# LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, October 6, 1976

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

## QUESTIONS

### ASSOCIATION OF COMMUNITY THEATRES

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to make a statement before asking a question of the Chief Secretary, representing the Premier.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I refer to the Association of Community Theatres, which was established, I understand, in May, 1975. It would appear from its financial statements that the association has received $6 500 in grants, and that the State Government has contributed $4 000 and the Australian council $2 500. I also understand from the financial statement that the association expects soon to receive a further $500 from the State Government. It has been reported to me that some wellknown and highly respected amateur and fringe theatre groups that have joined the Association of Community Theatres are dissatisfied with the parent body. Recently, some of its members were not given sufficient notice, in terms of the constitution, of the annual general meeting; nor were they given an opportunity, because of the time factor, to nominate for the management committee. I ask the Premier to say whether he intends to continue giving grants to this association, whether the officers in the arts section of his department are satisfied with the progress of this association since its formation and, finally, whether he considers that its aims and objectives are being achieved.

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

### ENERGY REQUIREMENTS

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I seek leave to make a statement before asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Mines and Energy.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I refer to the Electricity Trust of South Australia's annual report, which, under the heading "Future energy supplies", states:

> For increases in power requirements beyond 1985, a new source of energy will be required. In view of the likely amounts of energy required, it would be unrealistic to believe that new technologies, such as solar energy or wind power, could make a significant contribution by this time, and it is necessary to seek further conventional sources.

What plans has the Government's State Energy Study Committee or any other Government agency made to meet the expected energy needs of the Electricity Trust after 1985?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I will refer the honourable member's question to the Minister of Mines and Energy and bring down a reply.

### WATER HYACINTH

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: In late July, State Ministers, and I presume the Federal Minister for Agriculture, met at Moree to discuss certain aspects of agriculture, amongst which was a desire for a concerted effort for the eradication of water hyacinth. A fund of $200 000 was allocated for that purpose. The programme, I believe, was to commence on July 1. Can the Minister say whether the programme has been implemented and, if it has not, when it will be implemented?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: The programme was to be implemented by the New South Wales Department of Agriculture, when it was decided to carry out the various measures outlined in that plan, to cost $200 000. I do not know whether that department has proceeded to carry out the plan envisaged but I can find out for the honourable member from the New South Wales department.

### LOBSTER POTS

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: I seek leave to make an explanation before directing a question to the Minister of Fisheries.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: The Minister will know that the formula for assessing the entitlement to the number of craypots that professional fishermen are allowed was formerly based on a certain number of pots, which varied from zone to zone, plus one pot for each foot of length of vessel. With the change to metric measurement, that formula is now the same fixed number of pots for the zone plus three pots for each metre of length, disregarding fractions of a metre. It is easy to see that the vessel that falls just short of a whole number of metres could lose entitlement to as many as two pots, while other fishermen whose boat size happened to be right on a whole metre would lose none. Does this change mean a reduction in the total number of pot licences allowed in South Australia? Does the Minister agree that the change has meant that some fishermen have been unfairly discriminated against, and will he take steps to rectify these anomalies?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: To go through the honourable member's questions—yes, some reduction in the number of pots has taken place due to the change from imperial to metric measurement. I cannot remember offhand how many pots have been lost because of the change, but it has not been a great number. I think the honourable member must be aware, too, that it is desirable as far as the industry is concerned that the average catch for each pot has declined considerably over the years as the number of pots has increased, and there is no doubt that certainly in the south-eastern area, with fewer pots, the catch rate for each pot would increase and improve the efficiency and income of the rock lobster fishermen concerned. A reduction in the number of pots takes place on a transfer from one fisherman to another, so that the fisherman who takes over a boat on that basis is well aware of what he is getting in terms of pot allocation. I have had some previous discussions with the rock lobster fishermen on this point, and they are concerned that this method of reduction of pots is not appropriate. I have agreed to discuss the matter with them at a meeting of the Australian Fishermen's Council which will be held in two weeks time.

## WATER RESOURCES COMMITTEE

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to the question I asked on August 10 regarding the Water Resources Committee and the Acting Chairman of the Appeal Board?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Mr. G. Hiskey, S.M., has been appointed Acting Chairman of the Water Resources Appeal Tribunal pending the appointment of a permanent Chairman. The appointment of a permanent chairman has been held up to enable a reorganisation of the judicial officers and functions in various Government tribunals, such as the Planning Appeal Board and the Warden's Court. When these rearrangements have been completed and the personnel rationalisation has taken place, a chairman will then be appointed.

## ACADEMICALLY ABLE

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to directing a question to the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Education.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I refer to an advertisement that appeared on page 24 of the *Advertiser* on Saturday last (October 2, 1976), indicating that a meeting is to be held on October 7 by the Planning Committee of the School for the Academically Able. The advertisement indicated that His Excellency the Governor would be present and would speak at the meeting. The object of this group seems to be the establishment of a private school for academically able students in the community. It seems to me that the move to establish such a school is highly undesirable, is a departure from the general principle of social equality and is potentially socially divisive as it attempts to extract the more able and intelligent students from schools and seeks to place them in an elite institution. Also, it is educationally undesirable in that it seeks to remove the brightest students from the general educational main stream.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I think the honourable member is starting to debate the matter, which is not allowed at Question Time.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I am making a statement, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member is also expressing many opinions.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I have not asked my question. This is my preamble to the question. I am making my short statement. I agree that in my question I cannot express an opinion, Mr. President, but this is the statement leading up to the question. It seems (and this is legitimate in leading up to the question) that the establishment of such an institution is educationally undesirable as it removes the brightest students from schools, thus doing away with the interaction in schools between more intelligent students and average students. Moreover, it could draw away parents who contribute so much to the general school community by moving their efforts to this elitist institution. Does the Minister believe that such a school is either necessary or desirable in South Australia?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I will refer the honourable member's question to the Minister of Education and bring down a reply.

