

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**

Tuesday, October 22, 1968

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

**MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: STATE GOVERNOR**

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier): I ask leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Because of the need to make simultaneous announcements, it has not been possible for me previously to announce the appointment of the Governor of South Australia. However, I now take this first opportunity in the House to announce that Her Majesty has seen fit to appoint Sir James William Harrison as Governor of the State of South Australia. The Government and, I am sure, all members of Parliament and the public are pleased with this appointment, and we await with pleasure the arrival of Sir James on Wednesday, December 4.

**QUESTIONS****CRAYFISHING**

Mr. CORCORAN: I believe that representations have been made to the Minister of Agriculture, who controls the operations of fisheries in this State, with regard to an increase in the size at which crayfish can be taken for sale. As the fishing season will open on November 1, will the Minister of Lands ask his colleague whether or not he has decided to increase this size?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will obtain a reply as quickly as possible. Although discussions have taken place on the system of measuring, I am not sure of the details.

**RESEARCH LABORATORY**

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Is the Premier aware of rumours that the R. G. Menzies Research Laboratory at Philips Electrical Proprietary Limited which was established in 1960-61 is to be closed on December 31 next and does he know whether in consequence 14 of the 16 workers in that laboratory are to be affected? If he has any information about this, I should be glad if he would give it to the House; if he has not, I should be glad if he would take up the matter with the company to see whether this important facility for South Australia's technological development could be retained for the State.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: As I do not have any information indicating that this laboratory is to be closed, I will take up the matter immediately with my officers and the company and bring down a report.

**DAIRY FARMERS**

Mr. GILES: Can the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Agriculture, say whether any progress has been made with the Commonwealth Government in regard to helping dairy farmers who have small properties to acquire adjoining properties in order to enlarge their holdings?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will obtain a report.

**SITTINGS AND BUSINESS**

Mr. BROOMHILL: During September the Premier announced that Parliament would not sit next week. Can he say whether that arrangement still stands?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Yes, it does.

**BAND CHAMPIONSHIP**

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: I think the Minister of Immigration and Tourism is aware that people in the Barossa Valley in my district are noted for their love of music, particularly banding. Last Saturday the annual school bands carnival, with many schools from various parts participating, was held at Nuriootpa and was attended by people from many parts of the State. Within four miles of Nuriootpa there are five brass bands. On Saturday, November 2, the Australian brass band championships will be held at Tanunda in my district, and this function attracts many thousands of people. In view of the benefits that will accrue to the State, particularly in regard to tourism, through the holding of a function of this type (at which about 20 bands, seven of which come from other States, will compete), will the Minister take up with the Tourist Bureau the advisability of sending to Tanunda on November 2 a film unit to film some of the highlights of this championship?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I agree with what the honourable member said about the reputation the people in the Barossa Valley have for their interest in music, particularly band music. As I have been to the area several times, I believe the suggestion to send a film unit there is probably a good one. However, I should not like to commit myself entirely in this connection until I have discussed the

matter with the Director of the Tourist Bureau and examined our resources in this respect. I will do what I can and provide a reply shortly.

#### PORT ADELAIDE ROADWORKS

Mr. RYAN: Some years ago a project to build a new Jervois bridge was referred to the Public Works Standing Committee. While the matter was being investigated the committee brought down an interim report, recommending the following:

1. The construction of a road and bridge connection from the Old Port Road westerly across the Port River to Bower Road—  
this recommendation was made on January 31, 1961, and the causeway has been completed and operating for some time—

2. The construction of a road from the Old Port Road to St. Vincent Street *via* Church Street.

As yet the second part of the work recommended has not been commenced, and there has been no indication when it will commence. This work which would link up Old Port Road with Church Street, would provide a straight continuation over the Birkenhead bridge. As lights are to be installed on the corner, and as this will lead to congestion involving vehicles entering Commercial Road from Dale Street, will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport whether the second part of the work recommended by the committee in January, 1961, will be carried out and, if it will be, when?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will try to find out.

#### SNAKE ANTIVENENE

Mr. RODDA: Today's newspaper reports the discovery of an antivenene for bites by all types of snake. I understand that this antivenene is rather costly and will not be freely available. In the South-East last year a young married man from Naracoorte and a young child from Glencoe died from snake bite, and I think it important to have small doses of this all-purpose antivenene available at hospitals strategically placed throughout the State. If it had been available at short notice last year, it could have saved these two lives: in those cases the hospital authorities could not identify the type of snake responsible. Will the Premier ask the Minister of Health whether it is possible to have adequate doses of this antivenene available at hospitals strategically placed throughout the State?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Yes.

#### WATER RESTRICTIONS

Mr. ARNOLD: Can the Minister of Works say whether during this summer the River Murray Commission will restrict the water available from the Murray River?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I discussed this matter in Canberra on Friday and the Minister for National Development has told me that the Hume reservoir, which fills only in some years, is likely to fill this week and that, as a result, there will be no restriction in regard to Murray River water this year.

#### ASCOT PARK SCHOOL

Mr. VIRGO: On August 8 the Minister of Education, when replying to my question about the temporary buildings at the Ascot Park School, said:

However, the accommodation is especially generous in the special purpose rooms such as library activity and art and craft rooms.

Although I am sure that the Minister gave that reply in good faith, there is no art room or craft room at this school. The Minister also said:

Proposals have been made recently for the conversion of the woodwork centre to a headmaster's office and two classrooms, and for the moving of an existing triple timber room unit . . .

As a considerable period has elapsed without there being any activity, will the Minister find out whether there will be any activity and, if there will be, when it will occur?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I am sorry if I misled the honourable member. I will consider this matter and get a report for him.

#### WHYALLA SCHOOL

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about a site for a third secondary school at Whyalla?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The Whyalla Development Planning Committee has under consideration a proposal for the westward expansion of Whyalla for an estimated future population of 100,000 people. The committee is aware of the department's interest in obtaining a site for a third secondary school. The Town Planning Architect of the South Australian Housing Trust, working with the committee, has had discussions with officers of the Education Department with regard to the siting of a third secondary school. It is understood that the Whyalla Development Planning Committee should reach agreement on a master plan by the early part of 1969.

A site for a third secondary school will be allotted to the Education Department at that time.

#### LIBRARIANS

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Last Thursday the Minister of Education said that a total of 27 additional professional staff (including three lecturer-librarians) and 13 additional ancillary staff (including four library assistants) would be appointed to teachers colleges from the beginning of 1969. Has the Minister a reply to my question concerning the breakdown of those figures so that we may know what additional staff will be provided at each teachers college?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The breakdown of the additional professional and ancillary staff to be appointed to teachers colleges in 1969 is as follows: Adelaide Teachers College, two professional, two ancillary; Bedford Park, nine professional, including one lecturer-librarian, and three ancillary, including one library assistant; Wattle Park, two professional, including one lecturer-librarian, and two ancillary library assistants; Western Teachers College, three professional and three ancillary; Salisbury, 11 professional, including one lecturer-librarian, and three ancillary, including one library-assistant. This makes the total of 27 additional professional staff, including three lecturer-librarians, and 13 ancillary staff, including four library assistants.

#### OAKLANDS TREES

Mr. HUDSON: The Attorney-General will recall my raising the question of gum trees at the Oaklands railway station yard and the assurance given me by the Minister of Roads and Transport that instructions had been issued to the Railways Commissioner to ensure that only dead branches and unsafe branches would be removed from the trees so that the natural beauty of the area would be maintained. As I understand that a contract has been let by the Railways Commissioner for this work to be undertaken, will the Attorney ask his colleague whether the contract that has been let conforms with the instructions given by the Minister to the Railways Commissioner?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes.

#### CRYSTAL BROOK HOUSING

Mr. VENNING: Has the Minister of Housing a reply to my recent question about the housing position at Crystal Brook and the Housing Trust's intentions in this regard?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The General Manager of the Housing Trust states that the trust has little demand for rental accommodation at Crystal Brook, and at present does not hold any applications from pensioner couples. A further survey of housing demand in Crystal Brook will be made this financial year.

#### CRYSTAL BROOK SCHOOL

Mr. RICHES: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about the erection of additional classrooms at the Crystal Brook Primary School?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: As I have already informed the member for Rocky River, the Public Buildings Department had expected that work on the erection of a dual-timber unit at this school would commence about July or August of this year. I know that this information will be of interest to the member for Rocky River in whose district this school is situated. No additional classroom accommodation is to be built, but the building to be provided will consist of an administration block containing headmaster's office, staff room, book store and a library. However, because of urgent demands for the erection of classrooms where accommodation for the housing of children is inadequate, it has not been possible to adhere to the proposed schedule. The Finsbury works branch of the Public Buildings Department is fully programmed in erecting rooms which are urgently required for the opening of schools in February, 1969.

The following information will also be of interest to all members whose districts are concerned. The schools at which those rooms are required, in order to meet pressing demands, are as follows: Stradbroke Infants, two rooms; Stradbroke Primary, two rooms; Newton, two rooms; Mitchell Park Infants, two rooms; Athelstone Primary, two rooms; Blackwood Primary, two rooms; Dernancourt Primary, two rooms; Belair Infants, one room; Belair Primary, one room; Port Augusta West Primary, one room; and Para Vista Primary, four rooms. Because of the needs of all divisions of the Education Department for classrooms for urgently required accommodation in February, 1969, it has been necessary to postpone the erection of rooms and schools where accommodation is not likely to be so urgent. I regret that, for this reason, the Crystal Brook project has been postponed, but work is expected to begin there in March next year.

#### REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Mr. LAWN: My question is addressed to you, Mr. Speaker. I am concerned this session,

advanced as it is in length of time, about the lack of information given in reply to questions. This was understandable early in the session, but I think Ministers should be able to give replies at this stage of the session. One Minister invariably replies, "I will obtain a report for the honourable member." Unless the Premier is prompted by the Treasurer, he does not give the House any information in reply to a question, although we must be thankful for the fact that the Premier has good hearing. Last week, when I sought information on the appropriation of \$500,000 (a considerable sum), the Premier could not tell me how the money would be spent. Another time, I wanted to know the name of the new Governor. I knew he had been appointed and he was from another State, and I only wanted his name, but I was not told his name. Could you, Mr. Speaker, ensure that members' questions are answered or, if not, could you take the necessary steps to have the second leg of the Stott-Hall coalition replaced?

The SPEAKER: I think the honourable member realizes that all members have their privileges and rights in the Chamber and that it is the right of the Speaker to maintain these. On more than one occasion I have said that members have a right to be heard and that members of the Opposition have a right to seek information: that is what Parliament is for. Members of Cabinet (that is, the Government) have a right to provide that information to other members in the interests of the public. I think the honourable member knows that it would not always be possible for Ministers to provide the necessary information immediately, as they could not always be sure they were giving the correct reply. I do not think that, as Speaker, I can ask the Ministers to give proper replies to questions unless they have the correct replies. I will undertake to talk with the Ministers about this matter to see whether they can keep up to date with the information required by members.

*Later:*

Mr. LAWN: I address my question to you, Mr. Speaker. First, let me say I appreciate the reply you gave me earlier about the inability of Ministers to answer questions. This afternoon the Premier gave the House at least two or three prepared replies. When you discuss my previous question with the Premier, will you suggest that he do not follow the fashion set by Jackie Onassis of wearing dark glasses; otherwise, he will be unable even to read prepared replies to members' questions?

The SPEAKER: I do not know whether that is a matter of Parliamentary procedure in this Chamber. I will, however, honour the undertaking I gave the honourable member and try to get specific answers to members' questions. I believe sincerely that members of the Opposition, when asking questions, are entitled to receive answers given by Cabinet Ministers to the best of their ability, but I do not think that the wearing of dark glasses by Jackie Onassis has any bearing on this matter.

#### NEW RESERVOIR

Mr. EVANS: Can the Minister of Works say whether and when it is planned to build a third reservoir on the Onkaparinga River at a point below Kangarilla? If such a reservoir is planned, has an initial survey yet been carried out, and has it been ascertained how close the backwaters will come to Kangarilla?

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: The Engineering and Water Supply Department is planning to build another reservoir downstream from Mt. Bold reservoir. This project is yet some time away, and I know the honourable member and others will appreciate that the planning of a large major reservoir runs into several years. However, as I do not have the detailed information for which the honourable member has asked, I will obtain it as soon as possible so that he may receive information that is as up to date as possible.

#### GAUGE STANDARDIZATION

Mr. CASEY: Some time ago I asked the Premier a question about the estimated cost of converting the 5ft. 3in. railway line between Terowie and Adelaide to 4ft. 8½in. standard gauge, and he replied that it would cost about \$19,000,000 and that it would necessitate laying a line between Hamley Bridge and Adelaide. Has the Premier a reply to my subsequent question about the estimated cost of work on the line between Port Pirie and Adelaide?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: A preliminary estimate for the provision of a standard gauge railway between Adelaide and Port Pirie is \$17,000,000. This provides for an independent standard gauge railway between Adelaide and Virginia and Port Pirie, including Bumbunga to Lochiel. Mention in an earlier reply to distances from Adelaide to Perth and Alice Springs referred to the increased mileage from Adelaide to Port Pirie via Peterborough, compared with that via Bowman; it did not envisage use of the route to Alice Springs via Peterborough and Quorn, which route was

abandoned about 12 years ago. The honourable member referred to the distance between Adelaide and Broken Hill being about 90 miles longer via Port Pirie compared with that via Terowie. The actual figure would be 55 miles.

Mr. Casey: It is 60 miles!

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Railways Commissioner says it is 55 miles.

