

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, October 14, 1964.

The SPEAKER (Hon. T. C. Stott) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS.**INTERSTATE HAULIERS.**

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Has the Premier further information on whether the Government intends to introduce legislation this session to limit the number of hours interstate hauliers may drive without a break while on duty?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: When the Leader asked his question on this matter last week, I told him that I would go into the matter. The Government believes that this legislation is necessary, and in fact it has asked the Parliamentary Draftsman to draft legislation for submission to Parliament this year. However, some problems are associated with the matter, and the Government is not sure at present that it has all the answers. It is the Government's policy, for two reasons, to see that unduly long hours are not worked: first, the industrial reason; and, secondly, accidents are frequently associated with long hours of driving. The legislation has been discussed with the Victorian Government which, incidentally, has introduced appropriate legislation that has been passed. We still have one or two problems to iron out, and consequently I doubt whether a Bill will be ready for submission to Parliament this session.

MOUNT COMPASS CRAFT BLOCK.

Mr. MCANANEY: People in the Mount Compass district are under the impression that a new craft block will be erected this year at Mount Compass Area School. Can the Minister of Education say whether this work will be commenced soon?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Unfortunately, difficulty has been experienced in siting the proposed boys and girls craft blocks because of the rather steep slopes on the school site. It was also necessary in siting the buildings to take into account the future development of the school and the probable need for new permanent buildings. The Director of the Public Buildings Department has advised that his department proposes to erect these craft blocks on the existing school plateau. He has stated that work will commence as soon as possible, but due to present commitments it does not appear likely that a start can be made until shortly before Christmas.

RAILWAY CROSSINGS.

Mr. RYAN: The Parliamentary Labor Party Transport Committee has received correspondence from various organizations requesting consideration of a zig-zag crossing, with cyclone mesh, over railway lines for use by pedestrians. Fatal accidents have occurred at the Government Road railway crossing at Croydon, which adjoins the works of the Adelaide Rope and Nail Company Limited and, presumably as a result of these accidents, the Railways Department has installed this type of crossing there. Will the Minister of Works discuss with his colleague the practice of providing this type of zig-zag crossing for pedestrians? If finances will not allow the crossings to be installed, will he ask his colleague to consider the possibility of the Government and other bodies contributing to the cost, because many people consider that this type of crossing will prevent accidents at dangerous railway crossings?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I am interested in this proposal and I will ask my colleague, the Minister of Railways, to have the matter investigated and reported on by the Railways Commissioner.

GOVERNMENT BUILDING.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: This morning, as I walked along Rundle Street, I could not help noticing the extremely shabby exterior of Foy's Building. Does not the Minister of Works think it would be a good idea to have something done, either by painting the outside of the building or treating it in some other way, so that it would not look so shabby? What plans has the Minister for rehabilitating the appearance of the building? Does the Government intend to retain the building, and what is its likely future?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Each year, when preparing his budget for submission to the Treasurer and ultimately to this House, the Director of Public Buildings takes into account a building maintenance programme that represents a substantial part of his total vote estimate. He has evolved a policy over the years for various Government buildings, depending on their construction and based on experience gained by officers of the department over a period of time, as to how frequently it is necessary to renovate Government buildings of various types internally and externally. Each year a portion of his vote estimate is devoted to general maintenance of buildings of various categories. I should imagine that this year his finances are fully committed, so

it would be unlikely that a job as big as that referred to by the honourable member could be undertaken within his present estimate. As far as I know, the Director is not providing this year for external renovation of this building. I shall have to get expert opinion on the best method of treatment and the cost. I will inquire and let the honourable member know the details of the programme.

GAUGE STANDARDIZATION.

Mr. CASEY: The Premier may recall that I asked him a question relating to the converting of the railway gauge between Adelaide and Terowie to standard gauge (4ft. 8½in.). In view of the proposed new railway line between Adelaide and Port Pirie, on which a survey is being carried out at present, will the Premier have a detailed report made available so that the cost of the new railway line from Adelaide to Port Pirie can be compared with the cost of converting to standard gauge the present lines north of Adelaide? In referring to the northern lines I am not considering the lines from Riverton to Spalding and from Peterborough to Quorn.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Before I answer the question, it is necessary to have a clear understanding of the present proposal concerning the line from Port Pirie to Adelaide. It is not intended to construct a completely new line: it is intended to construct a new line of about seven miles from Crystal Brook to Merriton. From Merriton to a point adjacent to the metropolitan area a standard track will be laid on the present route. Some new construction would be necessary into the metropolitan area, and there would be a new line into the abattoirs, and a branch line to serve Port Adelaide. There will be a standard track from Merriton to a point near Adelaide and a separate line from that point to the Adelaide railway station. There will be seven miles of new track at the northern end and some miles of new track at the southern end where duplication must be affected. Before that proposal was submitted to the Commonwealth Government, all alternatives and their costs were studied closely by the Railways Department. Obviously, we wanted a proposal that would gain the support of the Commonwealth Government, and the proposition that gave most benefit for the least cost was the one that is now under discussion. I think its total cost was about £6,000,000, including the cost of the rolling stock. This proposal substitutes a standard gauge for a large part of the present broad-gauge line between Adelaide and Crystal Brook.

I understand that the alternative referred to by the member for Frome is a broad-gauge line to Peterborough via Terowie. That would be a beneficial proposition for servicing South Australian industry and its customers in the Eastern States, but it would not be appropriate for Western Australia. If the honourable member considers the proposals, he will realize that the one serving both purposes best is the one I have referred to, from Crystal Brook. Later today I shall give notice of a motion to introduce a Bill on this topic.

FLOODWATER RELIEF.

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked last week about subsidies by the Government to assist floodwater relief in the northern parts of the Prospect district?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: My colleague the Minister of Roads states that the Highways Department will contribute, under the Budget line "Drainage—Various Roads", £5,000 to the Corporation of Prospect towards the cost of the temporary improvement and outlet drain through the sewage farm.

GRANGE TRANSPORT.

Mr. FRED WALSH: When the Henley Beach railway service was discontinued beyond the Grange station I protested because I considered that it would cause considerable inconvenience to people who would otherwise have used the line south of Grange. However, I was assured by the Minister of Works that that would not be so and that the Municipal Tramways Trust would provide an adequate service to cater for those people. I understand that that is not the position, and my fears have been somewhat confirmed by a letter in yesterday's *Advertiser*, part of which states:

Each day at 4.37 p.m., as the train pulls into the station, the bus leaves the terminus empty and leaves intending passengers behind. This particular train brings home most factory workers and it is most frustrating to see the bus go as the train is slowing up . . . When the bus does go it moves only four stops and waits for the driver to punch a clock. That extra time could be spent at the Grange station.

Will the Minister ask the Minister of Railways to request the Municipal Tramways Trust to arrange a time table of the Henley and Grange to Adelaide bus service to coincide more conveniently with the Grange rail service, so as to meet the convenience of the people I have referred to?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I may be able to oblige the honourable member in another way.

I will take the matter up directly with the General Manager of the Tramways Trust, who is one of my officers, and I will ask him to confer with the Railways Commissioner in an effort to achieve co-ordination in this matter. I believe that the trust's time table is a tight one and that if the train happens to be, say, half a minute or a minute late the bus leaves without waiting.

PENOLA HIGH SCHOOL RESIDENCE.

Mr. HARDING: I congratulate the Education Department on the erection and establishment of such a magnificent high school and school grounds at Penola. About 18 months ago a suitable block was purchased for the erection of a headmaster's residence. Can the Minister of Education say what stage work on this building has reached and whether it will be ready for occupation at the beginning of the next school year?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: The Public Buildings Department has informed me that the Housing Trust expects that the residence will be completed by the end of this month, in ample time for use next year.

POTATO PRICES.

Mr. McKEE: Several people in my district have inquired as to the unusually high price of potatoes today. I notice that unwashed potatoes are selling on the market at £101 a ton and washed potatoes at about £150 a ton. Can the Minister of Agriculture explain these high prices?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will ask the Chairman of the Potato Board to give me a statement on this matter, and I will try to have it available for the honourable member tomorrow.

