flow, allowing for maximum use under all river flow conditions, and thus enabling divertees to produce seasonal crops such as tomatoes, peas, carrots, and so on, in periods of free flow. This production will be in addition to the divertee's permanent planting.

This policy has been made possible by the installation of meters on all diversions from the Murray River in this State. It would have been extremely difficult to implement a proposal such as this without metered diversion and, now that meters have been installed and the installation programme has almost been completed, the policy itself can be implemented. The Liberal Party believes the policy should be as follows:

Divertee's allocation of metered water as provided for in the licence will determine the limit of divertee's permanent planting.

It is obvious that a divertee's permanent planting is limited to his allocation of water because, in a period of restricted flow, that is all the water that will be available to him. The main object of the policy is to enable seasonal crops to be produced in addition to the permanent planting under the allocation granted to the divertee. Secondly, the policy provides:

Divertee's allocation of water will be divided into the 12 months of the year in a similar manner to that of the State's allocation in a period of declared restricted flow (terms of the River Murray Waters Act).

Water allocation will be divided in exactly the same proportions as is South Australia's allocation: it will be a continuing ratio as between the divertee's monthly allocation of water and that of the State. In any month during a period of restricted flow, everyone in South Australia who has a permit to divert water from the Murray River will receive water based on the same proportion as that applying to the State, and this will give everyone a fair go. The penalty or restriction on every divertee and user of water in South Australia will be exactly the same in proportion. Thirdly, the policy provides:

Divertee to be held to his monthly quota only in months of declared restricted flow in the Murray River.

If my motion is carried and the Government implements the announced Liberal Party policy, divertees in South Australia will be able to produce additional crops that will greatly assist the established processing plants along the Murray River in South Australia. In support of my motion and the policy we have announced, I shall quote from a letter I received from the Assistant General Manager of Berri Fruit Juices Co-operative Limited which is, as all members know, a large organisation producing a wide range of fruit juices in this State. The letter is as follows:

As you are aware, we are a co-operative company acting for the interests of citrus growers in the Riverland area and it is considered that the development of this area and the size of growers' holdings is restricted because of the limited quantity of water available. There is an Australian shortage of valencia oranges and tomatoes, two varieties of products that can be grown extensively in this area. Larger holdings and a greater variety of plantings would, no doubt, make fruit-growing in this area more viable. There are many years when the volume of water flowing in the river

exceeds the amount of water permitted to be used in South Australia. We wish to support any move made to allow growers an excess of water over their allocation in periods of free flow so that additional crops may be grown.

The same sentiment is expressed by the Riverland cannery at Berri, a company which at present lies idle for many months of the year because it basically cans fruit products, such as peaches, pears and apricots, which are very much seasonal crops. If areas of peas, tomatoes and carrots could be grown and then processed in this factory, it could stay in production for many more months of the year, thus reducing the unit cost of each can it produces. I was pleased to hear the Deputy Premier's announcement on the radio last Thursday evening that the Government would amend the regulations under the Control of Waters Act to enable divertees to use water over and above their allocation, and I take it that the announcement will be put into effect soon. I am also pleased that the Government has seen fit to adopt the policy we have announced, and that this will be implemented soon. This will enable the companies involved in processing along the Murray River to make far greater use of their plants, thereby increasing the productivity of the whole of this fruit-growing area in South Australia.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I have pleasure in seconding the motion and, in doing so, I emphasise that it refers to periods of free flow. The wonderful resource, the Murray River, is the lifeline of Eastern Australia.

Mr. Arnold: It's also a sewer.

Mr. RODDA: Yes, but even sewers can bring great fertility to agricultural practices. The motion is not the thin edge of the wedge to allow producers to obtain an extra allocation of water. The member for Chaffey referred to this State's allocation under the River Murray Waters Agreement. He also referred to the existing allocations, including the monthly allocations, and referred to the difference in allocation of water from the Murray once the Dartmouth dam is completed. For a long time we have seen this excess water flowing out to sea, and there are reasons why it could not be used. I was pleased to hear the member for Chaffey say that the metering programme had been completed. Now, we have these facilities to keep control of this precious resource.

Along the Murray is the type of producer with all the initiative that has won for him a world-wide reputation as a grower of fruit and agricultural products. I was interested to read today in the *Financial Review* a report by its rural correspondent (A. K. Holland), stating:

The signs in rural industry in Australia, and throughout the world generally, point to a very serious food shortage in 1976-77.

That is only two years away. The report continues:

If correcting action is not taken the price rises that could accompany that shortage would overshadow the recent food price rises. This would have both the producers and the consumers breathing down the Government's neck. Talk of a food shortage in two years when there are world-wide surpluses of beef, dairy products and fruit seems irresponsible.

Mr. Holland was not looking into a crystal ball but making a prophetic statement. The motion will allow the use of a resource which is currently flowing out to sea and which will produce some of the foodstuffs referred to by him. I, too, was pleased to hear that the Deputy Premier said last week that it would be Government policy to consider what is embodied in the motion. As it is the policy of the Party of which I am proud to be a member to do the very same thing, I hope it is a case of great minds thinking alike. Along the Murray, in this highly productive area, skilled producers will be able to take advantage of the quick cash crops, such as tomatoes and peas, to which the honourable member has referred. It will also enable the medium to high production of lucerne as fodder, which will keep growing most years even under dry land conditions. This allocation can be advantageous. If one studies the performance of the Murray over a long time, one can appreciate that the volume of water involved in this period of free flow has been excessive. I have pleasure in commending the motion to the House.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): I strongly support the motion so ably moved by the member for Chaffey and congratulate him on his efforts in preparing the motion and gaining the support of my Party for it. For the past 10 years I have advocated to and argued with the department that something like this should be done. In the low areas of the Murray and in Lake Alexandrina much water is wasted that could be used, apart from the water used by divertees. In the areas where water flows over the barrages, people should be licensed to use the water for the growing of cash crops such as carrots, etc., which are perhaps more risky than lucerne in the lower regions for which, at least for the early part of summer, irrigation water is always available. Early summer is when we get the best crops, and it would be of great financial benefit to this State if we could grow this high-protein product, for which there is a keen world demand.

The only argument I know of against this has come from the department, which has said that, in dry seasons, it would upset the people who irrigate, because they would expect and demand that water be made available to them. Surely if the licence were clearly marked that water would not be made available under conditions which indicated that there could be a shortage in South Australia, they would take this into their calculations and assess whether it could be done economically. The department has adopted a completely bureaucratic and illogical attitude. However, it has operated the barrages more efficiently lately than it did in the early life of the barrages. It has let water out when it should have been retained (and vice versa), but over the past few years it has done a good job.

I think it was in the 1956 flood that the department's employees could not remove the locks; this held the water up and made things worse. However, this year with an increased flow, the barrages have been kept at the correct level, with only a minimum of salt water flowing back. I congratulate the department on the way in which it has operated the barrages over the past few years. With a greater knowledge of management of the river, lucerne and cash crops could be grown in the lower regions, without creating any danger to the community as a result of over-use of water in the dry years. I commend the motion to the House.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I support the motion. The member for Chaffey did much of the initial work in promoting this idea and it stands to the credit of the Opposition that the Government has seen the wisdom of the Opposition's initiative. It appears that the Government will accept the idea and implement the proposals. Congratulations are certainly in order to the member for Chaffey for initiating the measure and doing much of the spadework, and a certain measure of congratulations is due to the Government for seeing the wisdom of the Opposition's efforts in this regard. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I move:

That, in the opinion of this House, per capita grants to all independent schools in South Australia should be increased.

I think all fair-minded citizens of this State acknowledge the fact that the independent schools perform a most useful function in the community. Of course, one or two people seek to put independent schools out of business but I think they are motivated largely by a sense of class hatred for certain independent schools, and I am sure these people form only a small minority. The majority of people acknowledge the fact that independent schools perform a useful function, even though those people do not support the independent school system by sending their children to independent schools.

The motives of parents who send their children to private schools vary considerably. However, the major political Parties believe that independent schools need some support. The decision of the Labor Party to support the principle of State aid was not made without much trauma in the initial stages. I referred to this during a debate last week and the member for Adelaide accused me of being a liar when I attributed certain comments to Mr. Clyde Cameron. Although I managed to find the comments I referred to and mentioned them yesterday, I am waiting for the member for Adelaide, who undertook to retract his unkind reference to me if I could find that reference, to do so.

Mr. Wright: You didn't. Don't tell lies again.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I will personally hand the press reference to the member for Adelaide and, if he does not think that is what I was saying a week ago, I do not know what he requires. I referred to a press clipping and I have found it. After considerable trauma, the Labor Party at the Commonwealth level believed that aid to independent schools was desirable. The costs of education are rising astronomically, and the public expectation as regards education is also rising. Costs have risen dramatically during the last two or three years. The costs of educating a child in a Government school between 1970 and 1973 are listed in the Auditor-General's Report, as follows:

Year ended June 30	Primary school education Cost per pupil $	Secondary school education Cost per pupil $
1970	187	353
1971	222	417
1972	274	507
1973	313	587

I asked the Minister of Education a Question on Notice about the estimated cost this year of educating a child in a Government school, and the reply I received states:

Precise figures cannot be given on a calendar year basis. On the basis given in the Director-General's report the estimated 1973-74 costs are $390 primary and $730 secondary.

Then follows the qualifying sentence:

On the basis agreed by the Australian Education Council in 1969, so that effective comparison could be made in all States between Government and non-government schools, the estimated figures are $388 primary and $685 secondary. The latter basis makes certain adjustments, for example, in relation to school transport charges, so that a more sensible comparison between Government and non-government schools can be made.

It is abundantly clear that costs have risen astronomically over the four-year period and we are now talking about $400 a year primary and $700 secondary. Current trends indicate that the cost of educating a secondary student in a Government school will be about $800 at the end of the year. It is obvious that, through the independent schools system, taxpayers are actually being saved money, despite exercises undertaken to prove otherwise. I think a survey was undertaken at Flinders University which sought to assert that the taxation deductions that accrued to certain members of the independent school population more than offset any cost to the community of these children being educated elsewhere. I believe that information is false and misleading. If we put the matter at the most selfish level, we see that independent schools are saving the community money. For every child who is forced out of an independent school into a Government school, the community will have to pay more than is paid now in per capita grants and needs grants to independent schools. The Cook committee in this State has done valuable work, and the committee eloquently sums up the predicament of the independent schools in its 1973 report to the Minister on the distribution of an additional $550 000 to independent secondary schools. These comments are relevant to the position of independent schools in South Australia, and I daresay they also would be true of other States. The committee reports:

It is clear therefore that without this financial help from Government sources and the additional grants which this committee recommends to all schools, the survival of many schools is gravely threatened. This applies especially to some of the schools which, on the basis of the criteria applied, do not appear to be in need.

The recommendations of that committee seem to conflict with the findings of the Karmel committee, which the Commonwealth Government appointed to inquire into the needs of independent schools. It has been extremely difficult to find out what criteria the latter committee used. Indeed, the committee's recommendations, whereby some independent schools would be phased out from aid completely, seem to conflict with what I am quoting from the Cook committee report, and the criteria used in that report have been stated and are clearly understood. They have received much agreement among independent schools. There seems to be a grave weakness in the way the Karmel committee made its recommendations. The report by the Cook committee continues:

Their need does not lie in the quality of education provided. In fact most of the independent secondary schools show up very well when the committee's criteria are applied to them. For example, their pupil-teacher ratio is good, their staffs are, in general, well qualified, and, although many buildings are old and in need of repair or replacement, essential facilities such as libraries and laboratories are satisfactory because of Commonwealth grants.