Mr. Casey: I quoted 60.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Government has already stated that it does not favour a standard gauge line in isolation between Adelaide and Port Pirie, but that it also seeks a connection between Snowtown and Gladstone in addition to other conversions. Such an arrangement would permit the retention of the existing mileage between Adelaide and Port Pirie; it would facilitate the creation of an integrated standard gauge system north of Adelaide; and it would mean that the distance to Broken Hill via standard gauge would be only 22 miles longer than that via Terowie. Even so, the 1949 standardization agreement provides for the ultimate conversion of all 3ft. 6in. and 5ft. 3in. lines of the South Australian Railways except those on the Port Lincoln Division. Those now proposed provide for the most advantageous first step.

#### EASTERN STANDARD TIME

Mr. EDWARDS: My question relates to the effect that changing to Eastern Standard Time would have on the people of Eyre Peninsula. Cowell is about 540 miles from the Western Australian border and people living in this vast area are concerned that South Australia will adopt Eastern Standard Time. For example, people living at Ceduna would not see the sun rise in the winter time until after 8 a.m., and that would cause much inconvenience to them, including the need to use extra fuel on lighting plants. Although a change may suit most people living east of Spencer Gulf—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is debating the question. I ask him to make his question as concise as possible.

Mr. EDWARDS: Yes, Sir. All members no doubt are aware that Eyre Peninsula comprises about one-third of the State, and the time operating in this vast area is almost half an hour behind that operating in the rest of the State. Will the Premier give this matter his full and earnest consideration before any decision to change may be taken?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I shall be happy to give this matter earnest consideration. I assure the honourable member that, were it

not for difficulties such as he has raised, it would be easy to bring South Australia's time into line with Eastern Standard Time. However, the Government is aware of a number of difficulties affecting specific industries and localities, including the one to which the honourable member has referred. I assure him that no precipitate action will be taken that ignores the situation of people living in the honourable member's district. All aspects of the change will be fully discussed before any decision is made.

#### GREYHOUND COURSING

Mr. McKEE: Has the Premier a reply to the question I recently asked about totalizator betting on dog coursing?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: No.

#### EVERARD PARK MAINS

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I recently asked about when work would start on installing new mains in the Everard Park area?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: It is expected that the re-laying of water mains in the Everard Park area, which was recently approved at an estimated cost of \$19,000, will commence some time during February, 1969. I emphasize that this commencing date is an approximation only and could be subject to variation, but it is hoped to keep to that target date.

#### MAIN NORTH-EAST ROAD

Mrs. BYRNE: The Main North-East Road has recently been widened to the intersection of Smart and Wright Roads, Modbury. As the further widening of this road is both necessary and urgent, will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport for details of what the Highways Department intends to do about the matter?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes.

#### TRANSPORT OPERATORS

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Premier a reply to my question of October 1 about giving relatives of persons killed or injured in road accidents in other States information about these accidents before public announcements are made?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Requests to advise next-of-kin of persons killed or injured in road traffic accidents in other States are received from Police Departments in other States from time to time. The operation sergeants attached to our radio branch are responsible for the notification of next-of-kin in these instances,

and do not release any information to the press or radio until relatives have first been notified. Police operations room personnel are very experienced in the handling of such situations and are always very discreet and most careful to protect the parties to be informed. Press and radio stations, however, have other means of learning about such accidents and unfortunately the police have no control over what they release, or when such releases are made by them.

#### MOIETIES

Mr. BURDON: Recently I have been approached by irate owners of houses along the highway leading into Mount Gambier from the north, which is within the boundary of the Mount Gambier Corporation, and is now under reconstruction. Before this, I understand the Highways Department had purchased land for road-widening purposes from all or most of the property owners. However, the main complaint at present appears to be that the corporation is levying moiety charges where kerbing and water tables are being constructed as it is entitled to do under the Local Government Act. As all the persons involved in these acquisitions were apparently not adequately informed of the situation when these properties were purchased, will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport to raise with the department the question of additional reimbursement to cover these moiety charges?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will ask my colleague about this.

#### WHITE ROCK QUARRIES

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have had drawn to my attention the fact that clearing took place by White Rock Quarries Proprietary Limited of a most extensive area of ridges in the Adelaide Hills and that this was drawn to the attention of the Minister in July. In September, the Minister wrote back to Mr. Fehlberg, who had raised the matter with him, saying that it appeared that the action in clearing land in part sections 1107 to 1110, hundred of Adelaide, in preparation for quarrying, constituted an infringement of section 41 of the Planning and Development Act and did not do away with the need for the company to apply to the State Planning Authority for consent. The Minister went on to say that the Manager had been informed that, if the company did not cease this type of activity, it would render itself liable for prosecution. The photographs I have show a considerable change in the outlook of the whole area as a result of this

clearing, though no prosecution seems to have transpired. Will the Attorney-General inquire of the Minister of Local Government whether, in fact, subsequent to this letter White Rock Quarries Proprietary Limited was asked to apply for retrospective approval for the work it had done and, if this was so, what effect this will have on its being allowed to quarry in this area?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will inquire.

#### PARLIAMENTARY DRESS

THE SPEAKER: I refer to the question directed to me by the honourable Leader of the Opposition last Thursday concerning the dress of members and others in the House of Assembly Chamber. Dress in our Chamber is governed by practice and not by Standing Order. The convention of the House has always been, in my experience and as far as I can ascertain otherwise, that the dress of male members (and of people occupying *Hansard* and press galleries) has included a coat and tie, with long trousers. The wearing of shorts or safari jackets, or the discarding of coats in the Chamber has never been acceptable practice. Officers of the House and our messengers wear traditional dress; and *Hansard* and press reporters conform with dress worn by members. I have ascertained that our custom as to members' dress is also the current practice in the Commonwealth and all other State Parliaments of Australia. Even in Queensland, with its high humidity, shorts or coat-shirts are not countenanced, and members in Brisbane are required to wear coats with ties in a Chamber which is not air-conditioned. I am also informed that the concession which the Leader seeks for this Chamber, and which I understand the honourable Attorney-General would avail himself of if it were granted, is not operative in our Supreme Court, and consequently Q.C.'s and others pleading cases in that court would not be allowed to wear shorts. I have also noticed that, down through the many years of procedure and practice in the House of Commons, shorts have never been worn. I may also refer to many great Labor leaders, including the late Right Honourable Ernest Bevin, M.P., who wore striped trousers and black coat while attending sittings of Parliament in London.

However, I have carefully considered the merits of the Leader's suggestion, irrespective of what happens elsewhere, and in doing so have had some regard to the pattern of the sessions of this House during the 68 years of

the twentieth century. During that period, certainly in practice and probably by design, the House has met on average on less than four sitting days for the entire summer months of December, January and February. The average for the last decade (to bring the figures a little more up to date) has been 2.3 sitting days a summer. During the whole of the twentieth century, the House has sat on average less than one day during the two hottest months of the year—January and February. In short, Parliament eschews summer sittings. As I understand the gravamen of the Leader's proposition, it seems to involve a question more of the inconvenience in changing from shorts into a suit before coming into the Chamber rather than any discomfort from the wearing of such apparel in our air-conditioned Chamber. Standards of dress are obviously a matter of opinion. I believe that our present convention in dress is appropriate to a legislative chamber, and is in no way oppressive or burdensome to members. I hold the view that the retention of our present dress standard is desirable, providing as it does for dignity without discomfort. I personally see no warrant for any change in conventional dress in the air-conditioned atmosphere of this Chamber, and I do not intend to change this custom by a ruling from the Chair. However, I am quite prepared, if the Leader so desires, to refer the question to the Standing Orders Committee for further consideration.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I listened to your ruling with interest and I thought that you had not ruled personally on the matter of dress in the House but that you were drawing the attention of members to practice and convention in the House recommending that, if something further were to be done, this might be referred to the Standing Orders Committee. However, I now understand that you meant that you were ruling that previous practice in the House bound members as to their individual action within the House, although nothing in Standing Orders binds members as to their mode of dress. If that is the position, with great respect, I do not think the Chair has authority to give a ruling. I had specifically asked you whether there was any rule of the House in Standing Orders, or in the rules of the House of Commons to which our Standing Order No. 1 applied, that would govern the matter. I understand you to have said that there is not. In those circumstances, I should like to be clear about the matter because, although I

respect the authority of the Speaker, I think that, if there is no provision in the rules of the House, members are free in the matter, it being one of personal taste, not of anything else. I am as keen as anyone else to preserve the rights of members.

The SPEAKER: I point out that practice and Standing Orders have grown up with the traditions of Parliament over the centuries since a Parliamentary system was adopted. I can give the Leader a good example in this Parliament. Since I have been a member nothing has been included in Standing Orders to say that the Speaker should call on the Leader of the Opposition to ask the first question, but that is a practice that has grown up. The same principle applies to dress. I draw the Leader's attention to the paragraph of my statement in which I said that dress in the Chamber was governed by practice and not by Standing Orders, and that a practice of this Parliament had become as equally binding as Standing Orders. I also said that I believed that our present convention in dress was appropriate to a legislative chamber and was in no way oppressive or burdensome to members. I said that I held the view that the retention of our present dress standard was desirable, providing as it did for dignity without discomfort; that I could see no warrant for change in conventional dress in the air-conditioned atmosphere of this Chamber; and that I did not propose to change this custom by a ruling from the Chair.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: What I am trying to get clear is whether, although you have expressed a personal opinion as to what dress is desirable, the result of what you are saying now is that you are ruling that a member may not enter this Chamber, if he is a male, dressed other than in the fashion you have outlined.

The SPEAKER: The answer to the question is "Yes". I think the old practice should be maintained.

Mr. Corcoran: On what authority?

The SPEAKER: Because, as I have said, of the practice that has grown up in this Chamber for many years since we have been a Parliament. It is a common law that has grown. I do not see any reason why we should alter the practice. That is my ruling on the matter. It is a practice that has grown up in this Chamber and I see no need to alter it. It has been a practice in this Chamber since we have had a Parliament.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: With great respect, Mr. Speaker, I must move dissent

from your ruling. I believe from what has transpired, both in the question in which I drew your attention to this matter and from what you have said, that members are not bound, and that this is a question entirely of freedom of members.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Why did you ask the Speaker the question on Thursday?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I asked the question because, as far as my researches had gone, I was unable to find any Standing Order or rule to the contrary and, therefore, I asked you, Mr. Speaker, whether there was one. That was a perfectly proper question to ask of the Speaker, rather than to initiate action that might lead to a ruling to the contrary, and I explained that at the time. Now, as I understand what you have said—

The SPEAKER: Order! If the Leader is moving to disagree to the Speaker's ruling he will have to bring this up in writing.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move:

That the ruling that the Speaker may bind members as to their individual dress by a ruling from the Chair without authority of a rule of the House or in Standing Orders be disagreed to.

The SPEAKER: Before putting the motion I refer the Leader to what I said on this matter: if he wants further consideration of the matter, I shall refer it to the Standing Orders Committee on the ground that a practice in the Chamber is of as much importance as Standing Orders. If the Leader wishes I shall do that without his moving a motion.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I should be happy if this matter were referred to the Standing Orders Committee. I am concerned, however, that if your ruling is allowed to stand (and it will stand unless it is immediately challenged under Standing Orders), a precedent will have been created by which a Speaker may rule from the Chair on a matter that is not provided for either in the rules of the House or in Standing Orders.

Mr. Corcoran: And it need not concern shorts.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Of course not: it could concern any individual liberty of members, and that concerns me. I am happy to have the question referred to the Standing Orders Committee if you, Mr. Speaker, are prepared not to stand on the ruling you have given which gives rights to the Speaker about which I have not previously heard. That is what concerns me, and not the gravamen of the matter whether one should wear shorts in this House or not.

The SPEAKER: If the Leader is happy for me to refer the matter to the Standing Orders Committee I am happy to do so, and he may withdraw his motion.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Do I understand, Mr. Speaker, that your ruling that you may rule in the way you have explained to the House does not then stand, and that the whole matter will be referred to the Standing Orders Committee?

The SPEAKER: That is correct.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In that case I am happy to ask leave to withdraw my motion.

Leave granted; motion withdrawn.

#### KINGSTON BRIDGE

Mr. ARNOLD: The Kingston bridge is of great concern not only to residents of the Upper Murray but also to people who travel through the Upper Murray to other States. This bridge will lead to increased efficiency and, while it is being constructed, there may be a substantial amount of supplementary work for people in the area. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport when work will start on the Kingston bridge project?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I shall inquire and see whether I can get the information for the honourable member.

#### HAY CARTING

Mr. EVANS: I understand that, in past years, permits have been issued to enable hay-carting contractors to cart hay in vehicles when the total width is more than 8ft., but that the procedure has been changed this year, persons wishing to obtain permits being limited to carting on days other than Saturdays, Sundays and public holidays. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport whether this change is a Cabinet decision or Highways Department procedure that will apply to all permits this year?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will ask my colleague, and bring down a considered reply.

#### EDUCATION CONFERENCE

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Postmaster-General is reported in Commonwealth *Hansard* of October 8 to have invited all State Education Ministers to attend a conference on educational television and to meet the Commonwealth Minister for Education and Science.



Will the Minister of Education say what was her reply to this invitation, as there seems to have been some difference of opinion among State Ministers?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I should prefer to bring down a proper report tomorrow, but I am able to say now that I received a communication from the Postmaster-General about this matter, and the honourable member would have some knowledge of that. I went to some pains to point out in a letter to the Commonwealth Minister that a press report that South Australia was one of the States that had not evinced much interest in this matter was at variance with the facts. I have told him that we are extremely interested in the proposition.