BORDERTOWN YARDS.

Mr. NANKIVELL: The Railways Department is at present reconstructing the Bordertown railway yards, spreading the work over several financial years. Will the Minister of Works obtain from the Minister of Railways a report on the work proposed to be undertaken on that reconstruction during this financial year?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes, I will endeavour to obtain a report. It may be possible also to get information for the honourable member of the programme over the next two or three years.

AGED PERSONS.

Mr. RICHES: Last week I received a letter from a constituent of mine explaining that

she has a mother, aged 86, in Adelaide who is now confined to a wheel chair. Apart from that, she is active, but she needs constant care and attention. This elderly woman has been living with a daughter who has looked after her for more than 20 years, year in and year out without a break. The stage has now been reached when the daughter living in Adelaide needs some rest. I have been asked to inquire whether any institution in Adelaide could provide accommodation for this lady for six or seven weeks a year while her daughter has a rest. Although I have inquired, I have been unable to locate an institution that provides for cases such as this. My constituent explains that she does not for one moment feel that hers is a special case: she realizes that other people are faced with the same difficulty. Can the Premier say whether in his experience he has known cases like this, and whether he knows of any assistance that can be given?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I realize that in these cases there is a great hardship to a daughter, for instance, who has to look after an aged person without any break whatever, and I assure the honourable member that if he lets me have the names and addresses of the people concerned I shall do my best to arrange something.

EGG LEVIES.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Last week I asked the Minister of Agriculture whether he would be so good as to ascertain from the Chairman of the South Australian Egg Board the amount of the per-dozen egg levy necessary for the board to cover its cost of handling, administration and other charges, apart from recouping losses on trading and export. Has the Minister a reply?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Chairman of the South Australian Egg Board reports:

For eggs received on board floors the cost of handling is 6d. a dozen (deducted on producers' account sales). The amount of levy to cover the cost of administration and other charges, apart from recouping losses on trading and export, is about 3d. a dozen.

NORTHERN RESERVOIRS.

Mr. HEASLIP: Following the splendid rains over the last week or so, and in view of the importance of topping-up of reservoirs at this time of the year, can the Minister of Works say whether there has been any reasonable inflow into the northern reservoirs over the last few days?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have brought down today the weekly reports for the honourable member's information, and they show that some useful intakes have occurred in country reservoirs generally. The Beetaloo reservoir, with a capacity of 819,000,000 gallons, at present has 305,800,000 gallons; Bundaleer reservoir, with a capacity of 1,401,000,000 gallons, has 1,259,000,000 gallons. That is rather good news, because Bundaleer reservoir did not have very good intakes this season until late in the spring. Baroota reservoir, with a capacity of 1,371,000,000, has 329,800,000 gallons, which means that it is still well down. Of the other country reservoirs, Barossa, with a capacity of 993,000,000 gallons, has a storage at present of 861,000,000 gallons. South Para is approaching its capacity (11,300,000,000 gallons), as its present storage is 10,349,000,000 gallons. The Tod River reservoir, with a capacity of 2,495,000,000 gallons, is at present holding 2,229,000,000 gallons.

ANZAC HIGHWAY INTERSECTION.

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Roads, an answer to my recent question concerning corrugations in the road surface at the intersection of South Road and Anzac Highway?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: My colleague, the Minister of Roads, informs me that the corrugations referred to are caused primarily by braking of fast moving cars and heavy vehicles approaching the traffic lights. This occurs at times under similar conditions on heavily trafficked roads, and modifications of the design of the asphalt mix may be necessary. It is planned to remove the corrugations shortly.

CITRUS JUICES.

Mr. CURREN: During the Budget debate I suggested that, where pasteurized milk was not available for distribution to schoolchildren, citrus juices should be made available. Will the Minister of Education take up with the Commonwealth Government the possibility of supplying schoolchildren with citrus juices as an alternative when pasteurized milk is not available?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: A few years ago I took up the matter with the responsible Minister of the Commonwealth Government, making a request similar to that of the honourable member, but the Commonwealth Government indicated that it would not accede to the request. As the milk scheme is

administered by the South Australian Government at the expense of the Commonwealth Government, we have to be grateful for what we receive. However, I shall be only too pleased to take the matter up again at the request of the honourable member.

NATURALIZATION.

Mr. LAWN: Last month a report in the press quoted some figures concerning naturalizations and the registration as Australian citizens of migrants from other Commonwealth countries. I have been approached by a British subject from another Commonwealth country seeking information on this subject, and, as information supplied by the Premier may be of importance to many other people, I am asking the question here instead of writing to the Premier personally. Can he say what is required of a migrant from another Commonwealth country to become an Australian citizen?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I would have thought that no naturalization was necessary. However, I will inquire, because the honourable member has used the term "other Commonwealth countries" and it may be that there is something I do not know about some of these matters. For instance, Pakistan is a Commonwealth country but its citizens do not have allegiance to the Crown, so there could be a set of circumstances that must be overcome.

VISITS TO PARLIAMENT HOUSE.

Mrs. STEELE: Last week I was interested to see a group of blind girls and boys from Townsend House in the Speaker's gallery. Earlier this year, while Parliament was in recess, I arranged a visit for some students from the spastic centre at Ashford House and you, Mr. Speaker, were gracious enough to take part in their visit. My own guests on that occasion were most appreciative of the courtesy afforded to them by the President of the Legislative Council, by the Speaker of the House of Assembly, and by members of the messenger and catering staffs of this place. Can the Minister of Education say whether facilities for similar visits can be arranged for pupils of other special schools or special classes attached to departmental schools of which, I understand, there are now about 90? I do not doubt that the opportunity to make such a visit in the same way as hundreds of other students from schools all over South Australia would be a tremendous morale booster

to these children and at the same time to the devoted teachers who accompany them on these visits.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I should be delighted to make arrangements for large numbers of these children from special schools or classes to visit Parliament House. On Tuesday of last week a group of about 20 blind, deaf, and otherwise handicapped children from Townsend House School at Brighton visited Parliament House and you, Mr. Speaker, extended your gracious consideration and all members of the Parliamentary staff rendered every possible assistance. All of these children were intensely interested in what they heard during a very unusual debate on Tuesday afternoon. Yesterday I received a rather unique letter of appreciation written to me in Braille by one of the little blind girls, Felicity Dobson. As it is a brief but charming letter, with your leave, Mr. Speaker, I will read it.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: The letter states:

On behalf of the senior students of this school I would like to thank you very much for arranging our visit to Parliament House last Tuesday. We all enjoyed ourselves immensely. I would also like to thank you for arranging that we sit on the floor of the House, besides being a great honour it was a thrill to remember. I would like you to convey our thanks to all who assisted us in any way, and particularly to Mr. Combe and Mr. Harrison for being so kind and co-operative to us. We were all very interested when the librarian, Mr. Lanyon, told us about the many different volumes which are stored in the library. Please thank him also, for giving us such an interesting lecture. I thought the debate in the House of Assembly was at times quite fierce, which of course made it all the more interesting. In the Legislative Council we were sorry to have to leave just as Mr. Dawkins rose to speak, as he is the uncle of one of my classmates. Once again our sincere thanks to yourself and to all who helped to make our visit such a successful one. After seeing Parliament actually in session I will follow politics more closely now.

Yours sincerely,

Felicity Dobson.

I am sure that such a visit would also be a great thrill to the students of so many of our special classes, of which, as the member for Burnside reminds me, there are over 90 in the Education Department. With your co-operation, Mr. Speaker, and with the co-operation of the President of the Legislative Council, I should be delighted to act on the suggestion of the honourable member and arrange further visits in the future.

GAWLER INTERSECTION.

Mr. LAUCKE: I have been making a close study of the Redbanks Road and Gawler by-pass intersection with a view to ascertaining what action might be taken to render the intersection safer. I find that a driver of a motor car entering the intersection from the west cannot see traffic approaching from the north on the by-pass road because of an earthen bank that was built when the Redbanks Road was being reconstructed, requiring a cutting at that point. It appears to me that this bank could be cut away without heavy cost and this would greatly improve visibility to the north. Can the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Roads, have my suggestion investigated?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes.