## CREDIT UNION

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I seek leave to make a short statement before addressing a question to the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I have been recently approached by a constituent who is employed at the Woods and Forests Department State sawmill at Mount Gambier. He is strongly critical of the alleged refusal of the department to establish a credit union for employees. A request by the social club through its President to the local office resulted in a meeting between the club President, the Chief Administrative Officer, Mount Gambier, and Mr. Thurgood. Mr. Thurgood opposed the establishment of a credit union because of the extra clerical work involved. He claimed that the Treasury would not accept the idea because other sections in the Public Service had previously applied for this and had been refused. I have been told that Softwood Holdings has quite a successful credit union, with more than 400 members. Many Woods and Forests Department employees are aware of this, as a member of Softwood Holdings staff recently spoke on the benefits and the organisation of a credit union in relation to the Woods and Forests Department social club. My constituent poses the obvious question: if Softwood Holdings can provide this service for their workers, why not the Woods and Forests Department?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: The matter has not been raised with me, but it seems to me to be quite a sensible suggestion and I will take it up to see whether we can carry out that approach.

## ITALIAN FESTIVAL

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to directing a question to the Minister of Health, representing the Premier.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I refer to the first National Italian Festival, which is currently being held in this State and which will draw to a close at the end of this week. It has been a festival of two weeks duration, covering a wide range of cultural and recreational activities, many theatrical and musical performances, and general recreation events such as a family fair in Rymill Park on the Sunday. Also, there was an opening day at Elder Park, where the Italian clubs from the Calabria region put on an excellent fete and fair in the park. That was followed by a performance of Verdi's *Requiem* in the Festival Theatre, and an impressive fireworks display. I commend the Italian community in this State for the enormous amount of voluntary work that has gone into this festival. Most of the clubs representative of the various regions of Italy have pitched in and contributed considerably to what is the undoubted success of this venture. Indeed, last Sunday there was a well patronised family fair in Rymill Park during the afternoon, and about six o'clock people moved from Rymill Park to Rundle Mall. It was a moving occasion as people walked from Rymill Park into the mall as the sun was setting over it.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member's preliminary remarks, for which he has been given leave by the Council, must be relevant to the question that he proposes to ask.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I can assure you, Mr. President, that it was a very moving occasion, and the mall was filled with people in what was, I think, the first major event held in it. It certainly brought home to me the advantages of the mall as a centre of commercial, social and recreational activities as people moved in about six o'clock and ate and drank until 10 or 11 o'clock at night, at what was a fantastic social occasion. I repeat that I believe that the Italian community and the Italian Festival Society Committee that organised this festival should be commended.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: I did not see you at any of the performances.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: That was because the honourable member was not at the functions. Does the Government support ethnic cultural festivals of this nature, and what financial support was made available to the Italian Festival Committee on this occasion?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: True, the Government supports these groups, but I do not know to what extent financially it does so. I will seek a report for the honourable member.

---

## ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Read a third time and passed.

## POULTRY PROCESSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON (Minister of Agriculture) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Poultry Processing Act, 1969. Read a first time.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

It provides for amendments to the principal Act, the Poultry Processing Act, 1969, designed to provide reasonable security for the operators of farms used for the raising of chickens for processing as chicken meat in obtaining a market for their produce. At the moment, persons who have made considerable capital investments in chicken farms are almost entirely dependent upon a quite limited number of processing plants for an outlet for their produce. The Bill seeks to resolve the fears of efficient chicken farmers that they may be excluded from the market by other farmers or by farms operated by the processing plants through the establishment of a form of licensing scheme.

Under this scheme, it is proposed that the operators of processing plants, which are required to be registered under the principal Act, may in future obtain chickens for processing only from the operators of approved farms or from farms that they operate themselves subject to an approval. The approving authority proposed by the Bill is a committee entitled the Poultry Meat Industry Committee, which is to be representative of the interests of the farmers and the processors. In addition, the Bill provides for a mechanism under which the committee oversees the contractual arrangements between farmers and processors. This is considered to be desirable in view of the very close relationship that exists in this industry between the farmer and his market outlet in order to avoid disputes as far as is possible before they may arise. The Bill provides that any matter that is not resolved by the committee to the satisfaction of those concerned may be determined finally by the Minister. The measure has been prepared in consultation with an informal committee representative of the industry and it is believed that it has their general support.

To consider the clauses of the Bill. Clause 1 provides that the principal Act, as amended by this measure, may be cited as the "Poultry Meat Industry Act, 1969-1976". Clause 2 provides that the measure shall come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 amends the long title of the principal Act so that it reflects the wider ambit of the legislation. Clause 4 rearranges the parts of the principal Act. Clause 5 inserts new definitions in the principal Act. Clause 6 applies the exemption provision of the principal Act to farms or classes of farms. Clause 7 inserts a new section 11a in the principal Act, providing for the imposition of conditions to the registration of processing plants.

New sections 11b to 11g, also provided for by clause 7 of the Bill, establish the Poultry Meat Industry Committee and regulate its operation. New section 11b provides that the committee is to be chaired by a public servant and have an equal number of persons representing the interests of processors and farmers. New section 11g provides that the functions of the committee are to be the granting of approvals of farms, processor-operated farms and agreements between farmers and processors; the resolution of disputes between farmers and processors; and an advisory function to the Minister. Clause 8 provides for the enactment of new sections 11h to 11j of the principal Act. New section 11h prohibits the processing of chickens other than chickens raised at an approved farm pursuant to an approved agreement between the farmer and a processor or chickens raised by a processor with the approval of the committee. New section 11i provides for mandatory approval of existing farmer-operated and processor-operated farms, and for the approval of future farms where the committee is satisfied that there is a demand for the supply of chickens for processing that cannot reasonably be met from approved farmer-operated farms.

The committee is empowered by this provision, upon approving the raising of chickens by a processor, to restrict the numbers of chickens that may be raised by the processor. New section 11j provides for approval by the committee of agreements between farmers and processors. It is intended by this means that the committee may ensure more certainty and continuity in the relation between processors and farmers. Clause 9 is a consequential amendment. Clause 10 provides for a right of appeal to the Minister against decisions of the committee. Clause 11 amends section 17 of the principal Act by providing an evidentiary provision in respect of approvals by the committee.

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

## FIRE AND ACCIDENT UNDERWRITERS' ASSOCIATION OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA (CHANGE OF NAME) BILL

Read a third time and passed.

## SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GRANTS COMMISSION BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from September 22. Page 1148.)

Clause 9—"Establishment of commission, etc."