#### CALLS FOR QUESTIONS

Mr. HURST: I listened with interest, Mr. Speaker, to your reply to the Leader regarding dress in this Chamber, in which you said you desired to uphold the dignity and protocol that had existed in this Chamber for many years. I have had occasion to speak to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the Deputy Speaker about the way in which members are called on to ask questions in this Chamber. The procedure is that a member raises his hand and, when he considers that the Speaker has given him "the nod", he waits to be called on to ask the question. One becomes confused at times about whether the Speaker has properly recorded one's desire to ask a question. Last week I raised my hand and I thought that you had recorded my desire. After I had waited about three quarters of an hour you left the Chair and the Deputy Speaker presided. I did not know whether my desire to ask a question had been recorded and I told the Deputy Speaker that I wanted to make sure. By that time some members had received two calls. The Deputy Speaker told me that he would give me the next call because I had been overlooked. However, Mr. Speaker, you then returned to the Chair and I noticed that, after the Deputy Speaker had spoken to you, three or four members were called before I got the call. I ask you to consider revising this system because I think that, if it continues, members of this Chamber will lose respect for the high office of Speaker, whereas a change in the method would help to uphold dignity. With respect to other members, I say that they have complained to me about the action of previous Speakers, and I ask that the present system be examined, because systems operating in other Chambers could be more satisfactory.

The SPEAKER: I have always tried to spread around the Chamber, on the first round of questions, the giving of the call so that every member is called on early on one day of the week. Probably a member who was called early on one day would be a little lower on the list next day when he signified that he wanted to ask a question. If the honourable member was overlooked on this occasion, I apologize to him. However, I think that if he looks through *Hansard* he will see that on one or two occasions he has been high on the list of those asking questions. I try to be fair, but sometimes members do not signify a desire to ask a question before I come to the second round. I think that was the case today: if the honourable member indicated earlier, I did not see him. The first time I saw the honourable member today was after the second round of questions had started. If I was wrong, I am sorry. It is extremely difficult to lay down hard and fast rules and, although I always thought that this system was the fairest way of having questions asked, I can consider whether it is possible to get a better system.

Mr. LAWN: I address my question to you, Mr. Speaker, and support the remarks made by the member for Semaphore. Since asking my first question nearly an hour ago, I have not had a second call.

Mr. Hudson: I haven't had a second call.

Mr. LAWN: Any clown would know that we cannot all have the second call first. The member for Semaphore said to me, "I think I will raise the question we discussed this morning." He was referring to the method adopted by you, Mr. Speaker, in calling members to ask questions. He indicated to you and got the next call even while the Minister of Education was replying to a question from this side: he put up his fingers and was called straight away, although I had been waiting half an hour at that stage. Since then, the member for Semaphore, the member for Edwardstown and the member for Gumeracha have been called before me. I instance this to show that there is some merit in the question by the member for Semaphore that this matter should be investigated.

The SPEAKER: The answer is very simple: that was the first indication after the Minister of Education had replied to a question, and it was the honourable member's first question. Therefore, he was entitled to ask his first question before we reached the second round of questions. That is only fair. I have the member for Frome, the member for Glenelg,

the member for Port Pirie, the member for Stuart, the member for Unley, the member for West Torrens, the member for Port Adelaide, and the member for Millicent down for second questions.

Mr. Ryan: You didn't put me down.

The SPEAKER: Yes, I did. The simple explanation about the member for Millicent was that I thought he should have the right to ask a first question before I called for a second question.

#### TEXTBOOKS

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Last week, the Minister of Education, in reply to my question on the provision of multiple textbooks, said that multiple textbooks would not be provided at the Adelaide Teachers College library, but I point out that this will increase the borrowing pressure on the university library. Has the Minister made any arrangements with the university authorities to cope with this increased borrowing pressure?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I thought I referred to the matter of university libraries. As it would take time to look this up now, I will obtain a reply for the honourable member tomorrow.

#### COMMONWEALTH-STATE FINANCE

Mr. VIRGO: I draw the Premier's attention to a report in today's *Advertiser* which states:

A special Liberal Party conference to discuss Federal-State financial relations will be held in Canberra early next year, probably in March. This follows behind-the-scenes moves to avert a confrontation between the Prime Minister (Mr. Gorton) and the Victorian and New South Wales Premiers (Sir Henry Bolte and Mr. Askin) at the Liberal Party Federal Council meeting, which began in Canberra today.

I am concerned that, despite the many promises we have received in the House, the South Australian delegation was apparently not reported as having said anything. I am equally concerned that, although the Premier saw fit (and I think he was right in doing so) to attend a special conference a couple of weeks ago on this all-important matter, he and the Treasurer were not at yesterday's meeting. However, my question relates to the proposed conference of the Liberal Party where policy will apparently be determined and at which the Liberal Party, at the State and at the Commonwealth level, will discuss Commonwealth-State finance with a view to embarking on a new financial relationship. In view of the importance of the subject to every State, particularly to South Australia, will the Premier approach his Party and insist that both he and the Treasurer are delegates

to the special Liberal Party conference so that the South Australian attitude can be put forward by elected representatives of the people? Also, in view of the extreme importance of this subject, will the Premier say whether the Liberal Party will discard its long practised policy of meeting behind closed doors and follow the example of the Australian Labor Party by opening its discussions to members of the public?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I appreciate the honourable member's interests in Liberal Party affairs, especially Commonwealth-State relations. There were some misconceptions in the press report as to the object of the conference which is to take place next year and which will be attended by State Parliamentary Liberal Party leaders and leaders of the Party organization. The States' insistence that there be such a conference aims to preserve States' rights, but that is where the honourable member and I part company. The objective of State Liberal Parties is to preserve the States' rights, not to see them centralized in Canberra. The honourable member belongs to a Party that believes in centralization: this is the basic difference that divides us at this point. The conference will deal not only with State-Commonwealth financial relations (that will be only one aspect of it), but with the whole question of Commonwealth-State relations. I attended the recent conference and was in close consultation with other State Liberal Party leaders when this matter was raised. The conference to which the honourable member has referred, and which will be attended by Liberal Party leaders and representatives, will in no way take the place of the conference of State Premiers in Adelaide, which will deal specifically with Commonwealth-State financial relations. At present, therefore, there are two projected conferences: one on a State Government basis and one on a Liberal Party basis. The latter will consider the whole subject of Commonwealth-State relations, whereas the Premiers' conference will consider the important aspect of Commonwealth-State financial relations.

Mr. VIRGO: Unfortunately, the Premier was side-tracked when replying to my question. Can he say whether he and/or the Treasurer will attend the Liberal Party conference as South Australian delegates, and whether the conference will be open to the public?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: It is likely that I will attend the conference as a delegate, but the conference will certainly not be open to the public. I think the honourable member knows the good reasons why it will not be.

### MOTOR VEHICLE CONSTRUCTION

Mr. GILES: Has the Premier a reply to my question of September 19, about the safety of motor car construction?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Further discussions have taken place with a motor car manufacturer and I can again assure the honourable member that the manufacturers of vehicles are very conscious of safety factors. However, since the manufacturers of motor cars build for the national, not merely for the State market, I think he realizes that it is impossible for the State Government to legislate on this matter without causing chaos in the design and construction of motor vehicles or getting the agreement of all the Australian States.

### EYRE PENINSULA ELECTRICITY

Mr. EDWARDS: The Sir Thomas Playford Power Station, which is in the important centre of Port Augusta and which is fuelled by coal from Leigh Creek, makes a valuable contribution to the South Australian economy. The considerable increase in the reticulation of power on Eyre Peninsula within the next few years will make additional demands on our power resources, and I believe that supplies of coal from Leigh Creek will have been exhausted within 21 years. Does the Government intend to increase the power-generating capacity of the Port Augusta station to meet the increased needs of Eyre Peninsula, including Whyalla's growing demands, and will natural gas be used as fuel?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: The Sir Thomas Playford Power Station at Port Augusta satisfies a need throughout many parts of the State.

Mr. Nankivell: Even the South-East.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: That is so, as well as the West Coast. The Government desires to generate power to the full extent at the Port Augusta station. The extensions to which the honourable member has referred, together with numerous other extensions, are being considered by the Electricity Trust, and forward planning is at present being examined. I assure the House that the trust has been planning well ahead to take care of the increased demand for future supplies throughout the State. Future changes may occur, regarding the districts supplied with power by a particular power station, when natural gas is introduced, but that is a matter of arrangement. I will obtain a detailed reply for the honourable member.

### STAMP DUTIES

Mr. CORCORAN: Has the Treasurer a reply to the question I asked last Thursday about the Stamp Duties Act Amendment Bill at present before the House?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The honourable member asked a series of questions about exemptions under the proposed receipts tax Bill, and, mainly, they concern charitable organizations which may or may not be exempt under the provisions of the Bill. Although the Under Treasurer's report is somewhat detailed, I think in fairness to the honourable member that I should give it to the House in full. The report states:

The following information is supplied in reply to the question asked about the liability for receipts duty of a number of different types of receipt: Exemption No. 6 of the Bill exempts a receipt given for money paid to any person to be applied for any charitable purpose. This exemption is intentionally drawn in wide terms and will be interpreted widely so as to ensure that the exemption may be available for all proper charitable purposes. There is no precise legal definition of what is a charity and what is a charitable purpose, but there is a considerable amount of case law that is already used by the Commissioner in deciding whether a purpose is charitable for other purposes of the Stamp Duties Act, for example, instruments conveying gifts made for charitable purposes are not chargeable with *ad valorem* duty as a conveyance but with a concessional flat rate of duty irrespective of the value.

The generally accepted legal interpretation of what constitutes charitable purposes is: (1) relief of poverty; (2) advancement of religion; (3) advancement of education; and (4) other purposes beneficial to the community. In the application of these four main principles, regard will be had to the nature of the purpose for which exemption is claimed, and particularly to whether it is a non-profit operation. With some organizations, some receipts may be exempt (for example, where they are gifts or subsidies for education purposes), but others may not (for example, where a school or a church may run a business for profit). The Government considers that by proceeding in this fashion all normally accepted charitable purposes can qualify as well as some which may be of a fringe nature. It takes the view that it is better to leave the exemption somewhat wide and leave the decisions to the Commissioner to make, having regard to case law and precedent, in the light of all available information regarding a particular purpose, than endeavour to be too precise about defining the area of exemption, and so run the risk of excluding other equally worthy purposes simply because they do not fall within a particular definition.

Applying the principles I have mentioned in relation to exemption No. 6 to the specific questions asked by the honourable member,

it is suggested that the decisions would probably be:

Receipts for funds raised by school committees: Such receipts, particularly if the school is not run for profit to individuals, would be regarded as for education purposes and thus exempt.

Receipts for payments made for purchase of school text books: A sale of such books by a trader is a normal commercial transaction and the receipt given by him or his agent would be dutiable. However, if a non-profit school purchased books and then sold them to students I do not think the school would be bound to issue a dutiable receipt.

Receipts for payment of fees and board to private schools: If the schools are not run for profit the payment is for educational purposes and the receipt would be exempt.

Receipts for donations and subscriptions to churches: Exempt as being for advancement of religion.

Receipts for donations to community projects, such as swimming pools and recreational facilities for the community: As these are normally non-profit projects, the receipts would be exempt.

Receipts for donations and subscriptions to sporting organizations and community clubs: These would depend on the nature and purpose of the clubs. Where, for instance, the emphasis is primarily on youth training or other desirable community objectives, receipts by sporting and community clubs could qualify for exemption. However, where the organization exists for purely recreational purposes (e.g., most football clubs), it would ordinarily not qualify for exemption. In the case of racing clubs and league football clubs that make charges to patrons and operate on a commercial basis, there would be clearly no exemption. Likewise, businessmen's clubs, social clubs, and the like would not ordinarily qualify for exemption as charitable purposes.

#### GLENELG PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about the state of the playing area at the Glenelg Primary School as a result of the rebuilding of the school that is now taking place, and the possibility of using the mounds at the Glenelg Oval?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Arrangements have been made by the Headmaster of the Glenelg Primary School with the Glenelg council for boys of grades 5, 6 and 7 to use the mounds as playing areas during recess periods. Teachers have been assigned to supervise these children while they are on the oval area, and the scheme is working most satisfactorily. Inquiries have been made regarding the use of tennis courts referred to by the honourable member, but it has not been possible to make any suitable arrangement. The Headmaster states that the situation

regarding playing space at Glenelg is quite satisfactory. The building contractor has been most co-operative in assisting in any way that he can. The new building at Glenelg is expected to be completed and ready for occupation by the end of April, 1969, and the present arrangement should suffice until that time.

#### GOVERNMENT DIRECTORY

Mr. RYAN: Has the Premier a reply to the question I recently asked about publishing a list of Government offices and their location?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I have a rather extensive schedule of the current head office locations of State Government offices, which shows all of the State Public Service departments, and many departmental sections. The locations of the Prices Commissioner and the City Coroner have also been included. All entries have been based on the "key word in context" method. Departments or departmental sections that may be shortly relocated have been asterisked to an explanatory footnote. This footnote refers relocation inquiries to the new Government Information Centre. The telephone number shown in the current issue of the Postmaster-General's Department's telephone directory for the Prices, Hospitals and Public Health Departments will be operative shortly, when a new P.A.B.X. service will be in operation. The Postmaster-General's Department has a standard practice relating to these matters, which is to show the proposed number in the telephone directory and supply a recorded answering service. This service re-directs callers to the temporary number until the proposed number is connected. Inquiries concerning the location of departments (or sections thereof) may be directed to the Government Information Centre, which has been established on the ground floor of the Government office block in Victoria Square (telephone 28 3387 or 28 3388). I will hand the schedule to the honourable member; if he desires to go further with it, that can be done by mutual arrangement or perhaps he can do it himself.