Those Commonwealth Government grants were initiated by a Liberal and Country Party Government in Canberra. The report continues:

The problem facing most of the least needy schools is how to keep their fee structure at a level which the parents can afford to pay. It is obvious to us that high fees charged by the schools in category D (least needy) are already becoming too burdensome and there is a decline in enrolments; a decline which is only partially arrested by those schools offering scholarships and part-remissions of fees. In addition to the problem of recurrent expenditure, almost all independent schools are incurring huge capital debts in order to provide a good quality education. While the committee recognises that capital assets such as good grounds and buildings provide an enriching environment for education, it is obvious that it is becoming increasingly difficult even for the most affluent schools to service such debts. The committee once again wishes to stress its conviction that all independent schools are finding it more and more difficult to survive in the face of ever-increasing inflationary trends.

It should be abundantly clear to the Minister, as it is to the parents of children in independent schools, that all our

independent schools face many difficulties. I have prepared figures on the escalation in cost for two of our larger independent schools. These schools have been operating for a long time. One is co-educational and the other is exclusively a boys school. These figures show a similar position to what I have instanced regarding the cost of educating children in State schools. I ask leave to have these tables of statistical material incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

ANALYSIS OF COSTS

School No. 1:	1971	1972	1973	Estimate 1974
Teaching salaries	338 000	365 000	417 000	533 000
Administration salaries	32 000	34 000	38 000	43 000
All other salaries and wages	67 000	90 000	101 000	125 000
Superannuation and long service leave	28 000	37 000	48 000	63 000
All other expenses	372 000	350 000	364 000	294 000
Total expenses	$837 000	$876 000	$968 000	$1 058 000

School No. 2:	1971	1972	1973	Estimate 1974
Teaching salaries	235 000	289 000	390 000	477 000
Administration salaries	22 000	25 000	29 000	34 000
All other salaries and wages	84 000	97 000	107 000	130 000
Superannuation and long service leave	15 000	17 000	24 000	41 000
All other expenses	255 000	262 000	256 000	302 000
Total expenses	$611 000	$690 000	$806 000	$984 000

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The reason for the reduction under the heading "All other expenses" at one school has been stated to me as being the making of undesirable economies. Provision has not been made to upgrade facilities that would be desirable to maintain the previous standard of education at the school. The figures for the other school follow the same pattern, and I consider that this would be true of all independent schools of this type, where only professional teachers are employed. For the second school, the total expenses have increased from $611 000 in 1971 to $984 000 in 1974.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Do you have student enrolments for each school for each year?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Although I do not have those figures, I can get them. The first school has increased its fees regularly. The second school has been forced to increase its fees each term (although its budget is not as high as that of the first school), so that from 1971 to 1974 the increase in fees has been 130 per cent. What effort is South Australia making to accommodate its independent schools? Last week, during a grievance debate, I raised the matter of independent schools in connection with the taxation deduction alteration made by the Commonwealth Government. On the day after the Commonwealth Budget had been introduced, the following newspaper report appeared in connection with the Minister's reaction to the changed deduction:

Reduction of the education deduction in tax from $400 maximum to $150 would hit people on higher incomes sending children to private schools. "I would be surprised if it affected State school students' parents," Mr. Hudson added.

That appears to indicate a singular lack of sympathy by the Minister towards this minority of people in South Australia. From that report, one can see that the Minister's main concern is with parents of children who attend State schools. Of course, we are all concerned about the standard of education provided at State schools. Nevertheless, I think it is less than fair of the Minister to brush off these people by describing them as being in the higher income bracket and sending their children to private schools. The inference is that, because of this, it does not matter.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: How do you draw that inference? Does it say that, or are you trying to put words in my mouth?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: To put the most charitable interpretation on the words, we can say the Minister is saying that it will affect people on higher incomes who send their children to independent schools; he doubts that it will have any effect on the parents of children who go to State schools.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I'm stating what I regard as facts.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Let me analyse the reference to people on so-called higher incomes.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: They are affected to a greater extent; the higher a person's income, the higher his tax, and the greater the effect of the deduction.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am glad the Minister has added that, because this imposes a grave penalty on a minority of people in this State. The Minister's needs scheme has attracted reasonably favourable comment. However, it is a fact that South Australia makes the second poorest contribution of any State in the Commonwealth towards independent schools.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: New South Wales doesn't make per capita payments to all students.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It has a means test, but payments to those who qualify are somewhat more generous than those made here.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: The total amount paid a student in independent schools in New South Wales is less than is paid here, but I suppose you show New South Wales as better than South Australia.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I will give figures in a moment. The fact is that South Australia makes a relatively poor contribution in aid to independent schools, when we compare the contribution made by other States. The following table shows the grants made by each State to independent primary schools:

	Qld.	N.S.W.	Vic.	Tas.	W.A.	S.A.	
	$	$	$	$	$	$	
1971	45	50	40	—	30	24	(average)
1973	62	61	55	24	52	47	(average)
1974	62	62	62	40	52	58	

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Did New South Wales pay those sums to every student?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I understand that there is a means test in New South Wales.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: So it is paid to only a percentage. You produce the average for South Australia, so why not produce it for New South Wales?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: These were the figures given me. However, I will make a qualification regarding New South Wales, where I think the means test is at the level of about $6 000.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: The average payment a student in South Australia is higher than in New South Wales.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I will concede that point for the moment; the figures can be verified. However, the point is that South Australia makes a poorer contribution than is made by most States of the Commonwealth. Incidentally, Tasmania appears to have the poorest record. The following table applies to grants made to independent secondary schools:

	Qld.	N.S.W.	Vic.	Tas.	W.A.	S.A.	
	$	$	$	$	$	$	
1971 ..	79	59	40	—	40	20	
1973 ..	104	71	72	34-54	91	55	(average)
1974 ..	104	104	104	50-70	91	77	(average)

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Would you care to include for South Australia much higher book allowances than are paid in other States?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I think it can be seen that South Australia has nothing to be proud of in relation to its contribution towards independent schools. I will not proceed now to the implication of the Commonwealth Government's decision in relation to taxation deductions for school fees, as that is the subject of another motion. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

STAMP DUTY

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I move:

That, in the opinion of this House, a transfer of real property from a party to a marriage—

(*a*) that is in contemplation;

or

(*b*) that took place not earlier than one year before the transfer is effected,

to the parties to that marriage, as joint tenants, should be exempt from stamp duty payable under the Stamp Duties Act, 1923, as amended.

The terms of this motion are self-explanatory. This matter arises out of several representations made to me and to other members by young couples who have recently married, one party of the marriage having owned a property and wishing to transfer the title of the property into joint names of husband and wife. It is becoming apparent that considerable cost is involved. The transfer of the property from one partner into joint names involves not only an $8 registration fee payable to the Lands Titles Office but also stamp duty.

On a house valued at $15 000 the stamp duty payable is $225; for a value of $20 000 it is $350; for a value of $25 000 the stamp duty is $475; and for properties valued at $30 000 the stamp duty is over $600. These are considerable sums. Supposing a young couple have married and the husband (or the wife: it could be either) has a property worth $15 000. He is probably struggling to pay it off, having put down as much as he could, by paying mortgage repayments to a building society or bank, and he finds the prospect of transferring the property into joint names and having to pay an additional $225 stamp duty to transfer it an extreme imposition at that stage. The aspect of gift duty must also be considered: if one partner has no funds or assets, this matter can be overcome technically over a period, provided the transfer is made in easy stages, but that partner cannot avoid the cost of stamp duty.

We are moving towards a two-income society: more and more people now depend on two incomes. The traditional position of the woman as being the wife staying in the house and looking after the children is fast dying out. Some people in our society wish the old conditions to remain, and that is their choice. Other women wish to move into the community and take their rightful and equal place with men without being discriminated against in any way. As members know, this matter is now being considered by a Select Committee of this House. Most difficulties with stamp duty can be avoided by long-term planning. If a young couple have a good idea of their intentions and reach an understanding, it is possible for them to purchase a house in joint names, and many problems can thus be avoided. Both are presumably earning income, can provide funds toward the cost of the house, and are in equal partnership from the beginning.

I believe many young people do this now because they wish to have the security of a house, even though it be mortgaged, before they enter into marriage. Many others who enter into marriage defer having a family for a considerable time until, with both of them working, they can accumulate enough capital to afford to have a family in this day and age. Long-term planning can avoid problems to some extent but, as members know, romance does not always take a long course. Things may happen more quickly and nowadays there seems to be a shift in the age of marriage.

Some people are marrying at an earlier age, whereas others are marrying in their late twenties. Those who marry at a later age frequently have property, and they may both be looking to their later years when they want to settle down in their own house. When they decide to marry, they find the problem will arise that, if they wish to transfer the property of one into two names, stamp duty must be paid at a fairly severe rate. Stamp duty will apply if both have property. Gift duty can be avoided if they both have the money to invest in the house but, again, it seems that the female is discriminated against. I was surprised to learn of this fact. A letter I have received from a lass who was previously an air hostess states:

I have been approached by my bank manager to re-register my home unit from my single name to my married name, the compulsory fee being $60. I cannot see how this is justified when at marriage my single name was changed to that of my husband's for nil. I feel that this problem would not arise in the case of a male. This is definitely a law which discriminates against women, as all other legal documents where changed are free of charge.

I believe this person has a valid point. I have received another letter, written particularly concerning discrimination against women, which states:

Recently, I sold a block of land. I was informed that I had to re-register the land in my married name. I requested that I sell this land under my professional name, i.e., I am registered as a trained nurse in my single name. This request was refused. At the time, I also presented a photostat copy of my marriage certificate. The fee was $40 and I was informed that the landbroker was entitled to charge a larger fee if he so desired but that $40 is the usual fee.

I have checked and I find that that statement is true. The letter continues:

I am in the process of selling another block of land, and the same conditions apply. Upon my marriage, nine months ago, all my bank accounts, car registration, and all other legal documents were changed free of charge. On marriage, the registration of my married name by the Department of Births, Deaths and Marriages was free of charge. Also, I have lodged a complaint with the Premier's Department and have not received satisfaction. I realise that my $80 is lost and that it is not a tax deduction for me, and the principle of the matter is that I do not wish other females to be penalised by this law which does discriminate against women.

These two people have raised the issue concerning the probable discrimination against women, but it is equally important in considering the other matter because, presumably, if two people marry and both have property, and the husband decides to sell his property, he is able to do so. However, if the wife wishes to sell, the name must be changed, and once again she is required to pay a fee of at least $40, possibly more. To me this seems absolute discrimination against the female sex. The couple is charged not only stamp duty but also the transfer fee and, in the case of a woman, she is up for a further fee to change the name of the registered title: that is wrong. In New South Wales a married woman may register her marriage by paying a nominal fee, by showing her marriage certificate, and by filling in the appropriate form. When that action has been taken, the title to the land can be transferred without additional fee.

I should like to see this matter taken further in South Australia and to see young people who marry after a property has been acquired in one of their names able to transfer that property into joint names without having to pay stamp duty or excessive fees on the transfer. I realise that a time limit must be imposed on such a transfer, so I suggest 12 months, although it might be a shorter period. The Lands Titles Office is currently processing transfers fairly rapidly; nevertheless, a reasonable time limit must be allowed.

The words of the marriage service "and all my worldly goods with thee I share", I believe, can be said by both parties to the marriage nowadays: it is the spirit of those words in the service that is important. I believe marriage is an institution highly regarded by many people in our community; so it should be. However, there are other people who for one reason or another desire not to marry but simply to live together, and that is their right. I believe, however, that marriage and the family is still very much the basis on which our society is built. Further, I believe that anything we can do as a Parliament to add security and stability to family life is well worth doing and that, if we can strengthen the life and security that our children will enjoy in future, we shall go a long way towards correcing the ills of our society. This is only a small measure; it will certainly not be the magic touchstone that will put everything right, but I believe it is a measure that deserves the support of this House.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT (DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS) BILL

Mr. DUNCAN (Elizabeth) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for the disclosure by members of the Parliament of South Australia of information relating to certain sources of income and other matters and for purposes incidental thereto. Read a first time.

