

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, October 3, 1972

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

QUESTIONS**EGGS**

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to a question I asked of him on September 26 about producer-agent licences under the Marketing of Eggs Act?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The number of producer-agents at present registered with the South Australian Egg Board is 312. These registered producers are distributed throughout the State. Recorded sales by these agents of the board in 1971-72 amounted to 3,796,639 dozen eggs. The total recorded sales by the board in the same period were equivalent to 13,059,034 dozen eggs.

SOUTH-EAST WATER SUPPLY

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to directing a question to the Chief Secretary, representing the Minister of Development and Mines.

Leave granted.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I understand a centre is being established at Naracoorte to study the hydrology of the South-East, in which everyone is very interested. In all the statements made in connection with this centre, attention has been directed only to the Lower South-East, and particularly Padthaway and the limestone areas south of Padthaway. The area that is worrying many people considerably is the extensive water beds lying north of Bordertown, upon which the whole prosperity of particularly the Pinnaroo, Parilla, Lameroo and Geranium districts is based. In this coming year it is expected that there will be an unusually heavy withdrawal from these beds under threat of drought, and it is vitally important that close watch be kept on them and the water table underlying them because, if anything happens to those beds, it will be tragic and a terrible blow to the State. Serious damage is not likely to occur quickly, but the low rainfall of the area will result in the replenishment rate being very low. Can the Minister say whether it will be possible for the water studies of the Lower South-East to be extended to this very important area?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: May I, before answering the question, be permitted to express

on my own behalf and on behalf of my colleagues our pleasure at seeing the honourable member back with us. We hope that his health will continue to improve and that he will come back to the real fighting fellow that he was. I shall refer the honourable member's question to the Minister of Development and Mines and bring down a reply as soon as practicable.

BRUCELLOSIS

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question about brucellosis?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The Chief Inspector of Stock reports that it is not possible to give even an approximate answer to the first question because, until we know the extent of infection in the beef herds south of Port Augusta, we cannot define a policy for eradication. Until we know the percentage of infected herds and the percentage of infected cattle within the herds, it is not possible to estimate to what extent we must rely on continued vaccination or how many herds could be freed immediately by test and slaughter or other programme or the amount of compensation likely to be involved. The existing programme of voluntary vaccination cost about \$95,000 for 1971-72. The figure for 1972-73 would be about \$100,000, and a further \$55,000 would be required for survey work to determine the incidence in beef herds south of Port Augusta. The compulsory vaccination of all beef or dairy heifers in South Australia, although recommended by the national committee, has not been adopted, because of: (a) the physical problems involved due to distance; (b) the doubtful value of vaccinating heifers in uninfected herds or in herds not at risk; and (c) the funds required. If we were to attempt to vaccinate all heifers in the State on a compulsory basis, we would require at least roughly \$250,000 a year for that area south of Port Augusta, and probably more for the northern pastoral areas. As I have already indicated, certain negotiations are at present being conducted with a view to enabling the programme to continue. I stress what I have said, because there is likely to be a special meeting of the Agricultural Council on Monday week.

SMOKING

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Education.

Leave granted.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: Over the weekend a suggestion was brought to my notice that a room in appropriate schools should be set aside where students could smoke in security and with permission. In view of the sum that the Commonwealth Government is spending throughout Australia at present on an education campaign against smoking by young people, can the Minister say what the position is regarding the provision of rooms for smoking in the schools of this State?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I shall refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring down a reply as soon as possible.

RURAL CO-OPERATIVES

The Hon. L. R. HART: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question about rural co-operatives?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The Chairman of the committee has informed me that his committee's report will be ready for submission to me in approximately six weeks. Incidentally, I mention that the purpose of the inquiry is not to investigate Government-sponsored group buying schemes as a means of achieving discount prices for producers in the purchase of their agricultural requisites. The inquiry is confined strictly to the question of syndicated purchase and operation of farm machinery and equipment by groups of producers as a means of achieving greater productive efficiency in the use of financial and physical resources.

HOSPITAL CONTRIBUTIONS

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to my question of September 12 about hospital contributions?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: For several years, the contribution of each metropolitan local governing body has been limited to three per cent of its individual rate revenue for the previous financial year. In the case of the St. Peters council the contribution of \$6,273 determined for 1972-73 is certainly \$591, or 10 per cent, more than that of \$5,682 for the previous year, but this increase of \$591 is only three per cent of the increase of \$19,701 in rate revenue for 1971-72, compared to 1970-71. If the rate revenue for 1972-73 is again higher than that for the previous year, the amount of \$6,273 will obviously be less than three per cent of the rate revenue for the year in which the amount is actually paid.

