

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday, September 28, 1972

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (PUBLIC SALARIES) BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the Bill.

QUESTIONS**KALANGADOO HOUSES**

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a brief statement before directing a question to the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I have been informed that six railway houses in Kalangadoo have been recently renovated and sewerred, and since the work has been completed the houses have been condemned and are scheduled for demolition. As there is a demand for rental accommodation in Kalangadoo I ask the Minister whether he will take up the matter with his colleague and furnish a report on the situation regarding these houses.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will ask my colleague for a report and bring it down when it is available.

MEAT CORPORATION BOARD

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Will the Minister of Agriculture indicate the qualifications of the six members of the new Meat Corporation Board, and will there be representatives of primary industry and of the trade union group among those six members?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The whole object of forming any board is that the people on it should have managerial experience. So far, I have not decided on exactly who these members will be. I shall be notifying certain people that I shall be interviewing them in the foreseeable future. Until then, I shall not know who will be on the new board.

STURT HIGHWAY

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to a question I asked him, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, on September 13 about the Sturt Highway?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: National Route No. 20 between Adelaide and Mildura follows the main road through Gawler, Sheoak Log,

Nuriootpa, and Blanchetown. It is proposed to reconstruct portion of this route to by-pass Greenock and Nuriootpa in the near future. The Sturt Highway follows the same route except through the Barossa Valley, where it passes through Lyndoch, Rowland Flat and Tanunda. Now that the main heavy through-traffic follows the national route, it is acknowledged that an anomaly exists in the designation of that portion of the Sturt Highway through the Barossa Valley. It is proposed to undertake a review of the classification of roads throughout the State during 1973, and the naming of Sturt Highway and the scenic route through the Barossa Valley has been included for review in formulating the proposals.

BRUCELLOSIS

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I understand the Minister of Agriculture now has a reply to a question I asked him recently about brucellosis.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Vaccinations in areas that are subject to tuberculin testing contracts (the main livestock areas) will be done by veterinary practitioners, as in the past. The fees charged are generally 75c a head, with higher fees in one or two areas of less concentrated cattle populations. In these areas the vaccination programmes are organized by the practitioners themselves by agreement with the department. In the more sparsely populated areas, such as Upper Eyre Peninsula, the Far West Coast and the northern pastoral areas, which are not served by practising veterinarians, vaccinations are done free of charge by the department when convenient, and in conjunction with other activities, such as tuberculin testing. Owners resident in areas serviced by regular practitioner services should make direct contact with their local practitioner for vaccination, as has been the practice in past years.

WHEAT

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I have information from a fairly authoritative source that the final payment for the 1968-69 wheat pool cannot be expected before 1973. The Minister is aware that most farmers are paying somewhere between 8 per cent and 14 per cent interest on borrowed money. So, the question of overdue payments greatly concerns them. First, will the Minister ascertain from the

Commonwealth authority responsible for the payment whether, in fact, the 1968-69 pool cannot be finalized until 1973? Secondly, will he ascertain the sum owed to wheatgrowers in connection with the various pools since 1968-69?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I shall endeavour to obtain the information for the honourable member.

GRASSHOPPERS

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Because of the growing number of reports of grasshoppers hatching in the northern areas of the State, will the Minister ascertain whether there are adequate supplies of chemicals for spraying the grasshoppers, should they reach plague proportions as has been suggested by some people? If there are adequate supplies of chemicals available for distribution, what advice will the Agriculture Department give to primary producers to help eradicate the grasshoppers if they spread south of the hatching areas?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I have had a discussion with Mr. P. R. Birks, the departmental officer in charge of entomology, who has just returned from a tour of the northern areas. I believe there have been grasshopper hatchings in the Peterborough district. Incidentally, I believe I am one of the culprits: the grasshoppers seem to breed on my property. Actually, there is evidence of grasshoppers right through to Hawker. The latest information is that they are not of the locust variety: they are of the common grasshopper type. Nevertheless, the department is keeping a close watch on the situation. I believe that insecticides are available at strategic points in council areas, as they were last year. Further, I believe that the landholders in the area know how they can obtain those insecticides. Also, spraying machinery can be leased for the purpose of combating the grasshoppers. I assure the honourable member that Mr. Birks has the matter well in hand. If there is anything further to report after I have had more discussions with him, I shall let the honourable member know.

POLLUTION

The Hon. L. R. HART: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Marine.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. R. HART: From time to time we hear reports of pollution of the waters of St. Vincent Gulf, because of the emission of effluent from the Bolivar and Glenelg sewage treatment works. I believe that the Government has agreed to investigate reports that industrial waste is entering the waters of Spencer Gulf and St. Vincent Gulf. Can the Minister say whether the Government will consider setting up a competent committee to investigate whether the discharge of effluent into the waters of St. Vincent Gulf is having a detrimental effect on the areas adjacent to where the discharge is made into the gulf?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague in another place and bring down a reply when it is available.

POLICE REGULATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the House of Assembly without amendment.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (COMMITTEE)

Read a third time and passed.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 27. Page 1608.)