Mr. DUNCAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill, as the long title indicates, is aimed to enforce the disclosure by members of this Parliament of their substantial financial interests, with the intention that, by doing so, any situations where the member's private interests conflict with his public duty may be avoided. It is a subject with which members to varying degrees will be familiar, as it has been a matter of some concern in Westminster-style Parliaments for many years. I should like first to refer to the background to this matter and then to the considerations that have led me and many other members to believe that this legislation is necessary. As members know, this is by no means a new subject, although this Bill is the first dealing with it to be brought before this House. It is a subject which has been studied in great depth in other places and which has, I think, been privately discussed here on and off for many years.

Where the income comes from originally is irrelevant for the purposes of the Bill; that a member presently benefits is what counts, notwithstanding what other members may think in their own particular case to the contrary. I believe that a member's constituents should have the right to know what his substantial private financial interests are (a different argument from the conflict school, which is the basic wrong which this Bill sets out to remedy). In promoting the Bill I wish to state clearly that I am not one of those who seek a fundamental objection to members of Parliament undertaking outside work; indeed, I recognise that in some instances it is only by doing such work that many members can provide themselves with the services and resources necessary to enable them to discharge efficiently their Parliamentary duties.

A member's part-time involvement in business, a profession, a trade union, industry, or other outside activity may be of direct assistance to him in his Parliamentary work. Parliament benefits from the variety of knowledge and experience that is brought to it in this way. Notwithstanding that, I am becoming more convinced than ever that a provision such as the one contained in the Bill is essential for the protection of the community from improper conduct by members of Parliament. The Parliament has nothing to fear from this legislation: in fact, its passage can lead only to the Parliament and us as members being held in higher regard by the community at large.

I have said there is no example to which one can point of the exercise of undue influence by members of this House. This is a most creditable situation and one for which this House and its members can be justly proud. However, this excellent record has, regrettably, not been the experience of other State Parliaments. The wrong the Bill seeks to correct is, of course, the danger of members partaking in the proceedings of this House as apparently disinterested legislators when, in fact, they have vital financial interests in the matter before the House.

There is possibly nothing wrong with members obtaining remuneration from business or other activities outside their Parliamentary capacity, but there is a general feeling in the community that all such remuneration should be declared so that, when a member speaks in the Parliament, other members may be apprised of his particular outside financial interests and judge his contribution to the debate accordingly.

Recently, for example, the member for Fisher spoke in the House on a matter on which he had had the opportunity of studying overseas at the expense of parties vitally affected by the legislation. Quite properly, he made known to the House the facts and declared his position so that members and the public at large could judge his comments with that knowledge. The effect of the Bill will be to equip members automatically with information on a member's financial interests and so avoid the possibility of a member speaking in this place on a matter in which he has a personal financial interest.

There are many examples of members in other Parliaments falling from the high standards of propriety required of a member of Parliament in regard to conflicting interests. However, I do not see that any useful service can be rendered by canvassing the details of such cases here.

If other members raise the matter, I will certainly do so in replying. However, to guard against similar abuses, it is also desirable to have a member declare the directorships which he or members of his family hold, and this is also provided for in the Bill.

Originally, I favoured a voluntary register; however, I was asked whether it would not in fact become almost compulsory. I think it would and, accordingly, I have provided for a compulsory register. We, as members, have nothing to fear from such a register and from making the disclosures required by the Bill. We are not crooks, and I personally want it to be seen that we are not crooks. We are in the public eye and we hold jobs which in the eyes of the public are important. I am entirely happy that the public should know my interests. I would volunteer the information, and the fact that the information will be required compulsorily, if the Bill is passed, will not make any difference to me.

I hope that other members will display the same attitude to this question and to the Bill. The South Australian Parliament and its members have been known both within the State and outside for the high level of propriety that has existed here. There is, however, a general lowering of the status and trust in which the public holds the institutions of Government and Parliament—a lowering which is, I believe, in one way a reflection on this House or its members. It is a fact, however, and I believe that the passing of the Bill and the implementation of its provisions would go a long way towards reviving public confidence in Parliament and Parliamentarians.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 is the definitions section. "Income source" is defined to require professional persons only to declare the nature of their profession as a source of income. In other words, there is no requirement to name the actual clients. "Members of the family" includes the lawful spouse of a member but does not include common law wives or husbands; it also includes children over 18 years of age. "The prescribed amount" is $500 or such other amount as is prescribed from time to time. Income from any one source of less than that sum in any one year is not to be declared. The effect of that provision is that interest on savings accounts will not be declared under the provisions of the Bill.

Clause 3 requires members to provide the Presiding Officer with a disclosure in the form of the first schedule of the Bill. Whence the source of income came originally is irrelevant to the purpose of the Bill and is not required to be declared. What is of concern is the fact that a member or a member of his or her family presently benefits from the income source. Clause 4 directs the Presiding Officer to lay on the table the disclosures as provided to him by the members. The Presiding Officer is the Speaker in this House and the President in another place. A penalty of $1 000 is to be imposed if the Presiding Officer fails to comply.

Clause 5 provides that the disclosures are to be printed as a Parliamentary Paper. Clause 6, the penalty section, provides a sanction of $1 000 for members who fail to make a disclosure without reasonable excuse or who knowingly furnish a false or misleading disclosure. Clause 7 provides that proceedings for offences under the Act shall be disposed of summarily, and clause 8 provides for a regulation-making power.

Dr. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

EDUCATION EXPENSES

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I move:

That, in the opinion of this House, the decision of the Commonwealth Government to reduce the taxation deduction for education expenses from $400 to $150 a child will cause grave hardship to many parents in the community and that the original deduction should be restored.

I shall not cover the same ground as I covered in my earlier motion that sought to increase the per capita grant to independent schools in South Australia. One cannot escape the conclusion, however, that the Commonwealth Labor Party is bent on breaking some of the independent schools in Australia. I well recall, while on a study tour from Parliament, reading a report in a British newspaper of the policy of the Labor Government in England at the time, reported by Roy Hattersley, who was at that time designated as the Labor Party's spokesman on education. On assuming office, the Labor Party was wise enough not to appoint him Secretary for Education. Mr. Hattersley said it was the Labor Party's aim to break the independent school system in Britain, and he said this to a conference of people associated with independent schools. He said that the Labor Party would try to achieve its aim in two ways: first, it would withdraw all aid to independent schools; and secondly, it would make it an offence to charge fees. This statement naturally caused a storm in Britain at the time.

Mr. Hattersley, who appeared with the Conservative Party's Assistant Secretary for Education on television, took a mauling during the ensuing debate. Nevertheless, this was the stated intention of the British Labor Party at that time, and one cannot escape the conclusion that the Australian Labor Party is hell bent on pushing some of our independent schools right into the corner and that the first move came as a result of the Karmel report.

Maybe the Labor Party in South Australia is not so open in its intentions as are its fellow travellers in Britian. Indeed, the A.L.P. has made two disastrous decisions regarding some of our independent schools. I said earlier today that the Karmel committee's recommendations as to how aid was to be made available to independent schools were open to serious challenge as a result of the recommendations of the South Australian Cook committee, which acknowledged that all independent schools were in serious financial trouble. The Karmel committee had no terms of reference. Despite the recommendation of the Karmel committee to phase some schools out from receiving aid, the Commonwealth Government wanted to phase them out at even shorter notice than that recommended by the committee. This was a disastrous decision and the Commonwealth Government decided to review the situation. As a result of that review, the blow was softened as to the time scale for the phasing out of State aid. That was a discriminatory decision made by certain members of the Commonwealth Cabinet who must have a king-size inferiority complex in respect of some of our independent schools. As an example of class warfare, it was a savage attack on certain sections of the community.

Dr. Eastick: And they talk about everyone being equal.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, although some are more equal than others. The recent decision to reduce the maximum taxation deduction for education expenses from $400 to $150 ranks with the previous decision as being a disaster for a minority of parents in this country. The Labor Government in Canberra is obviously not interested in minorities: it is interested in votes and it knows whence the votes come—from the large seaboard cities. For that reason the Commonwealth Labor Government has made an unwise decision when it is related to the country areas. Members of that Government are also well aware that most students attend Government schools and most of the students in the independent schools system attend Catholic schools. I would not challenge the opinion that Catholic

schools are among the most needy schools in the community, and there are compelling reasons for Catholic parents wanting to send their children to Catholic schools.

The decision of the Commonwealth Government will have a disastrous effect on some, if not all, independent schools. It is nonsense to say that $35 000 000 will be saved by reducing the maximum taxation deduction for education expenses. I said in an earlier debate today that it would probably cost $800 a year to educate a student in a Government secondary school during this financial year. The Minister has said that it would have cost $700 by the end of the 1973-74 financial year and I suggest that the figure will rise to over $800 during this financial year. Most of the parents who send children to independent schools would have a taxable income of less than $10 000. I believe the tax paid on such an income is less than 50c in the dollar. The extra taxation received, if the maximum tax deduction was reduced to $150, would be less than $200 for each child attending school. This would apply to the minority of parents in the group. If all of those children are forced out of the independent school system into the Government school system, the taxpayer will have to pay an extra $600 a year because the cost of educating a secondary student in a Government school will be $800. I cannot see how the committee can assert that we are saving money by reducing this tax deduction and thus forcing youngsters out of independent schools into Government schools. The independent schools are saving the taxpayers much money. At the most selfish level, it is in the interests of the public to keep these schools going if we do not want to charge the average taxpayer more for our State education system.

Dr. Eastick: Or overload the State system.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes. When it was thought that some Catholic schools would have to close because of financial difficulties, it was suggested that the Government could not cope with such a situation. Be that as it may, the operation of independent schools in this country is saving the general taxpayer much money. It is complete nonsense for people to go through fancy exercises to try to prove that the Government is losing money because of the operation of independent schools. It costs the taxpayer money every time a child is forced out of the independent system into the Government system. Although Liberal members say they do not believe in élitist or exclusive schools, the Commonwealth Government's decision will do precisely what the Government says it does not want to do: it will make the schools more exclusive. Headmasters of independent schools have told me that more and more parents who attended the schools cannot send their own children to the school: older brothers and sisters have gone to the schools but the younger brothers and sisters cannot be sent, because of the escalations in fees. This disastrous situation is being worsened by the recent decision of the Commonwealth Government. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

STUDENT TRAVEL CONCESSIONS

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): I move:

That, in the opinion of the House of Assembly, concessions for secondary school students travelling on public transport should apply at all times and irrespective of the purpose of the journey.

I move this motion with the strong support of the Secondary Students Association of South Australia. Yesterday I tabled in this Chamber a petition relating to this matter that contained 5 407 signatures. The petition reads:

Your petitioners pray that your honourable House will amend the present fare structure on public transport vehicles so that all secondary students will be able to use public transport at child fare whenever they wish.

I support the students in their stand and I do so in the interests of their education and in the interests of the community at large. At present secondary students over the age of 15 years can receive a monthly concession pass for use on public transport and they need to apply for such a pass on a monthly basis. This pass is valid until 6.30 each evening and it is only valid between Monday and Friday, when travelling to and from school. It is not valid for any other purpose.

A survey carried out at Unley High School has shown how effective is the present concession. Of the 79 students at that school who used public transport, only four had such a concession pass. Students are the first to grab any concession that will be a financial benefit to them, and that survey shows that the present pass is not a real financial benefit. Indeed, in many ways it is an inconvenience, particularly as the students must apply for it.