If the corporation was exempted from contributing towards the maintenance of the Royal

Adelaide Hospital, it "would have more money to spend on local and community health and welfare matters which it believes are more important to the people in its area". It is hardly necessary to point out that the residents of St. Peters are also dependent on the specialized services provided by the Royal Adelaide Hospital (and the Queen Elizabeth Hospital) and it is therefore not considered unreasonable that the corporation should continue to contribute annually three per cent of its previous year's rate revenue towards the maintenance of these services, the amount of \$6,273 for 1972-73 being only a small fraction of the estimated cost of operating those hospitals during 1972-73, namely, the Royal Adelaide Hospital \$20,668,000, and the Queen Elizabeth Hospital \$11,040,000.

WHEAT QUOTAS

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I seek leave to make an explanation prior to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I have read several press reports and have heard on the radio recently that the Minister of Agriculture has said that he believed the time is opportune to remove the wheat quotas that were imposed on wheat farmers in 1969. I wonder whether the Minister has studied the legislation carefully, because I believe that provision is made in the legislation for any year to be declared a non-quota year. If the Minister considers the time is opportune, will he take the necessary action either at Agricultural Council or directly with his own State to declare the next season a non-quota season, because I, too, believe that the time has come for some relaxation of wheat quotas? However, at the same time it may be prudent not to remove wheat quotas completely at this stage.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: We must consider this question sensibly, because when we talk about wheat quotas we must realize that we are talking about wheat quotas throughout Australia; I do not think we can take any State in isolation. The statement I made was to the effect that the Australian Wheatgrowers Federation should look at the situation of the present contracts signed for our wheat, the production over the past few years and future production, as well as wheat for new customers, bearing in mind that the world population is increasing at a tremendous rate. I quoted China, where the population is estimated to be

increasing at the rate of 20,000,000 people a year. It is expected that the population of Indonesia will double before the year 2000. The increased population of all such areas causes me to think that the federation should review the situation to see whether quotas could be lifted for a limited period (I mentioned two years), or to see just where we could be going. At the same time, traditional wheat-growers should be protected if quotas are lifted so that the big combines, which might possibly be able to come in, are controlled in some way. That is a question the federation should investigate very closely. It was touched on lightly on the last occasion at Agricultural Council, but it was not discussed at length. No doubt at the next council meeting it will be one of the major items on the agenda.

RURAL RECONSTRUCTION

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Lands.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: We have all noted the dramatic increase in the price of wool in the past few weeks; I understand that in one day in the previous week the prices rose by 20 per cent. There is a general feeling of confidence about many forms of primary production, and the only matter that will hold back the rising confidence could be drought conditions. This has a direct effect on the rural reconstruction scheme, and it certainly affects what could be regarded as a viable or non-viable property in the terms of the rural reconstruction scheme. Can the Minister say whether any rethinking is taking place regarding viability under the scheme, and under what system is the price of wool a pound established in deciding viability? Is a formula laid down to take into account market conditions at the date the application is lodged, or is it taken over a period of 12 months; finally, is the present lift in conditions in the wool market being taken into account in deciding viability?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I can give a very simple reply and say, "Yes". There have been occasions when I have queried applications that have gone before the Rural Reconstruction Board. That happened as long as 18 months ago. I have pointed out that these applications should be reviewed in the light of the increased wool prices which have been predominant in the past few weeks, and that has been done. I assure the honourable mem-

ber that increased prices are taken into account when applications are reviewed.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Is it necessary for the applicant to re-apply?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Not necessarily.

FRUITGROWING INDUSTRY (ASSISTANCE) BILL

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

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This short Bill is intended to authorize the Government of this State to enter into an agreement with the Government of the Commonwealth to provide certain assistance to the fruitgrowing industry of this State. This agreement is still in the course of negotiation and, although these negotiations have reached an advanced stage, it is desirable that formal authority be given to the Government to enter into the agreement and for the Premier to execute the agreement on behalf of the State. It is also desirable that the Government be given statutory power to do what is necessary to carry out and give effect to the agreement.

In the terms of this Bill, a copy of the agreement will be tabled in this Council as soon as practicable after it is made. I have given a copy of the agreement to the Leader. In summary, the agreement will provide for a scheme of assistance to the fruitgrowing industry by providing a payment to fruitgrowers for each tree they pull out. In this manner, it is hoped that the over-supply of certain fruit that appears endemic in the industry will, to some extent, be controlled. The moneys necessary to make these advances to growers will be provided by the Commonwealth by way of grant. However, this State will, out of its own resources, be required to bear the costs of the administration of the agreement.

I will now deal with the Bill in some detail. Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 makes clear that the application of the Rural Assistance (Special Provisions) Act, 1971-1972, will not be affected by the operation of this Act. Clause 4 provides the definitions necessary for the purposes of this Act. Clause 5 formally authorizes the Government to enter into an agreement of the kind specified in subclause (1) of this clause, and at subclause (3) authorizes the Premier to execute the agreement on behalf of the State.