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I move:

Lines 21 to 24—Leave out all words in these lines and insert:

(c) one shall be a person nominated by the Local Government Association of South Australia, except in the case of the appointment of members of the Commission next following the commencement of this Act where one shall be a person nominated by the Minister after consultation with the Local Government Association of South Australia who, in the opinion of the Minister, is capable of representing the interests of local government in this State.

This amendment is different from the amendment that I intended to move previously. The reason for the change is that—

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Under whose instructions have you done this?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I shall go to some pains and explain to the honourable member that I have had a short discussion with his Minister and, in an endeavour to compromise and co-operate, and to find the best solution to this problem, in the interests of Parliament as well as of local government, I have moved the new amendment.

I still hold to my original belief in this matter that the best way to amend this clause would be to make the third member of the proposed commission a nominee of the Local Government Association. That is how my previous amendment read. It would have provided that the third member of the commission had to be the person chosen, in effect, by the Local Government Association. I did that, bearing in mind that the Minister had the right to nominate the other two members of the commission.

As the Bill reads at present, the Minister has the right to nominate the whole three members of the commission, and I think that the clause in that form is a bad one indeed. My first wish in the matter was to try to amend this clause so that the association had the right to nominate one member. However, the Minister told me that such a proposal would have confronted him with a serious problem, in that an interim commission has been established, and there is a local government officer, namely, a town clerk, on the commission. The Minister, being particularly satisfied with the work of that nominee, considered that, if the previous amendment was carried, he might lose the services of that officer, because, understandably, the Local Government Association might (and I stress "might") have nominated another person.

So, in the interests of some continuity, because the interim commission is operating (honourable members would have noticed that it has already made allocations to local government from the fund), and in deference to the Minister's opinion, I have moved this present amendment. It provides that, although the third person shall be nominated by the Local Government Association, nevertheless the third member so appointed shall be a person nominated by the Minister after consultation with the association.

In other words, my amendment now gives the Minister the opportunity to continue with his nominee if he so desires but, after the term of office of that nominee expires, the law shall be shaped in such a way that the Local Government Association will have the right to nominate for the third position on the three-man commission. I think that amendment ought to meet with the satisfaction of the Minister of Lands, acting on behalf of the Minister of Local Government in another place.

The amendment seems to meet both views. I particularly favour the Bill's being amended in some way that shows good faith in and respect for the Local Government Association in this State. For too long, Governments have not shown sufficient respect, in my view, for the association.

I know that in recent years that association has passed through some troubled waters. Nevertheless, it represents local government in this State, and surely the State Government should be willing to allow the association to say who should be its representative on this very important committee, which, I remind honourable members, is annually taking the total allocation of Federal money and cutting it up amongst all councils in this State. I hope the Minister looks upon my amendment with some favour.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Lands): I am afraid that listening to the honourable member has not convinced me one iota that his arguments were in any way substantial. As the Act reads at present, the Minister consults with the Local Government Association. That seems to me to be the correct way to go about this, because we want to appoint to the commission the most suitable man who has the greatest technical knowledge available throughout local government in South Australia. Many councils are not members of the Local Government Association.

The Hon J. C. Burdett: How many?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: There are quite a few. Although I do not know all of them, I could name some. Many expert personnel work for those councils.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: But the Minister has his own nominee.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I am not suggesting that those councils that are not members of the association do not have expert men working for them. As the Hon. Mr. Hill said, the Local Government Association has gone through troubled waters over the last few years, and is still not out of that situation. Let us hope that it soon will be, and that it will become the representative, as it should be, of all local government bodies throughout the State.

It is interesting to note that the Victorian Grants Commission legislation requires the Minister in that State to appoint two persons with a knowledge and understanding of local government. There is no direct right in the Victorian legislation for the Local Government Association in that State even to nominate one person. In Tasmania, the Bill provides for a person to be nominated by the Municipal Association, but the nomination must be approved by the Minister. Naturally, the Minister would consult with the Local Government Association in Tasmania and make an appointment accordingly.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: That's what this amendment provides.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: No.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Read it and see.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: It provides that one shall be a person nominated by the Minister after consultation with the Local Government Association of South Australia—

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Read on.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: —who, in the opinion of the Minister, is capable of representing the interests of local government in this State.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: That is right.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Exactly the same applies in Tasmania.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: That is what I said.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: You said it was according to the amendment. We are apparently on the same wave length.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Yes.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I am glad to hear that from the Leader. That is the situation with the legislation in other States. Why do we have to be different in South Australia?

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: That is against the argument you have just made.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: No; I am saying that this is the situation in Victoria and Tasmania.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: What is?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: That the Minister appoints a member of the commission.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: As it is here, too.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: That is what the Bill does, not the amendment.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Have you read the amendment?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Yes; the Hon. Mr. Hill read the amendment out.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: You didn't listen.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I did.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: You have not understood it, then.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Yes, I have understood it completely. It is amazing how the Opposition tries to twist things when it thinks it is on a winner. Unfortunately, there is no reason for thinking that. By the amendment, you want to tie the Minister's hands for future appointments to the commission, which is wrong.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Would you read the Tasmanian case again?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I shall be happy to do so. In Tasmania, it provides for a person nominated by the Municipal Association and approved by the Minister.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Would you read the Hon. Mr. Hill's amendment?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Yes, I can do that. The position in Tasmania is that, if the Minister does not approve, he does not appoint the person; that is the point I made.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: And the Hon. Mr. Hill's amendment does not do that?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I am sure it does not. It reads:

> One shall be a person nominated by the Local Government Association of South Australia, except in the case of the appointment of members of the commission next following the commencement of this Act where one shall be a person nominated by the Minister after consultation with the Local Government Association of South Australia who, in the opinion of the Minister, is capable of representing the interests of local government in this State.