SALISBURY DRAINAGE.

Mr. HALL: Some time ago, what was then the Salisbury and Elizabeth council submitted to the Premier proposals for a comprehensive drainage scheme for that district council area. The council is now known as the Corporation of Salisbury and is still greatly concerned with the drainage problems in that area and the area of Para Hills. The council wishes to know whether anything further has been done as a result of its representations. Whilst it realizes that proposals are in hand for the establishment of a comprehensive body to deal with drainage in the metropolitan area (and the council has supported this move), it is still faced with considerable expenditure for immediate drainage works, and that expenditure must be borne by the council at this stage. Can the Premier say whether he expects assistance to be given to the corporation in respect of drainage in the immediate future?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The honourable member is correct in saying that a deputation waited on me to discuss the financial side of this work. Normally, drainage works would be dealt with by another Minister but on the financial side they are dealt with by the Treasurer. At the time, a deputation called on me from both Elizabeth and Salisbury and the position was explained to that deputation. In general terms, the Government would be prepared to assist financially with a drainage scheme for the area the same as it has assisted financially with the south-western suburbs drainage scheme. The Government would not be able to undertake the engineering responsibilities of the work. It would be prepared to give any assistance which was within its means but which did not prejudice other functions that it was

obliged to undertake. The Government would be prepared to submit this scheme to the Public Works Committee on the same terms of reference as were the proposals for the south-western suburbs drainage scheme and other schemes. Therefore, if the council's plan for the drainage is sufficiently advanced to enable it to be considered as a proposition and if the necessary engineering details have been worked out, there would be no objection to its being submitted to the Public Works Committee. This matter was held up for some time because of a complication in that it was not clear what the Commonwealth Government would provide by way of contribution in respect of the Weapons Research Establishment, which contributes water to this scheme. There was long drawn-out correspondence with the Commonwealth Government as to what contribution it would make. That matter has now been cleared up (not entirely satisfactorily) but we now know the position. Therefore, if the council concerned could submit a scheme the Government would be prepared to submit it to the Public Works Committee on the same basis of contribution as has previously applied: that is, the Government's share not exceeding 50 per cent. That is the basis that has been used in all drainage proposals throughout the State. If the honourable member will inform the council, I shall be pleased to hear from it.

GRASSHOPPER PLAGUE.

Mr. CASEY: It has come to my notice that a major grasshopper problem could develop in some northern areas of the State. Some years ago a large infestation of grasshoppers occurred in the area, resulting in the hoppers migrating into the Mid and Lower North of this State. I can remember that vividly. Previously, there were other major outbreaks in the areas but, fortunately for this State, the hoppers did not migrate too far south. At present this State is enjoying a lush season but in parts of the north there have been dense outbreaks of grasshoppers, and I believe they have been reported to the Agriculture Department officer at Jamestown. If the grasshoppers lay eggs this year (and they are multiplying quickly), an outbreak could occur soon. Will the Minister of Agriculture discuss this matter with his officers to see whether the areas that are infested (Nackara, Dawson and Cavenagh—and perhaps there are other outbreaks farther north near Hawker, which is in the breeding area) could be investigated to see

whether measures could be taken to minimize the excessive breeding?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I shall discuss this matter with the Director of Agriculture. Since the last serious infestation of grasshoppers occurred, several breeding areas have been suppressed in subsequent years by action taken through the Agriculture Department. I do not doubt that this situation is well observed at present, but I shall obtain a comprehensive report from the Director and inform the honourable member.

GEORGES CORNER.

Mr. RICHES: Georges Corner is well known to the Minister of Works, and has been the subject of numerous questions by me and the member for Whyalla. For two years or more I have been asking that a suitable sign be erected there to warn motorists that this is a dangerous corner. Signs indicate the direction of the road and that there is a corner, but nothing shows that the corner is any different from the numerous other corners or bends on the road between Adelaide and Port Augusta. Rumble strips were placed there some time ago but motorists are not accustomed to them and they do not serve as a warning. Perhaps there have been as many accidents since the strips were put down as there were before. Will the Minister of Works, together with the Minister of Roads, investigate again our requests that some sign should be placed at the corner warning motorists of the danger?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I agree that the members for Stuart and Whyalla have raised this matter on numerous occasions. Each time I have referred the matter to my colleague and he has discussed it with the highway authorities. I agree that the latest action taken does not appear to have been successful. I consider that probably the only real solution to the problem is the redesigning and reconstruction of the junction. I noticed a letter in the press recently from a writer who claimed that it was dangerous when approaching the corner from the south along the by-pass road. I consider that that letter must be treated with some caution, as approaching from that side one has the curve of the road into the main highway clearly defined by the posts and reflectors on them. When travelling south from Port Germein and intending to take the by-pass road one notices first of all that the black-and-white notice indicating the intersection is not far enough north to be effective

and to give motorists sufficient warning that the corner is near. That is one thing that could be improved.

There is merit in the honourable member's suggestion that a prominent danger sign might assist. Unless some better means can be devised of improving the geometry and contour of the corner it will be a problem child. The problem of redesigning is complicated by other installations at that point. It is an important junction for waterworks mains and they do, to some extent, inhibit what the highway engineers would like to do if they had free and open country on which to work. I agree that the recent provision of a rumble strip is not the answer: this is indicated from my own observations and from reports I have received. I shall discuss the matter again with the Minister of Roads along the lines of the honourable member's question and our discussion today.

BARLEY.

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question about the differential payments for grades of barley?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Chairman of the Australian Barley Board reports:

The second advance of barley of the 1963-64 crop made provision for a bigger differential between malting grades and lower grades. The board decided on this increased differential on the basis of generally higher realizations for malting barley, as compared with other grades. The greater differential is also aimed at encouraging growers to produce top quality barley.

ST. KILDA FORESHORE.

Mr. HALL: Earlier this year plans were submitted by the then Salisbury and Elizabeth council (now it is the Salisbury corporation which is concerned with the St. Kilda beach and foreshore) through the Minister of Marine, or with his approval, for investigations into constructing an embankment at St. Kilda for trailer boats and for the general use of people taking part in water sports in that area. I understand that the council desired to institute a scheme which it would financially support if it could obtain a Government subsidy. Will the Minister of Marine ascertain whether investigations have been made into the engineering feasibility of that scheme?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The matter was the subject of discussions between engineers and officers of what is now the Salisbury council. They had prepared tentative plans for foreshore improvements generally, which were of some magnitude, involving considerable

expenditure if they were to be carried out *in toto* as planned. As I recall, the plans were submitted by me, with the knowledge of the Director of the Tourist Bureau, to the Harbors Board for a report as to their technical feasibility, so that the council could then, acting on the advice received, go further into the matter and see what cost was involved and whether or not it could finance the scheme. The question of assistance towards that scheme would have been raised at the time. I will ascertain from the board what progress it has made in its investigations, and if I cannot get a report before the House rises I shall forward the information on to the honourable member by letter.

CAMPBELLTOWN BY-LAW: TRAFFIC.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I move:

That by-law No. 7 of the Corporation of the City of Campbelltown in respect of traffic, made on July 13, 1964, and laid on the table of this House on September 22, 1964, be disallowed.

This by-law is, as the motion sets out, in respect of traffic and contains only one clause which has caused the Subordinate Legislation Committee to recommend its disallowance. That clause provides:

1. Any person who without the consent of the council allows—
 - (a) any motor vehicle; or
 - (b) any trailer; or
 - (c) any motor vehicle and trailer whether connected together or not

which is or measured together are—
and the next three words are the important ones—

longer than 18ft. to remain stationary for more than one hour in any street or road shall be guilty of an offence and liable to a penalty not exceeding £20.