#### AIR POLLUTION

Mr. McKEE: Has the Premier obtained from the Minister of Health a reply to the question I asked earlier this month about air pollution?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I have not informed the honourable member that I have a reply to his question, which is at present with the Secretary to the Minister of Health.

## LONDON-SYDNEY RALLY

Mr. CASEY: The Premier will recall that some time ago I asked him about the London-Sydney motor car rally, and I thank him for his lengthy reply. However, what concerned me most was that motor cars acting as a vanguard for the rally were travelling through the North and North-East of the State and that nobody had been consulted about this. The Premier assured me that all station owners had been notified about the rally. During the weekend I received several telephone calls from people holidaying in the Flinders Ranges informing me that a car was tearing around at terrific speeds at great peril to holiday campers in the area. One man said that, after speeding past his party, the car became airborne as it went over the brow of a hill. I remind the Premier that the average speed set for drivers in the rally as they go through the Brachina, Morolana and Parachilna Gorges is over 40 miles an hour. The problem is that cars in this vanguard are testing out the route to see whether such a speed can be maintained. As the Premier knows, thousands of people visit the Flinders Ranges and, unless some notification is given of what is being done, I am afraid a serious accident will occur. Will the Premier raise this matter with those responsible for the cars that are acting as a vanguard and see whether the drivers cannot be asked to notify people in the North (at least the police in the area) that they will be driving through?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: From the tenor of my previous reply, it seemed to me that the sponsors of the rally were offering much co-operation. However, people lower down in the organization may not be as fully aware of the need for this responsible co-operation. Therefore, I will again bring the honourable member's question to the notice of the sponsors to make sure that they emphasize the need for this co-operation throughout their organization.

## DENTAL TREATMENT

Mr. BROOMHILL: Has the Premier obtained from the Minister of Health a reply to my recent question about what facilities are available at the dental department of the Royal Adelaide Hospital for children requiring orthodontic treatment?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: My colleague states: The recent building development for the dental department of the Royal Adelaide Hospital has provided excellent physical facilities for all forms of dental treatment, including orthodontics. These physical facilities are considered to be adequate for fulfilment of the

role of the department, which is to provide dental treatment for the indigent persons in the community and to teach dental students. Orthodontic treatment has several aspects, as follows:

- (a) Initially the patient and parents must be interviewed by an orthodontist, who must be satisfied that they will co-operate entirely in the treatment. Without absolute co-operation the treatment becomes ineffective.
- (b) A series of X-rays must be taken to diagnose the type of malocclusion.
- (c) A dental hygienist must give instruction to patient and parents in oral hygiene.
- (d) All conservative dentistry required by the patient must be completed.
- (e) Technical staff with training in this field must prepare models and construct appliances.
- (f) The orthodontist then commences the actual treatment.

Such treatment is very time-consuming and skilled staff is essential. For some years the dental department has been unable to attract sufficient professional staff to cope with the volume of work with which it is presented. All orthodontic treatments are carried out by, or under the close supervision of, two honorary dental officers, who can give only limited time to the work of the dental department. A full-time position of orthodontist was created in the dental department about two years ago as a means of increasing the number of orthodontic treatments that could be carried out but, despite wide advertising, a suitable appointee has not yet been attracted. Until more professional staff with adequate qualifications and experience can be attracted, full use cannot be made of the excellent physical facilities available.

## TRANSPORTATION STUDY

Mr. RICHES: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about what effect the release of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Report will have on funds available for roadworks in country areas?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Highways Department must plan ahead, and it is planning ahead for roadworks in both rural and urban areas. The department has an obligation to plan its works in response to traffic requirements, expected availability of funds for roadworks, and the most advantageous placement of such funds to give the maximum aid to the economic development and functioning of this State. The department has recently undertaken, in conjunction with the Commonwealth Bureau of Roads, an assessment of road needs throughout the whole of the State, and the results of this survey, when to hand, are expected to have a significant influence on the

future allocation of funds to roadworks in the various areas of the State. The agreement with the Commonwealth Government, under which this State receives Commonwealth grants for roadworks, expires during 1969. A new agreement for continuing Commonwealth grants for roadworks is expected, but it is not yet known what funds will be available from this source and what controls, if any, may be applied to the expenditure of such funds. The department intends in the next five years to increase its allocation of funds to the northern and western districts (to which reference has been made) by 34 per cent over that which was allocated to those areas over the past five years.

#### EGGS

**Mr. FREEBAIRN:** On Friday evening last I went to a well attended meeting at Saddleworth arranged by the poultry section of the United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia Incorporated.

**Mr. Jennings:** I'll bet they didn't know you were going.

**Mr. FREEBAIRN:** I am asking my question, which concerns the Council of Egg Marketing Authorities of Australia scheme and also a well attended meeting of poultry farmers at Saddleworth, in my district, last Friday evening. Several extremely angry references were made by poultry farmers at that meeting to the decision of the former Labor Administration.

**Mr. Riches:** Question!

The **SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member must now ask his question.

**Mr. FREEBAIRN:** I should like to ask my question, if members would be courteous enough to keep quiet.

The **SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member must ask his question.

**Mr. FREEBAIRN:** Will the Minister of Lands find out whether the Minister of Agriculture intends to conduct a poll of growers on the future of egg marketing in South Australia?

The **Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN:** Unfortunately, what would have been an informative statement was not quite completed. Therefore, I do not know the whole background to the question. The matter will be referred to the Minister of Agriculture, but I point out that the matter of the future of egg marketing can relate to either State or Commonwealth legislation, whereas the C.E.M.A. plan resulted from Commonwealth legislation, not State legisla-

tion. I ask the honourable member to give my colleague the whole statement that he intended to make in explanation of the question.

#### AIR FARES

The **Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY:** On October 16 the member for Eyre (Mr. Edwards) asked the Premier a question about the imposition by the Commonwealth Government of a tax on airline passengers. In reply, the Premier said that he would obtain more information and give the official view of the Commonwealth Government on this tax: up to the present the Premier has said only that he will get information on the matter. Can the Premier now say whether he will oppose this imposition, which is a matter of great importance to places served by airlines, particularly in rural areas (for example, air travel is being used to and from Whyalla to an increasing extent)?

The **Hon. R. S. HALL:** I have not yet replied to the question asked by the member for Eyre. This tax has been imposed by the Commonwealth Government and I have no power to actively oppose it: I can only express an opinion. When I have replied to the question asked by the member for Eyre, perhaps the member for Whyalla would care to ask me another question. Until then, I do not intend to give an opinion.

#### BOOLEROO CENTRE ROAD

**Mr. VENNING:** On July 23, I asked a question about the delay in the completion of the Booleroo Centre to Murray Town road No. 155, which has been under construction for several years and is now almost complete. On August 1, I was told in reply that it should be possible substantially to complete the project in the present financial year. I was also told that a crushing contract was being arranged on Magna Hill and that the excavation so created would form part of the ultimate road formation. My constituents are extremely concerned about the continued delay, which is increasing the maintenance work required and is expected to cause even more maintenance to be required because of the deliveries of the record grain harvest to Booleroo Centre. Will the Attorney-General find out when the Minister of Roads and Transport will finalize details of the crushing plant contract so that work on this road can be completed?

The **Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE:** I will obtain the information.

### CIGARETTE SMOKING

Mr. BROOMHILL: Has the Premier a report on my suggestion that the tar and nicotine content of cigarettes be published?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The matter of labelling cigarettes according to tar and nicotine content is well in hand in Australia. In October 1967, an *ad hoc* committee was set up by the National Health and Medical Research Council to consider whether there was a need or otherwise for the labelling of cigarettes which may indicate a risk to health. A meeting was held on February 23, 1968, and the following recommendations were made and subsequently passed on to the National Health and Medical Research Council: The committee was of the opinion, despite the fact that it might be impossible to be certain on scientific grounds, that there was, nevertheless, evidence by association to suggest that tar and nicotine played a major part in the causation of human disease. It was recognized that the major impediment to the clarification of this association on a scientific basis was that it would be impossible to carry out experiments on humans. It was noted that the Royal College of Physicians and the Federal Trades Commission, the only bodies which have specifically considered this subject, have both recommended labelling with tar and nicotine content. It was also noted that one cigarette company had advertised its product in Canada as safer because of its lower tar yield.

The committee agreed by majority that cigarette manufacturers should endeavour to produce a less dangerous cigarette. The committee believed that the danger was correlated with the tar and nicotine content. Since the amount of tar and nicotine present in cigarette smoke showed a correlation, it was probably necessary only to estimate the tar content. The committee agreed that actual figures would be meaningless to the average person and that it would be better to set ranges for low, medium and high tar content. Content might be indicated on a packet by a coloured disc or band with the appropriate words in a contrasting colour upon it. After considering the tar content of various cigarettes given in the literature, it was suggested that under 12 mg., 12 to 20 mg. and over 20 mg. tar a cigarette might be appropriate. These recommendations were accepted by the National Health and Medical Research Council in April, 1968, and were subsequently sent on to the Health Ministers' conference.

The last conference of Health Ministers received the recommendations of the National Health and Medical Research Council concerning labelling of cigarettes, and agreed to get details for the next meeting of Health Ministers and to propose a unified approach to the problem.

### MOCULTA WATER SUPPLY

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: In August I asked the Minister of Works whether the township and district of Moculta could be provided with a reticulated water supply from the Swan Reach to Stockwell main, which was nearing completion. The Minister, in replying to my further question on August 28, said that it would be practicable to give a reticulated supply to the township, that the investigation had reached the stage where two small pipelines had been designed, and that estimates of the cost that would be incurred and of the revenue that would accrue were being prepared. The Minister also said that it was expected that a report would be available by the end of September. Can the Minister say whether that report is available and, if it is, will he give the information contained in it?

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: I understand that this report will be available soon and, when it is, I will give it to the honourable member.

### AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION

Mr. GILES: Has the Minister of Lands a reply from the Minister of Agriculture to the question I asked on October 15 about the terms of reference of a committee inquiring into agricultural education and the names of the members of that committee?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Committee of Inquiry into Agricultural Education was appointed in December, 1967, and was given wide terms of reference which, in general, enable it to inquire into and report upon the State's total needs for the tertiary and post-secondary education of people who are or will be engaged in agriculture, animal industry, veterinary science and related occupations. For this purpose it is empowered to survey existing educational facilities in these fields and to report on the state of basic developmental research and its extension in South Australia. The committee consists of a Chairman and 10 members, whose names are as follows:

Chairman: Mr. A. M. Ramsay, C.B.E.  
 Members: Professor N. T. Flentje (Waite Agricultural Research Institute, and President of the S.A. Branch of the Australian Institute of Agricultural Science); Professor C. M. Donald (Waite Agricultural

Research Institute); Mr. M. H. Bone (Director of Technical Education); Mr. R. G. M. Harvey (a primary producer); Mr. J. Reddin (a primary producer and member of the Council of Roseworthy Agricultural College); Dr. E. W. Mills (Assistant Director (Academic) of the South Australian Institute of Technology); Mr. N. S. Tiver (a pastoral consultant); Mr. K. D. Williams (General Manager of Southern Farmers Co-operative Limited); Mr. A. J. K. Walker (Chief of the Division of Plant Industry of the Agriculture Department); and Mr. M. R. Irving (Deputy Director and Chief of the Division of Animal Industry of the Agriculture Department).

#### OAKLANDS CROSSING

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Attorney-General received a reply from the Minister of Roads and Transport to my recent question about reorganizing the Oaklands railway crossing?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The railway level crossing at Oaklands has been the subject of a departmental planning investigation for some time, and studies have now reached a stage where a firm proposal is expected early in 1969. The level crossing will be replaced by a grade separation, and some reorganization of the adjacent road system will be required to eliminate hazardous multiple intersections near the structure. Consideration is also being given to the recommendation of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study that Oaklands railway station should be a transfer terminal point for an express bus service that will necessitate improved access to the station. The implementation of the proposals will depend upon the availability of funds.

#### NARACOORTE CROSSING

Mr. RODDA: Three recent accidents have occurred at the double crossing at Stewart Terrace, Naracoorte, and requests have been made for "stop" signs or flashing lights to be placed at this crossing. Trains to Mount Gambier and Kingston travel over this crossing, about 30 yards from which is situated the main Lucindale-Naracoorte road. It seems that drivers of motor cars travelling to the crossing and stopping at the "stop" signs are aware of trains but, because of high grass, they are not aware of vehicles travelling from Lucindale on the road. An accident occurred as recently as last Saturday, as well as another serious one during the previous week, and several others have occurred. As the Naracoorte council has requested the Highways Department to do something about

this crossing, and as many people in the area have spoken to me about it, will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport whether some attention cannot be given to this dangerous crossing?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will do that.

#### NORTHERN ROADS

Mr. CASEY: Has the Attorney-General received from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about diverting the ore traffic from road transport to rail between Hawker and Quorn?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: My colleague states:

Further to my reply to a question asked by the honourable member on October 1, a reply has been received from the Commonwealth Railways Commissioner, who states that in the light of the exceedingly uneconomic operations on the Quorn-Hawker railway, he hopes in due course to seek its closure. In these circumstances, and also in the light of the understanding that S.A. Barytes Ltd. favours road transport, the Commonwealth Commissioner does not intend to divert the traffic back to rail.