That is the first part, as the Hon. Mr. Hill pointed out, but the second part goes much further and is different from what applies in Tasmania, where the legislation has gone through, and Victoria, where I understand it is almost through. If it is not through in Victoria by now, I shall be surprised, because it was introduced there before this measure was introduced here. The Victorian Parliament does not give the association the right even to nominate anyone: the Minister appoints straight out. The fact remains that it is in the interests of the Grants Commission to select members of the commission as outlined in the Bill. I cannot accept the amendment.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I am disappointed that the Minister has not yet seen fit to accept this amendment. I commend the Hon. Mr. Hill for the amendment, which he has discussed with me, because it provides for the Minister's present wish. The Minister in another place has given what would appear to be good reasons for the appointment of the commission in the way in which the Bill provides; the Hon. Mr. Hill, in his amendment, has provided for this and also he has provided in the future that the Minister, who will be nominating two members, will also be able to appoint one who has been nominated by the Local Government Association of South Australia. That is an eminently fair and suitable compromise, which provides that the Local Government Association, which has been recently recognised by the Government statutorily, will provide one person for the Minister to appoint. I take issue with the Minister when he says that many councils are not members of the Local Government Association. I think that the number of councils in South Australia has been reduced, by amalgamation, from 137 to just over 120, and possibly no more than half a dozen of those councils do not belong to the Local Government Association. We know that local government has had its troubles but it is in the process of getting out of them, and the Minister could be optimistic about that. The Local Government Association has largely overcome its problems, and its being recognised by the Government statutorily underlines my point. This amendment is a suitable compromise and a satisfactory solution to the situation. I support it.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I support the amendment. The Minister said that what was necessary in this appointment was to have the person with the most technical knowledge. Technical knowledge will certainly be important with a commission of only three people, but it is not the only matter. The other thing that is entirely necessary is that the commission be representative and especially that local government be represented. It is necessary that local government be truly represented. Local government should have some say in this matter of the Grants Commission and it should have some say as local government, and not as a person simply appointed by the Minister. If this representative is appointed by the Minister, and particularly in the terms of the Bill, for a term of appointment of not more than five years (it could be considerably less; it could be 12 months or, technically, one day), such appointee would not be truly representative of local government, even though the Minister expressed his opinion that he represented local government interests. He would be appointed by the Minister, responsible to the Minister, and would rely on the Minister for his appointment, and such a person should be truly representative of local government, so that local government should have a say. That is why I strongly support this amendment and commend the Hon. Mr. Hill for moving it. If the Minister really wants this commission to be simply a rubber stamp for himself (as it seems), there was no point in introducing the Bill in the first place.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): The points have been adequately covered by the Hon. Mr. Hill and the Hon. Mr. Burdett but, if the Minister examines the Tasmanian and Victorian situations, he will find that exactly the same position as is proposed in Tasmania and Victoria applies in South Australia for, if the Minister wants it, five years.

There is no difference between the proposed Act in Victoria and Tasmania and the Hon. Mr. Hill's amendment. The only thing this amendment ensures is that, after that first appointment, the person will be nominated by the Local Government Association of South Australia. So for the first five years, if the Minister so desires, he will virtually nominate the member to represent local government.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: He nominates all three.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Yes. All that this amendment provides is that, after the initial period, local government should have the right of nomination to represent its interests on the Grants Commission. It is short-sighted of the Government not to accept this amendment. The point made by the Hon. Mr. Burdett is correct. This commission must be representative of the various interests involved, and the Minister should not dominate by his nomination to the Grants Commission. Although we have met the Government half way, inasmuch as the Minister can nominate for the first five years, it is up to the Government to come half way and meet the valid point made by the Hon. Mr. Hill in his amendment. Therefore, I support the amendment and ask the Government to rethink its position on the matter. Finally, if the Minister's nominee is absolutely satisfactory and does represent the interests of local government on the commission, there is no doubt whatever that he will be renominated but, if that person does not act in the best interests of local government, local government should have the right to nominate someone else to take his place.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The Minister rested his defence plainly on the situation that has applied in Tasmania and Victoria. He has referred to new legislation in those States, but it is untried and is, to some extent, experimental. The only State with which the Minister should make any comparison is New South Wales, which has had a commission in existence for a long time. Only New South Wales has legislation that has been tried and found to be successful. In New South Wales the commission is composed of four members, two of whom come from local government. The third member shall be selected (and I refer to the New South Wales Act) as follows:

. . . shall be selected by the Governor from three officers of councils who have been nominated as prescribed by the governing body of the Local Government Association of New South Wales.

The fourth member is chosen, as follows:

. . . shall be selected by the Governor from three officers of councils who have been nominated as prescribed by the governing body of the Shires Association of New South Wales.

Whilst the Minister retains the right to choose one of the three representatives, the three must be nominated by local government in both of those cases. We have a numerical situation whereby the Minister wants the sole and absolute right to nominate the three members, but the amendment leaves him with the right to nominate the first and second members. This gives the Minister's nominees a majority on the commission. We are arguing only about the minority membership of the commission; that is, the third member. New South Wales, which should be used as the basis of any comparison, has two members nominated by local government groups. I believe that reference to the position applying in New South Wales defeats the point raised by the Minister.

I stress the argument made from this side, that it is not proper that the Minister has the right to nominate all three members. The Minister's explanation concerning the choice of the third member is an absolute insult to the intelligence of the members of this Committee: simply laying down in legislation that the Minister must consult with the Local Government Association but still have the absolute right to nominate whom he wishes is just too silly, because we all know that he does not have to take any notice whatever of the association.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: He could already have made up his mind.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Yes, but this amendment changes the situation. In effect, we are saying, "Hold on to that approach if you so wish for up to five years but, after five years, you must come back to show some respect and high regard for the Local Government Association in South Australia and, after five years, you must accept its nominee." I am amazed that the Minister is unwilling to accept this amendment. I hope that, despite what he has said, the Committee carries the amendment.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I am surprised at the Hon. Mr. Hill. There is no doubt that he is again playing politics in this matter. The Minister of Local Government has a good ally with the association in South Australia. It is incredible when Opposition members, and especially their Leader, say that the Government should come half way because, if the Minister appoints an unsuitable member to the commission, the association next time can appoint someone it considers more suitable. I point out that honourable members opposite forget that the Minister is responsible to Parliament; if he does not appoint someone with the interests of local government at heart, he will soon know about it and will have to correct the anomally forthwith.