This clause is in the same form as a clause in a by-law of the City of Unley which this House disallowed a few weeks ago. In this case evidence was given before the committee by Mr. Leaney (Town Clerk of Campbelltown) and by Alderman Ronald Johnson (an alderman of the City of Campbelltown), and they explained that the object of this clause was to prevent the parking for long periods of big vehicles such as semi-trailers and large trucks in the council's streets. With that object the members of the committee have every sympathy. The only trouble is that this clause, as was the case with the clause in the Unley by-law, has been drawn too widely, and it could catch cases involving persons

with, say big American cars (which, standing alone, are in some cases more than 18ft. long), or it may even catch the smaller cars which might have a trailer attached to them, thus aggregating more than 18ft.

Those vehicles would not be allowed to stand perfectly properly anywhere in the city for more than an hour; they would not be able to stand, say, outside a person's private house without creating an offence. The witnesses both agreed that it was not the intention of the council to prohibit those cases. They agreed with the members of the committee who questioned them that, in fact, this had been drawn too widely and they said they would certainly (and I quote their actual words) "redraft and resubmit these provisions". This principle has already been agreed by the House. The only regret is that, because of one clause to which objection must be taken, the whole by-law falls to the ground. However, the council understands the reason for that.

Motion carried.

LIBRARIES AND INSTITUTES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (PUBLIC SALARIES) BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

POULTRY INDUSTRY (COMMONWEALTH LEVIES) BILL.

In Committee.

(Continued from October 13. Page 1411.)

Clause 4—"Persons qualified to vote at poll."

Mr. BYWATERS: I move:

In subclause (1) to strike out "date on which the notice referred to in section 3 of this Act was published in the *Gazette*" and insert "thirtieth day of June, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-four".

Some poultry farmers cull their flocks heavily at this time of the year in order to replenish their houses with chickens. These chickens would not be considered for the purposes of this poll, because a hen is defined as a female domesticated fowl the age of which is not less than six months. If the poll were taken between now and late January, some commercial poultry farmers would be deprived of a vote because they would have depleted their flocks and replaced them with chickens. I do not think my amendment will affect the situation very much. Members may ask why I

have suggested the date of June 30 last. They may say that there would be no definite proof of how many birds a producer had at that date and that he might therefore declare a false number. However, I think this could be easily overcome either by having the producer make an affidavit declaring that he had a certain number of birds (and he would be subject to severe penalty if he made a false statement) or having him sign a proper declaration before a justice of the peace or some other responsible person. Surely in those circumstances a poultry farmer would state accurately the number of birds he had on June 30 last.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Agriculture): I cannot accept this amendment, for there would be no means of checking the statement of a person who said that he had had a certain number of birds on a certain date. He could say he had had the birds but that he did not have them now.

Mr. Jennings: The bird has flown!

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I think this amendment would be impracticable. The honourable member said that producers change their flocks and at about the beginning of the calendar year some would have insufficient hens to qualify them for a vote, but I would think, from my experience in the industry, that very few people would fail to qualify under the provisions. Should we not leave it to the Minister to decide when the poll should be held? The Government does not intend to rush this poll, but on the other hand when we get satisfactory replies from the Commonwealth authorities we will want to hold the poll with as little delay as possible. It would not be practicable to determine a date such as January 1 for the poll, because this matter must still be finalized and I still have to discuss it with the Commonwealth authorities. I think this amendment would only restrict the operation of the Bill. It could make the poll unworkable, for many producers probably would not know how many hens they had on June 30 last. On the other hand, it would unduly delay the poll if we selected another date. I think it is better to leave it to the discretion of the Minister to select a date which is suitable for the industry generally and which will not delay the determination of this important question.

Mr. SHANNON: I have some sympathy for the member for Murray (Mr. Bywaters) in this matter. I, too, have been approached about deciding the appropriate time to assess the number of birds poultry growers have had.

I think it is well known in the industry that the only way of assessing the number of birds which might have been held at any date would be by taking the records of the Egg Board on receipt of eggs and dividing the number of eggs by what might be called an average production per bird. I believe that is the only way that such assessments of the number of birds on a given date can be assessed by the South Australian board. If the date is fixed by the Minister for such an assessment there will be a possibility of a check and then it will be obvious if a producer is under-estimating or over-estimating. This would enable the department to have some opportunity of checking the actual number of birds held by a producer at a given time.

Regarding the fluctuation in the laying flock of birds at various times during the season, some growers wisely have their major laying flock ready for the autumn when prices are at their peak. The producers use various types of prepared feed. This means extra costs and the commercial producer takes those into account when he begins to produce eggs for a lean period. That brings about the fluctuation in the laying flock strengths at various periods of the year. The Minister would undoubtedly choose a period of the year to collect the evidence to decide on the poll that would not adversely affect the commercial growers. This is a commercial proposition and as such we should leave some discretion to the Minister as to how and when the evidence of the producers should be collected, and as to how the poll should be conducted.

Mr. HALL: I understand that if the poll is taken in January or February most efficient producers would have got rid of their adult stock. However, even then I take it that much of their stock would be under six months of age. I suggest that the wording of the definition of "hen" be altered from six months to three months.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: If the honourable member for Murray thinks that January 31 would be a suitable date, I point out that this poll cannot be held within a few weeks or anything like that. It will take considerable negotiation before I can even get the adequate details on which to prepare for a poll. Some outstanding questions have to be settled. In any case, there will not be any immediate crisis.

Mr. Bywaters: If you give an assurance that it will not be held before January 31, I shall withdraw my amendment.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I do not expect that the poll will be held quickly. I do not know just when it will be held but in view of the time it takes to get a reply from C.E.M.A. on other outstanding questions, I believe it will not be before January 31. If there is an urgent need to hold the poll before Christmas or during the Christmas period (and I can hardly imagine that this is essential) I undertake that, while the Bill is going to another place, I shall examine the position to see whether amendments can be introduced to cover this situation. I cannot accept the date of June 30 last, because that is ancient history in the poultry world and I do not think that is practical. I do not expect that the poll will be held before the end of January. I do not see how it could be held before then, but I should not like to give an outright guarantee until I have examined all the factors involved. Everyone knows that the poultry industry is in a difficult position at the moment. This is being represented as an urgent question, which it has been for a long time. Although C.E.M.A. has stated how urgent it is, it took it over two months to reply to my last letter. Therefore, I am not expecting anything to happen before the end of January.

Mr. BYWATERS: If the Minister had agreed to having the poll after January 31 my objections would have been met, but apparently he will not go as far as that. It apparently depends on when he gets a reply from C.E.M.A., and at this stage there is no assurance as to when this will come. Many larger producers will not have their flocks at the proper strength, and yet they will contribute most to this scheme when implemented. At this time of the year the stocks of the large poultry producers are depleted of six-month-old hens. These people could sign an affidavit and obviously would not over-estimate their flock, but we must consider the large producers as they will be the ones contributing most to this scheme.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Many large producers buy their day-old chickens about August or September and completely quit their adult stock, so that by the following February or March the birds are laying and the producers can satisfy the egg market at a time when the egg supply is short. They are the producers who benefit the industry today. They do not contribute to the export glut that causes so much damage and hardship to the poultry industry. However, I do not think this amendment makes the position clearer. I agree with

the Minister that it is undesirable to make a date that is so retrospective as the likely date of the poll. I hope this clause will be given consideration in another place.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (18).—Messrs. Burdon, Bywaters (teller), Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Riches, Ryan, Frank Walsh, and Fred Walsh.

Noes (17).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman (teller), Coumbe, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall, Harding, Heaslip, Laucke, McAnaney, Millhouse, and Nankivell, Sir Baden Pattinson, Messrs. Pearson, Quirke, and Shannon, and Mrs. Steele.

Pair.—Aye—Mr. Hughes. **No—**Sir Thomas Playford.

Majority of 1 for the Ayes.
Amendment thus carried.

Mr. BYWATERS: I move:

In subclause (1) to strike out "fifty" and insert "twenty".