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): In seeking leave to conclude my remarks yesterday I was approaching the point of looking at the total Budget, as it allocated increases to the various departments. This year the Budget follows a similar pattern to that of previous years; that is, important developmental and revenue-producing areas, or departments, have not received a proportionate increase in funds in comparison with the total Budget. I intend turning from there to examining the various areas of expenditure to see where these increases are occurring. Parliamentary Paper No. 7—Estimates of Revenue—at page 4 shows that estimated receipts for the last financial year amounted to \$91,300,000, and that the estimated receipts for 1972-73 from State taxation amount to \$107,800,000. The figure is up by about \$16,400,000 or 18 per cent over the taxation figure for the previous year. The estimated income from public undertakings last year was \$103,264,000, and the estimated receipts this year are shown as \$108,796,000, giving an increase of about \$5,500,000, or 5 per

cent, over the previous year. Other departmental fees and recoveries have gone from \$44,522,000 to almost \$51,000,000, an increase of approximately \$6,000,000, or 15 per cent. In departmental fees and State taxation the increase is about \$23,000,000 in this financial year.

The role of the Commonwealth can be very easily seen in the fact that not only has the Commonwealth undertaken to assume substantial sums of the State public debt, but it has also handed to the State the collection of pay-roll tax, as well as increasing its contribution by reimbursement from \$172,000,000 to more than \$201,000,000, an increase of \$29,300,000, or 17 per cent.

In these three areas—taxation, charges for public works and services, and Commonwealth reimbursement—the total increase available to the State is almost \$15,000,000 in this financial year. In following these increases through, one sees an increase of almost \$1,000,000 in motor vehicle registration fees, drivers' licences, and so on. Honourable members will recall the Bill debated in this Council last year, and debated with some vigour, in which it was pointed out to the Government that, in relation to stamp duties, the Government would gain more from the taxpayer than it had set out in the second reading explanation. That contention is borne out in the figures before the Council today.

If members will recall, the Government stated last year that the total increase in taxation to be collected from increased stamp duties would be \$4,150,000 in a financial year. We pointed out to the Government that the provisions of the Bill would have resulted, in our opinion, in a collection of about \$6,000,000 and, in very strong argument with the House of Assembly, that place accepted some amendments to the Bill which took from the expected collections about \$500,000. In the Estimates of Receipts this year we see that stamp duty (duty payable on various instruments) goes up by more than \$3,500,000, stamp duty on assurance and insurance companies' licences goes up by \$600,000, and the increase in other fields shows that the total increase in stamp duties this year will be about \$4,200,000. So, in the first instance, the Council's contention when the Bill went through has been proved remarkably accurate when we see the figures available at the present time.

There is a fall in gift duties from \$770,000 estimated for last year (and actual receipts of \$833,000) to \$600,000 this year. I would assume that perhaps this is because of changes

in the Commonwealth estate duty legislation, although I am not sure. It appears a considerable fall in gift duty receipts expected for the ensuing 12 months; it is a fall of more than 25 per cent. The estimated receipts from pay-roll tax last year were \$24,200,000, actual receipts totalled \$23,400,000, and estimated receipts for this year are shown as \$34,000,000, an increase of more than 10 per cent.

Continuing to read through Parliamentary Paper No. 7, one sees that in the area of Marine and Harbors the estimated receipts last year were shown at \$7,700,000, actual receipts were approximately \$7,800,000, and estimated receipts for this year have fallen to \$7,200,000. That appears rather a large fall of about \$500,000. Whether the Government is expecting a fall in revenue because of seasonal prospects in relation to the wheat harvest, I do not know, but the estimated fall is quite substantial.

Turning now to page 7 of the same document, the sum transferred to the Railways Department last year to cater for the deficit in railways operations was expected to be \$19,500,000. It is expected that this year that sum will be \$22,500,000, an increase of about \$3,000,000. Surely this continuing drain on the resources of the State in railway losses must cause all Parliamentarians and taxpayers grave concern. The Budget debate is hardly the time or the place to debate the whole question of railways management, but every member will realize that, in providing a rail service in a State such as South Australia so that everyone can receive a reasonable service from a common carrying service, certain losses on some services must be sustained. At the same time, we are burying our heads in the sand if we do not take a realistic view of many economic services that are presently operating.

Almost 5 per cent of the total finance available to this State is swallowed up in meeting Railways Department deficits. I am in no way being critical of the department's employees. A great deal of the problem in providing railway services in South Australia (and, indeed, in Australia) lies with the unrealistic attitude adopted in political decisions made in relation to railway operations. Going back over the Budget in total, one sees that the increase in expenditure this year is expected to be more than 13 per cent. State taxation is rising by 18 per cent, and by comparison we see an increase in railway losses of about 16 per cent. The total State Budget is rising by 13 per cent, and yet railway losses are

increasing by 16 per cent. These figures drive home the point I am making.

In providing the community with a satisfactory transport service we must be prepared to be quite ruthless. If a private enterprise road service on a short haul is more efficient and less costly to the taxpayer, then the railway service must be replaced. The matters that must be taken into consideration are, first, a high standard of service to the community and, secondly, the economic cost to the community to provide that service. Railway operation in this State and in other States (I am not singling out only South Australia) needs an absolutely thorough overhaul with the idea of getting rid of uneconomic services that can be provided in a much better way by some alternative method. Every honourable member would be concerned that each year we see this rapid escalation of funds being made available to meet railway deficits.