If local government appoints a representative, it is not responsible to anyone. Local government can appoint anyone it likes. It could be a case of jobs for the boys. That has happened in the past and doubtless it will happen in the future. It is the Minister's responsibility, and he is willing to accept it in appointing the nominee in consultation with local government to obtain the best man for the job. Mr. Wirth has been appointed. The Hon. Mr. Hill recognises that his is a good appointment. If the Minister's hands are tied and he hands over the problem to another Minister in the future, that would not be fair and it would not be above board. It is the Minister's responsibility because of the way the Act is written. He is responsible to Parliament and, if he makes an improper appointment, this is the place to raise it whereas, if local government makes an appointment without consulting with the Minister, the wrong man may be appointed to the job. The Minister has pointed out always that he is acting fairly and above board in all respects to ensure the right membership of the commission, and that is why I cannot accept the amendment.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The Minister has referred to Mr. Wirth, indicating that he is the present Minister's local government nominee on the Interim Commission. I have the highest regard for Mr. Wirth. I did not name him, and that was a proper course; I see no reason why his name should be brought into the debate. I have absolutely no criticism of Mr. Wirth and, if the amendment were carried, Mr. Wirth would be reappointed for five years. The Minister is dragging the matter on. First, I believe that the local government representative ultimately should be an elected member of local government, rather than a staff member of local government. Secondly, the Minister said that we on this side were playing politics with this amendment. That is absolute rubbish. We are supporting local government and saying in a tangible way

that we have a high regard for local government and its parent association. If that is playing politics, I make no apology for doing so.

I challenge, without further comment, the Minister's statement (and these were his words) that the present Minister of Local Government has a good ally with the Local Government Association. Lastly, I do not like the Minister's choice of words in using the phrase "jobs for the boys", because, if we wanted to get down to a lower level, I would point out to him that legislation before the Council provides that the Minister reserves the right to appoint whomsoever he wishes to the three positions on this commission.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (10)—The Hons. J. C. Burdett, M. B. Cameron, J. A. Carnie, Jessie Cooper, M. B. Dawkins, R. C. DeGaris, R. A. Geddes, C. M. Hill (teller), D. H. Laidlaw, and A. M. Whyte.

Noes (10)—The Hons. D. H. L. Banfield, F. T. Blevins, T. M. Casey (teller), B. A. Chatterton, J. R. Cornwall, C. W. Creedon, J. E. Dunford, N. K. Foster, Anne Levy, and C. J. Sumner.

The CHAIRMAN: There are 10 Ayes and 10 Noes. To enable this matter to be considered by the House of Assembly, I give my casting vote for the Ayes.

Amendment thus carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 10—"Conditions of membership of the Commission."

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I move:

Page 3, lines 26 and 27—Leave out all words in these lines and insert "office for a term of five years, except in the case of the members of the commission first appointed after the commencement of this Act who shall hold office for such terms (not exceeding five years) as are respectively specified in the instruments of their appointment."

The Bill provided for a term of office up to five years, and this is a new amendment that I have prepared since we last sat. Previously, I said that it was desirable that the term of office should be no less than five years: in fact, that it should be five years. The principal reason for that contention is that this commission will come under considerable pressure throughout the whole area of local government, because it will be involved in granting annual allocations and some councils will feel that they are not being treated as they should be treated.

The legislation would be the best possible if we tried to ensure that the commission could withstand any influence or pressure, no matter how minor or friendly that may be. In my view, that can be done by ensuring a long term of office. I had discussions with the Minister of Local Government, who made the point that he foresaw a serious problem with the amendment, in that he thought that, in the best interests of the commission, the dates on which terms expired ought to be staggered so that continuity could be preserved. So that continuity can be achieved and a better arrangement established with terms of office of five years, I have moved the amendment now before the Committee. The Minister can appoint members in the first instance for any time he wishes up to five years but, after their first term of office, they shall have a full five-year period. The point raised by the Minister and also my original intention of ensuring continuity are largely achieved by my new amendment, which I trust the Government will support.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The Government is happy to support the amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 11 passed.

Clause 12—"Remuneration."

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I move:

Page 4, line 19—Leave out "The Chairman" and insert: "(1) Subject to subsection (2) of this section the Chairman".

After line 21 insert: (2) No fee shall be payable under subsection (1) of this section to any person who is an officer as defined in the Public Service Act, 1967-1975."

I have been concerned for many years that senior public servants who give their time to various committees within their normal working hours have been receiving fees in connection with their appointment to such committees. While I do not want to be unfair to such people, I have a responsibility to those who have elected me. Public servants are paid from public funds and, as their title denotes, they are servants of the public. I have wondered for some time whether something ought to be done to curtail the practice to which I have referred, in the interests of the best form of management of the Public Service. I raise this point in the knowledge that the Public Service Board fixes such officers' salaries, and it is proper that those salaries should be adequate and reasonable. However, in some cases where work on committees is done within public servants' normal working hours, I wonder whether it is going too far for such a practice to continue. It appears that a public servant may be appointed a member of the commission. I stress that I am impressed with the standard of the appointees to the interim commission. Nevertheless, a principle is at stake. In legislation in another State, this same point is covered along the lines of my amendment.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I cannot accept the amendment. Perhaps what the honourable member intends to do has merit, but to alter the situation at this time would be ridiculous. Many public servants who receive appointments to committees receive remuneration. Whilst the honourable member may think it is an anomaly, it is something that has been with us for a long time.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I oppose the amendment. As the Minister said, the procedure has been with us for many years. No doubt, in years gone by it was a little perk provided to public servants who were perhaps not paid as well as their counterparts were in other States; that situation no longer applies in most cases. However, it is not for that reason that I oppose the amendment. The members of the interim commission are gentlemen of high standard. Further, I believe that take-home work may have to be done by members of the permanent commission, one of whom may be a senior public servant. In this case, I do not believe that that public servant should be precluded from getting extra remuneration for the extra work he will have to do.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I oppose the amendment. If Parliament had the power to make a provision binding all members of the community, perhaps one might take a different view. However, as things stand, the amendment discriminates against public servants. If the principle could be applied widely, a retired Parliamentarian would not be able to receive remuneration for being a member of a board, a company, a bank or any other organisation.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: Or a member of the Land Settlement Committee.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I find myself agreeing with the honourable member. In the community generally, there is a system that allows for a double reward, and we should not enact a provision that discriminates against public servants.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I sympathise with what the Hon. Mr. Hill is trying to do. He seems to think that a public servant is likely to be carrying out his duties as a member of the commission during working hours. He is already being paid in respect of those hours. However, it seems to me that if a public servant is to be a member of the commission he will have to do more work. A public servant who is likely to be appointed to this commission is going to be a senior public servant who is paid for a job rather than paid by the hour. He is still going to do the job, and extra work, to ensure that he fulfils his function on the commission. Under clause 12 it is possible for a different fee to be fixed in respect to different members, and a lower fee could be fixed by the Government if it so desires. If this clause is left as it is the Government may have regard to this, and may fix lower fees for public servants on the commission. It rests with the Government, and that, in my view, is where it should rest. I cannot support the amendment.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clauses 13 to 17 passed.