Furthermore, that pass cannot be used to travel to sporting functions on a Saturday morning, even though such functions may have been organised for the school. The students cannot use the pass to travel to or from a library or other educational facility. This points up the serious deficiency in the present pass system. Therefore, I will now give my reason for moving the motion to amend the provision regarding the concession.

I see education in a much broader scope than merely the formal education of a child at school. Part of the student's education is his sporting education, his reading at a library, his social mixing in our community, and his general mixing with people in all fields. The community should ensure that our secondary school students can mix and blend in with the remainder of society, to the maximum benefit of the students and of society. If the students are to do this, it is necessary that they have the necessary public transport facilities between the points of contact.

Obviously, secondary school students cannot afford motor cars. Some may have parents who can buy cars for them, but most students have no income and cannot rely on regular motor vehicle transport. Many use bicycles, but they are not satisfactory for some types of journey, particularly a long journey. I do not decry that students are forced to use public transport: obviously, public transport is provided as a public service. However, students must use public transport at the same cost as the cost to a person receiving a normal or minimum income.

We spend much money on other fields of education, and we should subsidise the students in this small way. I am sure that the Minister appreciates that the cost involved would not be large, compared to the remainder of our education budget. Travel concessions are not made available for travel at all times, and pensioners have their concessions available until only 4.30 p.m. I understand that the restriction on pensioners has been imposed to ensure that public transport is available during the peak period for those who pay the full fare.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: There's no restriction, and there hasn't been for about five years.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Well, I retract that statement. The fact that there is no restriction on pensioners means that there should be no restriction on secondary school students. Obviously, the concession is given to pensioners because they cannot pay the full fare, but similarly the students have not the money to pay the full fare. At least the pensioner receives the amount of the pension to live

on, whereas most secondary students have no income. Earlier this year a motion similar to the one that I have moved was carried at the meeting of the State Council of the Australian Labor Party.

Mr. Payne: You're wrong again.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: That is how the newspaper reported it.

Mr. Payne: That's what you go on most of the time, and it's about time you woke up.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I do not attend meetings of the council. The report stated that the Premier spoke against the motion, but I understand on good authority that it was carried. It is interesting that the Australian Labor Party Government has not adopted the policy set out in that motion, and I hope that the Minister will say why it has not done so.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I shall be pleased to do that.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: It is time that, in the general interest of educating our secondary students, we gave secondary school travel concessions to those who cannot receive them at present, covering public transport at all times and regardless of where they are travelling. I have the complete support of the Secondary Schools Association in moving the motion. In fact, the association has asked me to bring the matter before the House, and it gives me much pleasure to represent the members of the association in that way. Hoping that other members will see the common sense of the motion and the educational benefit that can accrue to students from it, I look forward to getting their support, irrespective of political Party.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport): I am interested to hear the honourable member's views, and it is clear that there has been a big change in the thinking of members on his side of the House, because all the restrictions to which he has referred have been imposed by a Liberal and Country League Government.

Mr. Dean Brown: You've been in office for 4½ years.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am pleased that the honourable member has helped me again. In that time we have been able to provide many benefits for the people for whom the honourable member apparently has now become spokesman. Those people have approached him about getting an improvement, presumably thinking that a back-bench Opposition member can arrange this sort of matter more effectively than can Government members. Obviously, the honourable member has not told those people what is the real position. For instance, we have given travel concessions to tertiary students, whereas the honourable member's Party previously denied them that.

We have extended the time and have made available all sorts of benefit. We have removed the restriction that the honourable member's Party enforced on people in relation to sex: we have removed sex discrimination, and we have removed the barrier in relation to the father's income. For the honourable member suddenly to get the urge to make everything rosy overnight, when his own Party has been the stumbling block for so long, is rather strange. The honourable member has relied on newspaper reports, such reports often being incorrect. So that he may be properly informed, I point out that at the annual State convention of the Australian Labor Party last June a resolution was carried asking the Government to extend travel concessions to all students. not just secondary school students. Now, on September 25, the member for Davenport says that the Labor Party carried a resolution last June, so now the Minister should be asked to give effect to it. What the honourable member does not know is that I have already put wheels in motion to give effect to that resolution. Soon, I expect to have further information to give members.

Mr. Venning: Will this apply to country students, too?

Mr. Coumbe: Will you support the motion?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is not necessary to support or oppose the motion. The fact is that the Government is already acting on this matter. As there are further details that I am sure members will be interested to know, I hope to bring them down to the House next week. For this reason, I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

BRANDY EXCISE

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I move:

That this House call on the members of the Commonwealth Parliament representing South Australia to take action in the Commonwealth Parliament to protect employment and development in South Australia from the imposts on the sale of wines and brandy which in the case of brandy are proposed to be increased in the Commonwealth Budget and which adversely affect South Australia far more than any other State.

Last Wednesday evening, on behalf of the grapegrowers and brandy producers of this State, I complained about the situation that had arisen following the introduction of the Commonwealth Budget on the previous evening. On that occasion, I gave the facts as I understood them, so I do not believe that it is necessary to go right through them again today, especially as I desire a vote on the motion today (I have indicated that desire to members of all other Parties represented in this House). Obviously, unless there is a vote today, most of the value of the motion will be lost, because it is meant to influence the attitude of South Australian members of the Commonwealth Parliament to the Commonwealth Budget, which is being debated at present. Unless we get a vote today and the motion to them, it will be of little use. On Wednesday, August 19, 1970, on the evening after the 1970 Commonwealth Budget was introduced, the Premier brought into this House, under a suspension of Standing Orders, the following motion:

That this House call on the members of the Commonwealth Parliament representing South Australia to take action in the Commonwealth Parliament to protect employment and development in South Australia from the impost on the sale of wines of 50c a gallon and from an increase of 2½ per cent in sales tax on motor vehicles and electrical goods which are proposed in the Commonwealth Budget and which will adversely affect South Australia far more than any other State.

Members will see that I have modelled my motion on that motion. On that occasion, the Premier kept the House sitting from 7.30 p.m. until after midnight to get that motion through. In other words, it was urgent enough in 1970, when a similar impost was proposed, to suspend Standing Orders to give the Government time to debate the matter until the motion was pushed through.

Mr. Venning: There was a different Commonwealth Government then.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: As the honourable member says, at that time there was a Liberal and Country Parties coalition Government in Canberra, and that may be the difference between the position then and now. However, I believe that what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. On October 19, 1972, the Premier wrote a letter (and I quoted it in full in the House last Wednesday evening), soliciting funds for his Party for the then forthcoming Commonwealth election, to the wine and brandy producers in this State, undertaking that a Commonwealth Labor Government would remove the wine excise. In fact, that excise was removed by the

Commonwealth Labor Government soon after it came into office. However, significantly the excise on brandy has been stepped up since it came into office from $3·08 a litre of alcohol to $8·55. That increase of nearly three times in the excise on brandy has occurred between August, 1973, and September, 1974.

The facts are that in exchange for removing the excise on wine the Commonwealth Government has stepped up the excise on brandy and is now receiving nearly three times as much in revenue from the latter as it received from the former. Wholesale wine sales in Australia for the year ended June 30, 1973, were 130 015 000 litres, and that netted the Commonwealth Government $7 149 000 in wine excise. The additional brandy excise since and including the increase in the August, 1973, Budget has meant an increase in revenue to the Commonwealth Government of $20 878 349. Therefore, the gesture of removing the wine excise, which brought in a little over $7 000 000, has been outweighed nearly three times by increasing the brandy excise so that it nets nearly $21 000 000 to the Commonwealth Government. I believe that what the Commonwealth Labor Government has done, aided and abetted by the State Labor Government (as exemplified by the Premier in the letter to which I have referred), is an absolute breach of faith that the Premier should be man enough to stand up to.

Not only is it a breach of faith: it is also a disaster to the wine and brandy industry in this State (and therefore to the grapegrowers of South Australia) because 80 per cent of the brandy produced in Australia is produced in South Australia, and 70 per cent of the grapes used in its production comes from up the River. I have said that this excise is a disaster. I am told that it is quite probable that brandy sales will drop not only in South Australia but throughout Australia by 50 per cent in a full year following the imposition of this excise. Last Thursday, having made these complaints in the House, I went on the channel 2 television programme *Today at One*. The Premier had been invited to debate the matter of his letter and the subject I had raised with him, but he declined saying that he had a luncheon engagement that was more important. The Minister of Agriculture was then invited to come on in his place, but he said that, although he was worried about brandy excise, he did not want to get involved in any conversation concerning the raising of funds for his Party, and he declined.

As luck would have it, the Minister of Works was in the studio to take part in the same programme but concerning another subject, and I was able, through a judicious remark or so, to persuade him to debate the matter with me. The only answer the Minister of Works could give on behalf of the Premier and his other colleagues was that the Commonwealth Government had nominally honoured its promises, and that brandy and wine production were quite different. Apparently, the Minister came back and told the Premier that he had won the debate with me. If this is his standard of failure or success in a debate, and the standard of honour and honesty of his Party, I want no part of either standard. Brandy production and wine production are part of the same industry and are interdependent. It does not matter to grapegrowers whether their grapes go into wine or into brandy. As I understand it, the winemaker first makes grapes into wine and, after pumping off the clear juice, the remaining lees are used to produce brandy and spirit.

Mr. Arnold: It is used for spirit not brandy.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Perhaps the member for Chaffey who, I hope, will support my motion, can explain the process, but I think my overall point is correct. It does not matter whether grapes are grown for wine or brandy, they are the same grapes. I am told there are four basic varieties used in producing brandy: doradillo, sultana, palomino, and grenache, and that these grapes can be used for either wine production or brandy production. It is well known to a person with my lack of technical knowledge that wine and brandy production are interdependent, and that, if either type of production suffers, grapegrowers will also suffer. Yet on television the Minister tried to make the distinction between wine and brandy production: he was being either dishonest or entirely ignorant, because the Premier in his letter made no such distinction. I remind the honourable gentleman, before he speaks in this debate, of one or two things he said in his letter showing that he made no distinction between growers and producers. His letter states:

> The industry together with the wine grape industry has already presented many well documented submissions on the hardships facing winemakers and grapegrowers.

He did not refer to winemakers only, but included grapegrowers in his comment. The letter continues:

> The future of the wine industry has become an issue at the forthcoming Federal elections. The Australian Labor Party believes, and its Federal Executive has stated, that the only solution that will guarantee continued prosperity for the wine industry and the many thousands of growers who supply it is complete abolition of the excise and its non-replacement by a sales tax or any other imposition.

Mr. Venning: How was the letter signed?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It was signed by the Premier as Chairman of the A.L.P. Federal Election Finance Committee, and he made no distinction in the letter between producers of grapes and producers of wine or brandy. If he is suggesting that the brandy excise is not, to use the phrase he used, "another imposition on the industry", I do not know what he thinks it is. It was quite misleading for him to say that. I have said that this motion will only have value if it is carried today, so that it can be transmitted to our Commonwealth colleagues. I ask the House to be ready to vote on it today. A refusal by the Government to let the motion go to a vote is just as sure a sign of opposition to it as would be an outright vote against it. If the Government will not allow it to go to a vote, that will show conclusively that it is against the motion because of the embarrassment it will cause its Commonwealth colleagues.

I tried to suspend Standing Orders on Thursday to have the motion debated then, but I was defeated by the Government. On Friday I wrote a letter to the Government Whip and a similar letter to the Whip of the Liberal Party, giving them notice that I intended to bring on this motion today and, with their co-operation, to ask for a vote on it. That letter was posted so that it would arrive in this House on Monday morning in order to give both Parties (and I sent a copy of the letter to the member for Flinders) ample notice of what I wanted to do and ample opportunity to be willing to debate and vote on the matter, if they wished to do so. So that there will be no misunderstanding, I quote part of the letter I sent to the member for Unley, in his capacity as Government Whip. It is dated September 20.

