

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, October 17, 1968

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

DISTINGUISHED VISITOR

The SPEAKER: I notice in the gallery His Excellency Mr. Joseph deBruyn, Ambassador for Belgium in Australia. I know it is the unanimous wish of honourable members that His Excellency be accommodated with a seat on the floor of the House, and I invite the honourable Premier and the honourable Leader of the Opposition to introduce our distinguished visitor.

His Excellency Mr. deBruyn was escorted by the Hon. R. S. Hall and the Hon. D. A. Dunstan to a seat on the floor of the house.

QUESTIONS

FESTIVAL HALL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yesterday, the Premier refused to answer questions from this side concerning the proposed festival hall on the ground that these were hypothetical questions. I cannot conceive that the Premier can have looked at the definition of "hypothetical", but can he now say how he proposes a building on any site unless he first knows what he wants to put there and, secondly, what the cost of putting that facility on the particular site is?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: This morning I discussed this matter further with my colleagues so that I could give as much information as possible to the Leader and his Party, because I understand his interest in this matter. In no way do I wish to deprive him of information I may have, and I hope I can help him, to some degree, this afternoon, but I cannot take the matter much further. The Government intends to support the building of a festival hall on the site I have mentioned. My first action, and I hope to be able to take it this afternoon or tomorrow, will be to write to the Lord Mayor asking him whether the City Council approves in principle this venue as the site for a festival hall. If the answer from the council is in the affirmative I will ask the council to arrange for its representatives to meet me and representatives of the Government to discuss any outstanding points that may arise in regard to financing the project—the question of what is to happen to Carclew, the value of the money put into

that property, and several other questions about possible development of the proposed site, which was favourably reported upon by the committee I asked to inquire into this matter. That is as far as I can go at present. Until these questions are settled one by one I think that any further reference to what might happen in the future could possibly prejudice negotiations that have to take place. I hope that, while the Leader may not agree with what I have said, he will at least agree that I have gone about as far as I can go until the conferences have been held and agreements reached. I reiterate that the Government intends to support the building of a festival hall.

Mr. CORCORAN: During his reply, the Premier said that a festival hall (and he emphasized "festival hall") would be built on this site. Will the Premier describe what type of festival hall he has in mind? Is it to be a concert hall, will it have sufficient room to contain the facilities necessary for a performing arts centre and, if it will not, does this mean that he has rejected the DeGaetani report?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I have tried to give as much information as I can to Opposition members. All I can say is that the Government intends at present to support the building of a multi-purpose hall. I do not know how far the honourable member takes his definition of a performing arts centre. Certainly the Government has not closed its mind to the further development of what will be erected.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: There is plenty of land.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Yes, plenty of land is available for additional facilities to be provided. I hope that the design, when settled upon, will be such that future Parliaments will be able to vote further money for the project if they desire additions to be made to develop it, perhaps, as a centre—

Mr. Corcoran: I just want to know whether it will be a concert hall or whether it will be so built that it can contain what is necessary for a performing arts centre.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Certainly the Government does not want to limit development because of the design of the hall. The Government does not want to put up four walls in a square and say that that is the end of what can go on the site. However, if the honourable member is taking the term "performing arts" to the full extent of its meaning, the

Government does not intend to take this course. We are thinking in terms of a centre to serve as well as possible, and plenty of land will be available for future development. I cannot give any more definite information than that until a conference with the City Council is held and each detail is worked out step by step.

Mr. HUDSON: Can the Premier say whether the hall will contain the necessary stage and other facilities to enable opera and ballet performances to be given and drama to be produced?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: When I have the necessary details I will supply them to the honourable member.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It seems from the Premier's replies that he can hardly have read the recommendations made to the Lord Mayor's cultural committee by Sir Robert Helpmann and others, including Mr. DeGaetani. I point out to the Premier that, after an investigation of the needs of venues for performing arts of any kind in South Australia, Mr. DeGaetani recommended that immediate provision was required for a multi-purpose hall consisting of variable seating accommodation and variable acoustics, a co-axial 750-seat theatre, an uncommitted experimental space available for multiple purposes, and a considerable foyer space. Based on costing here and overseas of other facilities, if the hall were simply erected an estimate of cost could be obtained on that seating capacity proposal. However, the Premier so far is apparently not clear about what is intended: whether we are to go ahead with the proposals for meeting South Australia's immediate needs in this area as disclosed in the report, or whether we will have something less than this or something different. Has the Premier accepted the proposal of the DeGaetani report as to the nature at least of the facilities that we need immediately, or has he rejected this and accepted some other proposal?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I have already told the Leader and other members what is proceeding: action is being taken, and the Government has neither accepted nor rejected anything contained in the DeGaetani report. It is going to see what the City Council says.

Mr. Casey: Now we are getting to it.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Do members opposite suggest that we should ask the council for \$1,200,000 and ignore its opinion?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Members opposite are obviously asking these questions in order to gain a little political advantage.

Mr. Corcoran: We want to know.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the honourable Premier is starting to debate the matter. Many questions have been asked by members of the Opposition about the festival hall, which is an important project, and, of course, they are entitled to ask questions. However, I think the Premier, on behalf of the Government, is entitled to reply in his own way. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: There is little more I can add, although I was going to say that the retorts, laughter and noises of derision emanating from members opposite when I said I would consult the City Council are not befitting of the Opposition. What is wrong with asking the council for its opinion?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It's your incompetence.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: It is ridiculous that the Leader and his members should drag this matter into the political mud.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You don't even know what you're asking for.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I have referred to the action already taken by this Government. The previous Government in three years did nothing to get a report, but in the last three months this Government has seen to it that plans for the construction of the hall are well in hand, and we will see this through. The Leader will receive the information he requires if he waits patiently.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! If honourable members do not cease interrupting, I shall have to adjourn the House.

Mr. CORCORAN: In view of the evidence placed before the Lord Mayor's cultural committee on the needs in this area in South Australia, will the Premier be good enough to inform the House exactly what he intends to place before the City Council for negotiation?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: No, I am not prepared to tell the honourable member that. I am prepared to have discussions with the City Council without prejudice, and I will inform the honourable member of the result.

Mr. LAWN: As this Chamber has approved the expenditure of \$500,000 towards the cost of erecting a festival hall, can the Premier

say how this money will be spent: on a concert hall, a festival hall or a dance hall? Is it possible that we will be asked to approve a greater sum for this project? If the Premier cannot answer these questions, will he pass over the whole project to the Minister of Works?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I can understand the honourable member's interest in halls. The Government included this \$500,000 in the Estimates this year in the hope that the project would proceed, and it appears that it will proceed. However, whether or not it will proceed quickly enough for this money to be spent will depend on the negotiations that I have already said will take place. As the Estimates indicate, this sum has been allocated for a festival hall. I think that answers the honourable member's question completely.

CHIRONOMID MIDGES

Mr. ARNOLD: Part of a letter that I have received from the Secretary of the Barmera Community Centre, which handles tourism and publicity for the district of Barmera, states:

The problem of the chironomid midges at Barmera, especially near the foreshore, is at times unbearable to such an extent that people—

referring to tourists—

move on. The midges assemble in millions out of the wind on buildings, caravans, and trees, etc.

As the Agriculture Department has been working in this field, will the Minister of Lands take up this matter with the Minister of Agriculture in a joint effort to try to solve this problem?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I certainly sympathize with the council concerned, and I assure the honourable member that I will try to ascertain whether a solution to the problem can be found. I think I had better discuss this matter with the Minister of Agriculture, because it has not been brought to my notice previously, and as soon as I obtain a statement from the Minister I may be able to help the honourable member further.

MILLICENT BY-ELECTION

Mr. VIRGO: I have asked the Attorney-General questions, the last on July 31, about objections lodged against electors being on the House of Assembly roll for the District of Millicent. Yesterday, in reply to my question of July 31, the Attorney said that the objections had been proceeded with, on information provided by Messrs. Potter and DeGaris, on two

occasions within one day of receiving the information and on a third occasion within two days of receiving it. Being somewhat concerned about the reply, I desire clarification of the Attorney's statement that the Registrar accepted the information in the letters from Messrs. Potter and DeGaris as being sufficient to lead him to believe that the names ought not to be retained on the roll. Will the Attorney say whether he concurs in the Registrar's view, having regard to the fact that objections to over 20 per cent of the names submitted by Messrs. Potter and DeGaris were dismissed by the Registrar and not proceeded with and that many of the objections with which the Registrar did proceed were found to be incorrectly based? Alternatively, does the Attorney-General consider, as many other people do, that Messrs. Potter and DeGaris were goaded into their action on the ground of political expediency in the knowledge that there might be a Millicent by-election and, as such, they might fall within the category of political pimps?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: In the question there are in respect of two members of the Upper House insulting overtones which I reject completely. The short answer to the honourable member's first question is "Yes".

HORMONE SPRAY

Mr. WARDLE: Two weeks ago I referred to the damage that had been caused to glass-house tomatoes and cucumbers in my district as a result, it was believed, of hormone spraying. As I believe that legislation controlling hormone spraying near market garden areas has been introduced in most of the other States, will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Agriculture whether he would consider introducing similar legislation here?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Aerial and ground spraying has been the subject of a number of questions this session. Speaking from memory, I believe my colleague has told me he is investigating this matter, but I am not sure just what he told me the last time I spoke to him on the matter. I will raise with him the possibility of introducing the necessary legislation and also ensure that the honourable member's question is considered.