Clause 18—"Moneys available to the Commission."

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I move to insert the following new paragraph:

(aa) shall not recommend that the proposed recipient of any special grant be obliged to apply the grant for any specific purpose.

This amendment is an additional paragraph and provides specifically that the commission will not have the right to make allocations of funds to local government and then set conditions concerning the expenditure of that particular money. I believe this ought to be made clear in the Bill. It is a very important principle, and the commission should have the chance to go into the local government areas in future to ascertain whether the money has been spent as intended. By checking the work carried out, the commission would have some control over local government, in that local government will apply annually for grants, and will, of course, want to keep a satisfactory record concerning expenditure in the eyes of the commission.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The Government is quite happy to accept the amendment. I would point out that this was a condition laid down by the Commonwealth Government, and accepted by all Premiers, that the money available is unconditional revenue to councils, and this continues what was started by the previous Labor Government when it introduced, for the first time, assistance for local government.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 19 to 23 passed.

Clause 23—"Regulations."

The Hon. T. M. CASEY moved:

To strike out "he thinks" and insert "are".

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Title.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I move:

After "South Auustralia" to insert "Local Government".

Amendment carried; title as amended passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

## BRANDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 5. Page 1213.)

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I rise to discuss this short Bill, which the Minister said makes a number of machinery alterations to the principal Act. The Hon. Mr. Cameron in his remarks on the Bill said that basically this short Bill does not do anything other than bring into law practices that are already in effect. I would agree with that statement, and it is a good thing that those practices are legalised by this legislation. I refer in particular to clause 4, which I commend the Government for introducing. Clause 4 provides that sections 17 and 18 of the principal Act are repealed and the following section is inserted in their place:

It shall not be an offence against this Act for the owner of a registered brand for cattle—

(*a*) to brand cattle with one or more of the numerals 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 or 0;

or

(*b*) to brand cattle on the near or off ribs with any letter or symbol.

I believe there have been some possible breaches of the Act, as it stood previously, which will no longer be breaches. It is a fact, particularly with the sales of animals, that they are sometimes branded with lot numbers which extend into double figures. This provides for that occurrence concerning cattle, and I believe that should also provide for other stock.

I note that clause 5, according to the Minister, amends section 53 of the principal Act, and recognises that the *Stock and Station Journal* is no longer published. I do not know why the Parliamentary Counsel made a statement like that or why the Minister has not picked it up. I know, having double checked this morning, that the *Stock and Station Journal* is very much alive. The only point is that it has changed its name by leaving out *"and Station"*. About 40 years ago when the *Advertiser* took over the *Register*, it was known as the *Advertiser and Register*. I do not think anyone would suggest that, because the *Advertiser* eventually dropped the words *"and Register"*, the *Advertiser* as such was no longer being published. The *Stock and Station Journal* is very much alive and is managed and owned by the same people as it has been managed by and owned for many years. Section 53 of the Act provides as follows:

The registrar may by notice published at least once in the *Government Gazette* and at least twice in a daily newspaper, and in a weekly newspaper, published in Adelaide, and at least twice in the *Stock and Station Journal*, advertise that after a day fixed in the notice the registration of all brands and marks registered under this Act or any repealed Act before any day specified in the notice, shall be cancelled. Any such notice may apply to all such brands and marks or to any specified kind of brand or mark.

All this clause does is to suggest that the notice should no longer be printed in the *Stock and Station Journal*. The suggestion in the second reading explanation (and I am sorry that the Minister did not pick this up) that the *Stock and Station Journal* is defunct was incorrect.

I believe that clause 5 could well be opposed, as it could mean that notices will be published in the *Government Gazette* only, whereas duplication of the publication of such notices in the *Stock and Station Journal* would result in their being noticed by those people who need to know of any variations that occur. Although this may be only a small matter, it indicates that serious mistakes can be made in second reading explanations. I believe the *Stock and Station Journal* is the appropriate place in which such a notice could be published.

This error in the Minister's second reading explanation exemplifies the fact that errors have occurred from time to time in second reading explanations that should not have occurred and, with respect, I think the Minister could well have picked up this one. Surely he, as Minister of Agriculture, should know that the *Stock Journal* is very much alive

and that, in fact, it is the only weekly paper in which information of this sort is able to reach the people whom it is required to reach. Regarding clause 7 the Minister, in his second reading explanation, said:

Clause 7 re-enacts section 62 of the principal Act in much the same form as it previously existed, with the exception that special provision is now made for branding cattle vaccinated against brucellosis.

In the main, I agree with that, except that I think that it should have been noted in the second reading explanation that section 62 did previously refer to infectious and contagious diseases, and that those words have been removed in this redraft of the legislation. Therefore, although section 62 (4) provided previously that infectious or contagious diseases were defined for the purposes of the Stock Diseases Act, it will now refer to "disease" only. This widens the matter considerably, and should have been brought to honourable members' notice in the second reading explanation.

The Hon. Mr. Cameron expressed his concern about the possibility of stock being branded with a permanent brand merely on the suspicion that it may be diseased. This flows through into the Stock Diseases Act Amendment Bill, which the Council will soon debate. I am concerned, as is the Hon. Mr. Cameron, about the stigma that can attach not only to the animal concerned but also to the property and the stock thereon, if cattle are branded merely on a suspicion that they are diseased.

I have been in a position to observe (fortunately, I have not experienced this) stock in certain studs being said to have a certain disease. This stigma attaches to the stud concerned for a long time after the actual disease is cleared up. I am concerned when we talk about doing this sort of thing as a result of what really is merely a suspicion in the first place. In this respect, I endorse the Hon. Mr. Cameron's comments.