I quite appreciate that this Bill would only authorize a poll but I consider this clause to be closely allied to the remarks made by the Minister of Agriculture in his second reading explanation. If the Minister's ideas were given effect to it would mean that, if the poll were carried, producers with under 50 birds would be exempted from the levy. The C.E.M.A. authorities could later hold South Australia to that number. The Minister has said that he has asked C.E.M.A. to exclude producers owning fewer than 100 birds; this clause would be only a compromise.

Mr. Casey: How do the other States feel about it?

Mr. BYWATERS: They have all accepted it, as is set out in the report of C.E.M.A.'s annual meeting on June 12 and 13, 1963. If the Minister is able to inform C.E.M.A. that the poultry farmers will accept its proposals (provided that the figure is fixed at 50), and if C.E.M.A. refuses, I submit that the poll would be null and void because people would have voted with the idea that 50 was to be the minimum.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I cannot accept this amendment for the reasons I have stated on other occasions. The whole intention of the C.E.M.A. plan is to benefit the poultry producers who are in the business commercially. They should be able to vote for or against the scheme but this does not apply to the small producers with only 20 hens, or even 30 or 35, because his produce does not affect the market noticeably. I frankly believe

that the scheme would be better if left merely to commercial growers with at least 100 birds. They are the people who want this plan and who will vote accordingly. I am sure that if 100 birds were the stipulated minimum it would be much easier to hold a poll. It might even be carried if the number were 50. When preparing the roll for election of producer members, the board had to examine its records to determine who qualified for a vote, and the qualifying figure was set at 8,000 dozen eggs, to be delivered to the board by the person concerned. That is the production of about 250 hens. Of the 13,000-odd people shown on the records of the Egg Board as having delivered eggs in that year, only some 600-odd were qualified to vote. If those producers sent eggs nowhere else but to the Egg Board, then it would be reasonable to infer that only those 600-odd had more than 250 hens.

It is estimated that there are 20,000 or 30,000 people in the State each with more than 20 fowls. Do we want to stir up these people, many of whom have never heard of this scheme? They would not know what it was all about, and I would not blame them. Let us assume that a man owns 25 fowls. If under the C.E.M.A. plan a tax of 8s. a bird is prescribed, he has to pay five times 8s. or £2 a year as his levy. He probably sells no eggs to the Egg Board, and he may sell no eggs at all. He has no account sales from which this levy can be deducted. It is prescribed that it shall be paid in fortnightly instalments, but I am told that arrangements can be made to pay the levy annually, in which case, if that person had a constant number of birds all the year round and was prepared to pay annually, he could pay his £2 once a year. However, I think it is ridiculous to expect a man to have to do this. He has to take the initiative of forwarding that levy to the authority, which has to provide inspectors to see that the law is carried out.

If we try to include these 20,000 or 30,000 people, or whatever the number is, it will be necessary to have inspectors going around the suburbs, the country towns, and the farms finding out from people how many fowls they own. I strongly suggest that 20 birds is too low a figure. The other States have their own business to run, and I do not try to tell them how to run it, but frankly I do not think all those States have looked at the implications of this scheme as it would apply to a minimum of 20 birds. I think one State still has as its criterion for the egg marketing authority the ownership of 50 birds, and that State would

have to lower its figure to 20. Other States have taken the advice of commercial growers in the industry who very properly want to do something to help their industry, but naturally they do not have to consider the position of the small poultry owner. I do not think the small owner's voice has been heard in the other States, and I do not think the average small poultry owner in this State, with perhaps a few more than 20 fowls, has taken much interest in this matter, but he would take much interest if he woke up one day and found that a law made him forward a prescribed sum to the authorities; or perhaps he might not even hear about the law until an inspector came to the door.

What will happen to the small poultry owner in these circumstances? I strongly suggest that anything less than a minimum of 50 birds is absurdly bureaucratic and that we should not have a bar of it. A vote on a 50-bird basis would be a much more logical one. Whether or not C.E.M.A. accepts this I do not know, but I believe that the authorities are willing to look at a figure higher than 20. However, those authorities finally came down on the side of making no change at all; they refused my request for 100 birds without any suggestion of compromise, and they did not answer the other part of my request to allow the publication of the proposed levy. If we go along with a poll of the owners of 50 birds, I shall be able to go to C.E.M.A. and get it to have another look at the scheme, and then we will put it to the commercial producers. We know that a person with 50 or 100 birds cannot be called a big commercial grower, but at least he is in the business of selling eggs and therefore I think he is entitled to vote and to take part in a scheme. I urge the Committee not to accept this amendment, because it would mean bureaucratic interference with the lives of many people; its total effect would be negligible, but the effect of the interference would be marked indeed. I can imagine that there would be many questions about the harrowing of people by inspectors, and that there would be many questions in this House in future years if we allowed the scheme to affect people with such small flocks.

Mr. SHANNON: I completely favour obtaining a favourable vote from South Australia on the C.E.M.A. plan, because I believe that this is fundamental to the survival of the egg industry in South Australia. If I were opposed to this measure I would go about defeating it by using the same method as

the member for Murray has used; yet I am sure that he supports it. The people in South Australia who enjoy the most profitable egg production are those who pay no levies, and they are the people to whom the honourable member's amendment would give a vote. At present the small producers ride on the backs of the commercial producers. Under the honourable member's amendment the people with between 20 and 50 fowls will have the same vote as those with 1,400. The small producer does not want to pay a poll tax. If the C.E.M.A. plan is not implemented on a Commonwealth-wide basis it will be completely ineffective. The Eastern States have the same problems as has South Australia. If C.E.M.A. is to work it must be worked on a commercial-producer basis. The argument put forward by C.E.M.A. is that the more poll tax that can be imposed the better for the industry. However, it will be impossible to collect the tax and the revenue will be used up in providing collectors. If I had my way I should increase the limit to 100 fowls, although I do not believe that that number is ideal, either. I think that 100 fowls is a modest number to keep. If the tax were 10s. a bird the total would be only £50 and, when the average farmer's income is considered, this is a very small sum. However, it is not a small sum to a housewife who may be keeping fowls in the backyard. A farmer who kept a cow for his cream would not be considered a commercial dairy farmer any more than a backyard egg producer could be called a commercial poultry producer. I oppose the amendment.

Mr. BYWATERS: I think the member for Onkaparinga is perfectly well aware of what I have in mind and I think that we both support the principle of the C.E.M.A. plan. His main objection to my amendment is that it will enable more people to vote on the poll and enable them to defeat the proposal, but that is not necessarily so. If this provision related only to the voting power, I should agree wholeheartedly with the honourable member but, as the Minister said, the purpose of it is to link it up with the C.E.M.A. plan. I do not think many more people would vote if my amendment was passed. I think that what would happen would be that people with between 20 and 50 fowls, because it is an optional vote, would not exercise their franchise on the poll. They would not vote because they now sell through the back door to someone privately or to a grocer and accept kind from the grocer. Therefore, there is no record of the number of eggs

that they have sold and they escape paying taxation. They also escape paying a levy to the Egg Board.

If they vote on this poll they will record the fact that they have more than 20 fowls and that they have committed offences against the South Australian Egg Board. Also, from time to time income tax inspectors go around and this would present them with an opportunity to examine the small producers' income tax returns. Knowing that, small producers will not exercise their franchise on this poll. It is remarkable to hear the Minister refer to bureaucratic control. If he believes that, why does he not believe it with regard to the South Australian Egg Board, because it has been the policy of the board that anyone owning more than 20 birds shall pay the levy regardless of where the eggs are sold. A person with over 20 birds has far more eggs than he requires for his personal use. Once people start selling eggs, whether to the grocer or anyone else, they are putting eggs on the market and that immediately reacts against the commercial producer, because a glut is created. The Minister said the large producer would benefit from the scheme, but the small producers will really benefit, especially if excluded from paying the levy. Stabilization will result from the C.E.M.A. plan because it will benefit the industry by keeping eggs at a reasonable price. Most interstate trade will disappear thus enabling the industry to stabilize prices.

Mr. Shannon: These people will have to pay the levy.

Mr. BYWATERS: Yes, and I agree with that. The levy can be paid from any increase they receive in their egg price because of the plan. People should pay the levy if they have more than 20 birds. Since the Egg Board has been in existence anyone with over 20 birds should have paid. It is wrong for the Minister to say that these people should not be taxed now, because they should have been taxed all the time.