BUSH FIRES

Mr. CASEY: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to the question concerning bush fire damage which I asked during the debate on the Estimates on October 3? I suggested that the Government should consider imposing a total ban on the lighting of fires in the open throughout the State from November to March.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister of Agriculture states:

Section 65 of the Bush Fires Act empowers the Minister of Agriculture to impose bans on the lighting of fires in the open on days of serious fire risk. The provisions of this section make reference to bans on "the day or days specified in the warning" and, accordingly, imply that the prohibition should be of short duration. In practice, it has been limited in the past to a period of 24 hours. Moreover, I am extremely doubtful whether a complete ban on the lighting of fires in the open for an extended period, as suggested by the honourable member, would be desirable or effective and I am reinforced in this view by the opinions of the Assistant Conservator of Forests and the Director of Emergency Fire Services. At the same time, I take this opportunity to issue a grave warning to the public to exercise extreme care, in view of the vigorous growth this season of inflammable vegetation in practically every part of the State. Seasonal conditions have produced a potentially hazardous situation, and special care will be necessary to prevent serious outbreaks.

GERANIUM SCHOOL

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of October 1 about drainage at the Geranium Area School?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: A drainage bore was constructed at the Geranium Area School in 1965 for the disposal of storm water and roof run-off. The bore is also capable of supplying irrigation water for the school oval. The proposal to use the bore for disposal of septic tank effluent will not jeopardize the town water supply, which is drawn from a bore more than 1,000ft. distant.

WATER RATES

Mr. JENNINGS: I recently received two letters from constituents in a certain part of my district. I do not know why both came from this particular part (perhaps writing to members is contagious). The first letter states:

Six months ago we had our water restricted. We promised to pay so much a week. Unfortunately, the payments got behind. On Wednesday they came out and informed me that payment was due. I left a \$15 post-dated cheque with my son on Friday. They would not accept any money, as they required the whole amount. They took a meter, which has left us with no water since Friday. I rang and offered to pay half the amount (somewhere around \$40). They also refused to accept same. As I have six children and we have a septic tank, I am hoping you will be able to act on my behalf.

I am unable to read part of the other letter I have received because, if I did so, I would identify the person who wrote it. However, part of it states:

I will readily admit that we owe the Engineering and Water Supply Department \$125, but this is due to the fact that my wife was a widow for three to four years before we married.

Apparently this gentleman married a lady without having any knowledge of her financial responsibilities. If I give these letters to him, will the Minister of Works examine them and see what can be done in these two cases? I point out that, in both cases, I have been asked by the Public Health Department to see what can be done. It seems strange that this department should ask a member of Parliament to see what can be done in these cases, for it is another member of Parliament who, as head of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, makes decisions on these matters. Will the Minister try to assist in these cases, and will he make a statement about the general proposition I have put to him?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: If the honourable member gives me the relevant correspondence, I will look into the matter immediately for him on behalf of his constituents. The Engineering and Water Supply Department, like all service departments, faces this problem from time to time, and its policy is to be as sympathetic as possible. When consumers get fairly well behind in paying their accounts, arrangements are often made for them to pay by instalment. Restriction of water supply occurs only after a protracted period of negotiation, the supply being restricted so that water is available for toilet purposes and for washing and cooking but certainly not for other purposes, such as gardening. The supply is cut off completely only as a last resort in exceptional cases. This procedure is administered as sympathetically as possible. I will certainly obtain full information for the honourable member as soon as possible.

STIRLING EAST SCHOOL

Mr. GILES: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about providing a swimming pool at the new Stirling East Primary School?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Further information has come to hand concerning the proposed use of the existing pool and basketball courts on the old site with the result that it has been decided to review the position. In the first place, the Director, Public Buildings Department, has been asked to assess the value of the present pool, after which officers of the Education Department will discuss the whole matter with the school committee.

WALLAROO HOSPITAL

Mr. HUGHES: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about councils' contributions to the Wallaroo Hospital?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Contributions by councils to this hospital for 1968-69 will be as follows:

District Council of Bute	\$ 1,500
Corporation of Kadina	1,200
District Council of Clinton	700
District Council of Port Broughton	300
Corporation of Wallaroo	1,400
Corporation of Moonta	700
District Council of Kadina	1,700
	<hr/>
	\$7,500

GRAIN PRODUCTION

Mr. VENNING: Has the Minister of Lands received from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I asked on October 2 concerning the estimated grain production for the coming year?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister of Agriculture states that an up-to-date official estimate of cereal production is now being compiled, and it is expected that it will be available late this month or early in November. However, it seems that recent rains have further improved harvest prospects, and that the previous record of 100,000,000 bushels of the three main cereals could be exceeded, subject to good finishing rains. As soon as the departmental estimate has been prepared, an announcement will be made.

SUPPLEMENTARY ALLOWANCES

Mr. HURST: In the district that I represent live many age pensioners, some of whom have difficulty in paying rates and other charges that are currently increasing, although the Port Adelaide City Council may remit rates or defer their payment if the pensioner applies. However, many of these people are still paying off house mortgages. For single pensioners the Commonwealth Government provides a supplementary allowance to help pay rent, but that allowance is not paid to a married couple. As many pensioners save the Commonwealth Government considerable expenditure by continuing to live in their own houses, I believe that greater assistance could be given by the Commonwealth Government in certain cases. Will the Minister of Social Welfare ask the Commonwealth Government to amend its policy in respect of supplementary allowances in order to alleviate the position of at least some of these people?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I very much appreciate the suggestion made by the honourable member. I think that a long-standing arrangement has been made by the Commonwealth Government and the New South Wales Government in this respect. However, in all fairness to the Commonwealth Government I point out that this year we are receiving about \$100,000 from the Commonwealth Government as assistance towards our payment of public relief and, as members will now know, this sum is being substantially passed on in the Budget in the form of additional relief payments. However, we are always glad of anything we can get from the Commonwealth Government for matters such as this. I acknowledge the problem to which the honourable member has referred and I have been turning over in my mind a rather different scheme to try to help, but in trying to find a solution to the problem I will bear in mind what he has suggested, and perhaps an approach to the Commonwealth would do no harm.

BORE SEALING

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Premier obtained from the Minister of Mines a reply to the question I asked on October 9 about the new method adopted by the Mines Department of sealing out the top saline waters to prevent their getting into bores?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The method of pressure cementing practised by the Mines Department is not new. It is based on techniques which have been developed in oil-drilling practice over many years, and similar procedures have also been in force in New South Wales for a long time. Pressure cementing, properly engineered, is considered much more effective than the old method of dump-bailing cement around the bottom of the casing, as it is designed to provide a continuous sheath of cement around the whole string of casing right back to the surface, thereby ensuring much greater resistance to corrosion from overlying saline waters. Whilst not completely foolproof, it is considered the best method currently available to ensure long-term protection of good waters, by reducing corrosion and preventing communication of formation fluids. A detailed explanation of the procedures involved is contained in a pamphlet that has been circulated and demonstrated to as many local drillers as possible.

FLUORIDATION

Mr. ALLEN: Steps are at present being taken to enable fluoride to be added to reticulated water supplies in South Australia. The Minister of Works is aware that, as some country people are not connected to a water supply and have to rely mainly on rainwater tanks, they will never benefit from the fluoridation of reticulated water supplies. Will he therefore consider supplying fluoride tablets to country people whose properties are not connected to a reticulated water supply?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: That is a rather interesting suggestion which I should like to examine, and I will in due course give the honourable member a considered reply.

EGGS

Mr. RYAN: Has the Minister of Lands obtained a reply from the Minister of Agriculture to a question I recently asked about whether the present Government intended to retain the Council of Egg Marketing Authorities plan as introduced by the previous Government?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Although I do not have a reply to that question, I point out that the C.E.M.A. plan was introduced as the result of Commonwealth legislation, not State legislation.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister a reply to my question about egg grading?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister of Agriculture states:

The Chairman of the South Australian Egg Board reports that the most recent provision for improving the standard of first quality eggs was an amending regulation operative from April 1, 1968, varying the maximum permissible depth of air cell in first quality eggs from $\frac{1}{16}$ in. to $\frac{3}{16}$ in. This requirement is designed to improve the standard of first quality eggs. The board considers that compliance with the new regulation should have little or no effect on producers, large or small, who practise modern egg-producing methods. The board has no other proposals before it at present for reviewing further the grading classifications.

WATERVALE WATER SUPPLY

Mr. FREEBAIRN: As is the case in the district of the member for Burra (Mr. Allen), some areas in my district do not have a reticulated water supply, and in this respect I refer particularly to Watervale. Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I recently asked about a water scheme for this town?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: As previously reported, investigations are still being undertaken on the proposal to supply water to the Leasingham, Watervale, Penwortham and Seven Hills areas from the Warren trunk main at an estimated cost of \$370,000. A study of alternative possible routes is being made to ensure that the maximum number of property owners benefit from the ultimate scheme. As the routes are modified, the corresponding revenue statements are also being reviewed. Until such time as the best route for the proposed scheme is decided on, it is impracticable to finalize the statements of revenue which will accrue and for the economic feasibility of the scheme to be determined.

PORT PIRIE HOSPITAL

Mr. McKEE: On October 1 last, the Minister of Works promised to obtain for me information in respect of intended improvements and a new children's ward at the Port Pirie Hospital. Can he now give me that information?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: No, although I thought I had told the honourable member privately that I was investigating this proposal to see whether it could be expedited and whether it should be referred to the Public Works Committee. I will obtain an official reply for the honourable member next week.