We must beware of rushing in and branding not merely the individual stock but also a stud or property with a stigma which will last for a long time and which will be a great financial problem to the person who must dispose of the stock. With those comments, I support the second reading.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE secured the adjournment of the debate.

## CATTLE COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 5. Page 1213.)

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I also rise to discuss this short Bill. This Bill and the Brands Act Amendment Bill and the Stock Diseases Act Amendment Bill are more or less inter-related, as has been intimated previously. The Minister is well aware that the Cattle Compensation Fund was established nearly 40 years ago and that it has been of great value to cattle breeders in relation to the compensation for diseased cattle in the same way as the Swine Compensation Fund has been of much value to breeders of swine.

These funds have been contributed to by stock owners. When herds have had to be destroyed because of disease, this fund has been valuable indeed in stopping individuals from becoming ruined by such an occurrence. It is virtually an insurance paid by cattle breeders so that they do not run into financial disaster when their cattle is affected by disease.

I have noted that the Cattle Compensation Fund was in credit at the end of June to the extent of $181 000, and that yesterday the fund was in credit to the slightly lesser extent of about $179 000. My friend the Hon. Mr. Cameron said yesterday that he thought the fund was in debit; I am pleased to note that it is not. I have also been told (and this is subject to confirmation) that at one stage the fund had to be provided with a loan of $150 000 from the Treasury. I ask the Minister whether that is so and, if it is, whether that loan has been repaid. Will the Minister also say what rate of interest the Cattle Compensation Fund obtains on the money in credit?

I was told a little while ago that the Swine Compensation Fund attracts interest at the rate of 6 per cent and, by way of a question, which is still awaiting a reply, I suggested that that rate of interest was rather low on present-day values. I am pleased to know that the Swine Compensation Fund is in a much better position and that at the end of June it had a credit balance of $891 000, which has slightly increased to $893 000 at present. I mention these figures because I am concerned about the relatively low state of the Cattle Compensation Trust Fund. I would think that the Swine Compensation Fund was in a fairly good position and that the Cattle Compensation Fund was in a position that would cause some concern, because there is not much money there to provide for the necessary claims when disease occurs, and particularly as we see in clause 3 of the Bill that the definition of "disease" is widened by striking out the present definition of "disease" and inserting the following definition:

"disease" means a state or condition declared by proclamation under section 4a of this Act to be a disease for the purposes of this Act.

Other clauses, such as clause 4, are consequential on clause 3 in that they provide for the widening of this definition. I have no quarrel with that. My only concern is that, if the definition is widened and the fund is relatively low in money, what is the situation if we have a serious outbreak of disease? I do not wish to speak to the matter further at this stage but, at the second reading stage, I support the Bill.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE secured the adjournment of the debate.

## STOCK DISEASES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 5. Page 1214.)

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I support this Bill. Here again, the Minister has indicated, in clause 4, that he is seeking to amend section 5 of the principal Act, the interpretation section, by striking out the definition of "disease" and substituting a somewhat wider definition and by inserting a definition of "the department", expressed in more general terms. The Minister states, in his second reading explanation:

Clause 6 amends section 11 of the principal Act by somewhat widening the powers of the inspector to order stock into quarantine. It is not necessary that the inspector should be satisfied that the stock proposed to be placed into quarantine are "diseased or infected".

Although I have no real quarrel with that, I underline what I said a little while ago about stock being placed into quarantine and the big question mark being placed upon the property or the stud, if it happens to be a stud, or the stock on that property in general through being placed in

quarantine on suspicion of disease where, in some cases, that suspicion has proved to be unfounded and therefore considerable damage has been done to the person concerned.

I express some concern about that definition, for that reason. I think the Hon. Mr. Cameron has an amendment to that, and I will give that amendment some attention in due course. I do not propose to discuss the matter in any further detail at present but I emphasise (and I am sure that, as a member of the agricultural profession, the Minister would appreciate this) the situation if stock are placed into quarantine on suspicion, without verification of disease. I hope the Minister will look at this again and that some restraint will be placed on such a practice; that it will not be the practice for the department to quarantine stock until it is sure the disease has been pinpointed by further tests, and it is not merely on suspicion. I suggest that serious problems could arise if the practice arose that the quarantining of stock became somewhat indiscriminate on suspicion of disease. I suggest that the Minister look again at that situation. With those qualifications, I support the second reading.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I support the Bill. As the Minister has said, it makes certain amendments to the principal Act to enable brucellosis to be dealt with more effectively. It is important, from my point of view, to recall briefly the history of the attempts to eradicate bovine tuberculosis and brucellosis in this State. I remember clearly in 1968, when I was still actively engaged in practice in the South-East. A top level meeting of many veterinarians was told by the then Chief Inspector of Stock that it was considered by the Federal, and indeed the State, authorities essential, in both these diseases, that we reached provisionally free status by 1975; and 1969-70 was the start of the first triennium. Technically, in the case of brucellosis this proved to be a far more difficult task than was thought at the time. This experience was the same as the authorities have had in the United States. In the event, the bovine brucellosis programme turned out to be merely a control measure; over the years we have been playing a holding game only. With the experience of the past years (1968 to 1974), however, we are now talking about a 1976 to 1984 programme, with provisionally free status before 1984. It is interesting to note in passing that as a result of the original programme, even though brucellosis eradication did not reach its required goal, the State's agricultural areas are now provisionally free of bovine tuberculosis.

There is no doubt about the need for tuberculosis and brucellosis eradication if we are to retain or regain export markets. There are three major advantages. The first is that brucellosis is a human health hazard. Undulant fever, as it is known, is a very long-term and debilitating disease, occurring most frequently in veterinarians, farmers and meat workers.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: How prevalent is it?

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: It is prevalent enough for the Industries Assistance Commission to have indicated a financial liability in excess of $100 000 in 1973-74. Secondly, it is very important from the point of view of increased productivity. In many herds it has been an endemic disease, and productivity decreases markedly. It was not uncommon in my experience during cattle infertility investigations to find that frequently over a period the disease had become endemic and was causing loss of calving percentage as high as 10 to 20 per cent.