Clause 6 provides that the Government of the State may do all things necessary, convenient or expedient to carry out or give effect to the agreement and for the Minister to whom the administration of the measure is committed to be the "authority" for the purposes of the agreement. Clause 7 ensures that such moneys as are required for the purposes of giving effect to the measure will, to the extent that they are not available from other sources, be payable out of moneys appropriated by Parliament. Clause 8 establishes a fund in the Treasury to be known as the Fruitgrowing Assistance Fund, and subclauses (2) and (3) provide for payments into and out of the fund. Clause 9 provides a usual exemption from stamp and other duties in respect of documents executed for the purposes of obtaining assistance under the measure. Clause 10 provides that a copy of the agreement and any amendment thereto will be laid on the table of this Council.

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

STATUTES AMENDMENT (VALUATION OF LAND) BILL

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

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 28. Page 1674.)

The Hon. E. K. RUSSACK (Midland): Although I support the second reading of this Bill, I should like to make a few comments. First, I comment upon the impression given that there should be further and greater assistance from the Commonwealth Government; but that Government already gives real financial assistance to South Australia. If one follows the table of statistics from the year 1958-59 to the year 1970-71 in confirmed figures and the estimated figures for 1971-72, one finds that throughout those years South Australia has benefited to a greater degree than have the Eastern States. I ask the Council to bear with me while I quote figures for the financial year 1970-71 and estimates for 1971-72.

In New South Wales in 1970-71 the Commonwealth made available \$142.23 a head of population, in Victoria \$139.28, and in South Australia \$187.22. It was estimated that it would be \$140.31 a head of population in 1971-72 for New South Wales, for Victoria \$137.44, and for South Australia \$191.92. I

would say, therefore, that South Australia is receiving favourable assistance from the Commonwealth Government compared to the Eastern States. Recently, we considered a statement by the Minister of Agriculture in respect of money made available for combating brucellosis in cattle. It bears repeating that the Commonwealth Government is really assisting this industry in South Australia. According to my investigations, in 1970 a fund was established for assisting the fight against this disease, upon which fund each State could draw. South Australia was the State most advanced and ready to receive that assistance compared to other States and, for that reason, although the original agreement was that money be paid on a \$1 for \$1 basis, South Australia received from the Commonwealth 59 per cent of the money used in that field, and contributed 41 per cent. At the beginning of the 1971-72 financial year, the Commonwealth made available about \$4,600,000 for that work—almost 2½ times the amount of money that had been made available in the preceding two years. Because the other States had reached a stage where they needed to call upon that fund more than they had in previous years, South Australia was obliged to revert to the rigid principle of the \$1 for \$1 basis. So again the Commonwealth Government has not reduced the amount of money made available: it has made more money available but has insisted on the principle that was first agreed upon when the agreement was initiated.

In round figures and in reviewing the statements of receipts and expenditures in South Australia, we find that in 1970-71 it was estimated that \$61,600,000 would be received in taxation, but in fact \$58,700,000 was received. In 1971-72 the estimate was \$91,000,000, whereas the actual receipts were \$92,000,000. I realize that, in this extra \$30,000,000, pay-roll tax was involved, which came under State administration, and \$24,000,000 was received as pay-roll tax. If we deduct that from the \$30,000,000, we find there was an increase of \$6,000,000 at least in revenue that year.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: The important point there is the fact that the Commonwealth contributions were still maintained at their same growth rate, even though pay-roll tax was levied by the State.

The Hon. E. K. RUSSACK: Yes; at that time I think the understanding was that the pay-roll tax would be collected by the States.

There would have been some readjustment but, despite that, the Commonwealth has maintained its increased contributions to State moneys. The estimated receipts for 1970-71 in connection with other departmental fees and recoveries amounted to \$38,900,000, whereas the figure for 1971-72 was \$44,522,909. The actual receipts for that year amounted to \$45,650,547, and the estimate for 1972-73 is \$50,981,581. So we find that each year there is a steep increase in taxation receipts in this State.

In connection with the Motor Vehicles Department, the estimated receipts for 1971-72 amounted to \$19,500,000, whereas for 1972-73 the figure is \$20,600,000—an increase of more than \$1,000,000, resulting from increased registration fees, drivers' licence fees, etc. So, the motorist seems to be a sitting target for taxation and increased motoring fees. In 1971-72 the estimated receipts from stamp duties amounted to \$21,400,000, whereas for 1972-73 the figure is \$25,621,000—an increase of more than \$4,000,000. This is an impost on real estate sales. The figures I have quoted cover assurance and insurance companies' licences, betting ticket tax and totalizator tax. So, there is a definite and steep increase in revenue in those fields.

The estimated increase in receipts from succession duties is \$305,256. This matter has often been raised in this Council. Almost weekly, if not daily, one is confronted with cases involving difficulty, hardship and inability to meet succession duties, yet each year there is an increase in receipts from those duties. The estimated revenue from succession duties in 1972-73 is \$11,000,000, but it is estimated that there will be a decrease in revenue from gift duty.