WILD TURNIP

Mr. EDWARDS: Whilst I was in my district about two weeks ago, I was surprised to see how the wild turnip weed had spread along the side of the railway line between Kimba and Rudall. The rapid spread has taken place only since about the time when bulk wheat was carted, but it is becoming a serious problem in these areas. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport whether something can be done about this serious problem, as the wild turnip does not presently affect the area generally but only that part which borders the railway line, and we do not want this weed to spread through the district?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will certainly bring the matter to the attention of my colleague, and I express, on his behalf, the hope that something can be done about it.

ROSEWORTHY COLLEGE

Mr. RODDA: Can the Minister of Lands tell the House the programme for tomorrow's visit to Roseworthy Agricultural College?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister of Agriculture has given me a statement to the effect that the programme tomorrow will commence at 10 a.m.; at 12 noon

there will be a barbecue lunch; at 1 p.m. there will be a conducted tour of the college; and at 3 p.m. the new building will be officially opened by the Minister of Agriculture.

TRANSPORTATION STUDY

Mr. VIRGO: I have received correspondence from a church organization, part of which states:

We have examined the proposed Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plans and note that we have at least two church properties which will be substantially affected by the proposal.

I have previously asked the Premier questions on this matter of replacement value, but, unfortunately, I have always been told that the Premier will not be fenced in. As a result, I have not received information I have sought. Therefore, I intend to ask him a straight-out question about this case, and I hope that I will get a straight-out reply.

Mr. Lawn: You'll be lucky; you'll have to wait for it.

Mr. McAnaney: Question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. VIRGO: I think the Premier might be a little more co-operative on this subject than he was in regard to the festival hall.

Mr. McAnaney: Question!

Mr. VIRGO: The churches have said—

The SPEAKER: Order! The question must now be asked.

Mr. VIRGO: Will the Premier accede to the request of this church organization to provide a replacement value (not the market value) for these church properties?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: If the honourable member will give me the details surrounding the question, I will give him an answer.

LONDON-SYDNEY RALLY

Mr. CASEY: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about the London-Sydney car rally?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I have ascertained that the London-Sydney marathon is a reliability trial, sponsored by the *London Daily Express* and the *Sydney Daily Telegraph*. An international permit has been granted by the Royal Automobile Club in Britain and approval and collaboration of the sporting authorities in all the countries through which the route passes, has been obtained. In the case of Australia, approval of the Confederation of Australian Motor Sport was sought. Before granting this permission the confederation required to be informed of the proposed route, location of controls, times allowed for

the various sections, and so on. In consequence of the information received from the organizers, the confederation requested that no time limit be set that requires any law of any State to be broken. It has been emphasized that control points must be located so that the general public is not endangered or inconvenienced. Trials and rallies are specifically precluded from being, or containing, any event in which speed is the determinant. They are "tests of reliability, navigation and driving skill" under varying conditions. This is not to say that some individuals may not exceed speed limits but if they do it is at their own risk of prosecution. The Deputy Commissioner of Police has reported that officers in charge of Police Divisions in South Australia have been advised the approximate dates and times the cars will pass through South Australia. The Deputy Commissioner is of the opinion that, unless it is very wet, which is unlikely in December, there is not likely to be any significant damage to the roads used.

Mr. Sheill of Australian Consolidated Press who is organizing the rally has said that he wrote on August 9, 1968, to managers or directors of five stations on the route. Arrangements have been made with three of these for gates to be supervised by their staff and costs reimbursed. Negotiations are still proceeding with the other two but Mr. Sheill believes settlement can be arranged. A sixth station, which was unknown to Mr. Sheill, concurred in arrangements made to supervise gates. In order to ensure that no stations on the route have been missed, a local officer of the Confederation of Australian Motor Sport will contact the land office and then visit the area on October 26 and 27, 1968. In view of this information, I do not think it is necessary to make representations to alter the route proposed. Today I have received a telegram which I believe might add to the information generally available. Addressed to me, it states:

Understand questions being asked regarding complaints by property owners in Flinders Ranges through whose holdings London-Sydney marathon will pass in December. We have personally interviewed all owners and resident managers affected.

Mr. Casey: That is in the Flinders Ranges: I referred to the North-East.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: If the honourable member will allow me, I will finish reading the telegram, which continues:

Understand principal objection is from Mr. Day but he has now been reassured. The marathon is being conducted by *London Daily*

Express and *Daily Telegraph* and will have supervision by senior automobile bodies in Australia. We are fully aware of our responsibilities in maintaining strict control of rally. Please accept assurance that no damage or annoyance will be caused to pastoralists through whose properties rally passes. Best wishes, David McNicoll, Editor in Chief, Australian Consolidated Press, Sydney.

That is all the information that I have been able to get so far, and it seems to be a fairly satisfactory reply although there may still be one or two points not covered. I appreciate the honourable member's co-operation and, if he wants further information, I shall be pleased to get it for him. However, I do not consider it necessary at present to make representations about altering the route.

STUDENT TEACHERS

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I ask leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Yesterday, when speaking in the debate on the motion to disallow the regulation amending the allowance to trainee teachers, I said that the Government would, before the Estimates came up for consideration by Cabinet, appoint a small committee to review the method of distributing allowances. It was reported in the press this morning that representatives of the five teachers colleges would be on the committee. This is incorrect, and I quote from the *Hansard* report of yesterday's debate, including the words I used, as follows:

The Government intends to set up a committee before the Estimates are prepared next year, comprising people like the Under Treasurer and the Auditor-General, who were loud in their criticism of the existing method of allocating allowances, the lack of control over travelling allowances, and the provision of textbooks on loan. Also, there could be a representative of the principals of the five teachers training colleges on the committee. I am not saying positively who will be on the committee, but it will comprise people at that level.

Mr HUDSON: Will you put a student teacher on it?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I do not know. These matters will be considered in due course.

I consider it most important that such an error be immediately corrected so that there is no misunderstanding on a matter of public interest.

The SPEAKER: As Ministerial statements are extremely important and as this matter has received much public attention, may I, as Speaker, ask that the press gallery take note of the Minister's statement.

Mr. RICHES: I assure the Minister that I am seeking information rather than asking a question that might embarrass her. I understood the Minister to say in earlier discussions that the new arrangement as to student teacher allowances would not save the Government any expenditure, and I was particularly interested in that statement. However, yesterday I understood the Minister to say that she could not turn a blind eye to excessive expenditure from year to year on these allowances and cover it by depriving some other branch of the Education Department of much needed funds. Can the Minister reconcile those statements or explain the position to members?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I did, in the course of answering questions and speaking on this matter in the House, direct attention to the fact that the internal lines (and these are not published in detail in the Estimates) showed these allowances as having so much voted for them each year on each particular line. These amounts were exceeded and excess transfer warrants had to be obtained to get money from other lines within the department to meet the excesses of these allowances. They are within the total vote.

Mr. HUDSON: My question refers to the bonding arrangements of the Education Department and the fact that anything that students received by way of travel allowance or from the loan of books to them did not affect the amount of the bond under which they were committed to the department and that, therefore, if they left the department at some time prior to their three years of employment with the department being up, the amount that they had received for either travel or book allowance did not affect the total amount that they had to repay. However, I understand that under the new arrangements the whole \$105 extra that they will receive each year will cause their total commitment to the department to be increased, in circumstances where most of them are worse off, or at least no better off. Will the Minister of Education consider whether the bonding arrangements can be modified so that a further burden is not placed upon the guarantors of those student teachers adversely affected by this change?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I will get a report on the matter.

Mr. RICHES: The Minister did not seem to get the purport of my question. In the earlier discussions I understood the Minister to say that the proposed change in the method

of payment of travel and book allowances would not effect a saving for the Government. Am I to understand now that it will effect a saving for the Government, and that that is one of the reasons for the change?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: It does not effect a saving. The sum for these allowances must be contained within the department's lines. In order to do that, it has been necessary in the last three years to take money from other parts of the department to meet the excesses on these lines.

LIBRARIANS

Mr. FREEBAIN: Yesterday, the Minister of Education, when replying to a question about the number of additional librarians and library staff to be appointed to the various teachers colleges as a result of the revision of the conditions of supplying multiple textbooks next year, said:

Regarding the provision the Minister is making for additional staff to administer the multiple collections, additional professional and ancillary staff for 1968-69 has already been determined. A total of 27 additional professional staff (including three lecturer-librarians) and 13 additional ancillary staff (including four library assistants) will be appointed to teachers colleges from the beginning of 1969.

Will the Minister obtain a breakdown of those figures so that we will know what additional staff will be provided at each teachers college?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Yes.

KIMBA HOUSING

Mr. EDWARDS: The Housing Trust has purchased 8½ acres in or near Kimba, and this land has been subdivided into 35 building allotments. In the 1967-68 Loan Estimates provision was made for the erection of three houses, but no houses were erected during the period. This year provision has been made in the Loan Estimates for the erection of six houses, but the District Council of Kimba wonders whether the building of these houses is being delayed because of lack of a reticulated water supply for Kimba. Can the Minister of Housing say when construction of these houses will be commenced?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The honourable member was good enough to show me the letter that he had received from the District Clerk of the District Council of Kimba (Mr. Sharrad), in which it was suggested that the Housing Trust had not been able to proceed with the housing programme because of the

lack of water supply to the subdivision. This morning I referred the matter to the trust for a report and, as soon as I receive that report, I will let the honourable member have it.