Mr. Goldsworthy: How does it start?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: With the word "Dear" and I think I put in "Gilbert". I am always friendly in my approach to other members.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You have a funny way of showing it sometimes.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I cannot see anything wrong with that, but if it has given offence I will try another appellation. The letter states:

I write to inform you that next Tuesday, I propose to give notice, in the House, for next Wednesday of the following motion:

Then follows the motion. The letter continues:

You will see that is the same motion which I tried to move under suspension of Standing Orders yesterday, but the Government opposed me. Although it would have been much preferable to have passed the motion on Thursday, it will still have value if passed by the House next Wednesday. The subject matter is of too great importance to South Australia and particularly to grapegrowers and brandy producers to be let drop. I am writing therefore both to you and to the Liberal Party Whip to request:

1. that I be given time to move the motion next Wednesday afternoon;
2. that both the Labor Party and the Liberal Party be prepared to debate it and allow it to go to a vote on that afternoon.

If you would like to discuss the request with me, please let me know.

I have to say that at lunch-time today the member for Fisher, in his capacity as the Whip for his Party, told me there would be a suspension of Standing Orders to allow me to move the motion today, with the member for Chaffey to follow me, and that his Party would then be prepared to let the matter go to a vote.

Dr. Eastick: I beg your pardon!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is what he told me, that his Party would then be prepared to let the motion go to a vote. That is what the member for Fisher told me in a telephone conversation this afternoon. I approached the member for Unley after the House met today to see what the attitude of his Party was. I very much regret to say he could not give me a straight answer. I got the impression from him (and it was no more than an impression) that the Government Party was not prepared to let the matter go to a vote today, but he said he would see in due course. I have had a definite and straight-out answer from the Liberal Party but not from the Labor Party.

Mr. Duncan: You'll get it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I hope I shall get it in due course. That is all I desire to say. I believe this matter, in the interests of South Australia and of the grapegrowers and producers, is so important that it transcends Party barriers (I hope that is so); it is absolutely in line with the motion that the Government itself four years ago, in similar circumstances, insisted on pushing through the House, at much shorter notice than this, in Government time.

The Minister of Works told me last Thursday that I would not get a suspension that afternoon (he said that arrogantly on television), that this was a matter of private members' business and that, if I wanted to bring it up, I should bring it up on a Wednesday afternoon. That is precisely what I am doing in response to his invitation. I hope to have the unanimous support of members for the motion this afternoon.

The SPEAKER: Is the motion seconded?

Mr. BOUNDY: Yes, Sir.

Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I support the motion, which deals with further imposts on the production of brandy in this country. In fact, this motion is basically in keeping with the motion I moved last year following the 1973 Commonwealth Budget. My only regret is that, despite my moving that motion and having it debated in this House, the member for Mitcham at that time did not see fit to support it. The motion was as follows:

That in the opinion of this House the Commonwealth Government should act immediately to remove the additional excise imposed on the sales of Australian brandy by the recent Commonwealth Budget.

As members will all recall, at that time the Commonwealth Treasurer put an impost of $1 a bottle on Australian brandy and at the same time indicated that a further 40c a litre would be put on brandy in 1974, and again in 1975. So at the time I moved that motion, October 17, 1973, we knew precisely what we were faced with—$1 a bottle then, to be followed by a further 40c a litre in 1974 and a still further 40c a litre in 1975.

Had the honourable member used his debating skills then in support of my motion, we might not now be faced with these additional imposts. Unfortunately, the Premier moved an amendment to my motion, which completely nullified it or at least watered it down to such an extent that we might just as well not have voted on it. He moved:

To strike out all words after "House" and insert "the elimination of the differential on brandy excise and the removal, without an adequate period for adjustment, of the provision for arbitrary valuation of wine stock is harmful to the wine industry and should not be proceeded with."

That virtually took all the teeth out of my motion. I had moved for a complete withdrawal of the provisions of the 1973 Commonwealth Budget relating to excise on brandy. Undoubtedly, the Premier is in an embarrassing situation in South Australia with the wine and brandy industry. He gave an undertaking prior to the Commonwealth elections of 1972 that the Commonwealth Government, if the Labor Party was elected to office, would remove the remainder of the wine duty and would not replace it with any other form of duty; but, as the member for Mitcham has pointed out, in view of the extent to which the present Commonwealth Labor Government has put imposts on this industry, there is no doubt, from the figures available, about the effect these imposts are having on the industry and its production. Members will recall that last week I cited the fall in the percentage of sales of Australian brandy. Prior to the 1973 Commonwealth Budget, the duty was at the rate of $3·08 a litre of alcohol. Immediately following the 1973 Commonwealth Budget, that was raised to $6 a litre of alcohol. As I said earlier, the Treasurer at that time indicated there would be a further 40c a litre in 1974, and a still further 40c could be expected in 1975.

It is interesting to note the increase in imported brandy. Once again, this can, in part, be attributed to the continuing increase in the duty on Australian brandy. Going back to February, 1969, we see that the percentage of imported brandy to Australian brandy cleared on the Australian market was 11·72 per cent. In February, 1970, imported brandy had reached 14·86 per cent; in 1971, 16·95 per cent; in 1972, 19·95 per cent; in 1973, 19·72 per cent; and, in 1974, that figure has risen to 21·11 per cent. So, we can see the steady increase in imported brandy compared to the Australian product. There has been a steady increase since 1969, stimulated by the effect of increased duty within Australia on our own product. The duty on imported brandy before the Commonwealth Budget was $6·19 a litre alcohol, while the duty on Australian brandy was $6, meaning that the difference in favour of Australian produced brandy was only 19c a litre alcohol. By comparison, we find that on imported whisky the duty is $7·46 a litre alcohol, while that on the Australian product is $6·80, a difference of 66c in favour of the Australian product, although the difference in favour of Australian brandy is only 19c.

Here is an industry which, for some reason, the Commonwealth Government is determined to cripple at any cost. The member for Mitcham mentioned the grapes

and wine used in the production of brandy. The wine is produced and, as he said, it is run off. That is the free-run wine, followed by the pressings. The remainder (the pressings that are left) usually goes for the production of rectifying spirit, and not the production of brandy. Brandy is produced from top quality wine grapes turned into a top quality wine from which the brandy is then distilled. I have been reminded many times that top quality brandy cannot be made from an inferior wine; it must be made from the best quality wine available. Rectifying spirit can be produced from any form of wine as long as the spirit content is there, but it is essential, to make good brandy, that it must be made from good quality grapes turned into premium quality wine. To indicate the attitude of the Commonwealth Government to this matter, I refer to an article appearing in the *Murray Pioneer* on Thursday, October 25, 1973, under the heading "Growers' protest meeting next week", which states:

Federal members representing Labor, Liberal and Country Parties will be among the speakers at a protest meeting organised by the South Australian Wine Grape Growers Association. The meeting, which will be held in the Rivoli Theatre, Berri, on Friday, November 2, has been called to discuss the effects of the recent Federal Budget on the wine industry.

The article then mentioned those members who had been invited to attend the meeting. The following week, under the heading "Meeting postponed", the *Murray Pioneer* contained another article, this time dated November 1, 1973, stating:

A growers' protest meeting which was to be held at Berri tomorrow night has been cancelled because no Labor Party politicians were intending to attend.

That is an extraordinary situation. Only a year or so earlier, when a similar protest meeting was called to give grapegrowers and brandy producers an opportunity to air their grievances following the wine duty imposed by the then Liberal and Country Party Commonwealth Government, Liberal and Country Party members faced up to the meeting and took the medicine dished out by the grapegrowers and winemakers at that time. The Liberal Party was represented by Mr. Giles, and the Country Party by the then Minister for Primary Industry (Mr. Sinclair). However, this is a marked difference, and it has not gone unnoticed that members were at least willing to attend that meeting knowing full well the protests that they would have to face. All due credit should be given to them for being willing to attend that meeting and to be told at first hand by growers and industry representatives precisely what they were thinking and what moves were being made at that time.

The situation regarding the State Government is summed up in the reply the Deputy Premier gave to a question I had asked on the afternoon of September 18, before the announcement of the Commonwealth Budget. I asked the Deputy Premier, because of the additional imposts that had been placed on the wine industry, to seek financial assistance for the wineries that were unable to meet their commitments to growers: in other words, to pay for the fruit that those wineries had contracted to take from growers during the 1974 vintage. In reply, the Minister said:

I shall have the matter examined to see what can be done. I do not know—

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the honourable member for Chaffey say on what date the reply to which he is referring was given?

Mr. ARNOLD: On September 18, 1974, Sir.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Chaffey is not permitted to refer to a debate that has already been determined by this House.

Mr. ARNOLD: I am referring to a reply to a question, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: I am sorry. The honourable member for Chaffey may continue.

Mr. ARNOLD: This reply was given by the Deputy Premier on the afternoon of September 18, immediately before the presentation of the Commonwealth Budget. The Deputy Premier said:

I shall have the matter examined to see what can be done. I do not know whether any good purpose would be served by applying to the Commonwealth Government . . .

That spells out clearly the State Government's attitude to this matter. It realises that, no matter what representations it makes to the Commonwealth Government on this subject, that Government will take absolutely no notice of it. Even though the Premier has given an undertaking on behalf of that Government, no matter in what situation it places him, the Commonwealth Government will not consider any State Government submissions made on this subject. I support the motion.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): As I wish to amend the motion, I move:

To strike out all words after "House" and insert "congratulates the Government of South Australia for its efforts on behalf of the wine and brandy producers to eliminate the wine excise and to avoid additional imposts on brandy".

The motion, as amended, will read:

That this House congratulates the Government of South Australia for its efforts on behalf of the wine and brandy producers to eliminate the wine excise and to avoid additional imposts on brandy.

The honourable member has moved his motion in an effort, apparently, to instruct the Senate. However, I point out that on a previous occasion to which he has referred, when this House tried to instruct South Australia's Senators, the Liberal Senators were not willing to be instructed on this topic and took no part in avoiding the wine excise. Why, therefore, on this occasion he uses such a ploy, which proved unsuccessful previously and which will be no more successful now, I cannot imagine. The honourable member has referred to the undertaking that I gave on behalf of the Commonwealth Labor Party at the request and with the approval of the Prime Minister. Previously, I have said publicly (and I say it again) that I regard the impost of a brandy excise and the elimination of the differential in the excise on brandy as an additional impost that is in breach of the undertaking I gave. I bitterly resent having been placed in that position, and I have clearly told the Prime Minister that never again will I give an undertaking on his behalf in that way.

Mr. Coumbe: Never again will you support him?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I did not say that: I said that never again will I be placed in a position where I give an undertaking and someone else is willing, and indeed in a position, to dishonour it.

Mr. Goldsworthy: They made a liar out of you.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It certainly grievously embarrassed me. However, they did not make a liar out of me, because I believed when I gave that undertaking that it would be honoured.

Mr. Goldsworthy: They are liars themselves!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They did not, I believe, honour the undertaking that was given. I have said clearly and publicly that I bitterly resent that fact and that I

have been placed in an impossible position by the Commonwealth Government by the action it took in relation to the wine industry. I made that perfectly clear at the time of the alteration of the brandy differential and the imposition of an additional excise on brandy. True, the Prime Minister and the Commonwealth Treasurer have argued with me that an impost on brandy is not an impost on the wine industry.