In making my next comment, I do not mean to condone gift duty, but I believe there is a difference between the principle of gift duty and the principle of succession duties. When a person makes a gift, he is usually putting his affairs in order when he is coming to the end of his active life in the commercial world, whereas succession duties often hit the person who can least afford them, and they place him in an untenable situation. At one time pay-roll tax was administered by the Commonwealth Government; actually, it was a Commonwealth Labor Government that introduced pay-roll tax. It seems very unfair that an employer should have to pay a tax for the privilege of paying wages.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Do you think that the employer passes it on?

The Hon. E. K. RUSSACK: I cannot see that he can pass it on, but I shall come to that point in a moment. The estimated receipts from pay-roll tax have been increased. Of course, when the States took over the administration of pay-roll tax, the rate of that tax was increased. The estimated receipts in South Australia from this source in 1972-73 will be \$34,000,000. There is an increase of \$302,000 in the estimated receipts from land agents' licences, valuers' licences, registration fees, and from publicans' and other licences. Further, receipts from small lottery and dog-racing control licences will be increased by \$26,000 to \$105,000.

Regarding business agents' licences, marine store dealers' licences, moneylenders' licences and secondhand dealers' licences, receipts for 1971-72 were \$18,196, whereas in 1972-73 they are expected to amount to \$87,000—an increase of \$68,804. It is in this area that increases in fees can be passed on to those poor unfortunate people who cannot afford to pay for an article immediately and therefore pay for it by instalments. Another type of person who will suffer is the person who cannot afford a new article and therefore has to buy a secondhand article. So, the increases in licence fees are passed on to the person who can least afford them.

Only yesterday I heard a man say that he had had no idea that a specific licence fee had been steeply increased until he had to pay that fee; he was unaware of the increase because it had been provided for by regulation. I realize that it is necessary and proper for a Government to have regulations, but I believe that regulations should be used, not abused. We could reach a dictatorial situation, where licence fees might be increased purely by regulation and people would know nothing of the increase until they had to pay the new fees. We see the same tendency right through the Treasurer's figures—an escalation of costs and an increase in revenue. This year there will be an increase in taxation alone of about \$15,500,000, although I concede that about \$10,000,000 of that sum is pay-roll tax. So, the taxation levy on the taxpayers in this State in 1972-73 will be increased by almost \$6,000,000, most of which will be obtained from the increase in licence fees.

Many district councils are concerned at the decrease in the debit orders being made available to them. I know that some people, particularly on Yorke Peninsula, are most concerned at the decrease. Although it has been

said that there has been an increase in grants, the debit order procedure in district councils has meant their viability over the years, and many major works are being completed because of this procedure. I point out the concern of local government at the reduction in debit orders. Although it would appear that I am pointing out things of an adverse kind, I realize that the Government must have money to carry out its programme. I appreciate and express my appreciation of some of the things the Government intends doing in social welfare and tourism.

Unfortunately, there is a deficit of \$22,500,000 in the Railways Department. By way of comparison, it may be of interest to know that it costs less to run all the following Government departments than it does to pay the railways deficit: the Agriculture Department costs \$6,900,000 a year; the Lands Department, \$6,000,000; the Public Health Department, \$2,400,000; Parliament, \$1,300,000; and the Marine and Harbors Department, \$4,300,000. These total \$20,900,000, compared to the railways deficit of \$22,500,000. With those few remarks, I support the second reading.

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

DAYLIGHT SAVING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 28. Page 1675.)

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): I support the second reading but, as I said last year, I have some misgivings about some of the effects of daylight saving on certain sections of the community. This view is also shared by the Government, because the Chief Secretary's second reading explanation also referred to some of the matters concerning the effects of daylight saving on certain sections of the community. I am pleased that the Government has considered these matters before extending once again the operation of daylight saving in South Australia. As I understand the position, the Eastern States, with the exception of Queensland (which has decided not to introduce daylight saving), have adopted daylight saving for the coming summer. Therefore, it is necessary that South Australia follow suit, because we would be placed in an extremely difficult position if we did not follow the moves made by Victoria and New South Wales.

These difficulties were enumerated in speeches on the Bill introduced last year, and

in the Chief Secretary's second reading explanation of the Bill this year. The people who will probably be most affected by daylight saving are those engaged in rural industry, particularly on the West Coast, which already has an inbuilt daylight saving in natural time. This matter was fully explored in the Bill that was before the Council last year. If honourable members study this matter they will see that the West Coast already has half an hour's daylight saving in its natural time.

The Hon. H. K. Kemp: I think it's one hour.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The honourable member may be correct; nevertheless, the West Coast has an inbuilt daylight saving in its time. I am pleased that the second reading explanation deals with the question of school-children who must make long bus trips to and from school. In some areas, such as the West Coast, long bus trips are involved, and much strain is placed on the children. The Minister of Education, who has considered this question, has made certain announcements. However, this position obtains for only about five weeks at the beginning and for about three weeks at the end of daylight saving.