STAMP DUTIES

Mr. CORCORAN: I should appreciate the Treasurer's obtaining for me information (I will give him details) that I have not been able to satisfy myself about from an examination of the Stamp Duties Act and the amending measure now before the House. I ask this question because the Bill is likely to be in Committee soon and the answers given may affect my attitude to it. Can the Treasurer say whether the following will be subject to receipts tax: funds raised by school committees; purchase of books for education purposes; payment of fees and board to private schools; donations and subscriptions to churches; donations and subscriptions to community projects, such as swimming pools and other recreational facilities in the community; and donations and subscriptions to sporting organizations and community clubs?

The SPEAKER: Order! Before the Treasurer replies, I point out that under the Standing Orders the honourable member is asking the Treasurer for an interpretation. However, I do not want to curb the supply of the information if it is important, and I leave the matter to the Treasurer to reply if he so desires.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: This Bill is somewhat involved and I am anxious to help the honourable member in every way. I could probably answer some of the questions the honourable member has raised, but if he will give me the list I will obtain the information for him so that it may be available to him when he is considering the Bill.

TOTALIZATOR AGENCY BOARD

Mr. ALLEN: I have been approached by a constituent of mine regarding Totalizator Agency Board facilities at dog racing meetings in this State. Although he has been told that the T.A.B. turnover on dog racing in Victoria and New South Wales is greater than the turnover on horse racing and trotting in those States, he says this is hard to believe. Will the Premier ask the Chief Secretary whether this information is correct and also obtain the turnover figures in respect of those two States?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will obtain the necessary information.

STATE GOVERNOR

Mr. LAWN: I have previously asked the Premier whether he was prepared to tell the House the name of the nominee for the post of Governor of South Australia. As I understand that the matter has now been finalized and an Australian appointed, will the Premier give the name of the person appointed?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Although I congratulate the honourable member on his persistence, I cannot tell him any more than I told him last time he asked a similar question.

WHYALLA VISIT

Mr. RODDA: For some time discussions have taken place regarding a Parliamentary visit to an important part of the State. Can the Premier say when this visit will take place and the likely programme?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I have received information from the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited that it would welcome a visit by members of Parliament to Whyalla. The thought has crossed my mind that I should have given the local member prior notice of the visit, but I have not done this. However, I assure him that no discourtesy was intended, and the same information would have been available to him as I will give now. I have suggested to the company that the visit could be a Parliamentary visit. The company has suggested that it would like all members of Parliament to be its guests on the visit to Whyalla. If it suits the local member's itinerary, I have suggested Monday, December 2, which could be adjusted if any large section of members could not attend on that date. The visit, a one-day trip to Whyalla by air, would be a good opportunity for members to revisit the district whose praises we often hear sung in this House by the local member. I should be happy to accept the invitation and, unless there is a major objection, December 2 seems to be a suitable date.

WHEAT

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Minister of Lands a reply from his colleague the Minister of Agriculture to my question of September 25 regarding this year's wheat harvest and the storage capacity of silos in the District of Light?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The General Manager of South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited advises that average annual deliveries in the last three-year period in the District of Light have not

reached the total storage capacities of silos constructed by that company. Nevertheless, greater acreages may be sown to wheat in this area in the future, and in anticipation of future needs the company has decided to build during 1969 cell extensions of 330,000-bushel capacity to the Saddleworth silo and another 110,000-bushel capacity silo at Eudunda.

PARLIAMENTARY DRESS

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I address my question to you, Mr. Speaker. A search of Standing Orders and of the works of Erskine May reveals to me that there is no rule either in this House or in the House of Commons regarding members' dress. Since some of us in this House are given not to dressing in the heat of summer as if we were wintering in Switzerland, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, is there any reason why we should not continue that mode and style of summer dress in the House rather than change before we enter the Chamber? If I am right in saying that that is the position under Standing Orders, does this also apply to the newspaper reporters and the *Hansard* reporters in the gallery? The newspaper reporters are allowed by their employers to dress decently and pleasantly in summer garb but, unfortunately, they do not seem to be able to do that in the gallery, and the *Hansard* reporters are required to wear jackets and ties in the gallery when from time to time they have to rush out into the hotter parts of the building and suffer consequent discomfort.

The SPEAKER: I will consult Standing Orders. I thank the Leader of the Opposition for doing his homework on Standing Orders. It is a long time since I have looked into this question, although I remember a rule on the wearing of hats. The reference to general garb widens the general question, particularly as it concerns press and *Hansard* reporters.

MARGARINE

Mr. VIRGO: Will the Minister of Lands ask his colleague the Minister of Agriculture whether the Government is currently considering raising the existing quota on margarine and, if it is, by how much? Will he also ascertain whether the Government is considering imposing further requirements on the makers of margarine as to its colour, packaging, etc.?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will refer the questions to my colleague. Any suggestion the honourable member may make in this regard would be considered.

TWO WELLS PROPERTY

Mr. HURST: A constituent of mine, Mr. F. Clemente, purchased a property near Two Wells (I regret I do not know the exact location) and applied to the Mines Department for permission to sink a well, because he was anxious to develop this property and to occupy and employ some of his boys on it. Permission was refused by the Minister to sink the well and on appeal, taken under the Underground Waters Preservation Act, the Minister's decision was upheld. As the person purchased this property with the express intention of putting his boys on it to do agricultural work, will the Premier ask the Minister of Mines to reconsider the decision if the possible quantity of water required is reviewed, and will he ascertain whether there is any possibility of this person's getting a water supply for that property?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I appreciate the difficulties encountered by this person and his family, because obtaining underground water supplies in the Virginia, Two Wells, and surrounding areas is causing much concern and is becoming more urgent. Many experts in the Mines Department have investigated, and are continuing to investigate, the problem caused by serious over-pumping of underground water in that area, which is why restrictions were imposed. I shall be happy to discuss details of this case with my colleague in order that it may be re-examined.

WATER CHARGES

Mr. RICHES: On page 3 of his report the Auditor-General again draws the Government's attention to the cost of supplying water to the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited at Whyalla and Iron Knob and states that there has been a loss of \$279,000 in 12 months in supplying water to this company. The Auditor-General considered that the time was ripe for discussing the possibility of rearranging the price structure in relation to increasing costs. He pointed out that the price charged to the company scales down from 23.33c a thousand to 20c a thousand gallons. All members recall that this House has just approved an increase in cost to the ordinary user from 25c to 30c. The more water the ordinary consumer uses the higher is the cost, but the more this company uses the lower is the cost. Can the Premier say whether the Government intends to approach the company to seek a review of the charges listed in the agreement, or whether discussions have already taken place? If they

have not, what action does the Government intend to take in view of the Auditor-General's Report?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will obtain a reply for the honourable member.

FISHING LICENCES

Mr. GILES: Has the Minister of Lands received a reply from the Minister of Agriculture to my recent question about the anomaly existing in granting fishing licences in this State?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister of Agriculture states that an Inspector of Fisheries who is currently conducting a survey of fishing conditions in the lower Murray River area has received a complaint from a reach-holder that a person has been "running" nets. The matter was reported to the local police but, apparently, insufficient evidence was available to sustain action under the Fisheries Act or the Police Offences Act. Mere interference with fishing gear is not an offence under the Fisheries Act, but this matter will be considered in conjunction with the drafting of the new Act. If the honourable member cares to furnish further details of the cases he has mentioned, further investigations will be made by the Director of Fisheries and Fauna Conservation.

Mr. CORCORAN: As a number of fishing licences that were endorsed last year are soon to be reviewed, will the Premier say whether he has received any representations from individuals in my district seeking his assistance in having the endorsement of certain licences continued?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I received one representation only this week or last week and several representations previously. I think the inquirers have been satisfied in each case.

ECONOMIC POSITION

Mr. McANANEY: I have been reading a survey of the economic outlook compiled by an independent market—

Mr. Casey: Question!

The SPEAKER: The honourable member must ask his question.

Mr. McANANEY: Is the Premier reassured at the reduction in unemployment figures issued this week, and also by the fact that this—

Mr. Jennings: Question! Question!

Mr. McANANEY: —independent market research has indicated that the growth in retail sales expected in South Australia is 7.3

per cent greater than in any other State, and compares with 5.8 per cent in 1967? Also, is he reassured by this confirmation of the increased confidence in business activity in South Australia?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I express satisfaction at the increase in business activity and particularly at the drop in unemployment figures and the decrease in the number receiving unemployment benefits in South Australia. The State still has the worst figure of unemployment in Australia at 1.3 per cent, and we have a long way to go before we return to anything like the position we once held in comparison with other States. For instance, in 1963-64 more than 18 per cent of the total number of migrants that entered this country came to South Australia, whereas in the last financial year only 3 per cent came to South Australia. This decline which occurred under the previous Government will take some time to remedy. However, the figures are favourable and I hope they will continue to improve.

Mr. HUDSON: In the last few days we have had indications from the Commonwealth Government that a credit squeeze of some magnitude is likely to be imposed. In addition to the announcement of increases in interest rates, the Reserve Bank at the end of last week called in special reserve deposits. As a further credit squeeze imposed by the Commonwealth Government on this State would impinge harshly on our economic position and could well nip in the bud any expansion that may be taking place here, particularly in the motor car industry and the consumer durable industries, which depend so much on the markets in the Eastern States, will the Premier take up this matter with the Prime Minister and the Commonwealth Treasurer and refer to them South Australia's special position and the need on this occasion to avoid the kind of disastrous credit squeeze that was imposed by the Commonwealth Government in 1960?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I have received no indication that a "disastrous credit squeeze", as the honourable member calls it, is to be imposed on the economic community of Australia. I assure him that there is constant communication between the State Government and the Commonwealth Government concerning South Australia's need to retrieve its former economic position. Only last Monday contact was made by an officer representing the South Australian Government with an important Commonwealth Government representative, and this contact is continual. I do not intend to answer a hypothetical question.