The third, and most important, reason of all is marketability of stock. Even disregarding the first two, a New South Wales Department of Agriculture report suggested that there was a 10 to one financial advantage in eradication. The Industries Assistance Commission report of April 10, 1975, was a little less optimistic but still projected a clear advantage of five to one, although cattle prices had fallen. Bureau of Agricultural Economics reports have similarly supported the move. The States have supported it. Indeed, South Australia has not only paid its share but has exceeded it in an endeavour to keep the programmes going.

For one moment, I would like to digress to bring to the notice of the Council a remarkable article that appeared in the *Murray Valley Standard* on September 30, 1976. It is headed "Brucellosis and Tuberculosis". It appears under a photograph of a tractor pulling a plough, indicating a rural scene. It is the work of Mr. Murray Vandepeer. The article states:

The South Australian Government has been urged to spend more money on tuberculosis and brucellosis programmes, which would attract more Federal finance.

As I have pointed out, that is incorrect. The report continues:

Mr. Vandepeer, the member for Millicent, who recently announced his intention to contest Liberal Party preselection for the enlarged seat of Mallee at the next State election, said this in an address in reply debate in the House of Assembly recently.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: Is he standing against a sitting member?

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I understand he is contesting preselection against Mr. Nankivell. The report continues:

He said he felt sure that, if the State Government allotted more finance to those programmes, the Federal Government would be willing to back it up.

As I will point out, that statement, too, is completely erroneous. My lines of communication into the Liberal Party suggest that Mr. Vandepeer could knock Mr. Nankivell off. That is extraordinary. The next part of the report deals with brucellosis and tuberculosis, and I would be most grateful if Liberal Party members could explain what the following statement means:

Mr. Vandepeer said animals were going to slaughter which were possibly good clean stock, whereas poorer quality stock should be destroyed and the best quality retained.

What does that mean? Certainly, I do not know, yet this report concerns the man who is the hot tip to knock off the sitting member in the House of Assembly District of Mallee. Obviously, Mr. Vandepeer warmed to his subject when he said:

It is a wonderful opportunity to do it—

I do not know what that means—

and we shall never do it cheaper, but the Government will not accept this challenge.

Those are the words of the present member for Millicent and the big contender for the seat of Mallee. I understand that, when the honourable member sought preselection in Millicent last time, the will of the heavyweights prevailed. I have referred to this extraordinary document because it highlights the actions of a member representing a rural seat held by the Liberal Party, which consistently claims it has the interests of farmers at heart. Obviously, that gentleman has not the faintest idea of what he is talking about.

As I have already indicated, the State Government has met its obligations and has, in fact, exceeded them. The only major holdup is the Federal Government, which

continues to cavil and cavort about the cost. However, it is an interesting exercise to see who does meet the cost of such a programme.

The Hon. A. M. Whyte: About $25 000 a year comes out of the Cattle Compensation Fund.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I am glad that matter has been raised. Producers themselves are meeting a major part of the cost. In 1975 a $1 a head slaughter levy from beef producers raised $7 500 000. Therefore, producers are paying substantially towards meeting the cost of such programmes. A further contribution to the State Cattle Compensation Fund was raised by the application of stamp duty on cattle sales. Again, the sum raised represented another major contribution by producers.

Moreover, this year the States had an undeniable case but were given $4 000 000 less by the Federal Government than the minimum amount necessary to continue the programmes. These programmes are in jeopardy because of the actions of the Fraser Government, yet this is the Government that is supposed to have a special interest in, and a rapport with, the primary producers of the nation.

If the Federal Government is so determined to cut spending—even on a project as vital as this—it could still meet the shortfall between the slaughter levy and the operational cost by the provision of a loan.

If the Commonwealth Government's great fight against inflation is such that it cannot spend money on essential programmes like the eradication of tuberculosis and brucellosis, such a loan could be repaid from the levy after 1984 when the diseases have been eradicated. Hopefully, this matter will be supported by the Federal Government. It would be especially just in that it will distribute costs between present-day producers and those who will subsequently reap the benefits after 1984. This is an equitable solution. I am concerned about beef producers in *bona fide* areas of the State, that is, in pastoral areas and the South-East.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: Have you a farm down there?

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I conducted a large and successful practice there for many years and I have retained many friends and associations in the area.

The Hon. A. M. Whyte: If you stayed there any longer you might have caught tuberculosis.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: The Agriculture and Fisheries Department has been gearing itself up to proceed with the programmes by extending its senior veterinary staff. In the *Australian Veterinary Journal* of August, 1976, four further senior positions were advertised seeking veterinary officers.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: Your veterinary friends will not be too happy when they hear of that idea.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: That is a totally inane interjection. A professional man in any area surely has the interests of his clients at heart. My concern and that of my colleagues in the profession is to see that these diseases are eradicated. As I stated, I would like not only to retain but also to regain our export markets. It is interesting to note that the Minister of Agriculture warned of the likely deterioration of the position in this area almost five months ago, and the press release of that time states:

The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Brian Chatterton), said "a severe cut-back in Commonwealth funds left the Agriculture and Fisheries Department with no alternative but to re-assess the current eradication programme for both T.B. and brucellosis." Mr. Chatterton said, "The States had asked the Commonwealth to provide $21 600 000 to finance eradication programmes planned for the current year. However, the Minister for Primary Industry (Mr. Sinclair) indicated last Friday that the Commonwealth would only provide $12 000 000 to cover operational costs. That is $9 600 000 less than the States requested." Mr. Chatterton said the department was heavily committed to a strain 19 brucellosis vaccination programme in the South-East. "This programme has to be continued if we are to maintain the present situation. We will not be able to make any further progress towards eliminating brucellosis until we have access to further funds. This must be very disappointing to all stockowners," the Minister said. "Certainly it is most frustrating for my departmental officers."

Any further delay by the Federal Government can be interpreted only as a complete misunderstanding of the concept of eradication. If honourable members have not a good understanding of that concept, as opposed to control, I am not surprised that their colleagues in Canberra do not understand the matter any better. I am talking about eradication, not control, and, if the Fraser Government cannot understand its advisers, the position is ridiculous: if it can understand the advisers and is avoiding the advice, that is reprehensible.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE secured the adjournment of the debate.

## ADJOURNMENT

At 4.19 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday, October 7, at 2.15 p.m.