Mr. LAUCKE: I do not doubt for one moment the keen desire of the member for Murray to see the C.E.M.A. plan implemented. If owners of fewer than 50 birds are to participate in a poll, that is a most deadly way of not having the plan accepted. Sheer weight of numbers of owners of fewer than 50 birds would have an adverse effect on the result of the poll. It would be difficult for the owners of small flocks of birds to account for payment of the levy. At present we have 20 birds as the maximum number that may be kept without

paying levies on eggs and without being a registered producer. These producers deliver their eggs, in the main, to the local store, and take an ungraded price that includes the levies payable by the storekeeper. At present the small producer is paying his levies because he is selling his eggs ungraded. The owner of more than 50 birds would have a credit account with an egg floor, from which account could be deducted levies and the tax. He would have an amount to which could be debited his liabilities in respect of local levies and the C.E.M.A. tax. That money would be easily obtained. If we wish this poll to be carried we must exclude owners of fewer than 50 birds. Bearing in mind the utter necessity of a rationalization plan for this industry, it is basic to it that this poll be carried in South Australia.

Mr. Shannon: There will be no C.E.M.A. plan if it is not carried.

Mr. LAUCKE: Yes, therefore I oppose the amendment.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I join with the member for Barossa in expressing appreciation to the member for Murray for his keen interest in this measure. We know that he is anxious to assist the poultry industry; so is the member for Barossa, and so am I. There will be a great and intensive opposition to the plan when the poll is taken. The people who will lose heavily if the C.E.M.A. plan is introduced to South Australia are those who are at present making a good thing out of the interstate trade. No doubt their campaigning will be most active in an endeavour to have the plan defeated, and they will concentrate their attention, if this amendment is passed, on small producers, because those persons do not realize the significance of the bird tax they will be obliged to pay. The small producers are much in the majority, and if the amendment were carried it would bring the limit down to 20 birds. This could result in the defeat of the poll.

Mr. RICHES: As I understand the Bill, the question to be submitted to the poultry owners is whether the C.E.M.A. plan, whatever it might be, should be adopted. Is that correct? We are afraid that, if it is not made clear whether producers will be voting in relation to the C.E.M.A. plan, they may end up voting on a scheme devised by the Minister. Corresponding legislation has not yet been introduced in some other States, although Ministers have agreed in principle to the scheme without consulting the producers by way of a poll. There

is no obligation on South Australia to take a poll.

Mr. Jennings: Or to abide by the result of it!

Mr. RICHES: No. As far as I know, no other State is conducting a poll. If any one of the other State Parliaments alters the C.E.M.A. plan, that will be the subject of negotiation. I know that the Minister, in his second reading explanation, expressed the hope that C.E.M.A. would alter the provisions of the plan from a minimum of 20 to 50 birds. If that is not done I assume the Minister will still submit to the scheme. Does the Bill stipulate that, whatever C.E.M.A. decides, its plan will be put before the poultry producers and will be the question voted on?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Bill will authorize the Minister to hold a poll for the purpose of determining whether a certain group of persons are in favour of the Poultry Industry (Commonwealth Levies) scheme, which I believe will be the scheme agreed on by C.E.M.A. This has all been brought about by a Commonwealth Bill, which will be voted on by producers. Clause 3 of the Bill states, "The Minister may direct that a poll shall be held." Unknown factors in this scheme should be cleared up before a person says whether he desires it or not. I point out that this Bill provides that the Minister may hold a poll—I stress the word "may"—upon this Commonwealth levy scheme, and he will do it, of course, only after a certain amount of consultation with the authorities.

If the scheme comes into effect, it will be the subject of one or more Bills in the Commonwealth Parliament. This may be necessary because of drafting requirements. I have seen the Commonwealth's draft Bills to provide for the poultry producer to pay the prescribed levy and also for that payment to be made to the State egg boards. It is not at all certain (in fact, I have not even heard it suggested in the other States) that the scheme will be submitted to any other State Parliament, for it is doubtful whether it is necessary to do this: it depends a little on the framing of the Egg Marketing Acts in the various States. I understand that no other State Minister expects to put this question to his State Parliament at all.

Mr. RICHES: How does the Commonwealth get its powers?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Under the Constitution the Commonwealth has the power of excise which enables it to provide for the

bird levy. The States cannot do this. Although the States can deduct levies on eggs handled through their own boards, they cannot levy a tax on the number of birds held. The Commonwealth has indicated that it is willing to provide for this bird levy if the State boards will collect the money. This is the only State that intends to hold a poll, and it is the only State that has come forward with legislation dealing with it.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (18).—Messrs. Burdon, Bywaters (teller), Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Riches, Ryan, Frank Walsh, and Fred Walsh.

Noes (18).—Messrs. Böckelberg, Brookman (teller), Coumbe, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall, Harding, Heaslip, Laucke, McAnaney, and Millhouse, Sir Baden Pattinson, Mr. Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford, Messrs. Quirke and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, and Mr. Stott.

Pair.—Aye—Mr. Hughes. No—Mr. Nankivell.

The CHAIRMAN: There are 18 Ayes and 18 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I record my vote in favour of the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. BYWATERS: I move:

In subclause (2) to strike out "date on which such notice was published in the *Gazette*" and insert "thirtieth day of June, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-four". This amendment is consequential to my earlier one that was carried.

Amendment carried.

Mr. BYWATERS: I move to insert the following new subclauses:

(3) Persons qualified to vote pursuant to this section shall be classified as follows:

- (a) persons who on the thirtieth day of June one thousand nine hundred and sixty-four were the owners of not less than one thousand five hundred hens;
- (b) persons who on the thirtieth day of June one thousand nine hundred and sixty-four were the owners of less than one thousand five hundred hens.

(4) Each person referred to in paragraph (a) of subsection (3) of this section shall be entitled to three votes at the poll and each person referred to in paragraph (b) of that subsection shall be entitled to one vote at the poll.

My amendment differentiates between producers and non-producers. It is recognized in the industry that 2,000 birds constitutes a living to the owner. To allow some latitude I have reduced the number from 2,000 to 1,500 because it could be assumed that once a person has 1,500 birds he is generally full-time in the

industry. The amendment will provide that where a producer is full-time in the industry he will have three votes and where he is part-time he will have one vote. This was mainly the reason for my moving earlier to make the date June 30. I ask the Committee to accept the amendment because it will give the poultry farmers engaged full-time in the industry (the ones who pay the highest levy and are most affected by the Bill) a little more voting strength than others.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I believe that the amendment will do nothing more than complicate the holding of the poll. I am surprised to hear the honourable member espouse this principle because I thought it was contrary to his Party's policy. If this scheme were adopted, possibly the only logical way to do it would be to give a vote for every fowl owned. However, the amendment really does not achieve what the honourable member wants. I think he wants to give votes to persons in proportion to the number of fowls they own and he has set out to do this simply by giving three votes to one group of producers and one vote to another group. I do not think there is any real merit in the argument and if there is I shall be interested to hear the honourable member develop it on other legislation that we have to consider from time to time. Most honourable members would have had experience of polls held in primary producer communities on marketing plans and I have never heard of this type of voting being introduced. I believe that the person with 50 fowls is entitled to vote the same as the big producer and I do not think the big producer is entitled to more than one vote.

Some of the biggest producers in the other States are against this scheme and if they ever got a vote (which they will not) then, under the honourable member's principle, they would demand many more votes than the ordinary producer. The amendment would complicate what is now a straightforward system. Under the Bill as it now stands, when the poultry producers decide on the C.E.M.A. plan they can give a firm answer one way or the other. To have to decide who had 1,500 fowls and who had not (especially now that the honourable member's previous amendment to make the date June 30 last has been accepted) would be a difficult administrative problem. Now that the date is June 30 last, the vote will be held six months or more away from the actual date. I do not know how we could work out who had 1,500 fowls then.