Mr. Hudson: It was not hypothetical. An increase in interest rates has already been announced.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I have received no intimation that the disastrous credit squeeze referred to by the honourable member is to be applied. Therefore, I do not intend to answer a question based only on an assumption. Continual contact is being made with the Commonwealth Government with a view to helping South Australia progress. I remind the honourable member that expansion in South Australia is taking place not only in the automotive field: at present I am communicating with a dozen companies, covering a wide variety of activities, concerning their possible expansion in South Australia. In fact, an important announcement will possibly be made next Monday concerning such an industry.

MARION LAND

Mr. VIRGO: On September 24, I asked the Minister of Education a question about vacant land at Marion and apologized for having in an earlier question given the wrong information. As it is now nearly three weeks since the question was asked, and as I have again received correspondence from the constituent concerned expressing alarm that nothing has happened, can the Minister expedite a reply to the question?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I will endeavour to get a reply for the honourable member by next week.

HARBORS ACCOUNTS

Mr. HUDSON: During the Budget debate on October 2, I asked the Minister of Marine a detailed question about the general method of presentation of accounts for the Marine and Harbors Department and the allocation of funds to various items and between Loan and Budget. Has the Minister obtained a reply?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The procedure adopted is the same as in all other departments, including the Public Buildings and Engineering and Water Supply Departments. The Treasury requires all salaries and wages, no matter what the ultimate source of provision, to be included in the Estimates of Expenditure for the information of Parliament. That portion which is to be met from some source other than revenue is extracted in the line "less charged to other accounts". The total is arrived at from the actual estimates of the various functions of Loan, revenue and

deposits. There is no latitude in allocating costs between revenue and Loan as the honourable member has suggested. Debit orders are issued in accordance with a maintenance or capital work as approved and included in the Estimates, and no adjustment can be made between Loan and revenue provisions to cope with excess expenditure in either of these categories. In any one year the Loan programme could be overspent whilst the revenue programme was underspent.

The method of compiling the Estimates is not varied from time to time but the emphasis of work can be and so the figure year for year comparable with \$284,118 in the current Estimates could fluctuate depending on the incidence of capital or maintenance requirements. A marked increase in overall Loan provision of almost \$1,000,000, or 45 per cent over last year's expenditure on Loan works, accounts for the majority of the \$284,118 expected increase in the line "charged to other accounts" for 1968-69. There are no wages in the sections classified as administration, engineering, and traffic on the Expenditure Estimates. These are purely salary lines, some proportion of which is charged to other accounts, including Loan accounts. I hope this information fully answers the honourable member's question.

HOVE CROSSING

Mr. HUDSON: Some time ago I approached the Minister of Roads and Transport regarding alterations that had been made at the Hove crossing and, in particular, regarding the fact that Addison Road had been so rearranged that no right-hand turn was possible from Addison Road into Brighton Road or from Brighton Road into Addison Road. I have received many complaints from residents about this restriction in traffic flow. The Minister, in reply, said that these changes were made because of safety, and I understand that, but he also indicated that, when Brighton Road was reconstructed farther south, a storage lane immediately south of the Hove crossing would be set aside, so that motorists wishing to turn right from Brighton Road into Addison Road would be able to do so. I have looked a couple of times at the traffic flow south of the crossing to the crossing itself, and it seems to me that a sufficient length of Brighton Road has already been reconstructed south of the crossing to permit this storage lane to be set aside immediately, rather than await the complete reconstruction of Brighton Road farther south. Will the Attorney-General raise this

matter with the Minister of Roads and Transport to see whether or not it is possible for the Highways Department to set aside a storage lane on the southern side of the Hove crossing?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes.

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Licensing Act, 1967. Read a first time.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I thank members for their courtesy in allowing me to give the second reading explanation of the Bill today. Before I do that, I wish to refer to a couple of matters. The Government finds it will be necessary to introduce two Licensing Act Amendment Bills during the present session. It was originally intended that the first of these Bills would deal with only two matters, the first of which, foreshadowed by the Treasurer in his Budget speech, raises the licence fee, and the second of which arises from a decision of the Licensing Court a couple of weeks ago on an application by Penfolds Wines Proprietary Limited for a licence. Members will recall that last Thursday I announced that Cabinet had instructed me to include in the other Bill the provision to reduce the legal drinking age from 21 years to 18 years. In the last week there has been a strong and, on the whole, a favourable reaction in the community to this announcement. Upon reflection, there seemed to be no reason why we should wait for the second Bill before introducing this matter.

The second Bill will contain a number of miscellaneous provisions, some of which will be of a complicated and technical nature, and it will probably be a few weeks before that Bill is ready. The drafting of this provision to reduce the age to 18 years is not difficult. I guess all members have their own views on it and it is unlikely that those views will change significantly in the next few weeks. As it seemed to the Government that the sooner this matter was placed before the House the better, it has been decided to insert the provision in this first Bill to give all members an early opportunity to express their views and to make a decision on the matter.

The purpose of the Bill is to make amendments to the Licensing Act, 1967, upon three main subjects. The Bill by no means represents all the amendments that the Government has in mind to make to the Licensing Act (as I have just explained), and it is intended that a second Bill will be introduced some time later this session, designed to correct further anomalies in the Act, and to render its operation more effective. The immediate urgency for the present Bill arises in consequence of a decision by the Licensing Court refusing licences to Penfolds Wines Proprietary Limited, a company that is not incorporated in this State. The court has held that Penfolds is not entitled under the Act to hold any licences in addition to those into which its licences under the old Act were converted in pursuance of the Licensing Act, 1967. The effect of this decision is seriously to impede the ability of Penfolds to carry on business in this State. Consequently the Bill makes an amendment to section 82 of the principal Act designed to remedy this situation. It is thought convenient at the same time to deal with two other matters. First, the Bill increases licence fees from 5 per cent to 6 per cent of the previous year's turnover, an increase that is to take effect from January 1, 1969. Secondly, the Bill reduces the age at which persons may consume liquor upon licensed premises and the age of persons to whom liquor may be sold or supplied in pursuance of licences or permits granted under the Act from 21 years to 18 years.

I do not intend to canvass at length the reasons for the introduction of this measure except to say that, in my view, the time has come to make this change, and I will set forth briefly three reasons why I believe this is the time. First, the trend in the community is to reduce the age at which disabilities on infants (and I use that term in its technical, legal sense as it applies to people under 21 years) are removed. Of course, the Opposition has already introduced, this session, a Bill to make sweeping changes in the law, this matter being one that is covered by that Bill. Secondly, I believe this provision will bring the law substantially into line with the present outlook in the community and, largely, with the present practice in the community. I am influenced to some extent by my own experience of this matter. I remember (and it is now just over 20 years ago—I think I was 17 at the time) that my father took me into the Windsor Castle Hotel, which was on the corner of Franklin Street and Victoria Square.

It was what we knew as the office hotel, Morialta Chambers being part of the same complex of buildings. I remember that, when I was a young articled clerk, I was taken there to have a drink with other members of the staff, and this was regarded as perfectly innocent. Although it was an unlawful act, I do not think it did me any harm and, as the time for prosecution has long since expired, I can make this confession.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: Did you have a soft drink?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I do not know about that, but I am not a heavy drinker and never have been. This is one of my experiences that has influenced my view, and that happened just over 20 years ago. Thirdly, I do not believe that the lowering of the legal age for drinking in hotels will bring with it the evils forecast by some. However, that is all I desire to say on the matter.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: Has it been salutary in Victoria?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I do not know; I do not intend to canvass the situation in other States. All members will have an opportunity during the debate to give their own personal views on the matter.

The provisions of the Bill are as follows: Clause 1 is merely formal. Clause 2 amends section 37 of the principal Act. Paragraph (a) strikes out a proviso from paragraph (a) of section 37 that has now served its purpose, and provides that, if a licence is granted or renewed on or after January 1, 1969, the licence fee shall be increased from 5 per cent to 6 per cent of the previous year's gross turnover. This paragraph of section 37 deals with licences other than those for which specific provision is made in the section. Paragraph (b) makes a corresponding proportionate increase in the fee for a wholesale storekeeper's licence. Paragraph (c) makes a corresponding increase in the fee for a wine licence. Paragraph (d) strikes out paragraph (d) of section 37. This paragraph deals with packet licences and the effect of this amendment will be to bring packet licences under paragraph (a) of section 37. There are very few packet licences at present in force, but it does seem that there is no real justification for making a separate and different provision for packet licence fees. Paragraph (e) makes a corresponding increase in the fee for a brewer's Australian ale licence, and paragraph (f) similarly makes a corresponding increase in the fee for a distiller's storekeeper's licence.

Clause 3 amends subsection (5) of section 65 of the principal Act. This section deals with the granting of a certificate for the supply of liquor by a publican in a booth or building at a fair, military encampment, agricultural exhibition, races, regatta, rowing match, cricket ground, or other place of public or private amusement. Subsection (5) at present provides that a certificate is not to be granted for an amusement held by an association of which the members are or may be of less than 21 years of age. The amendment reduces this age limit to 18 years.

Clause 4 amends section 66 of the principal Act. This section deals with special permits for the supply of consumption of liquor at entertainments to be held on licensed or unlicensed premises. The amendment deals firstly with subsection (10) which at present provides that the holder of a special permit in respect of unlicensed premises shall not supply or permit any person to supply liquor to a person under the age of 21 years. The age limit is again reduced to 18 years. A corresponding amendment is made to subsection (11) which at present provides that a person under the age of 21 years shall not consume liquor during the hours and in the rooms or places specified in the special permit. Subsection (16) is also amended. The section is at present anomalous, in that there is no provision that a person who contravenes its provisions is guilty of an offence. This anomaly is remedied by the amendment.