#### PORT PIRIE PLATFORM

Mr. RICHES: Has the Attorney-General received from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my questions on the difficulties experienced by passengers wishing to use the refreshment rooms at the Port Pirie railway station?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The passenger platform at Port Pirie was built to its present length at the request of the Commonwealth Railways in order to accommodate double consists operating to Kalgoorlie, and the refreshment room was located as near as possible to the centre of the platform. The south-bound trains from Port Augusta and also those from Marree, when an east-west train is not in the vicinity, stop on the eastern side of the platform immediately opposite the refreshment room, while the broad-gauge train to Adelaide is positioned on the western side of the platform and as near to the refreshment room as is possible. On these occasions, therefore, little walking is involved to passengers transferring from one train to the other.

On those occasions when a double consist operates on the Commonwealth Railways, it is necessary to arrange for the arrival and departure of the Marree train on a short length of standard gauge situated on the south-western end of the platform and this, unfortunately, involves a lengthy walk to the refreshment



rooms. However, when only a single consist operates to Kalgoorlie the Marree train is brought onto the eastern side of the platform at the rear of the Kalgoorlie train and somewhat closer to the refreshment rooms. It is regretted that circumstances are such that it is not possible at all times to arrange for the arrival and departure of the Marree train opposite the refreshment rooms, but in these instances every endeavour is made to allow sufficient time for the passengers to obtain refreshments, even if it means a delay to the departure of the connecting train.

#### MODBURY SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: Previously, I have written to the former Minister of Education and have also asked questions about the Education Department's plans for the buildings and land at the old Modbury Primary School, which is now not used, situated on Montague Road. As approaches have been made by organizations and certain bodies to the department concerning the buildings and land owned by the department, can the Minister of Education say whether any proposals have been accepted by the department and, if they have been, under what conditions?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I have no recollection of this matter being brought to my notice, but I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

#### RAILWAY REBATE

Mr. VENNING: Has the Minister of Lands a reply from the Minister of Agriculture to my question of September 19 about a 25 per cent rebate on freight in respect of two rail truckloads of sheep and whether this rate could be applied uniformly throughout the State?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Railways Commissioner reports:

Following the close of the financial year 1967-68 the matter of rebates on livestock carried under certain conditions was reviewed departmentally, and in the light of results obtained it was decided not only to continue the rebates then existing but also to widen their scope slightly. While it is not proposed, at this juncture, to apply the 25 per cent rebate to all livestock movements within South Australia, the matter will be kept under review from time to time and we shall be guided by the continued response to the present concessions.

#### STORM DAMAGE

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Treasurer a reply from the Minister of Local Government to my recent question about storm damage to houses at Seaview Downs?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: My colleague has forwarded the following comments from the Chairman of the Building Act Advisory Committee:

Regulation 158 of the Second Schedule to the Building Act refers to construction requirements for timber-frame buildings and for every building in which timber is used. That part of the regulation relating to roofs states: "Roofs shall be covered with tiles, slates, metal, asbestos-cement, or any other materials approved by the surveyor and shall be securely and effectively tied down."

The responsibility for ensuring the Act is complied with rests with the appropriate local government authority. The Interstate Standing Committee on Uniform Building Regulations is considering "roofs and roof structures" as a separate part of the Australian Model Uniform Building Code and when this is available the Building Act Advisory Committee will make recommendations concerning its adoption in South Australia.

#### WEST BEACH SCHOOL

Mr BROOMHILL: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about Government assistance for the establishment of school ovals, and particularly the West Beach Primary School oval?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: All new schools opened in February, 1967, and subsequently will be provided with grassed and reticulated playing fields at full cost to the Government. Future maintenance of the ovals will be the responsibility of the school committees. Estimates of costs have been prepared and approval of funds is now being sought for the establishment of ovals at all schools, including West Beach, that qualify for oval development under the above policy.

#### RAIL PASSES

Mr. VIRGO: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my recent question about train passes for retired railway employees?

*At 4 o'clock, the bells having been rung:*

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

#### FESTIVAL HALL

Mr. RICHES (on notice):

1. What is the estimated cost of the festival hall proposed for the riverside site?
2. What services are proposed to be provided at the festival hall?
3. Do the present proposals provide for (a) a festival hall; (b) a concert hall; and (c) an arts centre?
4. If no costs have been estimated, on what basis has the Government considered the feasibility of this proposal?

5. What is the commitment of the Adelaide City Council in the proposals currently under discussion?

6. What is the commitment of the Government as at this date?

7. What is the total commitment of the Government?

8. What guarantee can be given that the State will not be committed to an escalation of costs as has happened in connection with the Sydney opera house?

9. What consideration has been given to the cost of resiting services at present provided on this riverside area?

10. How will this cost be met?

11. Will Parliament be given an opportunity of considering any proposal representing increased expenditure before the State is committed?

12. Is it the intention of the Government to estimate the costs of the project before feasibility is assessed, regardless of how desirable the project may be?

I feel it is incumbent on me to explain that notice of these questions was given last Wednesday at the Premier's invitation to members to place questions on notice.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is making an explanation of questions on notice. He can do so only by leave. Has the honourable member leave to make an explanation?

Leave granted.

Mr. RICHES: I merely wanted to explain that these questions were placed on notice at the invitation of the Premier last Wednesday, when he said that if they were placed on notice he would obtain specific answers. The following day some of these questions were answered by the Premier. I merely want him to know that the questions listed were put on notice the day before the questioning took place.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The replies are as follows:

1 to 10. Firm financial proposals were made to the Adelaide City Council in respect of the former site purchased for the purpose of a festival hall. The provision of a festival hall on this site did not proceed, owing to certain difficulties that arose. In negotiations for an acceptable alternative, the Government proposed the site of the present Railways Institute, which was strongly recommended by the investigating committee. Negotiations are proceeding with the City Council in respect of this site. As soon as these negotiations are concluded a statement can be made to Parliament.

11. Expenditure for this proposal will require Parliamentary approval in the normal manner, in addition to such legislation as will be required.

12. Careful consideration will be given to total cost before any recommendation is made.

#### INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. RYAN (on notice):

1. Have the duties of Mr. A. M. Ramsay as Director of Industrial Development been determined?

2. Will the position be full-time or part-time?

3. What is the annual salary for the position?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

2. Mr. Ramsay will be occupied full-time on industrial promotion and housing development duties, both of which are interrelated.

3. The salary for the Director of Industrial Promotion in the Industrial Development Branch is under consideration.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE: HON. C. D. HUTCHENS

Mr. BROOMHILL moved:

That one month's leave of absence be granted to the member for Hindmarsh (Hon. C. D. Hutchens) on account of ill health.

Motion carried.

#### RAILWAYS STANDARDIZATION AGREEMENT (COCKBURN TO BROKEN HILL) BILL

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to approve an agreement between the Commonwealth, the State of New South Wales and the State of South Australia in relation to the construction of a standard gauge railway between Cockburn in South Australia and Broken Hill in New South Wales and other matters contained in the agreement, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I move:

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

It seeks the approval of Parliament to an agreement made between this State, the Commonwealth and the State of New South Wales for the construction of a standard 4ft. 8½in. gauge line between Cockburn and Broken Hill. Honourable members will be aware, no doubt, that this length of line is the final section of a through standard gauge link between

the east and west coasts of Australia. Honourable members will also be aware that, pursuant to an agreement made between this State and the Commonwealth (and approved by the Railways Standardization Agreement Act, 1949, of this State which, for convenience, I will refer to as the "1949 agreement"), the line from Port Pirie to Cockburn is being converted to standard gauge, and this work should be well advanced by the end of the year. The agreement, which is set out as a schedule to the Bill, is the result of long and complex negotiations by both the previous Government and this Government on behalf of the State. In essence, it provides that this State will build, own and operate a railway line within the territorial limits of New South Wales. Such an arrangement is not unusual in the case of so-called "border railways".

The marshalling yards at Broken Hill itself will be the responsibility of the New South Wales authorities. The route of the proposed railway is very nearly a direct line between Cockburn and Broken Hill and up to 13 miles to the south of the line belonging to the Silverton Tramway Company that is at present part of the Adelaide to Broken Hill line. This new route offers some advantages, not the least of which is that it is about five miles shorter than the present line. Since it is the agreement to which the approval of this House is sought, it appears desirable that the agreement, as set out in the schedule to the Bill, should be dealt with in some detail before the Bill is dealt with. Clause 1 of the agreement sets out the definition used in the agreement. Clause 2 makes the agreement subject to the approval of the Parliaments of the States concerned and the Commonwealth before it can have any force or effect. I can inform honourable members that an appropriate measure has already been introduced into the Commonwealth Parliament and that a similar measure will come before the New South Wales Parliament in the very near future. Clause 3 sets out the detail of the work to be performed by the State and, as honourable members will observe, pursuant to clause 4 the bulk of the work will be carried out by this State. I also point out that the work referred to in paragraphs (d) to (g) of clause 3 (1) are extensions of the 1949 agreement between this State and the Commonwealth and in fact somewhat clarify the position as to certain works related to the 1949 agreement in respect of which there was some doubt. In addition, in clause 3a (1) (c) provision, which was sought by both this and the previous Government, is made to assist in the retention of

certain Broken Hill business over and above the ore business. Clauses 5, 6 and 7 are self-explanatory.

Clause 8 deals with the calling for tenders for work under the agreement but provides that States may undertake the work themselves. Clause 9 is self-explanatory, and clause 10 authorizes the execution of "extra work" by the State at its own expense. Clause 11 provides that, subject to the agreement, the Commonwealth will meet the expenditure under the agreement, and subclauses (2) and (3) deal with certain allowances against that expenditure. Clause 12, in effect, amends and extends the agreement made between this State and the Commonwealth in 1949 and provides for the allocation of expenditure against this agreement and that agreement in the proportions specified therein. Clause 13 sets out the limitation on the Commonwealth expenditure in relation to the various aspects of the work; clause 14 sets out the procedure for the actual payment of the amounts payable by the Commonwealth, and clause 15 guards against improper expenditure by the States. Clause 16 provides for repayment by this State to the Commonwealth of three-tenths of the amount of the payments made by the Commonwealth to this State in connection with the agreement. These repayments are to be made by equal annual instalments over 50 years. This repayment provision is generally in line with clause 16 of the 1949 agreement. Clause 17 provides for the provision of annual estimates of expenditure by the States, and clauses 18 and 19 are fairly standard accounting provisions. Clauses 20, 21 and 22 relate to the provision of information and collaboration generally. Clause 23 rescinds clause 23 of the 1949 agreement, which states:

The Commonwealth shall take all reasonable steps to ensure that the Silverton Tramway and the locomotives and rolling stock thereon shall be acquired and vested in the South Australian Railways Commissioner.

Since the approval of this provision by the Parliaments of the Commonwealth and this State it has, as has been mentioned in connection with the route of the railway, been decided to follow a southerly and more direct route than that followed by the company's line. Accordingly, this provision is now redundant. While legal advice indicates that there is no obligation to compensate the company, it is recognized that the new line will substantially affect its business. Accordingly, the company has been offered an *ex gratia* payment of \$1,250,000 by the Commonwealth Government.

The company has at this stage declined to accept the offer, and since the future course of this matter is in the hands of the company it would be inappropriate to make further comment. Clause 24 is a formal matter relating to the giving of notice as required under the Act. The schedule to the agreement sets out the general route of the railway and appropriate standards for its construction.

In substance, the Bill is fairly straightforward. Clauses 1 and 2 are quite formal. Clause 3 formally approves the agreement and gives it the force of law in this State. Clause 4 extends the power of the South Australian Railways Commissioner under the South Australian Railways Commissioner's Act, 1936-1965, to encompass the work he will be required to perform as a consequence of this Act. Such a specific extension of power seems necessary, since almost all of this work will have to be carried out within the State of New South Wales. Subclause (2) ensures that the Railways Commissioner will have sufficient power to act on behalf of the Government in the construction, operation and maintenance of the railway. Clause 5 is a standard financial provision. Clause 6 empowers the Governor to make such regulations as may be necessary. Clause 7 gives direct statutory effect to the rescission of clause 23 of the 1949 agreement by clause 23 of the agreement proposed, by this measure, to be approved. This is a matter of some consequence to the State and to the very important link in the completion of the east coast to west coast standard gauge railway. I ask members to give this measure their best consideration at an early date so that it can be quickly passed, if it is the wish of the House that it be passed, and so that this State's approval can be added to the other approvals necessary in order that the line can commence.

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

#### STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 17. Page 2007.)

Mr. JENNINGS (Enfield): When the House was gracious enough last Thursday to allow me leave to continue my remarks, I had almost completed my speech. However, there are a few matters that I will mention for the benefit of the House now that I have had an opportunity to study in depth the remarks

of the member for Stirling, the member for Eyre and the member for Victoria. This is surely one instance where truth is not at the depths of the well.

Mr. Clark: You didn't have to go too deeply.

Mr. JENNINGS: No. We on this side believed that Government members were determined not to speak on this matter because of the political embarrassment it might cause them. Needless to say, it was the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) who, with his inimitable courage, and faithful to his maiden promise to be invincibly himself, broke the ice. This does not mean that he was any more understandable to the majority of us than he usually is, but how could we lesser mortals hope to understand the views of an acknowledged financial genius such as the member for Stirling, even if he is a self-acknowledged genius? All I could gather from the honourable gentleman's remarks was that, whilst supporting the Bill, he had some reservations about it and, indeed, he said it would not be the type of tax he would impose if he were the financial dictator of South Australia. On the surface, this may sound an innocuous statement, but we are endeared to the member for Stirling because of the inflexions in his voice. He plays on his voice as Kriesler (and do not let the member for Eyre now start telling me I am talking about motor cars) played on his violin.

Mr. Clark: It was more like Paganini, in my opinion.