I move on to Parliamentary Paper No. 7. Under "Waterworks and Sewers" there is an increase this year in estimated receipts of \$2,700,000—from \$34,500,000 to \$37,200,000. I do not know whether the Government expects any further rise in the cost to the community of sewerage and water services. Now we come to "Community Welfare—Aboriginal reserves: sale of farm produce, etc." Last year it was expected that \$245,000 would be raised from the sale of farm produce on Aboriginal reserves but the actual receipts were under \$200,000. I notice that the estimated receipts for this year are down to \$100,000. Perhaps that may be explained by the fact that some of these reserves that have been operating for many years (the Point Pearce reserve in particular) have been transferred to the Aboriginal Lands Trust for control and management. Perhaps that is the explanation for this rather dramatic predicted fall in the sale of farm produce from Aboriginal reserves. Would the Chief Secretary mind telling me later whether or not that is correct?

Another line on which I think the Chief Secretary could get some information for me is "Road Safety Purposes—Recoups and sundries", for which last year the estimated receipts were \$178,000 and actual receipts were \$186,000; this year receipts are expected to fall to \$110,000. Once again, I cannot follow the reasoning why there should be a decrease of almost 100 per cent. Several other lines appear under "Public Works and Services and Other Receipts"—for instance, "Motor Vehicles—Sundries", for which the

estimated receipts are \$120,000; "Prices and Consumer Affairs—Sundries", for which the estimated receipts are \$2,500. The Chief Secretary may like to give me some explanation about those two lines. I come now to the Registrar-General's Department, and in particular the line "Fees for registration of transactions of real and personal property". Last year the estimated income was \$750,000 and the actual receipts amounted to \$846,000; this year the estimated receipts are \$1,300,000. I do not know whether this takes into account the increased stamp duty of last year—I do not think it does. I wonder why in this case there is a 60 per cent increase expected in receipts for this line. There may have been (I cannot recall whether there was) an increase in fees last year.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I think that was dealt with on page 12 of Parliamentary Paper No. 7.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I am not sure whether this represents an actual increase in stamp duties or is an increase in fees for the registration of transactions. Is there any variation between the two? I seek an explanation of that.

With those few questions on Parliamentary Paper No. 7, I go now to page 16, where we find that the increase in estimated receipts from State taxation is about \$16,400,000; the increase in Public Undertakings income is \$5,500,000; the increase in the Recoveries of Debt Services income is \$4,800,000 and the increase in the income from Other Departmental Fees and Recoveries is \$6,400,000. The increase in estimated receipts from "Commonwealth" is about \$29,000,000, making a total increase in funds available to the Government this year of about \$62,000,000. One must feel envious of the Government's present position in framing its Budget, because of the change in policy of the Commonwealth Government in respect of State Government matters. Whilst I am not being critical, I envy the State Government its present position.

I turn now to Parliamentary Paper No. 9 "Estimates of Expenditure". I take first the Department of the Premier and of Development, under which for "Publicity and information for industrial promotion" there is a decrease in funds available from the \$57,000 voted last year to the \$37,800 voted this year. It appears that the actual money spent last year was almost \$50,000, and the amount proposed this year is down to \$37,800. I wonder why, when so much publicity has been given to trade promotion and industrial potential.

Also, \$42,000 was voted last year for subsidies towards swimming pools, while this year the amount proposed is \$21,000. Does the Government expect to offer as many subsidies for swimming pools this year or not? That, too, is a big decrease in the money available as subsidies for pools.

I turn now to the line "Australian Mineral Development Laboratories—Contribution towards operating expenses" under the Mines Department. The South Australian Government is, of course, involved in contributions to Australian Mineral Development Laboratories for its operation. Last year \$240,000 was voted, but this year it has dropped to \$200,000. Again, I should like an explanation of that decrease. Under "Mines Department—Miscellaneous" there is a series of lines indicating clearly the change of direction we are taking in our expenditure. Under "Grants and provisions for the performing arts" \$268,000 was voted last year but this year the allocation has been increased to \$419,000. The grant to the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust is to be \$180,000 this year, but nothing was voted last year. The vote for the Industrial Research Institute has been increased from \$20,000 to \$100,000. Under the line "State Film Corporation—Operating expenses", nothing was voted last year, but \$25,000 is proposed to be allocated this year. All these increases under "Miscellaneous" amount to about \$500,000. We can see the steep increase in many of those figures.