Clause 5 amends section 82 of the principal Act. First, a new subsection (1a) is inserted after subsection (1) of that section, providing that a company incorporated in the United Kingdom or in any State or Territory of the Commonwealth of Australia and registered in this State that held a licence of any kind under the old Licensing Act, or was carrying on business without a licence pursuant to that Act, shall be entitled to obtain and hold a licence of any kind except a full publican's licence, a limited publican's licence, a retail storekeeper's licence, a wine licence, or a brewer's Australian ale licence. Subsections (5) and (6) of section 82 are struck out. These subsections were transposed uncritically from the old Licensing Act without consideration of the fact that they are really inappropriate in their new context. The matters with which they were intended to deal are now to be incorporated in new subsection (1a) to which I have referred previously.

Clause 6 amends section 89 (1) (h) of the principal Act. This deals with the rules of a club that is to be licensed under the Act. Paragraph (h) at present provides that no person under the age of 21 shall be admitted to full membership of a club, except where the club is primarily devoted to some athletic purpose, in which case no limitation is placed upon the age of membership. The amendment reduces this age limit from 21 years to 18 years.

Clause 7 amends section 137 of the principal Act. This section at present imposes a duty upon a person who is upon licensed premises to state whether he is under the age of 21 years, upon request being made by a member of the Police Force. The amendment requires him to state whether or not he is under the age of 18 years.

Clause 8 amends section 153 of the principal Act. Paragraph (a) strikes out the words "twenty-one" occurring in subsection (1), and paragraph (a) of subsection (2), and paragraph (b) of the clause strikes out paragraph (b) of subsection (2). The effect of these amendments is to permit a licensee to sell or supply liquor to a person above the age of 18 years, and to provide that it is a defence in proceedings for an offence under the section if the person charged proves that he had reasonable cause to believe that the person was of, or above, the age of 18 years. Paragraph (c) of the amending clause amends subsection (3) of the same section. This subsection is anomalous, in that whilst it creates an offence if a person attempts to consume liquor on licensed premises, it is not an offence if he actually consumes it. In its amended form the subsection will provide that any person under the age of 18 years who obtains or attempts to obtain any liquor from any person on licensed premises or consumes any liquor on licensed premises is guilty of an offence.

Clause 9 amends section 154 of the principal Act. The effect of this amendment is that a male person of 18 years or over may be employed to sell or serve liquor in a bar-room or a female person of or above the age of 21 years may sell or serve liquor in a bar-room. Consequently, there is a reduction in the age of male persons who may be employed in this kind of work. That concludes the explanation I have. I have been thinking, while reading it, that I should make one correction to the confession I made a few moments ago. On making a quick calculation, I have realized

that I was just 18 when I first entered a hotel, so if this measure had been law at that time, I would have been within the law.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 16. Page 1955.)

Mr. CASEY (Frome): In 1965, when Labor took over the reins of government in this State, it became apparent that the affairs of the State were not very healthy, because considerable expenditure had been committed by the previous Government.

Mr. McAnaney: Oh?

Mr. CASEY: It is all right for the member for Stirling to show his usual forthrightness in a case like this, when he knows that what has now been said in this Chamber many times is completely true.

Mr. McAnaney: Refer to the Auditor-General's Report.

Mr. CASEY: This State's expenditure was heavily over-committed in 1965. The Government at that time, realizing that more money had to be raised in the form of taxation, acted responsibly. When our Government introduced measures, claiming that the financial position was such that more taxation was warranted, surely if the Opposition was responsible in any way it should have at least admitted the need on that occasion. However, *Hansard* shows that the opposite was the case.

From one point of view, I think it was more a tactical move by members of the Liberal and Country League on that occasion, because they knew that the more publicity they could get and the more criticism they could level at the Government in this House, the more chance they had of knocking the measures out in the Upper House. How effective those tactics proved to be! Any move by the Labor Government was shattered completely, utterly and ruthlessly by the members of the then Opposition.

Mr. McAnaney: It was constructive criticism.

Mr. CASEY: No, it was completely irresponsible. The present Government is now asking the House to vote for something to which its members, when in Opposition, completely disagreed three years ago. The present Treasurer said that the proposals introduced

by the Labor Government in 1965 were bad, because they set back the clock of progress in the commercial world. This is the sort of criticism that was levelled at the measures that were before the House in 1965.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Knowing they got favourable publicity for everything they did.

Mr. CASEY: Yes, because the then members of the Opposition went out of their way prior to the election to say that all the Labor Government could do was to increase taxes. This Bill is the greatest taxation-raising measure that we have had before the House since I have been a member: it means that in a full year (if the measure becomes law) almost \$5,000,000 will be extracted from the public for the Treasury coffers. The Labor Government never introduced a measure as wide as this one. It was a known fact that anything the Labor Government introduced would be watered down in another place, because the whole object of the Opposition in those days was to break the Government financially. Those were the tactics that were used.

Mr. Rodda: That's not correct.

Mr. CASEY: It is. When the member for Victoria spoke on this Bill last evening he did not refer to the Bill or say how it would affect people in general. He did not say there would be difficulty in getting it through the Upper House, because his Party has a majority there.

Mr. McAnaney: That's not true.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. CASEY: I do not think I have ever heard a more stupid interjection than the one just made by the member for Stirling. I suggest he should go back to school and learn to read and think for himself. When speaking on the measure last evening, the member for Stirling said, "I don't like this tax or this way of raising taxation. I have been reprimanded for speaking against this type of legislation in the last Parliament." If he does not like this Bill or believe in this kind of legislation, why does he not vote against it?

Mr. McKee: He hasn't the courage.

Mr. CASEY: Of course he has not the courage, because the members of his Party vote on Party lines and they have no alternative but to do so. The member for Stirling continued by saying, "We have to face facts."

Mr. McAnaney: We're committed to paying for your expenditure.

Mr. CASEY: After the honourable member had talked about extracting about \$5,000,000 from the people of South Australia and had said he did not agree with the tax or the way it was to be imposed, he turned around and said he would support it. That does not make sense to me, and I doubt whether it would make sense to people outside Parliament. I suggest that the honourable member should get his statements accurate when speaking on a Bill of this nature. The Bill is a complicated measure, and the Treasury officials are to be congratulated on preparing the précis that explains the Bill's ramifications. This Bill will be hard to police because there are so many ways in which people can evade payment of this duty. Nevertheless, I think the Treasurer has made allowances for this. While he estimated that the proceeds could amount to about \$5,000,000 a year, they may exceed that sum. The Auditor-General's Reports for the last four or five years show that in respect of stamp duties the increase has not been so marked as the increase will be in the next financial year or the year after that. How can members opposite substantiate their claim that all the Labor Party could do was to increase taxation, when next year's Auditor-General's Report shows a vast increase in stamp duties collected?

The Auditor-General's Report for 1963-64 shows that \$5,666,254 was collected in stamp duties. For 1964-65, the report shows there was an increase of over \$3,000,000; for 1965-66, an increase of just over \$1,000,000; for 1966-67, an increase again of just over \$1,000,000; and for 1967-68, an increase again of just over \$1,000,000. What will the report show next year? How will the Government go to the people and say, "We did not increase taxation to the extent that the Labor Government did"? They will not be able to, because it will be in the Auditor-General's Report, and I hope that the people of South Australia will throw this back at the Government and accuse it of misrepresentation by blaming a Party that did not deserve the criticism it got prior to the election.

The member for Stirling spoke on education, of all matters, saying that the Labor Government did not spend as much money on education as it claimed it had spent, but I have heard the member for Whyalla state facts that proved that the amount of money allocated for education increased under the Labor Government, and he cited specific examples to show how the money had been spent. If the member for

Stirling studies the Auditor-General's Report, under "Education" he will see that the payments increased from \$39,460,580 in 1964 to \$59,059,575 in 1968, so how could the honourable member say that there had been no increase in the expenditure on education under a Labor Government? What a lot of rot! This is the kind of tripe Government members try to dish out to Opposition members whenever the facts are put before them. The member for Stirling continued by saying, "I would like to oppose the Bill and this form of tax, but what would be the alternative?" I think there are several alternatives. The member for Victoria said that the Bill would boost the morale of the Treasurer and that the members of the Government were being criticized for not speaking to the Bill.

Mr. Lawn: He said a few words, but he didn't speak to the Bill.

Mr. CASEY: That is my point. He said:

It has also been said that this Bill hits people who can least afford to pay, but credit must be given to the Treasurer for spreading this tax over the whole community.

Mr. Rodda: That's true.

Mr. CASEY: The honourable member for Victoria went on to say:

We believe in taxing those who earn most.

That statement is completely illogical.

Mr. Rodda: It fits you.

Mr. CASEY: It does not fit me. I did not say it. Despite his expressed belief that this tax should be borne by the people who earned the most, he said he agreed with the Treasurer for spreading the tax over the whole community! He cannot have it both ways: it has to be one way or the other. The member for Victoria continued:

We are all workers and we will all pay according to the circumstances.

I do not know what he meant by that statement. I suppose it depends on one's circumstances, but under the Bill everyone will be taxed. On every motor vehicle, irrespective of its make or type, there will be several payments of tax under this Bill, and that will happen whether Government members realize it or not. The member for Rocky River probably does not realize that when the manufacturers of, say, a Holden or a Chrysler sell the car to a distributor there is, automatically, a stamp or receipt duty, and when the distributor sells the car to a purchaser the stamp duty is applied once again.