Mr. JENNINGS: The member for Stirling makes his voice sing like the superb instrument that it is; it is capable of nuance that could not be conveyed by the ordinary meanings of words themselves. Arising from this, the inference is inevitable; namely, that there is a financial dictator of South Australia even if it is not the most appropriate member (the member for Stirling). Therefore, it can only be the Treasurer himself but, personally, I do not think it is the Treasurer: I think it is the whole Government, which is doing things just the opposite of the things its members advocated before the election, when they wanted votes at any price. The member for Victoria (Mr. Rodda) spoke on this matter briefly, for which I commend him, as follows:

I rise to say only a few words about this Bill. I commend the Treasurer for trying to correct the financial difficulties he found when he entered the Treasury. Although we have heard much from the Opposition I do not know that it has been terribly constructive.

Later, referring to the member for Millicent, the honourable member said:

We have been charged with being full of deceit and, by interjection, the honourable member was prompted into saying, in effect, that had we won Millicent this tax would have been bigger and better. However, we did not win Millicent.

It was surely unnecessary for the honourable member to say that. He went on as follows:

With the exception of my friend the member for Edwardstown (Mr. Virgo), all members opposite took part in the milking that went on in the dark three years preceding this one, for the Labor Party really dried the cow out in the Thirty-Eighth Parliament.

I think the member for Victoria might eventually make a good assistant honorary Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. Clark: It sounded like a lot of bull!

Mr. JENNINGS: I think there is a prerequisite to milking a cow that would involve a bull. The member for Victoria continued:

The member for Edwardstown was not correct when he said that Government members were not allowed to defend their Treasurer and that they would remain silent while the measure went through. That honourable member was also incorrect when he said that not one Government member of the Victorian Parliament spoke in support of taxes similar to these introduced by Sir Henry Bolte, because Mr. Stokes, a Government member of the Victorian Parliament, said, as reported at page 1202 of *Hansard* of October 24, 1967:

I am in favour of the proposed tax, which has two great advantages. No individual in Victoria will be unduly harmed by this tax. I am one of those back-bench members of the Government who can see a lot of good in the measure, and I rise to the defence of the Treasurer.

Apparently, the member for Edwardstown was incorrect when he said that no member of the Victorian Parliament supported Sir Henry Bolte; he was wrong to the extent that one member apparently supported him.

Mr. Rodda: Do you object to quality?

Mr. JENNINGS: No, I should like to see more of it.

Mr. Rodda: You are casting aspersions on it.

Mr. JENNINGS: The honourable member continued:

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. We believe in taxing those who earn most.

If the honourable member believes in spreading tax over the whole community, he is certainly supporting legislation now that will do just

that, but, unfortunately, it will spread the tax on a basis that will hurt most the people least able to pay it which, as we have said before, is not particularly unusual for people of the honourable member's political philosophy. Then we heard the commendable remarks of the member for Eyre (Mr. Edwards), who said:

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. There was not much for a while in the remarks of the member for Eyre of any great importance until he said something I found rather difficult to follow, perhaps because there was considerable interjecting at the time.

Mr. Edwards: You should make your own speech, not mine.

Mr. JENNINGS: I am making my own speech. I do not think the honourable member has contributed anything to it whatsoever.

*Mr. Hurst interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Enfield does not need any assistance.

Mr. JENNINGS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I heard the interjection of my friend, the member for Semaphore (Mr. Hurst), but at this stage I do not want to interfere in the contention he has made. I think the member for Semaphore has completely misunderstood the whole thing. The member for Eyre said he had heard many workers say that they did not want the extra week's leave that was granted by the previous Government; they said they did not have time to take the three weeks' leave to which they were entitled.

Mr. Edwards: That is quite correct.

Mr. JENNINGS: It may be, but it is something that, with my limited capacity, I find hard to understand.

Mr. Edwards: You would.

Mr. JENNINGS: That is possibly so, and I am not disputing it. So far, the member for Eyre and I are on very common ground. However, one thing I did learn about the member for Eyre was that he spent much time (and this is undoubtedly where he gained his tremendous knowledge) working in various occupations before going over to hibernation in the Eyre District, or going back to that district. In explaining the experience he has had, he said—

Mr. Edwards: You cannot read now.

Mr. JENNINGS: No, and I cannot write very much, either. I am, however, doing my best, and I hope members will be charitable. The honourable member said:

The honourable member—

I do not know which honourable member he was talking about, but it was probably the member for Edwardstown (Mr. Virgo)—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.

The member for Eyre must have been referring to the member for Edwardstown, because the latter member then interjected:

Where were these workers?

Mr. Edwards: You can't even read *Hansard*.

Mr. JENNINGS: There are some sections that are not relevant, and it would be inimical to the great prestige of the member for Eyre if I were to read them, so I do not wish to do that. The honourable member said that the reason he did not go to the war was that he was mentally (I thought he said) unfit. The member for West Torrens (Mr. Broomhill) interjected and said "Hear, hear!" The member for Eyre continued:

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

The member for Edwardstown interjected:

Were you a member of a union?

The member for Eyre replied:

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

This is rather remarkable. I can only assume that the honourable member is a person who is always prepared to take anything a union can gain for members but contributes nothing to the union itself.

Mr. Hurst: Is such a person known as a scab?

Mr. JENNINGS: That is not a term I intended to use. It so happens that I have here a book written by a wellknown American writer, who undoubtedly is well known to the member for Eyre. The writer is Jack London, who said:

In a competitive society, where men struggle with one another for food and shelter, what is more natural than that generosity, when it diminishes the food and shelter of men other than he who is generous, should be held an accursed thing? Wise old saws to the contrary, he who takes from a man's purse takes from his existence.

Mr. Edwards: This has nothing to do with the Bill.

Mr. JENNINGS: I knew that, when I mentioned a "wise old saw", the honourable member would probably be more aware of the "wise old saw" that Jack London was talking about than he would be about Jack London himself, because the "wise old saw" obviously was a certain Mr. William Shakespeare, who said, "Who steals my purse steals trash." Jack London did not quite agree with William Shakespeare on this. He continued:

To strike at a man's food and shelter is to strike at his life; and in a society organized on a tooth-and-nail basis, such an act, performed though it may be under the guise of generosity, is none the less menacing and terrible. It is for this reason that a labourer is so fiercely hostile to another labourer who offers to work for less pay or longer hours. To hold his place, (which is to live), he must offset this offer by another equally liberal, which is equivalent to giving away somewhat from the food and shelter he enjoys. To sell his day's work for \$2, instead of \$2.50, means that he, his wife, and his children will not have so good a roof over their heads, so warm clothes on their backs, so substantial food in their stomachs. Meat will be bought less frequently and it will be tougher and less nutritious, stout new shoes will go less often on the children's feet, and disease and death will be more imminent in a cheaper house and neighbourhood.

Later, London said:

The sentimental connotation of "scab" is as terrific as that of "traitor" or "Judas", and a sentimental definition would be as deep and varied as the human heart. It is far easier to arrive at what may be called a technical definition, worded in commercial terms as, for instance, that a scab is one who gives more value for the same price than another.

In other words, it would take a heaven-sent inspiration to raise a scab to the depths of degradation.

Mr. Edwards: At least I did not go out on strike like your mates at Salisbury.

Mr. JENNINGS: It might have been a good thing if the honourable member had, if he were fighting for a worthy cause. There is no doubt whatever that the incidence of this Bill will fall most heavily on those least able to pay. This is usual L.C.L. policy, provided we accept that there is certainly nothing liberal about that Party's policy. It seems to me there are many gentlemen opposite (and I suppose once again I can include in this the member for Eyre) who are familiar with the Bible, and I refer them to Matt. 25.29 as follows:

For unto everyone that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance; but from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath.

This modern definition of "liberal", of course, has come about since the Liberal Party was formed by Sir Robert Gordon Menzies. In 1949, after he won the Commonwealth election, with his new Liberal Party, he showed us what he thought orthodox Liberal financial policy should be. In his first Budget he decreased income tax by 10 per cent—not a graduated 10 per cent, but a flat 10 per cent. However, before the three years of that term of office were up, he had reimposed that 10 per cent and more. At the same time as he reduced, in his first Budget, income tax by 10 per cent, he imposed that snide, surreptitious form of taxation—sales tax—by much more, as it affected the ordinary person, than the amount that had been reduced from income tax. Ever since then we have seen this form of taxation from Liberal Party Governments. They are determined to impose taxation in a way that affects most those least able to pay.

Perhaps the most important thing about this Bill is that no inkling of the impost it contains was given prior to the election or during the previous three years. What people could possibly have expected this savagery? For example, could it have been this gentleman (and I now quote from that well-known publication *The Voice of South Australia*) who is stated to be an 81-year-old retired South Australian and who is quoted as saying, "State taxation is too high"? The pamphlet continues, "Hundreds of other South Australians, interviewed in their homes, echoed his sentiments. A few are recorded on page 2, and what caused them to say it is set out on page 3. Now read on . . ." On page 2, a 67-year-old retired fruitgrower is quoted as saying, "The State Labor Government has upset the basic principles of fair taxation." Further on the pamphlet states "Higher water rates: the Minister of Works (Mr. Hutchens) has announced higher water rates. The increases would average between \$1 and \$2 a householder." Despite all the protestations from the present Government, I have noticed a certain increase in water rates recently.

Regarding the Bill, we had this comment in the pamphlet, "Stamp duty up: double stamp duty on all South Australian cheques forced through Parliament." This is the kind of publication that was being put into everyone's letter box before the last election and perhaps even three years before the election campaign began. The pamphlet states that a 38-year-old storeman said, "They've pushed

up taxes for the working man as well as those who can afford to pay." That 38-year-old storeman is apparently one of those anonymous persons referred to, because of course his name does not appear anywhere. He talked about pushing up taxation for the working man, yet in this debate we have heard several speakers opposite say that they were all working men. Nevertheless, the man in the pamphlet referred to "the working man as well as those who can afford to pay". Then there is a reference to the following statement by another 81-year-old retired man (he must have monkey glands or something: he is pretty active for an 81-year-old retired man): "The Government is not doing enough for the man on the land." A 24-year-old apiarist is referred to. I do not know what that is or whether it has anything to do with wombats.

Mr. Edwards: Then don't show your ignorance.

Mr. JENNINGS: I have admitted I do not know what it means. He is quoted as saying, "I'm against the Government's action in stopping freeholding of land." Then, of course, we had the overriding advertisement from the then Leader of the Opposition (now Premier), "Get South Australia moving: go L.C.L." That appeared in many different forms. Unfortunately, these pieces of dishonesty were sufficient to mislead enough people (admittedly only 43 per cent of the people of the State) to change the Government. Now the people are suffering the inevitable consequence of that mistake. Some new members have commenced their speeches by saying, "This need for imposing extra taxation is something we do not like—something no-one likes—but nevertheless it cannot be helped because of the financial position we were placed in." I can understand that this was a story told them by the senior members of their Party as an excuse to have them accept this Budget and the legislation that would undoubtedly flow from it.

I was in the dining-room when Government members came in after having been briefed. I think that was the day on which the Budget was introduced. Apparently, the Government was not going to trust its members before then. We did not have to listen to the Treasurer reading his Financial Statement: we had only to look at members of the Government Party as they walked into the dining-room, for we could see that their chins were down to their feet. We knew that the Budget was going to be extremely savage—a horror Budget.

One of the stories (and this is a bedtime story that has been put over new Government members) is that the Liberal Government faced a parlous financial position when it took office. It certainly faced a position in which the standards in education and all kinds of social services had been raised to the standards that had applied in some other States for many years, and it had been necessary for the Government to increase taxation to provide these improvements. However, these honourable gentlemen apparently have not been told what happened when the Labor Government took office. The Playford regime commenced its last year in office with surpluses in the Revenue Account, Loan Account and the Uranium Account, totalling \$8,600,000. That Government budgeted to overspend, absorb all this money and run into a deficit of \$1,760,000. That this is so is beyond dispute, but I have not heard any member opposite mention it.

The Playford Government, in its last year in office, intended to spend over \$9,750,000 more than it received, but it finally overspent only \$7,437,000. Once again, that is only half the question, because that Government started that financial year by commencing numerous new Government projects. The incoming Labor Government, from the point of view of economics, had to continue those projects, because nothing is more uneconomic than a building, bridge, or something like that, left half finished. Therefore, in actual fact, we inherited not only a deficit of \$7,437,000 but also many buildings that had to be completed.

If honourable gentlemen to whom I have been addressing myself are honest, they ought to be convinced that what they have been saying about the financial position when they assumed office in March last is not true and that the position was not in any way different from that which we inherited when we came into office in 1965. I imagine that I have said sufficient to convince the House that I oppose this Bill. I consider it to be a nefarious and dishonest measure, and surely that is sufficient to encourage any honourable member to oppose it.

Mr. FREEBAIRN (Light): It comes as some surprise to me, as I look back over speeches by Opposition members, to find that they all oppose this measure, because I should have thought they would be the first to desire to take some sort of action to correct the enormous deficit that the Treasurer faced when

he took office a few months ago. The sole reason for this legislation is to correct the enormous deficit that the Hall Administration inherited from the Walsh and Dunstan Ministries. I was interested in the remark by the member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings) about the member for Eyre (Mr. Edwards), who had done a good job for South Australia during the war. The member for Enfield made some reflective comment about the fact that the member for Eyre had not joined a trade union, and the member for Eyre, quite properly, said that by joining a union he had more to lose than to gain. I understood the member for Enfield to imply then that people who did not join a trade union gained benefits at the expense of those who were members.

Mr. Langley: Commonly known as "scabs".