I come now to "Prisons Department—Country Gaols" and the line "Keepers, prison officers and matrons", where the amount of \$89,000 voted last year has been increased to \$140,000 for this year. I assume that this allocation has increased so dramatically because of the completion of the Port Augusta gaol. I notice under "Chief Secretary and Minister of Health" several areas where it appears that a policy is being adopted of appointing full-time medical superintendents to hospitals. There has been an increase from \$3,800 to \$16,200 in the provision for salaries at the Port Pirie Hospital of the medical superintendent, pharmacist, radiographer, social worker and therapist. So, it appears that a policy will be adopted of appointing permanent staff to some such positions, and one cannot object to that policy.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It is economically sound to do that.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I realize that. I often think that we do not spend sufficient money on the prevention of disease in the community. The provision for the Public

Health Department has been hovering around the \$2,000,000 mark for a number of years. I sometimes think that we are more intent on the highly emotional aspects of medicine than on preventing disease in the first place. I do not mean to criticize the Government in this connection, but I have noticed for many years that only slight increases have been made in the provision for public health. I believe that a great deal more could be done and spent on public health to the ultimate benefit of the community and of future Budgets. I hope that in future public health will not be pushed into the background, because money spent for that purpose is money well spent.

Probably there is a good explanation for the reduction in the provision for the salary of the Registrar-General of Deeds from \$14,404 to \$7,000. I notice, too, that there is an increase of \$3,000,000 in the transfer towards deficits of the Railways Department. Regarding the provision of \$10,000 for law costs associated with the Kangaroo Island industrial dispute, there could be an interesting debate if one followed that matter right through, particularly in connection with the timing of the announcement that the Government would meet those costs. However, I shall not pursue the point now.

Yesterday I asked the Minister of Agriculture how much money had been appropriated in the last two years from general revenue towards the campaign for eradicating tuberculosis and brucellosis in South Australia. The Minister said that he would obtain a reply for me. Last year \$9,500 was provided for this purpose, and the same sum is provided this year. I believe that most of the money available for eradicating these diseases has come from the Cattle Compensation Fund. While the State has spent \$220,000 and the Commonwealth has provided \$326,000 over the last 2½ years, the Government is appropriating practically nothing from general revenue for this campaign. The great bulk of the money has come from the pockets of the primary producers themselves and from the Commonwealth Government. I feel strongly about this matter, as most honourable members know, following the statements I have recently made.

In the Budget the Government once again intends appropriating only \$9,500 for this purpose out of a total appropriation of \$500,000,000. And the Minister had the temerity to blame the Commonwealth Government for the fact that this scheme would possibly be curtailed as a result of a charge being made for vaccination. My basic point

is not that I mind the Government standing up and saying that it will appropriate only \$9,500 for this programme: the point I object to is the way the Minister tried to shift the blame for the situation on to the Commonwealth Government, which has played its part extremely well in this campaign. This year it has made available a record sum of \$4,600,000 from its general revenue for eradicating tuberculosis and brucellosis in Australia. Yet here in this Budget we see an allocation of only \$9,500.

The provision for the Minister of Marine this year is \$4,500,000, compared to \$4,600,000 last year. I have investigated this matter very carefully, and I find that the big deviation from last year's figures is in connection with materials, services, machinery, hire and general expenses in operating and maintaining ports. The sum of \$1,400,000 was provided last year, whereas only \$1,200,000 is provided this year. It was clear from the Loan Estimates that less money was appropriated for work on ports and harbours this year than was appropriated last year, and in the Budget we see a reduction in the money available for maintenance of ports. I hope that this does not affect the work that must be done on many smaller ports that are used by fishing fleets; I have a grave suspicion that that work will be affected.

This is an area where increased expenditure is needed. The fishing industry is one of our growing productive industries, and I believe that the Government should be more aware of the need to encourage it. It has developed extremely well in the last 20 years. Regarding the provision of \$100,000 for transport research projects, I do not believe that this item quite covers the matter. If I remember correctly (and the Chief Secretary can correct me if I am wrong) a sum was made available from industry and other sources toward research into transport projects. I do not know how that money has been spent, nor do I know what money has been spent so far, but I believe there has been a significant contribution (I have heard an amount of \$25,000 mentioned) from outside industry towards this transport research project. I am not sure of the exact amount of money spent up to the present, but I hope that with the support of outside industry we may get some reasonable transport research projects under way in this State.

I turn now to one area where there is a heavy increase—something like 33 per cent over the last year—and that is in the section dealing with the Minister of Community Wel-

fare. I notice that the Glandore Boys Home has no proposed expenditure this year; I presume that that has now been closed, or is being changed to another location. In addition, no allocation has been provided for the Point Pearce Reserve, and this probably ties in with my previous remarks on the fall in income from the sale of produce from the Aboriginal reserves.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: There were three questions asked, and I will get replies for the honourable member.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Turning now to page 90, dealing with Miscellaneous, under the Minister of Community Welfare, I notice there is an increase of 33 per cent in expenditure on community welfare. Looking through the Miscellaneous group, one can see mention of the Australian Child Care Conference 1972, Boy Scouts Association, Girl Guides Association, Juvenile Delinquency Research Project, Marriage Guidance Council of South Australia, Roselea Children's Home, Save the Children Fund, Service to Youth Council, Society of Sponsors, South Australian Council of Social Service, Whyalla Counselling Centre, Young Men's Christian Association, and so on; yet we do not see for this group of organizations, which have been performing fantastic work in the community for many years, the large increase reflected in the total line for the department. Indeed, I am somewhat perturbed that the grant for the South Australian Council of Social Service is increasing from \$1,500 last year to only \$2,500 this year. I think that that council is performing a most important function in our community, and I believe that the total money required to maintain its high degree of efficiency this year would be about \$7,000. Yet it is to be restricted to \$2,500. It is running a secretariat and paying about one-third of the true cost of its officers at the present time. This is an organization which is performing well in the community, and I am certain it will continue to perform an important function in the future. I am most concerned that the proposed increase is so small.