Mr. Millhouse: That's exactly the line that your Deputy took on Thursday.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Although this argument has been used, I do not believe it is valid regarding the undertaking I was asked to give. The position is, I believe, that an impost has been placed on the wine industry that is quite wrong. It ought not to have been placed on the industry, and I have protested about it from the outset. Indeed, I have made representations to the Commonwealth Government in relation to the differential in excise, the provision of an extra excise given the unfair competition between oversea brandy and that produced in Australia, and the situation in relation to tariff protection. Those representations have been made by me, together with the President of the Wine and Brandy Producers Association and the Chairman of the Wine Board of Australia, to the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry and the Commonwealth Treasurer. Those representations have been backed up by this State's Minister of Agriculture, and I have received the constant thanks and appreciation of wine and brandy producers and of the Wine Board for the efforts that I and my Ministers have made on their behalf.

Mr. Coumbe: They haven't been successful.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I regret that the representations have not been successful. However, that does not mean that I will not continue to fight to get this situation altered. Immediately following the announcement regarding this matter in the Commonwealth Budget, our Minister of Agriculture sent the following letter to the Australian Minister for Agriculture (Senator Wriedt):

You will recall that at the recent meeting of the Australian Agricultural Council I made a strong (and, I had hoped, convincing) plea on behalf of grapegrowers and brandy producers for some degree of tariff protection for the brandy industry, and I presented what I considered was a well-documented case for special concessions to this industry which, I feel, has borne the brunt of the Australian Government's tariff and excise policies. It was with keen disappointment, therefore, that I learned from press reports on the Budget that the Australian Government proposes to place an impost of 40c a litre on brandy.

I am satisfied that the imposition of this additional levy can only spell doom for some of those engaged in the industry. For South Australia, where there are more than 2 000 wine grapegrowers in the Loxton area who have already been adversely affected by the impact of the brandy excise, the prospects are, I believe, serious. I find it incomprehensible that, while the Australian Government permits imports of oversea brandies on an increasing scale, at the same time it refuses to grant the Australian industry tariff protection, and now places added burdens on it by imposing higher excise duties. In my view the continuation of this policy can only serve to weaken further the viability of this local industry.

I am informed that over the past 18 months or so excise payments have risen from $470 a tonne of grapes to $1 130—an increase of over 260 per cent, whereas during the same period the return to growers has increased from $51 a tonne to a little more than $60, that is, 15 per cent. I earnestly request that you bring to the notice of your Cabinet colleagues the serious situation facing this industry as a consequence of the present policy, and that you use your best endeavours to obtain some relief for grapegrowers and brandy producers from the impact of the excise tax.

Mr. Millhouse: What is the date of the letter?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: September 24.

Mr. Millhouse: I see, after you received the other letter.

Mr. Venning: It seems as though Senator Wriedt does not cut much ice with your Commonwealth colleagues, doesn't it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The September 24 date is stamped on the letter; it is not part of the original copy.

Mr. Millhouse: That's the best date you can give, though, isn't it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is the date on the file.

Mr. Millhouse: I thought there might be something in it when you didn't disclose the date of the letter.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not mind disclosing the date to the honourable member. The letter was sent after officers of the Agriculture Department had studied the Commonwealth Budget.

Mr. Langley: How many grapegrowers are there in Mitcham?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: My Government has made constant efforts on behalf of this industry. It is of grave concern and dismay to us that our efforts have not met with the success we believed that the justice of the case merited. We believe it wrong that oversea brandies, which are not required to have the kind of maturation required of Australian brandies and which are not even required to be proven brandy, are imported into Australia.

Mr. Arnold: That's the whole point.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There is no proper examination of those spirits entering this country under the label "brandy" and they are able to be sold at a price so close to the Australian brandies, which are required to go through an expensive production process: indeed, a far more expensive process than any competing spirit.

Mr. Chapman: There's also the excise.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Excise taxes in other countries are not low. There is no guarantee that what is imported is brandy; it could easily be potato spirit for all we know. In these circumstances, I express my dissatisfaction with what has happened, and I have expressed it publicly many times. I have done so to the wine and brandy producers, whose interests I have tried to advance constantly. However, I do not believe that the motion will achieve anything. The previous time we tried to achieve something similar we did not get any action in the Senate, and I do not believe that the motion will achieve anything now. I believe that the amendment is the appropriate way of expressing the opinion of the House.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): During the debate the member for Mitcham drew an inference from what I had said to him. Although I was not present earlier this afternoon, I was told that the member for Mitcham said that he had had a conversation with me at lunch-time. As Opposition Whip, I told him that Standing Orders could be suspended to enable him to move his motion today and that all private members could get their notices of motion off the Notice Paper and debated. I also told him that the member for Chaffey would follow him, as he was to be the only speaker of my Party who would take part in the debate, and the Government, of course, could decide whether to adjourn the debate.

Mr. Payne: Did you reciprocate by calling him "My dear Robin"?

Mr. EVANS: I will not comment on that. Immediately after the proceedings began, the member for Mitcham asked me what time his motion might be called on. I

said, "After 4 o'clock. You understand the position. The member for Chaffey will follow you and, if the Government decides to adjourn the debate, that will be it or, if it decides to go to a vote, that will be it." That is the gist of the conversation, and it makes it difficult for me if the member for Mitcham deliberately puts his own interpretation on a conversation. Surely, I do not have to put everything in writing. I appreciate his co-operation in addressing a letter to me as, "My dear Stanley", and the co-operation the Government has given in this matter, but I do not like a conversation being construed to suit his own position.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You have known him long enough not to get involved. You can't trust him.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Kavel.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): The amendment, which completely destroys the force of the motion, is similar to the exercise on which we embarked last year, as has been pointed out by the member for Chaffey. What the Premier seeks to do by his amendment is give himself and his Government a pat on the back when, in fact, they have admitted that they have failed to make any impression on their Commonwealth colleagues. What, in effect, the Premier said this afternoon was that he was asked by the Prime Minister to give an undertaking to the wine and brandy producers and grapegrowers that no impost would be placed on them, and he did this in good faith. What he further indicated was that his Commonwealth colleagues did not see fit to honour their promise. Politics in Australia is in a parlous state when the Premier can say that his Commonwealth colleagues have deliberately used him to promote a promise to an important section of the community when, in fact, they are not willing to honour that promise. The Premier said, not in as many words but in replying to an interjection of mine, that his Commonwealth colleagues were liars. That word was used in connection with a statement of mine last week in the House that I have subsequently verified, but it has not been retracted.

No retraction can be made in this instance, because the Premier said that it was a source of acute embarrassment to him that his Commonwealth colleagues were not willing to honour their promise. In plain Australian language, that makes them liars. I support the motion. Obviously, the amendment seeks to take away any force that it may have. The motion is similar to one that the member for Chaffey moved last year, and the Premier is admitting that he has lost the battle with his Commonwealth colleagues, whom he cannot trust, and he seeks to pat himself on the back, acknowledging that the Commonwealth Government has failed.

Mr. Langley: Do you trust your Commonwealth colleagues?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I know that, if they gave an undertaking, they would not break their word.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What about O'Halloran Giles? Hasn't he a nice record on this one!

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): First, I want to clear up the unpleasant little implication made by the member for Fisher a short time ago. It was quite irrelevant to the main subject matter, of course.

The SPEAKER: Order! I allowed the honourable member to include in his remarks certain matters that were not relevant at that time and, in fairness, the honourable member for Fisher retaliated. However, I think that at this stage we should confine ourselves to the motion under discussion and leave personalities out of the debate.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: All I will say in answer to that part of the speech made by the member for Fisher in this debate is that, if that is the attitude that he intends to take, I would much prefer that he replied to my letters in writing so that there could be no misunderstanding.

Mr. Coumbe: How else can he reply to a letter, if not in writing?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: He replied to this letter orally. I point out to the member for Torrens that it is possible to reply to a letter orally or in writing. The member for Fisher chose to reply to this letter orally. I hope that he replies in writing in future, because I clearly understood that he said that there would be no other speaker from his Party, except the member for Chaffey. If I misunderstood him, that was because he did not express himself clearly. It would be better if he replied in writing in future. That is all I want to say about that, and I hope that in future he will do as I do to him, namely, reply in writing.

I could not for one moment accept the Premier's amendment. He has said in the debate that he has failed to move his Commonwealth colleagues in this matter and, instead of there being a reduction in the excise on brandy, there has been a steady increase. Why that should call for congratulation, I do not for the life of me understand. Of course, the whole point of the amendment is to avoid embarrassment to his Commonwealth colleagues, who have, on his own admission, absolutely let him down in this matter.

If the Premier were an honest man, he would allow this motion to go to a vote in the way that I have moved it. If he could not move his Commonwealth colleagues, he would no longer support them, because he has stated that they are not honest men. Of course, he is not willing to do that, because, even though he has been humiliated, as he has been over this matter by the Prime Minister and the Prime Minister's colleagues, he puts Party loyalty above loyalty to his State and the people particularly affected by this impost. I think that that is all I need say about the Premier's attitude and the way in which he has been treated.

I will make one comment about the letter that the Premier was pleased to read out and which his Minister of Agriculture wrote to the Commonwealth Minister for Agriculture (Senator Wriedt). I thought that there was something strange when the honourable gentleman did not at first disclose the date of that letter. He stated that it was written immediately after the Budget, and he did that to give the impression that it was written some time last week. Of course, the Premier is adept at giving impressions in that way.

Mr. Wright: You're fairly good at it, too.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: When I interjected to challenge him on this point, we found that the letter was written yesterday, six days (because the Commonwealth Budget was delivered during an evening) after the Commonwealth Budget was brought down. It was written after I had let the Government Whip know that I intended to move this motion and some days after I first gave the contents of this motion in the House. The implication is crystal clear. It is that that letter was written to Senator Wriedt, using much of the material that I used in the House last Wednesday afternoon, for no reason other than this debate this afternoon. That is not something that deserves congratulation: that deserves—

Mr. Venning: Condemnation.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It deserves condemnation, and I thank the member for Rocky River for the word. This

is one more chapter in the sorry story of the way this State Government has let the wine industry down, just as the Commonwealth Government has done. It shows that there is no good faith in the Premier on this matter. He has said (and this is the most transparent of excuses), in moving an amendment and not accepting the motion as it stands, that there can be no purpose in sending the motion on, because four years ago we carried a similar motion and failed.

The Premier, of course, concentrated on the Senate, but this motion would be sent to all members of the Commonwealth Parliament. The Premier said that four years ago the Liberals took no notice of the motion. Not even a fool would be taken in by such a transparency as that. The Premier is putting his Party ahead of the interests of this State. He does not want to embarrass his Party members in Canberra and, therefore, he will avoid a motion of this kind by all means possible. He has the numbers to do it and his members are sitting behind him. They will tramp to vote regardless of whether they believe in the motion, and I do not think some of them do believe in it.

I remind the Premier of one way in which, if he wanted to, he could bring pressure to bear on the Commonwealth Government through South Australian members, of his own Party anyway, despite all that he has said about bitterly resenting the Prime Minister's attitude, and so on. All members of that Party require endorsement. We use the word "selection" in our Party, and the Liberal Party uses the word "preselection". The Premier has never suggested this, but one sure-fire way of bringing pressure to bear on those members is by threatening their endorsement.

If he was genuine on this and other matters on which he kicks the Commonwealth Government for political purposes from time to time, he would threaten to bring pressure to bear on Labor Party members and would actually bring it to bear, unless he got an undertaking that the Commonwealth Government would act in the interests of this State. The Premier has never suggested that he would do that, but we on this side, as well as members opposite, know that that is the ultimate weapon—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —which a Parliamentary Party—

The SPEAKER: Order! I can find nothing in the motion dealing with the preselection of members of any Party, and honourable members, in debating a motion, are expected to speak to the motion or to the amendment. The honourable member for Mitcham is wide of the mark and out of order in the references that he has made.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not believe that I was speaking irrelevantly.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ruled that way. The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am merely showing the way in which the State Government could put pressure on the Commonwealth Government.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have ruled that reference out of order. The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I think I have made the point clearly enough, anyway. It could be done if the Government wanted to do it.

The SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member is going to disregard totally the ruling of the Chair, he knows what consequences the Standing Orders provide. If he wants to continue the debate it will be on the basis of what he is permitted to do under Standing Orders. The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Let me now pass to another point. The Senate is now significantly differently constituted from the way it was constituted four years ago; the Premier referred to this matter in his transparent attempt to argue his way out of this motion. There is now a Liberal Movement Senator, and I can assure all members that he would use his influence in this matter.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: As he has in the past!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: He is now a very important Senator, in the estimation of other honourable gentlemen in Canberra, including members of the Minister's own Party. Let me remind the Minister that Senator Hall is recognised in the Commonwealth Parliament as the Leader of a political Party in his own right; that is with the approval of the Prime Minister. The situation is different in the Senate: it is now so evenly balanced that we could in that Chamber, even though this motion is not restricted to the Senate—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: The Senate was evenly balanced until Senator Townley went back to the Liberal Party.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: We could bring pressure to bear effectively in that Chamber if we carried this motion. I will vote against the amendment and, when the amendment is carried (the Government has the numbers to carry it), I intend to vote against the amended motion, because the last thing the Government deserves, with its disgraceful record (admitted by the Premier this afternoon), is congratulations on anything. It is aiding and abetting the ruination of the brandy producers of this State and, through them, of many of the grapegrowers of this State, too. I believe we could do something to help them if we carried this motion but, if it is not carried in its original form, the whole exercise is worthless.

The House divided on the Hon. D. A. Dunstan's amendment:

Ayes (24)—Messrs. Max Brown and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Crimes, Duncan, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, McKee, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.

Noes (17)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Becker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, McAnaney, Millhouse (teller), Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, and Venning.

Majority of 7 for the Ayes.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan's amendment thus carried.

The House divided on Mr. Millhouse's motion as amended:

Ayes (24)—Messrs. Max Brown and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Crimes, Duncan, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, McKee, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.

Noes (17)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Becker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, McAnaney, Millhouse (teller), Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, and Venning.

Majority of 7 for the Ayes.

Motion as amended thus carried.

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT (DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS) BILL

Order of the Day, Other Business, No. 16: Mr. Duncan to move:

That he have leave to introduce a Bill for an Act to provide for the disclosure by members of the Parliament of South Australia of their sources of income and for purposes incidental thereto.

Mr. DUNCAN (Elizabeth) moved:

That this Order of the Day be read and discharged.

Order of the Day read and discharged.

[*Sitting suspended from* 6.3 *to* 7.30 *p.m.*]

EXPLOSIVES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It deals with a number of matters of a disparate nature, and for that reason it will be more convenient to explain it by considering each clause in turn. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 25 of the principal Act by providing that unpaid storage charges and expenses for explosives deposited in a Government magazine may be recovered by selling the explosives by public tender. The present procedure of sale by public auction has been found to be cumbersome in practice, and it is believed that sale by public tender would be more satisfactory.

Clause 3, by paragraph (*a*), would enable the Government to recoup travelling expenses and expenses incurred in the examination of explosives required to be destroyed or disposed of by an inspector in addition to the cost of their actual destruction or disposal, which at present is all that may be recovered from their owner. Paragraph (*b*) of clause 3 also amends section 42 of the principal Act but provides for a matter of more importance. Doubt has arisen whether in certain circumstances that section gives the Chief Inspector and his inspectors sufficient powers to remove an immediate or potential danger involving explosives, and this provision is intended to ensure that the inspectors have sufficient power to prevent the serious injuries which may result from an explosion.

Clause 4 provides that the Chief Inspector may revoke any licence under the principal Act of a person who fails to co-operate with or obey an inspector in the exercise of his powers. This sanction would appear to be appropriate in the dangerous area of explosives. Clause 5 is intended to clarify the power to prescribe fees for the purposes of the principal Act and the conditions on which licences may be granted, suspended and revoked. In addition, this clause empowers the raising of the maximum penalty for a breach of the regulations to $500, an amount more in keeping with today's money values.

Mr. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

SWINE COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 24. Page 1096.)

Mr. ALLEN (Frome): I support the Bill, which is introduced as a result of the healthy state at present of the Swine Compensation Fund. This legislation was originally introduced in 1936, and at present the fund has substantial reserves. At June 30, 1973, the fund stood at $617 917. For the year 1973-74, receipts were $108 383, with payments being $25 127, leaving a balance at June 30, 1974, of $701 173. Therefore, the increase in the fund for the year was $83 256. That bears out the fact that the fund is presently in a healthy state. Clause 4 amends section 12 of the Act, which provides for the establishment of the Swine Compensation Fund. The amendments provide, first, that bulk payments of duty to the Minister in lieu of payments by means of duty stamps will be credited to the fund. When the legislation was first implemented in 1936, the custom was to affix tax stamps to producers' returns. As time went on, it became more convenient to pay the tax in bulk; I understand that this practice has continued to the present. Now, it is intended to write this practice into the legislation in order to make the position much simpler.

As the cost of research in the industry is increasing, it is intended in the Bill to increase the grant to the Pig Industry Research Unit from $10 000 to $25 000 a year. Apart from the increase of the grant to the research unit, the most significant alteration in the Bill is to enable annual surplus amounts to be applied for the benefit of the industry. The Government intends that, in the disbursement of these sums, it will pay close attention to the views of the industry expressed through an informal committee to be established. I take it that surplus sums each year will be given to the industry for various purposes, with the industry being protected by an informal committee. I wonder what will be the role of this committee. Will its members be paid? Probably, it will be appointed by the Government. However, in Committee, I should like a little more information about it.

Clause 5, by amending section 14 of the Act, merely provides that, in future, stamp duties will be fixed by regulation, subject, of course, to the limitation that they will not exceed the present rates. At present, the rate is 35c maximum for any individual carcass. By the Bill, the rate is to be reduced to 21c, a reduction of more than 30 per cent. In future, the rate will be fixed by regulation, but a safeguard is provided, since by regulation the rate cannot be increased above the present rate of 21c. The pig industry is in a slightly different position from the rest of the meat industry at present. The price of pig meat has not declined greatly, compared with the price of beef, lamb, and mutton. However, the price of pig feed has increased astronomically, so that the margin of profit in the pig industry is similar to that in other sections of the meat industry, since there is only a small margin of profit at present for producers. There has been a significant fall in the price of other meats, such as beef, lamb, and mutton, but the cost of feed for that meat at present is not very great, because we have had an abundance of good seasons and, therefore, no hand-feeding has been necessary for that stock. Therefore, the cost of feed is not very great for grazing stock, whereas pigs have to be fed by grain, the price of which has risen astronomically in the past year or two. I support the Bill, and I shall be seeking some information in Committee.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): I support this short Bill. It is significant that we are speaking of an industry that is self-supporting in relation to this fund. As applies to the other compensation funds, the growers through their contributions have subscribed a large sum of money to this fund for the purpose of compensating any producer who has the misfortune to produce for sale or have on his property an animal found to be defective when inspected by the department. In that case, it is through this fund that the producer can receive compensation.

These compensation funds, which were established in the interests of the producers, have been well worth while. The fund has grown enormously over the years and it is considered that the sum payable on the sale of pigs will be reduced somewhat. It is interesting to note that, in the second reading explanation, the Minister stated that a committee would be set up to work out how the surplus money in excess of the $25 000 would be spent each year. I know the industry itself wants competent men on this

committee so that the money will not be merely thrown around willy-nilly.

Mr. Mathwin: Practical men.

Mr. VENNING: Yes, to see that this money will be put to good use. The industry was most concerned a few months ago about the establishment set up at Northfield for pig research; there was some doubt about the future of the activities there when there was so much talk about Monarto and the Agriculture Department being shifted to that area. I wish all other branches of the rural industry were in a similar state to this branch. With those few words, I support the comments of the member for Frome.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): This Bill breaks new ground, because it creates a situation where the compensation fund can be distributed over a much wider field than hitherto. I appreciate that this action is being taken with the concurrence of the industry. It is not so many years ago that the person in charge of the Swine Compensation Act and the Cattle Compensation Act (the Minister of Agriculture) saw fit to maintain a large sum of money in both those compensation funds, because it was appreciated that, with the threat of exotic diseases in those industries, the demands for compensation payments at any one time could be great. While I am totally in accord with using within the industry the funds raised from members of those industries, there could conceivably be a considerable drain on the State's resources, and particularly on Consolidated Revenue, if one of the exotic diseases was to enter Australia, as we in South Australia are required, along with the other States, to provide some of the compensation funds for fighting such an outbreak, no matter where it occurs in Australia.

Also, if the disease was not exotic but was one of the diseases described in the Act and an outbreak occurred in South Australia, the demand on the fund could be far greater than the amount of money in the fund. Provided the Government realises it may have to raise money from Consolidated Revenue to fight an outbreak of some major disease, I have no argument with this Bill. To emphasise further the magnitude of the problem, I point out that we now have a situation in which one organisation in this State currently has two piggeries, run as part of a total of 32 000 pigs. A further farm is being established, with possibly two units in that one farm, some little distance from the base piggery at Gawler River, the secondary piggery being at Sheoak Log, and the two further piggeries to be established at Wasleys, north of Roseworthy.

With the intensive conditions under which these piggeries operate, with the crowding together of pigs, an outbreak of disease could spread right through the establishment. I do not predict that that will happen, because the people concerned are careful with their disease control programme, and they have introduced into the piggeries pigs designated "minimal disease pigs". If there was to be an outbreak of one of the infectious diseases that would be compensable under this Act, at the speed with which it would spread through such an establishment where the base piggery has pigs of minimal disease (which means they have not suffered any contact with the disease to enable them to build up an inherent resistance), and because of their close proximity to one another and of their numbers, the cost to the Government of compensating a spread of the disease could be excessive.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: That is an argument against the operation.

Dr. EASTICK: Yes, one could say that. One could also say that, with the ups and downs there have been within this industry, and because of the need for economy in production costs, spreading the cost of the overheads and getting the maximum benefit from the capital outlay for sheds and equipment, probably those people are helping to maintain pig meat costs at a level at which people can purchase the product. We could enter into several discussions on the pros and cons of whether there should be a balanced cost for pig meat. I do not want to delay the measure any further, but it is conceivable that this Government or a Government of the future will suddenly have to find a considerable sum of money from Consolidated Revenue to fulfil its commitments to the owners of pigs with compensable disease.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I take the opportunity to raise a matter while we are talking about swine, and that is the intention of all Governments, decided at the Australian Agricultural Council meeting, to ban the feeding of swill or garbage to swine. I realise the importance of keeping diseases, such as foot and mouth disease, out of Australia. However, this legislation will place some pig farmers, especially those who operate near the city, in jeopardy. In some piggeries, garbage has for many years been used to feed the pigs.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Swill!

Mr. EVANS: That may be the Minister's expression, but the term I use is garbage, and that is usually fed to pigs, so that until now a resource has been used. If its use is banned, it will not be possible to dispose of it by this method, but it will have to be carted to a solid waste depot and disposed of. This highlights the need to have in our community a resource recovery unit. The use of this resource has not been detrimental to the pig industry or any other section of the animal husbandry industry, and it will be wrong to waste it by banning its use. It is important that the Government upgrade its priorities regarding the establishment of a resource recovery unit as opposed to the establishment of a solid waste authority. I do not know when the State Government will implement the decision made at the meeting that was chaired by Senator Wriedt.