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I want to find out what a trade union can offer the worker today and what it can do to help his cause.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I consider that trade unions became out of date when arbitration was introduced.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member can make passing reference to that, but I will not allow debate on it.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I just wanted to set the record straight and correct some of the remarks made by the member for Enfield. I am very proud that the member for Eyre was one man who did not go on strike while his fellow Australians were fighting a war at the front.

Mr. Nankivell: For five bob a day.

Mr. Langley: He was a scab.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, looking back over the speeches made earlier in the debate, I was also interested to find that members of the Party opposite maintained that this was regressive taxation and, therefore, undesirable. They also said, in effect, that everyone should pay his fair share of taxation and that it was unfair that the lower income groups should pay more in proportion than should the higher income groups. I agree that there may be some validity in the claims some Opposition members have made, but they forget that, in some ways, they themselves do not pay all the taxation they really should pay. In many ways they are getting capital grants and special privileges that people in the lower income groups and people whom members opposite claim to represent in this House are not getting.



Opposition members are getting much higher income than they would get if they were continuing in their previous vocations. They are now enjoying very much higher income than they would be getting if they were doing an honest job for South Australia by standing behind a lathe all day or using a welding rod. Members opposite know this. In addition they are receiving superannuation handouts, free of taxation, that the people they claim they represent in this Chamber do not enjoy.

Mr. McKee: Who's getting this?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I am speaking about regressive taxation, and I am developing the remarks made by members opposite last week. This measure has an element of regressive taxation about it but, in all honesty, what could the Treasurer do but impose this kind of taxation in order to raise revenue to correct the deficits that were inherited from the previous Administration. If Opposition members were honest they would admit that this is the only way. A State cannot apply an effective direct income tax and, as the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) said, a turnover tax is an important part of the revenue structure of most of the American States. I believe that this Bill is a start in making State Treasurers in Australia realize and accept that they must raise more money to provide for increased expenditure on services demanded by Australians in education, health, and law and order. This measure is an immediate legacy of Socialism. I suggest that turnover taxes are here to stay.

The Treasurer, when forecasting this measure in a debate earlier this year, said that a receipts duty of 1c in each \$10 on the pattern of measures recently implemented in Victoria but not extending to wages and salaries, would be expected to raise about \$4,800,000 in a year and about \$1,600,000 this financial year. In other words, this tax is expected to raise about \$5,000,000 in a complete financial year. One must appreciate that South Australia has under 10 per cent of Australia's population, and that if every State applied this tax the total receipts of all States would barely exceed \$50,000,000. This indicates the poor position the States are now in in raising revenue. This \$50,000,000, which a general turnover tax applied by all States would return, is interesting. I am speaking to members opposite and I suggest that the member for Mount Gambier (Mr. Burdon) should listen with care. I do not know whether he has contributed anything to this debate.

Mr. McAnaney: Has he ever made a contribution in this House?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I am not as unkind as to say that, and I do not agree with the member for Stirling. If we compare this modest taxation rate with the enormous revenue derived by the Commonwealth Government from its taxation programme, we must realize how difficult it is for the States, which are equal and Sovereign partners in the Federation, to play their important role. Apparently, this does not worry members opposite, who hope to see the end of federalism and look forward to the day when there are no State Parliaments. According to the Budget speech of 1966-67 in the Commonwealth Parliament (and that is the latest copy I can get from the Parliamentary Librarian) indirect taxation returned in 1965-66 a colossal total of \$1,598,000,000, income tax on companies was \$818,000,000, and income tax on persons was \$1,732,000,000, a total of about \$4,100,000,000. As the total revenue from taxation raised by the Australian States, as shown in the paper *National Income and Expenditure 1967-68*, was only \$1,087,000,000, this shows the great disparity between the taxation-earning capacity of the Commonwealth Government and of the State Governments. This Bill is modelled on the Victorian legislation, and I have read the debates on that measure as reported in the Victorian *Hansard*.

Mr. Virgo: I have seen them, too, and they are most illuminating.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Both the member for Edwardstown and I can share that mine of information. I regret that the honourable member has already spoken in this debate, because it is a pity that with all his study he could not have done better. Sir Henry Bolte, when introducing the Budget on September 13, 1967 (and this was a fore-runner to the stamp duties legislation) said:

I present to the House the Budget statement for the financial year 1967-68.

He continued with very real pride:

Budget day is an annual event, and I mention with humility, yet with a sense of pride which I hope will be pardoned, that this occasion marks the submission by me on behalf of the present Government of 13 successive Budgets.

Despite the taxation increases that the Liberal Administration in Victoria has been forced to apply, it has the overwhelming confidence of the Victorian electors. I know that the Labor movement in Victoria has broken up into several fragments.

Mr. Virgo: How do you know that?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: It is common knowledge. Anyone who takes an interest in the contemporary Australian political scene cannot help but know that the Australian Labor Party in Victoria has been smashed.

Mr. Virgo: You wouldn't know.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Sir Henry Bolte, when speaking about the great problems the Victorian State Treasury faces, said:

On the one hand the Government is involved in the spending of money to maintain services, the biggest and most important being education. On the other hand the Government is involved in getting the money to spend. Much though some might wish, there is no magic formula to be invoked. I have already made reference to the number thirteen, and wistfully recall here that in the 19th Century a "thirteen" was the name given in Ireland to an English shilling which was worth thirteen pence Irish.

I know the member for Stirling is very proud of his distinguished Irish heritage but even he, with all his economic understanding, cannot make 13c out of a shilling. Would that he could! Sir Henry Bolte continued:

A Victorian 10c piece which was worth 11c Australian would conveniently overcome our financial problems, but such is not within reach.

I think every member would agree with Sir Henry Bolte on that.

Mr. Virgo: What did other Liberals have to say?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I have no time in this debate to discuss that.

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

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I wish to read what the Premier of Victoria had to say (it is only a brief reference) when speaking on the Stamps Bill, when he greatly deplored the fact that he had to introduce that legislation:

It has been necessary to include special provisions in the Bill at this point to cover the position of Commonwealth employees. In the view of our legal advisers, the Commonwealth Government and its authorities would not be bound by the general provisions relating to deductions by employers, nor would its employees necessarily be bound by the liability to pay receipt duty on periodical payments of salaries and wages. To cover this possibility—I am quoting what Sir Henry Bolte said on September 19, 1967—

the Bill provides that such an employee would be required to make an annual return to the Comptroller of Stamps showing his periodical salary and pay duty on that return.

Then he went on to say he was going to extract this stamp duty from the salaries of Commonwealth employees. This will interest members

on both sides of the House. The very first Commonwealth employees against whom he took deliberate action to extract the turnover tax were the Commonwealth Parliamentarians from Victoria. I hear he was going to make an example of them and set them up as the first Commonwealth employees from whom he would extract the turnover tax. We are fortunate, at this stage anyway, that our State Treasurer has been able to balance the Budget—at least, to forecast a balancing of the Budget—without applying a stamp duty to wages. I do not doubt that that will cause great regret to the Victorian Treasurer, but it highlights the fact that the States have great difficulty in raising additional taxation to fulfil all the obligations they are required to meet under our federal compact.

Mr. Virgo: They are in the family.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I doubt whether the Commonwealth Treasurer in Canberra pays great heed to the colour of the Government in the various States when he is making allocations to them, but members opposite will know (and perhaps the newer members, like the member for Edwardstown, will not know) that the former South Australian Premier (Sir Thomas Playford) was able to get a much larger pro rata share—

Mr. Jennings: Absolute rubbish!

Mr. FREEBAIRN—of the national cake than was any other State Premier. This is a good education for the new members like the member for Edwardstown, who has not been a member of Parliament for very long, and we on this side are only too happy to give him any help we can. I recall that Sir Thomas Playford on several occasions told the House how reluctant were the Labor Premiers in other States to borrow money to help their States develop: they were quite happy just to paddle along and let their States, as far as they could, remain backwaters. He cited in particular the example of the Labor Premier of Queensland, a highly respected gentleman, who said he wanted his State to stay a simple primary-producing State; he did not want any industries there so he wanted the very minimum allocation of Commonwealth Loan funds. My friends on this side of the House are smiling, because they know Sir Thomas Playford said that. It is a good story to show how irresponsible Labor Administrations are towards development.

The philosophy of the Liberal and Country Party is to increase the size of the national economic cake so that we can all get a bigger

share, have a higher standard of living and so be all the happier for it, but the Australian Labor Party—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member should get back to the Bill.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I am sorry, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but members opposite do tend to sidetrack me a little. I was making out a general case for the necessity of increasing State taxation to cover (1) the enormous deficit we inherited from the previous two Socialist Administrations, and (2) the increase in State expenditure, which we must meet to cater for the demands and requirements of the South Australian people.

Mr. Jennings: Why didn't you say that before the last election?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I have never hidden anything from the people. I was talking about regressive taxation and how previous speakers had commented so much on this stamp duty being regressive. Of course it is, but (and I repeat this for their benefit) honourable members opposite should be the last people in South Australia to talk about the troubles and tribulations of the working man and how regressive taxation will affect him, because they employ all means possible of getting good incomes, tax concessions and district allowances and, if they were earning an honest 10c—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HUDSON: I take a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Quite apart from getting away from the Bill again, the member for Light is reflecting on other members of this House. He should cease doing so.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have already drawn the attention of the member for Light to the fact that he is wandering away from the Bill. I call him to order. He should come back to the Bill and not reflect on other members.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: If I have hurt the sensibilities of members opposite I apologize. However, if the cap fits, they should wear it. I support the second reading.

Mr. McKEE (Port Pirie): The member who has just resumed his seat has rambled on about various matters, and I think some of his comments should be replied to. I point out to him that any person who does not join a union that is responsible for obtaining increased wages and better conditions in a particular job—

Mr. Lawn: What is he called?

Mr. McKEE: I am sure the member for Adelaide would agree with me on this point: these people are commonly referred to as "scabs". Fortunately, not many of them are around. The only ones we strike are people who support the Liberal and Country League. The member for Light continually brings up the issue of Parliamentary superannuation, although I do not know why. He refers to members on this side who have paid into the fund (fairly substantially, I might add), but I should be surprised if he were not a contributor. I am sure that he will expect something out of it when he leaves this Parliament.

Mr. Lawn: It's compulsory to contribute to it.

Mr. McKEE: The member for Light has criticized people who have given service to the State and who have paid substantial sums into the superannuation fund.

*Members interjecting:*

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Port Pirie.

Mr. McKEE: This Bill may not affect the member for Eyre, and I am quite sure—

Mr. FREEBAIRN: On a point of order, I should like to know whether it is an acceptable expression to refer to another member of Parliament as being "scurrilous".

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Has that expression been used by the member for Port Pirie?

Mr. McKEE: I do not know what the honourable member is referring to; was it "squirrels"? I cannot understand him.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Exception has been taken by the member for Light concerning the member who made the remark. I ask the honourable member to withdraw the remark.

Mr. Lawn: Which remark?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The word "scurrilous".

Mr. McKEE: I never used that word, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Chair did not hear the word, but my attention has been drawn to it. I ask the member for Port Pirie whether he used it.

Mr. McKEE: No, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I never used that word.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: If I misheard, I apologize. Anyway, I withdraw my complaint.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Port Pirie.

Mr. McKEE: I understand the member for Eyre interjected a while ago to the effect that this Bill would not affect him, but it could affect the wombats, dingoes and crows in his district, where the wild turnip grows, and I am sure it will affect some of his constituents also.

Mr. Lawn: He is behind the time; did you hear him say so today?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Port Pirie.

Mr. McKEE: With other members of my Party, I object to this form of taxation, because it will affect the people who can least afford to pay it.

Mr. Edwards: It will not affect me and it will not affect you.

Mr. McKEE: This Bill is directed at the people who support the Labor Party, and those people represent practically the whole of the work force of the State. It will have little effect on the majority of people in L.C.L. districts.

Mr. Nankivell: Oh!

Mr. McKEE: This will not affect people in the districts of Government members, except those people on wages, who are outweighed by Government supporters, anyway; otherwise, members opposite would not be here. This Government will not introduce legislation that will affect its wealthy supporters, and this Bill is an example of its attitude. This form of taxation is designed to go hand in glove with the abolition of price control, and the wage-earner and family man will be seriously affected. Members on this side are aware that the family man and wage-earner are already sufficiently burdened, but I would not expect members opposite to agree with that, because they would not be aware of the problem.

Mr. Virgo: They don't even represent people.

Mr. McKEE: No; if they represented the people as a whole, they would certainly have never introduced legislation such as this in the first place. Government members who support this Bill (and I am sure they all will) are outright hypocrites.

Mr. Edwards: Speak for yourself.

Mr. McKEE: The member for Eyre has put himself in the picture again. If there is a hypocrite in this House, he is a fair example of one.

Mr. EDWARDS: On a point of order, I object to that lot.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: What is the honourable member's point of order?

Mr. Jennings: "That lot"!

Mr. EDWARDS: I object to being called a hypocrite, and my fellow members also object.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has taken exception to the remark of the member for Port Pirie and I ask him to withdraw it.

Mr. McKEE: If I have upset the member for Eyre, I am prepared to withdraw.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Very well. The member for Port Pirie.

Mr. McKEE: Members on the Government benches pay lip service to representing the people as a whole, but if they did represent the people it would most certainly be with their tongues in their cheeks after introducing legislation such as this. We all know that the Government must have money to finance the public services, but the people expect a responsible Government to collect fairly the revenue required for those services.

Mr. Jennings: The people are entitled to expect a responsible Government, too.