As one of the most constant complaints I heard about daylight saving last year (and these complaints came from country and city people alike) was in regard to television and radio news services, I am pleased that the Chief Secretary referred to these in his second reading explanation. Although I admit that most such complaints came from people in rural areas, city people also complained. I ask whether requests for altering the times of these news services and other programmes of vital interest to the community could be pursued more vigorously; perhaps a full-scale news service at 8.30 p.m., instead of a short news service, would meet some of these objections.

As I understand it, only two changes are being made to the legislation passed last year. First, daylight saving will no longer terminate on the last Sunday in February but will cease on the first Sunday in March, but I do not think that that makes much difference. The other change is that the legislation now becomes permanent unless repealed, whereas the original Bill provided for a one-year trial period. Daylight saving has been tried and, although there were complaints about it, I believe that most people want it to be continued. It appears that daylight saving will become permanent in the Eastern States, and this would place South Australia in an almost impossible situation if we did not follow suit.

Although I should like to see a continuance of the renewal each year, I believe the legislation should now become permanent on the Statute Book.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE (Northern): I rise to oppose the Bill, as I opposed a similar Bill last year when daylight saving was introduced. In my opinion, our authorities and our politicians, or whoever was responsible, fell down in not trying to reach a point of conciliation between the Eastern States and South Australia and arriving at an arrangement more satisfactory than the present one, which sees the time in part of South Australia an hour behind that of the Eastern States, which insist on a further hour of daylight. Standard time was adopted at a world conference in 1884, and 24 zones, extending over 15 degrees of longitude, were set. In Australia prior to 1895 the official time adopted in the several colonies was, for the most part, the mean solar time of the capital city of each colony. In November, 1892, a conference of surveyors in Melbourne suggested that Australia should be divided into three time zones, and there is no doubt in my mind that those gentlemen were right on the ball. It is a great pity that their findings were not adopted, and then we would not see ourselves in this stupid position of having to work by the sun time of a State 300 miles to the east.

It was suggested at that time that Australia should be divided into three zones, the standard times for which should be respectively the mean solar times of the meridians 120°E., 135°E., and 150°E., thus giving a standard time of eight hours, nine hours, and 10 hours respectively ahead of the universal time, with no half hours involved. It was proposed that the 120°E. zone should cover Western Australia, the 135°E. zone should cover South Australia and the Northern Territory, and the 150°E. zone should cover the Eastern States. The meridian of 135°E. passes practically through the middle of South Australia, and there is no reason why we should not be setting our time by a central standard, such as that suggested by the surveyors back in 1892. At present our Central Standard Time is set by the meridian 142° 30'E., which lies somewhere near Warrnambool, in the State of Victoria, and passes through Ouyen, 250 miles east of Adelaide. The 135°E. meridian about which I spoke, and which almost bisects South Australia and the Northern Territory, lies 200 miles to the west of Adelaide.

The main reasons which cause me to oppose this legislation, revolve around the manner in which primary producers and other people living in the country, especially in the western part of the State, are adversely affected. The Government would be well aware of the opposition to daylight saving. Practically every responsible organization has submitted a petition; the United Farmers and Graziers Association submitted a petition with 6,000 signatures. I have presented a number of petitions in this Chamber, and most country members of Parliament have also presented petitions imploring the Government not to proceed once again with daylight saving. The reasons are easy to follow. The difficulties of children in outback areas have been given a good deal of prominence. Many of these children travel 80 miles or 90 miles a day and must leave home very early in the morning, returning in the afternoon. I know of one small boy who is attending school, in grade 3 this year, and he travels 32 miles on a bus. His mother takes him seven miles to catch that bus. He returns early in the afternoon and quite often is very tired, but it is almost impossible to persuade him that he should go to bed in a fairly warm house during the heat of the afternoon. The western parts of South Australia already suffer the inconvenience of being half an hour behind Adelaide time and one hour behind the time in the Eastern States, but now they are to be put further back. There is no justification for this move except that, in my mind, our negotiators were so weak that they did not stand out for the good of South Australia and the proper rights they should have upheld.

I can understand very well that it is most convenient for business people to have the time altered to suit them in their negotiations with people in the East. I understand, too, that many people in our work force appreciate an extra hour of daylight to play some type of sport, but this could have been regulated without compelling people throughout the State to accept a situation which is by no means fair or acceptable. I have stated the case of the schoolchildren, some travelling 90 miles in a day. We hear quite often (and I believe it) that this Government and the previous Government were genuine in their desire to see that schooling throughout the State should be made equally available to all children, but very little thought has been given to this in the introduction of this hour of daylight saving. Most of the activities of the farmer revolve around the school time of the children, and business away

from the farm is usually regulated so that at least one parent is home when the child returns on the school bus, although quite often it is most inconvenient to arrange matters in this way. No matter what this Government says, no matter what is said by the Governments of Victoria and New South Wales, they will not alter the time and they will not alter farm hours. It is not unlike the situation, although it is the reverse case, where King Canute had the good sense to explain to his followers that he could not control the waves; politicians have come a long way since that time, and they are now able to set up some sort of legislation that will regulate the hours of the sun.