Mr. Ryan: It is passed on.

Mr. CASEY: Yes, and from the time the car leaves the manufacturer until it reaches the private owner there have been two taxes.

Mr. Venning: Each party normally pays income tax.

Mr. CASEY: What has that got to do with it? This taxation will increase. Let us not misunderstand the contents of this Bill. No-one will get away with anything under this measure. The green-grocer, the butcher, the baker, and the candlestick maker: everyone pays and no-one is exempt, except for a few categories that appear on the back sheet of the précis compiled by Treasury officials.

Mr. Virgo: What about the friends of the Liberal Party?

Mr. CASEY: Yes, one of the most outstanding exemptions is that of directors' fees. That is a beaut. Was it necessary? The Bill has been introduced and will pass by a majority of one: the Speaker.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Why are directors exempt?

Mr. CASEY: In its wisdom, the Government decided to do this, but this cuts across what the member for Victoria said, and this is what makes it so laughable when Government members make these ridiculous statements. When one considers the Bill one realizes how completely idiotic are these statements. It makes me wonder why some Government members speak in the debates on this sort of measure, because they do not know what they are talking about.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: Often we don't know what you are talking about.

Mr. CASEY: I hope that, on occasions, I can convince the Minister of Works, and I am sorry he was not in the House when the member for Stuart suggested that it was high time the Government re-considered the Broken Hill Proprietary Company's Indenture Act. That company should pay its fair share of water rates the same as other people in the north have to do, and the Minister should consider this matter.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: The Government is saving at the expense of students.

Mr. CASEY: Of course. The whole purpose of this Bill has often been stated in this House, but I am sorry that the new members did not hear what the former Liberal Premier, Sir Thomas Playford, said in this House about a similar measure. He said:

I am not against taxation—

I do not think anyone is against taxation. This has been openly said by all members. We on this side are not against taxation, because we

implemented certain taxation measures when we were in Government but, as I have said previously, the then Opposition rejected them completely. It knew that the Bills would be knocked out in the Upper House and that the increases would not become law. Talk about a democratic system of Parliament in this State! It is a complete and utter mockery. Sir Thomas Playford said—

Mr. Venning: When did he say this?

Mr. CASEY: On November 10, 1965, and the following is reported at page 2736 of *Hansard*:

I am not against taxation—

This was in the debate on a similar measure, and the same circumstances apply today. The member for Rocky River should realize that this was said only three years ago.

Mr. Venning: How many years prior to that did we have a Labor Government?

Mr. CASEY: The member for Rocky River should take heed of Sir Thomas Playford's words, because they were important not only to people in the District of Rocky River but to all South Australians. When the honourable member votes in this Chamber he should remember that he represents not only the District of Rocky River but all the people of South Australia. The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford said:

I have always said that for this State to progress it must keep taxation costs down. I think that Government members consider that it can adopt a principle of levelling down, but the more this is done the lower is the standard of everyone.

True words, and I wholeheartedly agree with them. He continued:

In the last few months—

this was political propaganda— we have seen a drift of industries away from South Australia.

I have seen a marked drift in industries away from South Australia since the Liberal Government has been in power, and at least six, to my knowledge, have left the State.

Mr. Venning: You know that's wrong.

Mr. CASEY: It is not wrong, and I suggest that the honourable member check what I have said and he will find out that it is true. I do not profess to know every one that has left, but I know of a few. I do not speak untruths: what I say is truthful in every respect, and I do not wish to hoodwink anyone. I challenge the member for Rocky River to take time to check whether what I have said is not true: that would be some homework for him to do.

The whole crux of the matter is the fact that, in South Australia, we have to keep our costs as low as possible in order to attract industries to this State. No-one will deny that. It was advocated on many occasions not only by Sir Thomas Playford and the late Mr. Frank Walsh but it has also been advocated by the former Premier—the Leader of the Opposition (Hon. D. A. Dunstan). Every conceivable effort was made to keep taxation in this State as low as possible so that we had more advantages to offer industry that contemplated establishing here. I do not think this measure will improve our position. Transportation costs are our first problem to be considered, and once our level of taxation equals that in other States we shall not be able at all to entice industry into South Australia. This measure will not help one iota.

Mr. McAnaney: That is a different tale from what we heard a couple of years ago.

Mr. CASEY: This measure is totally different from the previous one, and the member for Stirling must know that. The previous measure was nothing compared with this one, which will hit everyone in South Australia. Admittedly, the Bill affects the whole community, but who pays more in the long run? It is the low-wage earner, whose purchasing power will be reduced. In his case, the more money in his pocket the more goods he can buy, but the less money in his pocket the fewer goods he can buy. The present Government seems to have no hesitation in trying to hoodwink the people of this State. During Labor's term of office, members opposite were highly critical of any taxation measure we introduced, and it blasted us at every opportunity, telling us that we were robbing the poor, etc., and that the State would suffer. Members of the then Opposition knew full well that our measures would be watered down in the Upper House, so that we would eventually be faced with large deficits. The story would have been entirely different had our taxation measures been implemented.

Mr. Rodda: They were sectional measures.

Mr. CASEY: When an Upper House is controlled by the Liberal and Country League, politics enter into the picture. It will be interesting to see whether or not the Upper House passes this Bill in its entirety or whether it waters it down as it did the Bill introduced by the Labor Government.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: They like this sort of taxation, because they get out of it.

Mr. CASEY: The purchasing power of those supporting the Government is not diminished at all.

Mr. McAnaney: Oh!

Mr. CASEY: The member for Stirling, who is a brain of an economist, must realize that a person who earns \$40 a week will experience greater hardship in having to pay more for goods than will the man on a salary or running his own business, turning over \$6,000, \$8,000 or \$10,000 a year. That is common sense.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: It is logic?

Mr. CASEY: I am pleased the Minister agrees with me on this, because the member for Victoria was being critical only a few moments ago, so there is confusion already among Government members. It will be difficult to implement certain exemptions. However, I favour the provision that persons or corporations may elect to pay the duty on the basis of a periodic bulk return, and I do not think this aspect can be dealt with otherwise.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: Similar to sales tax.

Mr. CASEY: That is correct. Another provision to which I refer is the elimination of the possibility of double duty being paid when more than one State is involved. That is particularly important to the member for Victoria because many of his constituents trade in Victoria, selling their wool, cattle and, no doubt, sheep in that State. This Bill spells out convincingly the fact that the duty will be paid in the State where the money is actually received. That is an important provision, particularly as many transactions involving the sale of goods take place in another State. Of course, this is only the first of a series of taxation measures that we foresee being introduced by the present Government. Unfortunately, we seem to be adopting many American policies. I warn Government members that it will not be long before we have a type of sales tax on goods which—

Mr. Virgo: Do you mean a purchase tax?

Mr. CASEY: Call it what you will, it will be a tax on goods that will be levied whenever one goes into a shop to buy a certain commodity. I remember that, several years ago when I was travelling through the United States of America, I took the opportunity to buy several things for members of my family at home, and in different States in that country this purchase tax varied. Once in San Francisco I paid a 3 per cent tax on a shirt. The market price alongside the shirt was about \$2.50. However, when I presented it to the young person behind the counter she told

me the price would be \$2.75, or something like that. When I asked what the extra sum was for, she said that it was a purchase tax. In that case, the tax went to the Federal Government. To my knowledge, this tax applies in most States of the U.S.A.

In view of the way this Government is going, I shall not be surprised if, one day, this type of tax applies here. The provisions in this Bill represent one way for the Government to raise revenue. I have no quarrel with a Government's introducing taxation measures, but I believe this is not the time for extra tax and this is certainly not the way to tax people. This type of tax hits those who find it most difficult to pay. I believe in progressive taxation, but this tax is regressive. The Government says that it is treating people equally by imposing this type of tax, but why does it not give them a vote that is equal? People should be equal in all respects.

Mr. Broomhill: Some are more equal than others.

Mr. CASEY: Yes, members opposite do not believe in one vote one value. I know the Attorney-General believes in it, but his voice is lost in the wilderness on the Government benches. The Premier is coming around on this matter.

Mr. Broomhill: What about the member for Eyre?

Mr. CASEY: He is still down wombat holes, although I understand he will say something on this matter, and I hope it will be a contribution—

Mr. Jennings: Worthy of him and up to his usual standard.

Mr. CASEY: I could not agree more. In conclusion, I say that I have no quarrel with the imposition of taxation to increase revenue, because all Governments must have more money. However, I am sure the Government does not have a mandate for the Bill. No mention was made of this type of thing when the present Government was in Opposition or before the election. For these reasons I oppose the Bill.

Mr. EDWARDS (Eyre): I do not desire to allow the second reading of the Bill to pass without saying that I support the Treasurer in introducing this Bill to recoup funds, in view of the poor state of the finances when we came into office. No-one likes to increase taxes of any kind. What do members opposite mean when they refer to "workers"? I am a worker, as are all members on this side. I am sure that I can do just as hard a day's work as any member opposite.

Mr. Hurst: I'll accept your challenge.

Mr. EDWARDS: Members opposite would be far behind at the end of a day, especially in the type of work I have been used to. Members opposite have said much in the last two days that has degraded the standing of the House and, as I do not want to become involved in that sort of thing, I will stick to the Bill. I have as much thought for the worker as has any member opposite. Small farmers, dairy and poultry farmers, and any other men and women who try to carry on a small business and make their living in that way work far harder than any man or woman who works in an eight-hours-a-day job, except for men in heavy industry. As I have worked in all these types of job at one time or another, I am sure I know what I am talking about. Therefore, I believe that when everyone settles down and gets on with the job we will all be much happier and much more work will be done.