The same can be said of the Service to Youth Council, another worthwhile organization, and the increase there is from \$6,400 to \$7,200 for the ensuing 12 months. The Miscellaneous section covers all the voluntary organizations that have virtually begun from nothing and gradually built up to a worthwhile position in the community; I believe they are not receiving the increase in grants to which

they are entitled. I think that, if the Government needs to spend more money on community welfare, it would be better to sponsor organizations of this kind than embark on its own projects.

I almost overlooked another important matter, one of a rather wider scope than is contained in any one line in the Budget. Under Lands Department is a line dealing with War Service Land Settlement, and over many years this Council has been pressed in relation to the claims of the zone 5 settlers. While that immediate case is complete, many matters involving soldier settlement are still outstanding and requiring correction. At the present time negotiations are continuing between the Commonwealth and the State for the correction, or the partial correction, of problems existing on Kangaroo Island relating to soldier settlement. Negotiations are proceeding relating to single-unit settlement associated with the original A.M.P. scheme in the South-East.

Although the legal standing of these cases may vary from the original zone 5 case, nevertheless there is an important tie between them. I do not wish to proceed to outline the case for these two groups, because certain progress is being made between the States and the Commonwealth, but I wish to refer to one case which illustrates the difficulty that one person can face in achieving what he believes, and what I believe, to be justice in his situation.

To my mind, this man (whose problem I will present to the Council shortly) has a strong case for some action to correct what appears to me to be an obvious wrong. We know that the zone 5 case is closed, but several settlers were forced to sell before a final decision was made on the zone 5 case between the Commonwealth and the State. Honourable members will recall that a declaration was made by Mr. Justice Bright in which he held that the original rentals, as fixed, were fixed illegally. In other words, there was no basis for these particular rentals to be fixed, and, in negotiations between the Commonwealth and the State, the rentals were reduced to what they were originally.

In the case I now detail, two settlers occupied half of an original estate. One was a Mr. H. L. Watson, and the other a Mr. C. Alford. Mr. Watson's rental was finally fixed in accordance with the recommendations of the Eastick report of late 1963 at \$360. This figure was the provisional one fixed on both leases and the first payment was due on April 1, 1953. Bear that in mind;

both were on the same farm, sharing half each; that is, the same original farm divided into war service leases, each man paying \$360 a year. In both cases, the amount was increased by \$420 to \$780 as from May 1, 1963. This is where Mr. Justice Bright declared that this fixing of rental was illegal, and therefore was not done correctly. It is reasonable to assume that under the Eastick report the rental of \$360 would have applied to both leases, but Mr. Alford sold his block when the rental was \$780 before there was any adjustment to these leases. If the Eastick recommendation and the decision of Mr. Justice Bright had been accepted prior to the Alford sale in 1967, then he would have received considerably more for his property. He sold his property, with a rental of \$780. The rental of the property next door is down to \$360.

The buyer would have capitalized higher rental at 5 per cent and would have paid that much more for it. Indeed, Alford received, in my opinion, \$8,000 less than he was entitled to receive. Having lost this amount initially on the sale, Alford was faced with having to pay a rent increase plus compound interest from May 1, 1963, to April 30, 1968, to enable the transfer to go through. He did this under protest. When he made the sale, he protested. He said he would pay to the department the back rental and compound interest on a rental illegally fixed, but he would do it under protest so that he could sell. He had to sell, because of sickness in his family.

He attempted to make payment by the production of bonds to be lodged with the Crown Law Department, and this would have secured both Alford and the Lands Department, according to the final outcome of the case which was pending. This suggestion was at first accepted, and later rejected. Because the question of rent was and had been for some time *sub judice*, the collection of the increased rent and interest in the manner suggested may have been suspect because of *sub judice* restrictions. The bonding suggestion appeared to be the proper solution.

Alford received several letters from the Director disclaiming any liability regarding the bonding of money paid. At the time the letters were written the rental case was still not settled, in spite of the declaration handed down by Mr. Justice Bright in the Supreme Court late in 1970. Since then, the position has been resolved and a solution satisfactory to both parties has been arrived at, but there is no satisfactory solution for any person who

was forced to sell his land with a very high rental fixed illegally. In view of all these facts it is considered that the negative reply to Alford's request for a refund of money is neither fair nor justified.

To take the matter a step further, I should like to quote one letter written by Mr. Alford and the reply received from the Lands Department. The letter from Mr. Alford to the Director of Lands reads as follows:

Referring to my telephone conversation of 18th instant, I respectfully request that consideration be given to a suggestion which I make regarding the disposal of certain moneys due to your department and the S.E. Drainage Board before the transfer of my property can be effected.

I suggest that the amount of money which constitutes the rental increase and interest thereon, instead of being paid out entirely into revenue, be bonded with the Crown Law Department, to be available either to you, or myself, either wholly or in part, in accordance with the final determination of the court in connection with the "Rental" case which is pending.