We would have to rely on a producer's word because there would be no way of disproving his statement. I believe this will be an involved matter anyway and the honourable member's amendment would make it much more involved. This is a surprising move from the other side of the Committee. I ask the Committee to oppose the amendment.

Mr. SHANNON: It is refreshing to have this suggestion from the member for Murray. It is not to be lightly taken; in fact, I think it is Labor Party policy. The amendment gives three times the voting strength to commercial producers. I am not greatly opposed to the principle: indeed, my amendment on the file shows that I have some sympathy for it. This legislation affects those earning a living by keeping fowls. Egg producers have asked for an orderly marketing system and they have worked out this scheme. I do not know the best method to ascertain the weight of opinion in the industry and my attempt is not much better than that of the member for Murray. I have laid down that a man shall have a vote for every 500 birds he owns. It will not be difficult to demand that a person who wants to vote at the poll should nominate the number of birds he possessed on June 30, 1964. If he cannot answer that question I would not give him a vote. Many growers with fewer than 2,000 birds make more than the basic wage. These days much science is involved in poultry-keeping and a good manager can reduce the cost of production considerably. I do not think the member for Murray goes far enough and he certainly does not satisfy me. There should be a graduation of votes consistent with the number of birds owned on June 30, 1964.

Mr. LOVEDAY: I support the amendment and add that the member for Murray has been consistent in his attitude on this amendment. He has shown that his main concern is in preserving the interests of the man making a living from producing eggs. The Minister in his rejoinder said that it was inconsistent with the policy of the Labor Party. If the Minister analysed the reason for our attitude on plural voting or on the card vote, he would realize that our policy in these matters turns on the analysis for the reasons for which the particular policies are applied. We are against plural voting when it represents wealth as opposed to the vote of one person who is not so wealthy. This is not the case here. We anticipate giving a man extra voting power because poultry production is his living, as opposed

to the vote of a man who does it as a sideline, and not a substantial sideline.

Mr. Freebairn: How many full-time poultry farmers are there in South Australia?

Mr. LOVEDAY: I cannot give the figures. Can you?

Mr. Freebairn: Yes, no more than 200 or 300.

Mr. LOVEDAY: The main consideration should be the protection of the person making a full-time living from this industry. The main objective is stabilization for the man making a living from the industry, therefore his voice in this question should be stronger than that of the person who is in it as a sideline. This is not a departure from our policy at all.

Mr. SHANNON: I cannot let the member for Whyalla get away with that. It is too much of a sophism for him to suggest that features are different in any other form of wealth. He is now trying to blind us with the fact that the fellow who keeps fowls, irrespective of the number, shall not be measured in the sphere of worldly wealth as is the man who keeps sheep or grows wool or produces fruit or any other commodity. The feathered brigade is a peculiar one that does not count for wealth. I have never heard such a peculiar argument, especially from my worthy friend the member for Whyalla who is usually logical. This is obviously to justify what is a departure in this Chamber from his Party's usual practice of one vote one value. I have one or two poultry producers in my district who, under the definition of the member for Whyalla, would qualify as wealthy men.

Mr. BYWATERS: The situation, as clarified by the member for Whyalla, has been grossly misconstrued by the member for Onkaparinga. What the member for Whyalla and I are saying is that this amendment differentiates between full-time and part-time producers. That is the crux of the situation; it is not a matter of multiple voting.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (18).—Messrs. Burdon, Bywaters (teller), Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Riches, Ryan, Frank Walsh, and Fred Walsh.

Noes (18).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman (teller), Coumbe, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall, Harding, Heaslip, Laucke, McAnaney, Millhouse, Sir Baden Pattinson, Mr. Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford, Messrs. Quirke, Shannon, Mrs. Steele, and Mr. Stott.

Pair.—Aye—Mr. Hughes. No—Mr. Nankivell.

The CHAIRMAN: There are 18 Ayes and 18 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I give my vote in favour of the Noes. The question therefore passes in the negative.

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. SHANNON: I have an amendment on file, but I accept the decision of the Committee in this matter.

Clause as amended passed.

Clause 5—"Particulars of scheme to be set out in ballot paper."

Mr. BYWATERS: I move:

After "as" to insert "are agreed upon by" and after "Minister" second occurring to strike out "thinks fit" and insert "and the South Australian Egg Board."

The purpose of the amendment is that, whereas the Minister would have the full right to word the explanation accompanying ballot papers, he should have some help in this matter, namely, from representatives of the Egg Board, because they are the most knowledgeable on this issue. Most honourable members are aware that the board's officers are also C.E.M.A. representatives. It is essential that this matter should not be left to one person, for it could be claimed, unfairly, that the Minister, by preparing this explanation himself, had expressed only his views and was therefore biased. The wording of the statement will certainly influence the poll, and it should therefore be a joint effort by the Minister and those I have mentioned, which would dispel any suggestion that the Minister had been biased in any way. I think the Minister will accept this amendment.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I cannot accept the amendment. I appreciate the sympathy offered by the member for Murray, who very rightly points out that I may be criticized by people in the other States over the conduct of this poll. I can only say that some people in the other States will criticize me in any event. However, it is doubtful whether they would want to hear the truth even if it were put in front of them, and I am not greatly concerned about what they think. The important thing is for me to do the job correctly and forget about what propaganda is put around. After all, it would cut both ways: if it were said that I was being unfair in some way, it could react and people would be inclined to vote against what they thought I wanted. I will set out to make sure that I am giving a fair interpretation of the question and that it is set out as clearly and as simply as possible.

This amendment means that unless agreement were reached between the Minister and the Egg Board on the question to be submitted nothing could happen, and I do not think that would be satisfactory.

Mr. Bywaters: Surely you can reach agreement.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Often agreement cannot be reached on matters such as this. It is much better to put the responsibility where it rightly belongs, namely, on the Minister. Under no circumstances would I consider putting a question to the voters (in this case, the poultry owners) that had not been discussed thoroughly not only with the Egg Board but with the Crown Law authorities. With any poll, it is most important to see that the Crown Law authorities agree that the question is put in a clear form and that the explanation of the scheme is as clear as it possibly can be. Therefore, I would consult a number of authorities, including the State Egg Board, which is established under another Act.

Much anxiety was reported to me at one stage when poultry producers thought that this poll would be handed over to the Egg Board to be run by the board as it desired. I do not criticize the board: I merely point out that whereas some people support the board others always criticize it, and therefore giving responsibility to the board to prescribe the question to be voted upon would inevitably cause some suspicion in some quarters. I think it is better to let the provision stand as it is and allow the suspicion (if people wish to think of it that way) to concern the Minister. No responsible Minister would unfairly influence a poll. The Minister already, by reason of the other provisions of this Bill, has very wide powers indeed, for there are many ways in which he could alter the provisions of the poll. He has the power, in clauses already passed by the Committee, to alter all sorts of conditions without reference to any other person, and, in fact, he is not obliged to arrange a poll at all. Why, in this instance, insert a rider which prescribes that agreement must be reached with some other organization? I do not think it would be wise or in anybody's interest to do that. I hope the honourable member will accept my explanation and not pursue this amendment.

Mr BYWATERS: I think the statement the Minister has just made is the most concise and positive statement he has made in the whole debate. Earlier we were trying to get something definite from him but he would not

give it. However, on this occasion he has said that he intends to consult the Egg Board and the Crown Law authorities, and in the light of that assurance I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Leave granted; amendment withdrawn.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (6 to 8) and title passed.
Bill read a third time and passed.

METROPOLITAN AND EXPORT ABATTOIRS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

BULK HANDLING OF GRAIN ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council with an amendment.

BRANDING OF PIGS BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

PUBLIC SERVICE ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

CITY OF WHYALLA COMMISSION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Minister of Works): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The object of this Bill, which is introduced at the request of the City of Whyalla Commission, is twofold. It is designed to enable the Commission to take appropriate steps to increase the number of wards from three to four and to empower the commission to introduce the system of assessment based upon annual value. Clauses 3 and 4 deal with the first matter and clauses 5 and 6 with the second. Clause 3 will amend section 3 of the principal Act which provides that the city is to be divided into three wards. Clause 3 will, by subclause (b), insert a new subclause (3) into section 3 making applicable to the City of Whyalla the provisions of the Local Government Act relating to the increase in the number of wards with the proviso that the number cannot be increased beyond four. Subclause (a) makes a necessary consequential amendment to section 3 (2).