The Minister in his second reading explanation made several remarks on which it is worth commenting. He said that before introducing the legislation the Government invited representations from persons and organizations most likely to be affected by the reintroduction of daylight saving. Although that is true, he did not say that these organizations opposed (and, indeed, still opposed) the reintroduction of the legislation. It would have saved much time, therefore, had these interviews not been conducted, since they were not heeded.

The Minister also said it was clear that the community supported daylight saving. I wonder what would have been the result of a referendum on this matter and whether the Government would have had the support it claimed it had if South Australia's population had been given a chance to express its opinion. The Minister also said that a number of adjustments could be made to suit people during the daylight saving period. All participating States had, he said, agreed to alter the times of television and radio news services when daylight saving was in operation. Perhaps this can be done and some will benefit as a result. The Minister continued:

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.

I know that this has not worked very well either, because some places (where the teachers are pleased about the reintroduction of daylight saving but the parents are opposed to it) has agreement with teachers been reached. The Minister also said that representatives of South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited had informed the Government that, although it had been the policy of the State Bulk Grain Handling Authority to approve receivals of

grain in bulk during normal working hours, receival hours were extended before 8 a.m. and after 5 p.m. on weekdays and overtime approved at penalty rates for work done by silo staff. He did not go on to say that these extra overtime costs would have to be borne by the producers, who themselves do not want daylight saving at any price.

The situation in this respect is much different from that in relation to wage rises, when a manufacturer who must meet increased wage costs merely passes his additional costs on to the consumer; the Commonwealth Government then claps its hands because it receives half the rise anyway. The State Government also receives its share, and the union representative gets a pat on the back for his efforts and a salary rise as well. Therefore, the only one who misses out is the fellow doing the work.

The primary producer cannot pass on his extra costs. This is, therefore, an injustice because, no matter how we try to regulate silo receivals, overtime must be paid. For many days during the reaping season many producers cannot commence reaping early in the morning because of moisture content, and silos are, on present standard time, just starting to reach the peak of their intake at about 4 p.m. or 5 p.m. When this aspect is considered, therefore, and if the State harvest is a reasonable one, a considerable sum of money will have to be paid out in overtime to silo workers by primary producers.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Do you think the Minister of Agriculture would receive a deputation along those lines?

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: If the Government was really genuine in its desire to see that everyone got a fair go, it would pay this overtime rate so that impositions would not be placed on only one section of the community. That would be the most acceptable way of handling the situation.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: It would be nothing new for the taxpayers to give the farmers a hand, would it?

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: It will take me only a short time to explain this matter to the honourable member. If he looked back into past statistics and considered the various tariffs to which the primary producer has so largely subscribed and which have protected other industries (and for a long time much wheatgrowers' money, on which no interest was charged, was made available to the Commonwealth Government), he would realize the correct position. He should also consider that payments to wheatgrowers are now lagging by

four years, with growers receiving no interest on the money owing to them. Considering all those matters, the honourable member may find that things have evened out fairly well in relation to subsidies. The honourable member should also consider that, if farmers were paid an average wage for the hours they worked, they would not remain on their properties.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: It wasn't many years ago that none of them did not have a Rolls Royce.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: The honourable member should not get back to that old story.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: The honourable member is obviously against primary producers.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I must not let him put me off the track. I was dealing with my suggestion that the Government should perhaps meet some of these overtime costs. That would be fair and would save one section of the community from having to pay for a time adjustment that it does not want. Dairy-men have complained about daylight saving ever since it was first suggested. They find it hard to convince the cows that they should adjust their habits. Cattle that have become accustomed to the training they have received over the years resent being stirred up in the middle of the day to come in for evening milking. Any suggestions regarding daylight saving do not gain impetus in country areas, especially with the wheatgrowers and dairy-men. The most important consideration of all, of course, is the imposition on children.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: And not only in the country.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: That is so, because many city children spend long hours, sometimes catching two buses, getting from one part of the city to a school in another. These children are also placed at a disadvantage. However, these mainly older children and the whole family do not have to adjust their habits around them. There are parents who have to be home in time to collect their children from the bus, and in many cases they have to take them to catch the bus.

Clause 3 repeals section 6 of the principal Act. I shall oppose this clause as far as I can; I shall attempt to have it amended, because if we repeal section 6, we are then stuck with daylight saving for year after year, which could be done by regulation. Never shall we be able again to negotiate for Greenwich mean time adjusted on the 135° meridian.

That is what we should be aiming for—a sensible approach to a standard time and not bending over backwards to do exactly what is desired of us by the Eastern States. I oppose the Bill.