Regarding drainage, this is for maintenance only, as we have at present a Local Court ruling on the matter in our favour. I understand that the S.E. Drainage Board has or will be, entering an appeal, and I suggest that this money be bonded in a like manner.

I point out that I am quite willing to pay both the amounts, if legally bound, but I feel that an arrangement along the lines I have suggested would simplify matters should the ruling of the court be given in our favour.

I feel that the suggestion is fair and reasonable and, in view of the unfortunate state of conditions that exists *re* both these matters, I respectfully request that early and favourable consideration be given.

The reply is as follows:

I am forwarding herewith formal consent to the transfer of War Service Perpetual Lease 245 (Sections 177 and 179, hundred of Fox) from Mr. C. T. M. Alford to Mr. L. N. and Mrs. N. Hurst. In letters dated April 21 and 22 last, Mr. Alford stated that in making the payment required by the department to enable consent to be issued, certain amounts were included "under protest", and suggested that these amounts, being portion of the rent and drainage rates, be "bonded" to secure repayment to him in the event of the court proceedings on the general question of rents and drainage rates being decided against the Crown.

I am directed by the Minister of Lands to advise that he cannot accede to those conditions, and that payment made on the 31st ultimo has been accepted unconditionally. However, should the final rents fixed for this and other War Service Perpetual Leases concerned be judged invalid as a result of the litigation now pending in the Supreme Court, consideration will be given to refunding appropriate amounts paid as rent, to those who, in the opinion of the Minister, are fairly entitled to them. This would also apply to drainage

rates. Consent to the transfer has been issued on that understanding.

These people who, through no fault of their own, because of illness, have been forced to sell their war service blocks and move away, also have been forced to pay back rental which was illegally fixed and has since been changed, yet there is no way that this man, being an ordinary person in the community, can get any refund from the department.

The only way out for him is a long and costly legal case which would probably cost \$20,000 or \$30,000 to recoup perhaps \$5,000. This is a case where one man, in my opinion (and anyone who likes to look at the document will see this), has a perfectly fair case for a refund from the Government, yet there is no way in which that can be achieved, no way in which he can afford to take the Government to court, and no way in which the Government will appropriate the money to which he is entitled.

Summing up the whole Budget, I said in the first place that I felt envious of the Government and its position in framing such a Budget, but in that envy I appreciate that the change in relation to the Commonwealth Government over the past two years, a change of policy towards financial matters of the States, has made a very great change in the financial position of all States. I hope that, with the Constitutional Convention which is to take place in the very near future, further changes may be made whereby the original concept of federation can be put into operation, and that the State, in its own right, will be able to provide for community needs in South Australia.

The Hon. E. K. RUSSACK secured the adjournment of the debate.

DAYLIGHT SAVING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary):
I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The effect of this short Bill is to provide, with one minor exception, for the observance of daylight saving in this State on the same basis as it was observed during last summer. Before consideration was given to the question whether or not to provide daylight saving in the forthcoming and ensuing summers, representations were invited from organizations and persons most likely to be affected by the

reintroduction of daylight saving. The Government, having given these representations the careful consideration they merit, has come to the view that on balance a reintroduction of the previous arrangements is justified to the extent that it will be of benefit to a considerable majority of people in the State.

The Government was represented at a Ministerial meeting in Sydney dealing with the reintroduction of daylight saving on an Australia-wide basis. Discussions at this meeting showed that views supporting or opposing the continuation of daylight saving were similar in each State. It was clear that the community at large supported daylight saving and therefore a decision was made by all States, except Queensland, that it should be reintroduced next summer. This decision was made with the realization that some people and organizations would be disadvantaged.

Discussions centred around how best such people and organizations could be assisted in overcoming their difficulties during this period. To this end the South Australian Government subsequently got in touch with a number of organizations and held discussions on possible ways of overcoming the difficulties. For instance, country dwellers relying on a limited news service believe that, during the daylight saving period, the news services are too early. All participating States agreed to contact the media in their respective States recommending that they consider altering the times of their television and radio news services when daylight saving is in operation. As occurred last year, the Minister of Education has again stated that headmasters, with the agreement of the majority of parents and staff, may vary school hours to suit local requirements during periods when daylight saving is in operation.

Complaints were made by farmers last year that daylight saving affected the hours of receipt of grain at silo stations during the harvest period. We discussed this matter with representatives of South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited, who informed us that although it has been the policy of the State Bulk Grain Handling Authority to approve receipts of grain in bulk during normal working hours (8 a.m. to 5 p.m. on weekdays) receipt hours are extended before 8 a.m. and after 5 p.m. on weekdays and overtime approved at penalty rates for work by silo staff on Saturdays when the volume of deliveries warrants such action. The representatives of the co-operative expressed the view that grain growers in this State should have no more difficulty with deliveries

to silos during the harvest period with daylight saving than previously, as the co-operative's policy is to facilitate receipts from growers and, provided there is a sufficient volume of deliveries, silo staff are directed to work extended hours for receipts.