Clause 4 makes the necessary amendments to section 7 of the principal Act dealing with the membership of the commission. As in the

case of clause 3, clause 4 inserts a new sub-clause (7) in section 7 to provide that, if the number of wards is increased to four, the membership of the commission will be increased to eight with the necessary consequential provision that four are to be elected by ratepayers in the respective wards in accordance with the Local Government Act. Subclauses (a) and (b) of clause 4 make consequential amendments to subclauses (1) and (3) of section 7.

I come now to the system of assessments. At present the principal Act provides that rates in the city shall be assessed on the unimproved land value as provided by Division III of Part X of the Local Government Act. However, the commission has requested that it should be empowered to introduce the alternative scheme under the ordinary provisions of the Local Government Act which, in this case, do not apply, since section 27 of the City of Whyalla Commission Act expressly excludes the commission from the operation of Division IV of Part X of the Local Government Act which enables councils to alter their method of assessment. The alternative scheme (provided for in Division II of Part X of the Local Government Act) would enable the commission to increase its revenue which is necessary if it is to cope effectively with the problems associated with the rapid expansion of the City of Whyalla. The Government has agreed to the commission's request, and this Bill is introduced to give effect thereto.

Clause 5 (b) amends section 26 of the principal Act by adding a new subsection providing for the introduction of the annual value system. Clause 5 (a) makes the necessary consequential amendment to subclause (1) of section 26. Clause 6 amends section 27 of the principal Act by removing the exclusion of the operation of Division IV of Part X of the Local Government Act. As the Bill is of a hybrid nature it was, in accordance with Joint Standing Orders, referred to a Select Committee in another place. The committee recommended passage of the Bill in its present form.

Mr. LOVEDAY (Whyalla): I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill. In dealing with its provisions, I wish to go back briefly to the situation that applied when the Whyalla Town Commission, as it was then, first came into being in 1944. The Whyalla Town Commission Act then provided for three elected commissioners, three Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited appointees, and the appointment of a chairman by the South Australian Government. At that time the town was divided into

three wards, the boundaries of which were set out in the schedule of the Act. Those wards were determined as east, central and west wards, the west ward being determined as a small ward in order to allow for further expansion. That situation was satisfactory for some years, but with the rapid development of the last five or six years in particular, the position has completely changed in regard to these wards.

I shall give the approximate number of ratepayers in the respective wards to indicate how the position has changed. At present there are about 700 ratepayers in east ward, 1,100 in central ward and 3,000 in west ward, and it is in the west ward that all the future expansion must take place. The rate of expansion has increased and this is emphasized by the fact that the building programme for the next two years is estimated to be about 1,200 houses at least, and it could be as high as 1,500 allowing for the houses to be built by the B.H.P. Company and by private builders in addition to those to be built by the Housing Trust. Obviously, the wards are now completely out of balance and will become increasingly so shortly. The proposal is to provide four wards and to readjust boundaries in such a way that the existing east and central wards will be greatly enlarged. Two new wards will be created and the prospective extension will mean extension in three of those four wards. Boundaries may be drawn so that they are clearly defined and move along roads and highways travelling north and south, while at the same time allowing for reasonably even expansion in three of the four wards, so that the future position will be satisfactory for some time.

Turning to the subject of voting, I emphasize that the method of voting to be used in respect of the Whyalla Town Commission, as it was then, was determined at the public meeting that decided what form of local government Whyalla should have. Prior to 1944, when the meeting was held, there was no local government body as such in Whyalla and residents held a meeting at which they had the choice of three alternative forms of local government—a single commissioner, such as exists in Colonel Light Gardens; the ordinary form of council; and the form of commission that was accepted by that meeting as being the most desirable. The meeting also carried a motion that the rating should be on an unimproved land values basis, and that provision was placed in the Act in accordance with the people's wishes. The residents of Whyalla desired that there should

be fewer opportunities for land speculation, because at that time much land could be used for speculative purposes as it was privately owned and open for development. The position is entirely different now. The only land available for development is Crown land, and the opportunities for speculation have diminished so much as to be almost non-existent. Minor opportunities occur but they do not affect the situation, so that it is possible that the attitude of the people will change today when they consider this aspect.

The rating amendments will place the City of Whyalla Commission in the same position as other councils; that is, the method of rating will be optional, depending on a poll of property owners as laid down in the Local Government Act. It has been suggested that the changed form of rating will enable the commission to benefit from its financial operations as businesses will contribute more to the rates. It is claimed that it will be beneficial for the commission to move towards the changeover to the annual rental values system of rating. Whether this is done or not will depend on an analysis of the situation and on a poll of property owners in accordance with the Local Government Act. When this legislation is passed there will be four elected members, three B.H.P. Company appointees, and a chairman appointed by the Government. There is no need to fear that this will not work well, as the chairman's casting vote has been used only rarely in the past. The decision to approach the Government to create a fourth ward (and necessarily the election of a fourth elected member) was a unanimous decision by the commission.

The B.H.P. Company does not object to this move, and, in my opinion, the move will be acceptable to the residents of Whyalla. It will remove criticism that has been levelled at the commission in the past, that it is a local government body that depends on the chairman's casting vote. That criticism has been made even though the casting vote has been used only rarely. This indicates that the commission, despite its constitution, has been able to make decisions after considering all aspects of matters brought before it and that it is not merely a question of three opposed to three. I have no doubt that this change will be for the general good. It will not only solve the problems that have arisen as a result of the out-of-balance situation caused by the development of the city's wards, but it will enable an analysis to be made whether the city should change to a different form of rating. There is no certainty that it will change, but

it will certainly leave the commission in the same position as that of other local government bodies and enable a poll to be taken, if necessary, of the owners of property to make this important decision. I believe the Bill is in the best interests of Whyalla.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

BOOK PURCHASERS PROTECTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

In Committee.

(Continued from October 13. Page 1418.)

Clause 3—“Amendment of principal Act, section 4”—to which Mr. Millhouse had moved the following amendment:

In paragraph (b) to strike out “heavy” and insert “bold”.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON (Minister of Education): Yesterday I asked that progress be reported because I was not sure of the distinction between “bold” and “heavy”. The Parliamentary Draftsman has discussed the matter with the Government Printer, who has expressed the opinion that “bold” is better than “heavy”. Accordingly, I accept the amendment.

Mr. HALL: Does “bold” refer to size or to intensity of the print?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is simply the word used in the printing trade, whereas non-printers use the word “heavy”. It is better that we should use a word that is capable of precise definition in the printing trade, because if this were ever tried out in court it would be easier to get a printer to say specifically whether a print was of bold type or not.

Mr. CLARK: I support the amendment, although a better remedy (if indeed a remedy is needed here) might have been to use a print of a different colour, such as red.

Amendment carried.

Mr. HALL moved:

In paragraph (b) after “bold” to insert “black”.

I agree with the member for Gawler in that we need to be definite here.

Amendment carried.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have another amendment on the file, but I do not press it. I understand from the Parliamentary Draftsman that the Government Printer does not think that the addition of the words “Times Bold”, which is a printing term indicating a type of print, makes any difference.

Clause as amended passed.

Clause 4 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

FLUORIDATION.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham) moved:

That the time for bringing up the Select Committee's report be extended to Wednesday, October 21.

Motion carried.

BULK HANDLING OF GRAIN REGULATION: FEES.

Order of the Day No. 2: Mr. Millhouse to move:

That the regulations under the Bulk Handling of Grain Act, in respect of fees, made on April 2, 1964, and laid on the table of this House on June 10, 1964, be disallowed.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham) moved:

That this Order of the Day be read and discharged.

Order of the Day read and discharged.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.39 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, October 15, at 2 p.m.