The Hon. L. R. HART secured the adjournment of the debate.

MARKETING OF EGGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 28. Page 1678.)

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT (Southern): In rising to speak to this Bill, I realize that much of what has already been said in this debate covers the important points. What impresses me is the value of this industry to the country and to the whole community: I understand its value is about \$7,000,000 to South Australia. The industry has been considered, as far as this State is concerned, from the point of view of the domestic intrastate and the export interstate levels and the oversea market. Oversea exports demand refrigeration and a satisfactory method of drying and processing eggs. Dried eggs were a familiar sight to many people some years ago, immediately after the Second World War, and many true stories were told of children complaining when given an ordinary egg: they did not want "one of these things"—they wanted a "real egg"! However, those days have gone as far as "real eggs" are concerned, but not as far as dried eggs are concerned; we are back to the point where, because of the production of shell eggs on the market, there is great competition in Australia for a share in that market. There is strong feeling about the marketing of eggs and how it should be ordered and arranged. That was evident during the early days of the Council of Egg Marketing Authorities, at many of whose meetings there were frequent battles of words as people expressed their views one to the other.

The Hon. Mr. Hart, in speaking to this Bill, produced figures to show that the growers in South Australia had benefited in the past from the producers' levy. Also, previous speakers have referred to the skills and knowledge that the members of the proposed new board will require. I am sure that the three members representing the producers will be well and wisely chosen. Based upon their three electoral districts, they will have experience, knowledge and wisdom in the production side of the industry; they will be very experienced people. The Minister himself has made it clear that he sees the need for the board to involve itself in

all aspects of egg marketing, including perhaps egg processing. It is true that, however good a product may be, it will still fail commercially if it is not properly and well marketed. How will the board ensure that that is done? The power of advertising demands that a product be presented with a good image to the housewife, to the large commercial concern and to the oversea importers and salesmen. If it has not already been asked in this debate, may I ask who on the new board will guarantee that this marketing side of the problem will be well and thoroughly dealt with? The Hon. Mr. Story referred to the importance of watching carefully the operations of egg processing and the careful control required in that respect.

We all know the value of eggs as a source of vital food; that has been proved beyond doubt. However, we tend to forget sometimes how delicate the egg is and how easily it can be damaged. It can be damaged physiologically by being left to get stale. It easily loses its freshness and its pleasant taste. It can also be damaged structurally, sometimes by the lightest of knocks. Either type of damage makes it unmarketable as a shell egg. The Hon. Mr. Story referred to an epidemic that occurred not many years ago in Whyalla (in 1968, I think it was) when there was an outbreak of food poisoning in the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited's mess. An organism passing through dirty shells caused food poisoning to a whole group of people. The bacteria involved in that case were diagnosed as being in the salmonella group. Many types of it are to be found in different sorts of food. The foods in which they are found include eggs, and especially duck eggs, but hen eggs can be involved. The shells of the eggs may have on them dirt and soil, which come into contact with the shell, and the egg may have organisms in it that are sometimes fatal to men's lives. These organisms are of the salmonella group. They pass through the shell of the egg and take up residence inside, which forms a delightful medium for the development of bacteria; there they can multiply. The outbreak that occurred in Whyalla was found to pose certain problems.

First of all, the organism itself did not actually grow to prove which type of salmonella it was, but 38 out of 39 people involved had eaten egg sandwiches prepared in that mess kitchen. Also, other foods had been prepared in the kitchen: for instance, eggs had been used in making cake, again in the same kitchen. Everything pointed to the fact that it was one type of salmonella possibly from

the eggs from a hatchery nearby, and also that one particular type of organism was responsible for the outbreak. Eggs can even be laid in an infected state, if the hen has been affected by salmonella. An egg can be boiled for half an hour, yet still be contaminated by salmonella. Therefore, the whole chain of production needs careful control, because a \$7,000,000 industry could be wrecked overnight by the clearance of one or two eggs containing germs such as salmonella. There is no need to say more, except to echo the Minister's hope that eggs will improve qualitatively and that the prices will be reduced. I hope, but I wonder! I support the Bill.

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

[Sitting suspended from 3.43 to 4.20 p.m.]

LEGAL PRACTITIONERS 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.

It introduces a number of amendments to the Legal Practitioners Act designed to increase the revenues available for the purpose of legal assistance in this State and to facilitate the collection of the contributions that assisted persons are personally liable to make towards the cost of legal assistance. The Bill increases the proportion of the trust moneys to be invested by a practitioner with the society from one-half to two-thirds of his lowest annual trust account balance. This will increase by one-third the investment revenue payable into the Statutory Interest Account maintained by the society. This revenue, after deduction of administrative expenses, is at present divided equally between the Legal Assistance Fund and the Guarantee Fund. It is proposed, however, that all additional revenue should be paid into the Legal Assistance Fund. Accordingly, the Bill provides that the revenues derived from the investment of trust moneys by the society should be divided between the Legal Assistance Fund and the Guarantee Fund in the ratio $\frac{5}{8} : \frac{3}{8}$. As a result of this allocation of revenue, the income of the Guarantee Fund will be maintained at its present level and the Legal Assistance Fund will receive the benefit of the increase in revenue.