Ministers considered the period of operation of daylight saving and decided that, since the last Sunday in February can be as early as the 22nd of that month, when the benefits of daylight saving are at their peak, the period of daylight saving should be from the last Sunday in October to the first Sunday in March, thus extending by one week the period during which daylight saving will be observed. This alteration means that the period of daylight saving is uniform between the States involved.

The Bill now before the Council was prepared after taking all the foregoing matters into consideration and bearing in mind that, if the proposed action was not taken, the time difference between South Australia and the major Eastern States during the daylight saving period would be 1½ hours. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 3 of the principal Act, this being the section that provides for a period of daylight saving to be observed in the summer. The amendment proposed is to substitute for the last Sunday in February the first Sunday in March because the last Sunday in February can be as early as the 22nd, that time being when the benefits of daylight saving are at their peak. The effect of this amendment will be to extend by one week the period during which daylight saving will be observed. The period now proposed is from the last Sunday in October to the first Sunday in March. This amendment ensures that the period of daylight saving is uniform as between the States involved. Clause 3 repeals section 6 of the principal Act, which provided that the Act should expire on October 15, 1972. The effect of this amendment is that a period of daylight saving as set out in the principal Act, as amended, will occur each summer in this State until Parliament determines otherwise.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COUNCIL BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 27. Page 1618.)

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): I rise to conclude my remarks and to say how disappointed I am that the Government has made

no effort to meet the requests made over the last two or three days, and particularly my own request yesterday that the Jordan report be laid before us before this Bill gets into its Committee stage, and certainly before it is passed. There has been no response whatever, as far as I understand. I know that sometimes there are printing and administrative difficulties, but I cannot see why at least one copy of that report could not be made available to the Opposition in this place in order that it might at least know what that committee thinks about this high-powered council to be set up; its decisions will be binding upon the future of the people of this State and its whole development. I find it almost incongruous that the Government should not take the trouble to give us at least one copy of that report, even if only in photostat form, to enable the Opposition to be properly apprised of so important a matter.

At present in Australia we are lagging behind in environmental protection. I mentioned yesterday some of the things that happened and that I observed in California, but more especially, as the Hon. Mr. Hill says, the tremendous amount of work done in the Midlands in Great Britain where, as one looks across the countryside and sees so many chimney stacks, one wonders how the authorities have been so successful in reducing air pollution in that area; but it has been done and I believe that the Jordan report would probably give us some indication that the same sort of thing might happen here. In my opinion, it is little use advertising over the radio and on television that certain days have been declared days when it is dangerous to light an ordinary incinerator in the State. Probably the Jordan report contains more far-reaching information than we know of. I, for one, am not prepared to go through the Committee stage of this Bill without having seen a copy of the Jordan report.

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

MARKETING OF EGGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 27. Page 1620.)

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): Probably much to the amazement of the Minister of Agriculture, I support the Bill though perhaps not for the reasons that he does. This is the type of Bill that I would have liked to introduce when I was Minister of Agriculture. However, I must disagree with the present

Minister on one or two points. Marketing can easily become shockingly disorganized.

I was surprised to see that the Minister had not agreed with the retail traders, who are represented on the present board. Those people are experts in their own sphere. It will be unfortunate if the right person is not picked, because many people in the trade are eager to promote any commodity that comes into their hands, because they know that that is good business. Perhaps the Minister will tell me, in reply, that he will make the necessary appointment when he chooses the three people whom he has the right to appoint; he may say that in that way the ideal person will be found to look after the traders' viewpoint. I do not want to see the committee loaded with deadheads.

I have sufficient confidence in the producers to know that they will select the best three people as their representatives. I am concerned that many people have been deprived of a vote. This is hardly democratic, particularly when one remembers that the Labor Party purports to be democratic. In order to qualify for a vote, a person must have 500 hens, instead of the previous qualification of 250 hens. I cannot see why the qualification should be changed, particularly when we remember that a person must pay a hen levy to the Council of Egg Marketing Authorities if he has 250 hens. In the case of the citrus industry, the qualification for a vote is that a person must have one acre of citrus trees; and, in the case of the dried fruit industry, the qualification is that a person must produce 5cwt. of fruit.

The only sensible way to approach the subject is to have one Act in South Australia dealing with marketing. If we are to become involved with all these boards, we must have some master legislation regulating them in a consistent and uniform manner. The question of whether a person should have a vote should be related to the amount of productivity and to the income derived from that unit, whatever it may be. The nearest approach to this idea occurs in Queensland, where there are marketing boards. New South Wales has moved steadily toward this idea. I have been involved in marketing throughout my adult life. Since 1923 marketing in connection with the dried fruit industry was successful until we ran into difficulties with oversea markets.

In connection with partnerships and proprietary companies, I point out that a man and his two sons, as partners, could own 25,000 birds and get only one vote. However, if a man sets up business under a company name and splits it into five units, he could have five

votes. I do not think this is a good situation, and I have challenged it over many years in connection with co-operatives, many of which have now altered their articles to ensure that partnerships and bodies with company names are provided for. As the Bill stands, it leaves the way wide open for people to get additional votes and additional powers by taking full opportunity of the relevant provisions.