I received from the Minister today a letter stating that only about 4 per cent of pigs were fed swill, garbage or offal. In a newspaper report of August 31, it was stated that only a small number (in fact, only 843) of the 38 000 piggeries in Australia fed swill or garbage to their swine. However, this still represents a livelihood for the people involved. At least five people in my district will have to leave the industry because of this regulation, and some of them have taken the correct action in the circumstances obtaining. One person, having purchased a property outside the water catchment area at Harrogate, has committed himself to the expenditure of a considerable sum of money in order to do the right thing by the Minister and his department. However, he now finds that he must enter into a much larger operation because his profit margin with the more expensive food that he will be forced to feed his pigs is not as great as the profit margin when swill or garbage is used.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: We have had a few cases in the catchment area itself.

Mr. EVANS: That is so, and the department acted correctly by preventing others from starting up in the industry there. In some cases, piggeries have stopped feeding this type of feed to their pigs, it being better for them to preserve the quality of the available water. Also, some people who wanted to expand their operations were not permitted to do so and had, therefore, to leave

the industry. They accepted this, except in the case of a Mr. Karanewitsch, on whom a considerable burden was placed.

In making this move, we are disadvantaging a small section of the community. Although this is their livelihood, these people will have to move out of the industry and, according to a letter I received from the Minister today, it appears that they will not be paid compensation. Indeed, no compensation was mentioned in the press report of August 31, to which I have already referred. I hope that, at a time when the Commonwealth Government is making available millions of dollars to certain disadvantaged people in our society, this small minority will be helped. The operators of all the 843 piggeries would not have to be helped, as some could survive if they used the more expensive type of food for their pigs. However, the operators of smaller piggeries should be entitled to some compensation.

We are trying to protect not only the pig industry but also the dairy cattle, beef cattle, and sheep industries from exotic diseases and, if a small section of these industries is asked to make a sacrifice, the Government should make a small sacrifice itself and pay compensation to that group. I hope the Minister takes heed of what has been said and that he will refer the matter back to his colleague so that these people can be considered, even if it involves representations being made to the Commonwealth Government.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Establishment of Swine Compensation Fund."

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): During the second reading debate I said that the Bill broke new ground by inserting in the Act new section 12 (3) (*d*). If the Minister does not have the relevant information, will he ask his colleague what is the nature of the undertaking that is to be permitted? The new provision to which I have referred does not define for what purpose the aggregate of any surplus amounts can be used within the industry, although I accept they will be used entirely in the industry that is responsible for the establishment of the fund. Although this tax has been reduced, it cannot be spent by the Government in its own right.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): Not being the Minister responsible for the Bill, I do not claim to have special knowledge of it. However, new section 12 (3) (*d*), to which the Leader has referred, illustrates that the Minister can do nothing other than apply the funds to the benefit of the pig industry, but in what area I do not know. As the Leader said, certain unforeseen or unpredictable things could happen within the industry; it is for these reasons that this provision has been included. I assure the Leader that the Minister would be unable, even if he wanted, to go beyond the ambit of the provision. I will check this matter with my colleague to ensure that what I have said is correct, but I hope that the assurance I have given the Leader is sufficient.

Dr. EASTICK: I accept the Minister's assurance and his undertaking that the information will be forthcoming. However, the Minister would not have inserted such a provision unless the industry had clearly indicated the nature of its interest and the area in which it hoped that this excess of funds would be spent. It is on that basis that I seek the information.

Mr. VENNING: As I understand that the fund amounts to more than $700 000, can the Minister say whether it bears interest and, if it does, at what rate?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As I am unable to answer the honourable member's question, I will obtain the information from my colleague and let the honourable member know.

Clause passed.

Clause 5 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

MARGARINE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 27. Page 687.)

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): The Opposition supports the Bill, which is supplementary to the Dairy Industry Act Amendment Bill and the Dairy Produce Act Amendment Bill, in that the Agriculture Department has devised a mixture called dairy blend, containing some of the ingredients used in making margarine; this is a good thing.

Mr. Coumbe: What about the railways?

Mr. McANANEY: Margarine is carried on the railways. This Bill will mean that dairy blend will not be subject to the Margarine Act. Dairy blend consists mainly of butterfat combined with a small percentage of the ingredients used in making margarine, and I support this. An amendment to the principal Act passed last year increased the required distance of 100 yards (91·4 metres) between a dairy factory and a margarine factory to 100 m, which has now been reduced to 90 m (or about 100 yards). The removal of margarine quotas was opposed by the dairy industry for many years, but it has now come to realise that the elimination of quotas was a wise decision. I think it is a step forward, as it will increase genuine competition between two commodities. Primary industries have had most of their protection removed over the past year or 18 months; this removal is a good thing, provided that protection is removed from manufacturing industries and from city people.

The sooner we achieve equal competition between various commodities, the sooner we will produce the things we produce more efficiently. Undoubtedly, secondary industries and city people are more highly subsidised and protected than are primary industries and country people. I accept the principle that there should be competition between butter and margarine, but the same principle should apply to industry as a whole. It is important for the protection of the consumer that the ingredients used in margarine and dairy blend be printed on the wrapper, because many people do not realise that cooking margarine is mutton fat, which they might object to eating if given in the form of dripping. Any person who uses margarine should know what he is eating; that is essential, as quotas on margarine have been abolished. People in the dairying industry I have contacted are willing to accept the removal of quotas on margarine, which I think is a good thing. We need to achieve genuine competition between people, such as those who use the roads and those who use the railways. If we are to increase our living standards, we must have competition rather than have guesswork about our needs by people working in offices who do not have a clue. If we have competition, we will improve our living standards and catch up with the rest of the world.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): I find it unusual that we should be debating this Bill, which amends the Margarine Act, 1939-1973, before we have debated the Dairy Industry Act Amendment Bill. I say that because clause 3 of this Bill refers to dairy blend, which is referred to in the Dairy Industry Act Amendment Bill. We are tending to put the cart before the horse, because we have not yet talked about the definition of dairy blend, which appears for the first time ever in other legislation;

yet this Bill depends on the Dairy Industry Act Amendment Bill. It appears to me that the whole procedure is back to front. I hope the Minister appreciates what I have said and explains why we have not yet dealt with the Bills that amend the Dairy Industry Act and the Margarine Act.

I support this Bill, which is one of three Bills that will enable dairy blend, as it is now called, to be produced. Dairy spread, which was devised at Northfield, the first place at which it was produced in Australia, is a spreadable substance similar in taste, flavour and colour to butter. However, it has the one great advantage that butter does not have, namely, it can be taken from the refrigerator at 0°C and spread easily. I am sure the Minister appreciates fully the work of the people at Northfield who did this, and I refer particularly to Mr. Hehir, if I may pay a tribute to my former colleague. I may add that I played a small part in this matter, in that I used to be a guinea pig who sampled the various things produced.

I refer now to some other matters regarding margarine. The first relates to margarine quotas. I fully support the proposal to abolish these quotas throughout Australia. I consider that the quotas on table margarine have done the dairying industry much harm over the years and have created the impression that the Governments of each State have acted merely to protect the dairying industry. Initially, this impression was valid, because 98 per cent of all vegetable oil used for margarine was imported from overseas. Therefore, we were protecting an Australian primary industry against an oversea industry.

During the past three or four years, however, since the crisis in the wheat industry, the production of vegetable oils in Australia has increased dramatically to a stage where we import only 2 per cent of Australia's requirements of vegetable oil and produce 98 per cent. For this reason, I, as a Liberal, no longer can support favouring one primary industry in Australia against another. Both are now on an equal footing, and we are not now considering imports, so it is time that quotas on all table margarine were abolished.

However, in regard to margarine, we could move further in relation to cooking margarine. Most people who buy margarine consider that, irrespective of whether it is cooking margarine or table margarine, it is poly-unsaturated. An honourable member opposite looks surprised when I say that, but people believe that that is so and, therefore, that cooking margarine is particularly good as far as blood cholesterol is concerned. However, the potential cholesterol level from cooking margarine is far higher than that from butter, because 95 per cent of all cooking margarine must be from animal oil, particularly the whale.

The fats of these animal tallows have a far higher concentration of saturated fats than butter has. Therefore, cooking margarine is a greater danger regarding high blood cholesterol levels than is butter, and I consider that controls should be placed on cooking margarine in regard to its labelling, what can be added to it to give it colour (particularly yellow), and the flavour allowed to be added to it to give it a flavour similar to that of butter.

The label should specify clearly the animal-fat content in cooking margarine. It should be stated clearly, in large print, right across the front of the container that the product contains 90 per cent or 95 per cent animal fat. Also, cooking margarine manufacturers should not be allowed to include any yellow colour in their product. They merely try to imitate butter, and I ask how many industries have been prevented from trying to imitate another product. If they do imitate in that way, normally they are prosecuted.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Butter eaters make better lovers!

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I thank the Minister for that significant pronouncement. Manufacturers add a chemical to cooking margarine to give it a flavour similar to that of butter, and they should be prevented from adding that chemical. I will not name the chemical, but it is a chemical compound that has a long name.

The other point I should like to make in relation to cooking margarine is that manufacturers no longer should be allowed to use whale tallow in cooking margarine. I strongly support the preservation of the few whales that we have in the world. I realise that the Japanese are continuing to kill whales for food, but I see no reason why, because of that, Australia should adopt that policy. There is no need for Australia to kill whales for human consumption. Indeed, we should not kill whales at all.

We should prevent the use of whale fat and tallow in any cooking margarine. If we did that, we would be making our small contribution to the world campaign to conserve whales. I support the Bill, and I hope that the Government will give attention to the matters I have mentioned and make further amendments to the principal Act.

Mr. PAYNE (Mitchell): I am pleased to be able to support the Bill, and I am somewhat surprised to know that Opposition members support it. I say that because I distinctly remember an honourable member opposite (I think it was the member for Davenport) making a rather disparaging remark about reference, in the Governor's Speech at the opening of this session, to a certain product.

Mr. Dean Brown: What was that comment?

Mr. PAYNE: I do not remember the exact comment, and I do not want to quote the honourable member out of context.

Mr. Dean Brown: Don't make accusations like that if you can't prove them. I haven't made such comments.

Mr. PAYNE: The honourable member should be the last in any queue in making statements about who should be making allegations and presenting accurate information to the House. Only this afternoon, in the debate on another matter, he came what is called a "gutser" when he produced entirely incorrect information about a matter that I will not go into now.

Members opposite have spoken about the Bill in a technical way, and I understand it to refer to a product that is a mixture of what may be termed milk fat and vegetable oil. I am pleased to support the Bill because the raw materials used in this spread are produced in Australia, and I am informed that the main ingredient is butter. Consequently, if there is resistance by consumers to butter itself and if the housewife turns to this spread as an alternative, it will still be helpful to the dairying industry.

During this session and the previous session many questions have been asked as a result of difficulties that housewives have experienced in obtaining types of table margarine. The Minister and the member for Davenport have sampled the spread and, because they have not said anything disparaging about the product, it is apparently palatable. It will be a boon to housewives and will alleviate a difficult situation. I therefore support the Bill.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Mr. Speaker, under Standing Order 141, I wish, without introducing any new matter, to explain a point brought up in the previous speech. Under that Standing Order I wish to explain that at no stage—

The SPEAKER: Order! Is this a personal explanation in accordance with Standing Orders? The honourable member may speak, but his remarks must be confined to the part of his speech that is the subject of the explanation. The honourable member for Davenport.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I wish to draw attention to the fact that at no stage did I pass any derogatory remark, either during my speech or at any other time, about the product called dairy spread or dairy blend. The previous speaker implied that I had made such a remark, but I wish to make clear that at no stage did I do that. I have always praised the product, which a group of my colleagues in the Agriculture Department produced, and I have the greatest admiration for the work they are doing.

Bill read a second time.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works) moved:

That it be an instruction to the Committee of the whole House on the Bill that it have power to consider new clauses relating to labelling requirements for margarine and removal of margarine quotas.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

At 8.26 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, September 26, at 2 p.m.