The other amendments to the Act enable the society to make an arrangement for legal assistance on terms that the assisted person will

make payments directly to the society. At present the arrangement can be made only on terms requiring the assisted person to make payments to the practitioner assigned to his case. The society hopes that ultimately it will be able to establish a centralized collection agency by which all amounts recoverable from assisted persons (except, perhaps, disbursements and out-of-pocket expenses) may be collected. An ancillary amendment is made to the principal Act relating to the recovery of the society's legal costs in the new debt-collection proceedings that it will undertake. Honourable members are no doubt aware that the society has legal practitioners on its staff. However, it is not convenient for these practitioners to appear on the court records in these new proceedings as solicitors for the plaintiff because the consequent payment of judgment debts to them personally would give rise to a duty to establish separate trust accounts. This would be an unnecessary administrative burden. On the other hand, if no solicitor appears on the court record as solicitor for the plaintiff the society will not, under the ordinary principles, be entitled to recover a proper amount on account of the expense that it incurs in employing legal practitioners on its staff who will in fact have the conduct of the proceedings. The Bill overcomes this problem by providing that the society shall be entitled to recover its costs in all respects as if it had engaged a solicitor to act on its behalf and the name of the solicitor appeared on the court records.

Clauses 1 and 2 of the Bill are formal. Clause 3 makes a drafting amendment to the principal Act. Clause 4 alters the proportion of the moneys held in a legal practitioner's trust account that is to be lodged on deposit with the society from one-half to two-thirds. Clause 5 provides that the revenue obtained from investment of trust moneys under the principal Act is to be divided between the Legal Assistance Fund and the Guarantee Fund in the ratio $\frac{2}{3} : \frac{1}{3}$. Clause 6 amends section 24i of the principal Act to enable the society to make an arrangement for the provision of legal assistance on terms that the assisted person will make all or some of the payments for which he is to be liable to the society. Clause 7 amends section 24j of the principal Act to provide that the costs incurred by the society in proceedings for the recovery of amounts due for legal assistance are to be assessed on the assumption that a legal practitioner has acted for the society in the institution and conduct of the proceedings.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER secured the adjournment of the debate.

HIGHWAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time. This short Bill is intended to deal with two matters. First, it sets out an additional power in the Commissioner of Highways in relation to structural alterations to buildings and land subject to acquisition. Secondly, it provides for an amendment to the principal Act, the Highways Act, 1926-1972, consequential upon the decision, given legislative effect in a recent amendment to the Road Traffic Act, 1961-1971, that will, subject to Ministerial approval, permit certain motor omnibuses, including those of the Metropolitan Tramways Trust, to be used on roads notwithstanding that they do not comply with the requirements of section 144 (1) of the Road Traffic Act, which relates to maximum axle weights. Honourable members may recall that an amendment of this nature was foreshadowed on the introduction of the amendment to the Road Traffic Act. The amendment proposed in this regard is to increase the contribution payable by the Municipal Tramways Trust towards the maintenance of roads.

Clauses 1 and 2 of the Bill are formal. Clause 3 amends section 27b of the principal Act. This section deals with the acquisition of land by the Commissioner of Highways for road-widening purposes. The amendments proposed by this clause are to strike out subsections (6) and (7) and re-enact them in a somewhat extended form. This is effected by paragraph (a) of this clause. Proposed new subsection (6) at paragraph (a) repeats in almost identical words portion of old subsection (6) of section 27a of the principal Act. Proposed new paragraph (b) of this subsection provides that the enhancement of the value of the land subject to acquisition by reason of any alterations, additions or repairs of any building, fence, structure, well, dam or water supply shall not be taken into account for the purposes of determining compensation unless those alterations, additions or repairs have been carried out with the consent of the Commissioner.

Proposed new subsection (7) re-enacts the remaining provisions of old subsection (6) and, in addition, provides that it shall lie upon

the person claiming compensation for alterations, additions or repairs to prove that they were carried out with the consent of the Commissioner. Proposed new subsection (8a) to be inserted by paragraph (b) of this clause sets out the powers of the Commissioner to give his consent to alterations, additions or repairs under this section and also gives the power to the Commissioner to make the consent subject to certain conditions. Clause 4 increases the contributions payable by the Municipal Tramways Trust towards the cost of the maintenance and lighting of certain roads from one-half of one cent for every

kilometre travelled by the trust's omnibuses to .95 of one cent for every kilometre so travelled. This increase in contribution is intended to be some recompense to the Commissioner for the additional wear and tear on roads arising from the use of the heavier buses.

The Hon. C. M. HILL secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.30 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, October 4, at 2.15 p.m.