I know this tax will not be liked, but we do not want to face another three years under a Labor Government, when we would be much worse off. Members opposite should realize that it is the man with the most initiative who pays the most, because he earns more and therefore has to pay more. I have heard plenty of workers say that they did not want the extra week's leave granted by the previous Government. They said they did not have time to take the three weeks' leave to which they were entitled.

Members interjecting:

Mr. EDWARDS: Members opposite may laugh but I have been told this by men in high positions in the Government service: they have told me that they did not have time to take three weeks' leave. They say that, if they take an extra week's leave, when they get back on the job they have to perform night work to catch up, because the people who have carried on while they have been on leave have left much work undone. Therefore, they believe the extra week's leave to be worth nothing at all.

Let us look at succession duties. If the Labor Party is returned to office and the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) gets a free hand, he will kill the goose that lays the golden egg. I assure him that many farmers are not much better off than he is, and that hundreds of small farmers are not as well off as he is. The honourable member will pull down the workers and everyone else.

Although he says that he represents the workers, he has not as much consideration for them as I have. I have spent many years among them.

Mr. Virgo: Where were these workers?

Mr. EDWARDS: I do not know that the member for Edwardstown did much work during the war apart from sitting behind a bench telling the mass of workers what fees they ought to pay. I was not able to go to the war, because I was declared medically unfit.

Mr. Broomhill: Hear, hear!

Mr. EDWARDS: At least I played my part, along with many other workers, in the munition works at Salisbury.

Mr. Virgo: Were you a member of a union?

Mr. EDWARDS: No, I refused to be, because being a member would have done me more harm than good.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is nothing in this Bill about unionism.

Mr. EDWARDS: Members opposite always speak of our getting only 43 per cent of the votes at the last election. However, I received 79 per cent of the votes in my district.

Mr. Broomhill: That was a personal vote!

Mr. EDWARDS: I ask members to show more respect to me when I am asking questions at Question Time. Sometimes it is almost impossible to ask my question.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! That matter is not relevant to the Bill.

Mr. EDWARDS: I am sorry if I have departed from the Bill, but I am sure members opposite have done it many times. I am sure that we in this House are entitled to more respect than we are getting, and that applies in more ways than one. If members do not want to listen to the truth, they had better go and have a cup of tea.

Mr. RICHES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think that the honourable member should be required to keep to the Bill. You have called him to order two or three times but there is no indication that he will obey the Chair. So long as he continues to reflect on other members, I object.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: A few moments ago I drew the attention of the honourable member for Eyre to the fact that the matter that he was discussing then was not relevant to the Bill. I ask him to come back to the Bill.

Mr. EDWARDS: If this great State is to expand and progress, the whole community must be prepared to contribute, and this must

involve making sacrifices. I commend the Treasurer for introducing the Bill, which I support.

Mr. BURDON (Mt. Gambier): I was rather amazed and taken aback by the speech made by the member for Eyre. Having heard some of his previous efforts, I had not thought his speech today would give me such a shock. As he has followed the line of all other Government members by supporting a Bill to increase stamp duties in South Australia, he will also have the responsibility of voting on the measure soon. He will have the further responsibility of answering to his electors for what this Government is doing. Although he may have got 79 per cent of the votes in his district at the 1968 election, I doubt that he will get the same percentage in future, now that he has supported this measure introduced by the Stott-Hall Government. My colleagues and I were delighted when the member for Eyre said that South Australia would have a Labor Government again soon. This morning a businessman in Rundle Street asked me, "How long will it be before you boys are back in Government?" When I said that I did not know, he said, "I hope to God that it is not too long."

We hear similar statements everywhere. Indeed, if the L.C.L. went to the people on this Bill, it would be annihilated. Not much can be said in support of the measure, except that, under our system, it is necessary for a Government to raise taxes, but I disagree completely with the present Government's methods of raising taxes. I tell the member for Eyre that, when a measure similar to the Bill was introduced by the Labor Government in 1965 in connection with receipt duties, some members who are now on the Government side criticized it vehemently. At that time the present Minister of Works (Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe) said:

I protest against certain aspects of this Bill which is another revenue-raising measure. The Government has introduced endless taxing Bills, and we are entitled to know how much farther the Government intends to go in this regard, and when it will call a halt to further imposts on the unsuspecting public. If we consider the Bills that have been introduced, we find tax after tax has been imposed and charge after charge increased. People are realizing that taxes are being severely increased.

Before the last State election, no-one in South Australia was given any hint by the Liberal Party of the taxation measures it would introduce. If this Bill is passed it is estimated that \$4,800,000 will be raised in a full year—almost \$5 for every man, woman and child in

the State. This serious impost on the salary-earner, the wage-earner, and particularly on the small business man will be reflected in the costs and the living standards of the people. It will increase the consumer's costs. It will affect every person in the State, whether he has an income of \$1,000 or \$100,000 a year, but people on low incomes do not have the means to combat this insidious method of raising taxation that the people on higher incomes have. This is one of the Bill's aspects with which I disagree.

Other forms of taxation could be imposed without causing such a heavy burden on people with limited incomes. These people comprise the majority of the State's people. I believe there is a saying in horse racing (and I do not want to offend people in the racing game) that, if a horse runs a crook race, it is swabbed. As this is a crook Government (and I have borrowed the term "crook" from a former Liberal Premier of the State), I believe it is time the Government was swabbed by the electors—and I have no doubt that the penalty would be disqualification for life.

I do not oppose the Bill because I do not believe that revenue must be raised: I oppose it to remind the Government, particularly some of the new Government members, that the Labor Government was subjected to criticisms for the small tax increases that were made during its term in office in a manner that left it no alternative. The measures adopted by the present Government when in Opposition were such that it criticized the Labor Government, saying that its taxation measures were ruinous to the people. It said the people would suffer, that the Labor Government would take away South Australia's competitive advantage in the manufacturing field, and that it would destroy the ability of South Australia to attract industry. It is against this background that the new Opposition Party has been trying to get across during the course of this debate the effect of what the Government is trying to put over on the people of South Australia. It was mentioned this afternoon by way of interjection from the Government side that the Government inherited a large deficit from the Labor Government. No doubt a deficit was inherited, but the Government should be reminded that in the last year of its previous term of office about \$9,000,000 was over-spent. Not only did the Government commit this—

Mr. Jennings: A lot more was committed.

Mr. BURDON: Yes, and I believe that the sole responsibility for the major part of the deficit should go to the Liberal Government that was in office from 1962 to 1965. The Treasurer, who introduced this measure and whose responsibility it is, said in speaking in the Budget debate in 1965:

This is just another case of medicine that the community is being compelled to swallow as a result of trusting the promises made by the Leader of the Opposition during the election campaign.

The people of South Australia are swallowing a very bitter dose of medicine today: it is being served up to them in much larger doses and it is much more bitter than it was in 1965.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Are you going to mention the Bill?

Mr. BURDON: I do not support the Bill.

Mr. EVANS (Onkaparinga): I am sorry that this type of measure must be taken to help rectify the State's financial position. The member for Edwardstown (Mr. Virgo) has said that the Government would not have enough stomach (he used another term) to remove the benefits that had been given to certain Government workers: that is, the extra week's leave, equal pay for women, and service pay. As I said earlier in the House, however, it is not the usual practice for a Government to remove something that has been given by a previous Government: the benefit is there and it has been given to the workers.

Mr. Riches: You just take it off them by this tax.

Mr. EVANS: These people work for the benefit of the people of South Australia. They are employed by the people of South Australia and, if they have to be given benefits, the people of South Australia have to pay for them. The member for Mount Gambier (Mr. Burdon) said that this tax would hit all sections of the community. He also said that it affected the small man, but I remind him that the small man is served by Government workers the same as is the man who may have a little more luck with his finances. Why should the minority be the only section that is hit by the tax? If we are served by people we should all pay for any increases that are required to cover the extra charges.

Mr. Jennings: Why didn't you say this before the Millicent by-election?

Mr. Nankivell: Why do we have to say it?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Onkaparinga.

Mr. EVANS: When we can afford to give people a 364-day holiday each year we should give it to them; but to give these benefits we must pay the cost. The member for Edwardstown admitted that this was something that had been introduced by the Australian Labor Party, implying that we are in our present position because of handouts by that Party.

Mr. Hudson: Do you appreciate that the previous Playford Government accepted the principle of service pay? Do you know that?

Mr. EVANS: The member for Mount Gambier said that previous L.C.L. speakers had suggested that, because of A.L.P. legislation, South Australia would suffer. Possibly that is what is happening today. However, to rectify the unsatisfactory balance of payments in this State so that we would have a balanced Budget at the end of the financial year, the people of South Australia have to suffer. Perhaps the statement by the member for Edwardstown is proving correct, and that is why we are experiencing today's conditions. If members of the community want a service

that costs money they must pay for it, and that is why the present legislation has been introduced. All members of the community realize that, and all members of this House must realize that, if handouts are given, the people must pay for them. Whatever is taken out of the bin must be replaced. Our attitude today, however, is that we demand rights but do not accept responsibilities. What we are doing today by supporting this Bill is putting back something that has been taken out. I therefore support the Bill.

Mr. JENNINGS (Enfield): I oppose the Bill. I make that clear so that you, Mr. Speaker, and all other members will not have a worrying weekend. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, October 22, at 2 p.m.