Regarding qualifications for nomination as a condition for election as a member of the board, the first qualification is that the candidate or the firm of which he is the nominee must market through the board or an agent of the board at least 10 dozen eggs for each leviable hen; I do not disagree with that. The reason for that provision is that, under the terms of the present marketing arrangements, it is lawful for a producer to market no eggs at all through the board or only some of his eggs; all or some of his eggs could be sold in another State. It is patently absurd that such a person should be eligible for election to a board that he himself has rejected. This fellow is one of the smartest cookies in the whole of the poultry industry, and what is more, in my experience, that gentleman acquitted himself extremely well.

He brought to the board more expertise (as this word is being used so frequently) than probably anybody else who has been a member. Why not use some of the brains that are available? Just because he does not want to put the whole of his eggs through the board, surely he should not be disqualified, and surely the rest of the poultry industry should not be deprived of his wide knowledge because, as I said, he was one of the smartest cookies in the whole of the poultry industry.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: A little too smart, I think.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: He was not too smart; he got away with it beautifully, and he has not been put in gaol yet. The second qualification is, in effect, that the proposed candidate shall not hold an executive or administrative position in an organization declared by the Minister for the purpose of this section. That is the most absurd bit of legislation I have seen written into a Bill for a very long time. I would have thought that the Minister and the primary producers of this State would wake up after having lately come out of the experience of licking their wounds as a result of the operations of the Citrus Organization Committee. The Government should realize that it should not write into the legislation the wording I have

mentioned. He could be one of the best operators in any one of the four or five different categories of egg production and egg selling, and yet, if the Minister decides that he is a declared person, he cannot take his place upon the board.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: He cannot stand for election.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: That is so. What is more, if the Minister is consistent with what he did with the Citrus Organization Committee, it also means he must not have any interests at all in the industry, or that he must be divested of any interests. In this State, irrespective of what anybody may say, we have probably one of the best grading floors and one of the most efficient and up-to-date floors in the whole of Australia. I refer to the Red Comb Association.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: The other two are not so bad.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I referred to the Red Comb Association because, first, it is a co-operative, and people serve on such boards for nothing much more than love. As far as board fees are concerned, they would not buy each member a pasty a week. The situation is that anybody who is willing to give his or her time to an organization such as that would automatically be precluded from becoming a member of the board. That, to me, seems idiotic. The second point I make is that over the years there have been a number of people on the other egg floors, of which I think there are three operating. The great fear that I have (and I am sure others have also) is that we may get down to one grading floor, and that that floor may be in the hands of the board itself. That, to me, would be an absolute and utter tragedy, because I have probably been as closely associated as anybody with the co-operative movement in this State, and unless we have private enterprise or other co-operatives as a yardstick, inefficiency can become so terribly great that people will find themselves in much the same situation as has arisen at Gepps Cross. I am pleased to see that the Minister is taking action to try to clean up that particular mess.

I believe anything that would tend to give a State-owned organization an absolute monopoly, or a near monopoly, would not be in the best interests of the State. I also believe the danger of this organization reaching that situation is a real one, because money will have to be poured into the board by the State if it is to do the processing for all. I am hopeful that that danger will be averted, but I see

that the Minister is shaking his head, which indicates that he does not intend to do this. With the best will in the world, whether he intends to do it or not, he has provided in the legislation sufficient power for this to happen.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: There is nothing wrong with that.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: It is up to Parliament to watch carefully the operations of the Egg Board, particularly in the processing of eggs, which requires careful control. It was not long ago when, through careless processing, an outbreak of salmonella occurred in Whyalla at the Broken Hill Proprietary Company's mess. I will not mention that matter any further because I am sure that the Hon. Mr. Springett will be speaking of it later in the debate when he will probably have much to say about the processing of eggs and the necessity for this to be done with a great deal of care.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: He is a medical doctor and should be well acquainted with it.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: He will know as well as I know that an egg, or rather the shell of an egg, has a very thin membrane, and also that if an egg is pummelled in water impregnated with salmonella germs and with manure and other things, as I have seen done, then the membrane will be penetrated by way of the outer skin. In that way there would occur the very worst build-up of germs; and if the eggs are turned into pulp and kept in tins for a certain time we get one of the best incubation media possible.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: For germs.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes, for salmonella germs; and this has happened. I will not

oppose the measure, but I make these points strongly to the Minister. First, Parliament has to watch this closely, because if the Government starts to pour money into the board as a marketing board, or as a processing firm, and does anything that will upset any of the other good floors in existence at the present time, then I believe that that would be detrimental to the egg industry in South Australia. It would be equally detrimental to the unfortunate housewife who must budget to see that she can get sufficient protein for her children.

A claim has been made (and I do not see how it could be substantiated) that the Minister is acting in that wonderful way of "Hope springs eternal in the human breast" when he says it is hoped that the quality of eggs will be improved and the price reduced. That can be done only if the board itself is willing to fight in open competition and to use every bit of expert knowledge it can get, even to buying a general manager at the sort of price some of the big Rundle Street stores would pay for a general manager. Then it would get along very well, and then, I think, it would be superfluous to have three producer members and three other members. The board fees could be saved and a little bit more could be put into the pocket of the general manager. In that way we would be very much better off. I support the Bill.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 3.57 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, October 3, at 2.15 p.m.