Mr. McKEE: They did not expect this measure, which will extract money from those who are always easiest to get at. This seems to be the policy of the present Government. The man who has to buy over the counter is the man who is taxed most, and the business people are not affected, for they have the opportunity to pass on the burden to others. It is as simple as this: these people who can least afford to pay the tax will be the most affected by it.

Mr. Edwards: I get a pay packet every month.

Mr. Lawn: Yes, but your hand shakes every time you get yours!

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: It does when he looks at you.

Mr. McKEE: When we were in Government we introduced a Bill to set up a State Government insurance office, but the then Opposition opposed the Bill and voted against every clause in it. Eventually, it was defeated in another place.

Mr. Virgo: They were hypocritical then.

Mr. McKEE: Yes. Unfortunately, the member for Eyre was not a member then.

Mr. Clark: If he had been a member he would have voted the same way as the others did.

Mr. McKEE: Yes. We attempted to set up a State Government insurance office, which would not only have been a reasonable means

of collecting revenue but which would have given a service to the people.

Mr. Jennings: It would have made for competition, too.

Mr. McKEE: True. It would have provided competition for the Government's wealthy supporters. Last week, I told the Attorney-General in this House that some insurance companies are reluctant to provide certain types of insurance but, if a State Government insurance office had been established, it would have been able to cater for people who had been refused this insurance.

Mr. Lawn: Were the companies reluctant to provide the insurance or did they refuse to provide it?

Mr. McKEE: They refused. I applied at various insurance companies to obtain comprehensive insurance and was asked whether I had any other form of insurance with the company. People have complained to me that they have applied to insurance companies for comprehensive motor vehicle insurance and have been told that they could not get it unless they insured their house and other effects with the company. These are the tactics used by insurance companies here.

Mr. Virgo: Even those that contribute to Liberal Party funds?

Mr. McKEE: I think so.

Mr. Virgo: No wonder they protect those people.

Mr. McKEE: Obviously, there was a reason for protecting the insurance companies when the Bill was before the House. I do not think one needs to be an Einstein to know why the Government supports private insurance companies. The Succession Duties Bill that the Labor Government introduced would have been a much better way of collecting revenue from the people. It would have been levied on people who can afford to pay and who, in some cases, have possibly exploited the workers.

*Members interjecting:*

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. McKEE: I know of several wealthy pastoralists who have exploited workers. In this House we have attempted to obtain awards for pastoral workers.

Mr. Lawn: The Government members do not like what you are saying now.

Mr. McKEE: Of course they do not! When we were in Government we supported the principle of awards for pastoral workers. Government members say that these pastoralists have never exploited the people, but they have had them working in the middle of the night with hurricane lamps. I think the member for

Stuart would agree with me. He knows of many people who have been exploited. This stamp duty is a petty action by the Government to take out its spite on people who do not support it politically. The Government says, "We do not have to worry about these people, because they do not support us. Let us extract as much as we can from them." I oppose the Bill.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Albert): I will reply to a couple of matters raised by the member for Port Pirie. First of all, I point out that Tasmania has introduced similar legislation. It has a State Government insurance office. All other States, except South Australia, have State Government insurance offices, yet they have introduced this legislation, so State Government insurance offices are not the answer. Regarding succession duties, these would never have met the current expenditure. A figure of about \$2,500,000 for a full year was mentioned. The member for Glenelg said that over the period the Labor Government was in office it would have raised about \$5,000,000 in duties to make up the deficit, but this would have only balanced the Budget. All members will agree that the Government has an increased expenditure to meet.

Mr. Virgo: Take your tongue out of your cheek.

Mr. NANKIVELL: It is not in my cheek. Some of these increased expenditures flow from things the honourable member believes in, such as arbitration and wage-fixing. No-one is complaining about that. The Government has to meet the \$1.35 rise in the living wage and also the flow-on from the Metal Trades Award. I understand the teachers have claims before the Teachers Salaries Board that could cost the State \$10,000,000 if they were granted. All these things have to be met. These are expenses that any responsible Government has not only to meet but in some measure to anticipate.

Mr. Corcoran: When we made provision for increased wages and better conditions we were harshly criticized by members of the present Government.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I criticized the Labor Government for doing what it did when it first took office, but I agreed it should pay service pay and allow four weeks' annual leave to public servants if the State could afford it. These things multiply costs. In the Labor Government's first Budget debate I asked repeatedly for information on what these things would cost but I could not get a factual figure,

yet the Budget presented to us tried to anticipate expenses the Treasury could not calculate. Is it any wonder there was a deficit? It was done deliberately. I think the member for Edwardstown knew something about it, because at that time he was king of the Trades Hall. The other interesting point raised by the member for Port Pirie was that this legislation went hand in glove with the removal of price control and was something that was brought in to trample on the wage-earner and the salary-earner. The Prices Act is still in existence. There is still a Prices Commissioner.

Mr. Casey: Prices have gone up.

Mr. NANKIVELL: They are all subject to review.

Mr. Langley: But prices have gone up.

Mr. NANKIVELL: The Prices Commissioner in his wisdom, after deliberating on certain applications before him, has raised some prices. Many of these increases are legitimate; they offset increases in cost to the people who manufacture and retail the goods. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that this is an irrevocable tax. I do not believe, of course, that even he would deny that, had his Party been in office, it would have been faced with considering a similar tax. This kind of legislation operates in Western Australia and Victoria. We have heard it called Sir Henry Bolte's tax, but this kind of tax was introduced in Western Australia before it was introduced in Victoria. I wish to reply also to the question of who is principally affected by this kind of tax. I speak for the people I represent when I say that I do not like this sort of taxation. I accept it only because I believe it would be impossible for a Government to fulfil its proper functions, whichever Government was in power, without imposing it.

Mr. Langley: Things have changed, haven't they?

Mr. NANKIVELL: It is incorrect to say, as the honourable member for Unley said by way of interjection when his Leader was speaking, that every time a person goes down the street and buys \$10 worth of goods he will pay a direct tax. This would happen only if the tax was passed on. It will be passed on, but it will be like a cancer: it will spread with such thin lines to all sorts of people that it will not draw very much from any one section, except the people whom we are supposed to be protecting!

I ask members opposite to look at the effects of this Bill. I am a primary producer, so I will be burdened with income tax as a result

of this Bill; I will be taxed on my gross turnover. What happens to the thrifty person who has invested money for his retirement? He will be burdened with income tax. However, when we look at the Schedule to the Bill we see that salaries and wages are not affected.

Mr. Langley: Not yet.

Mr. NANKIVELL: This tax is inequitable. If it was essential for us to have this tax, I would have imposed it on everything immediately, as it is it is only fair that, if it is to be imposed, it should be imposed overall. The reason for its imposition stems basically from the limited taxing powers of the States. As the member for Light (Mr. Freebairn) pointed out, this tax, if applied by all the States, would yield only about \$50,000,000, whereas the Commonwealth Government's income tax receipts from all sources will amount to \$5,414,000,000 this year. The States have undoubtedly been obliged to impose this sort of taxation because of the inequitable redistribution of taxation receipts in accordance with the formula applied by the Commonwealth Government. I understand that the Commonwealth Treasurer (Mr. McMahon) at present does not propose to change the present formula, so we can only assume that the situation will stand. Furthermore, there are no additional funds that we can derive directly from this source. The only way we can obtain money for this State's requirements is by increasing the normal charges for services provided by the Government (it is in this field that most of our deficits arise) or by imposing additional forms of taxation such as the one under consideration at present.

This is, in a sense, a turnover tax. It is not quite as vicious as that which is applied in the United States of America, despite what the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) implied. The member for West Torrens (Mr. Broomhill) may be interested to realize the limitations of the capital tax to which he is always referring. When one looks at the estates coming up for review, if one has the proper information one can see that estates are becoming smaller. There are legitimate ways of breaking them down. Anyway, they are being whittled down despite gift duties and other normal taxes, so there is not an unlimited field for taxation from this source.

Mr. Hudson: But there is more.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Yes, and I do not doubt that this Government will see that alterations are made to that Act also. The States have been forced to apply this

sort of tax. They should have the right to receive further reimbursements of income tax, which is the most equitable form of taxation because, as members opposite claim, people pay income tax according to their means. However, people paying capital taxes are not necessarily paying according to their means. I have expressed my opposition to the principle behind this Bill: it is wrong that the States should have to enact this sort of legislation. However, I accept that, in the circumstances, this Government had no alternative but to introduce legislation of this nature in order to finance the services it provides for the people.

Mr. Virgo: Will you vote against the Bill?

Mr. NANKIVELL: One thing prevents my doing so: I could never accept the alternative Government, because I suffered it for three years. I support the Bill.

Mr. LANGLEY (Unley): I am sure that this is one of many such Bills that will be introduced this session. No doubt the Treasurer's second reading explanation was very resounding outside, but it has not been very reassuring to us. I am sure that most South Australians will suffer from this form of taxation, and I am equally as sure that the big business people of this State will gain from it.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: Will you explain that further?

Mr. LANGLEY: Yes, I will explain it as I continue my speech. The tax imposed under this Bill was mentioned in the Treasurer's Budget speech, but not in the policy speech prior to the last election. The further the present Government goes the more it becomes out of touch with the people of the State. I am sure that, contrary to what the member for Albert (Mr. Nankivell) said, a Labor Government will be returned to the Treasury benches at the next election. It appears that Victoria is dictating the financial policies to be adopted in this State. I listened intently to what some members opposite said about how many Victorian members spoke on the Bill for this purpose that was introduced there in this connection. However, I have found that, apart from the Victorian Premier, only one other member spoke in support of that Bill. Members opposite have said that they do not like what is being done, but that they will support the Bill, saying that that is the only way that the financial difficulties forced on the Government can be overcome. In his explanation of the Bill, the Treasurer said:

This is the measure that is expected to attract the greatest additional revenue in the bridging of the gap between essential expenditures and available revenues to bring to the State's finances the degree of stability this Government set out to achieve.

On perusing certain documents, I have found that, during its term of office, the Playford Government had more deficits than it had surpluses. I am willing to say that, at this time next year, this Government, too, will have a deficit.

Mr. McAnaney: How do you work that out?

Mr. LANGLEY: Unlike the honourable member, I do not put myself up as a financial wizard. I do not talk about things about which I do not know, but ask for information about them. As I told the honourable member once before, I should be interested to hear the member for Glenelg and him debate financial matters. As well as being a business man, I am a member of a trade union, and I know that unions do much for workers in the State. If it were not for trade unions, the State would be dictated to by its moneyed people, and we do not want to see that happen. The trade union movement deserves great credit for the existing relationships between workers and management. Over the years, the unions have ensured that workers' conditions are improved.

I believe that provisions in the Bill will affect small businesses and not big businesses. As many constituents in my district will be affected by the Bill, in their interests I will raise some matters with the Treasurer that I hope he will deal with later. I do not agree with what the member for Albert said. All purchases made in shops of less than \$10 will involve the payment of stamp duty. However, big business men will get away with not paying as much, because they will submit bulk returns. A private person does not have to issue a receipt for a transaction of less than \$10, although for transactions above that sum the issue of a receipt is mandatory. I believe that receipts are desirable but that the tax involved in their issue should not be so great. The issuing of receipts clears up many doubts. We all know that often when receipts are not issued people believe they have paid for certain goods but, as they cannot produce a receipt, they may have to pay again. I do not favour the extent of the duty for which the Bill provides.

In connection with small businesses, I can refer to the electrical trade. Electrical repairs, such as those undertaken in

the case of toasters, irons and other household appliances, often involve payments of about \$4 and, in such cases, electricians must issue receipts. In the case of a healthy business, many such receipts would have to be issued. However, as I see the Bill, these business men would not be able to submit bulk returns. Therefore, it seems to me that a duty will be involved in each transaction. On the other hand, big businesses will be able to submit bulk returns monthly, quarterly, half-yearly or yearly. I find it hard to believe that a grocer would issue a receipt, as required in the Bill, when he sold only \$4 worth of goods. The Bill says that these people can make bulk returns. As I understand the Bill, a receipt will have to be issued to a person who buys only 50c worth of groceries, but such a transaction would most probably be marked on the cash register and a bulk return submitted.

Mr. McAnaney: Why don't you talk about the provisions of the Bill?

Mr. LANGLEY: I am not perfect, as the member for Stirling thinks, he is. When I am not sure about something I seek information about it. If I am wrong about something I am happy to admit it; if a person cannot take a beating there is something the matter with him.

Mr. Hudson: Business men will have to keep their accounts up to date to comply with the Bill.

Mr. LANGLEY: I am sure most people keep their accounts up to date. However, as I am looking after my constituents, I just do not have the time. I hope the Treasurer will provide information about the matters I have raised. During the term of the previous Government, the duty on cheques was increased and the issue of receipts became unnecessary in certain cases. Although many people thought that receipts would still have to be issued, it was found that this was not necessary and the only sum involved in many cases was a 2c duty on a cheque. This was a help to business people, who I am sure were not affected by the increase in the duty on cheques imposed by the previous Government. However, this Government has found another avenue to tax the people in relation to this duty on receipts. I wonder what will happen in another place when this Bill is considered there. During the term of the Labor Government, members of that place were not keen about taxation increases. Therefore, I hope they will be consistent, so that the taxes imposed

on the people will be imposed fairly to enable the State to get back on its feet. However, this Bill does not do justice in that way and I oppose it.

Mr. GILES (Gumeracha): I support the Bill and should like to reply to remarks that have been made about this Government's misleading the public. Those statements were a lot of twaddle and were untrue. This is the *Hansard* report of part of the speech of the member for Edwardstown (Mr. Virgo):

Mr. VIRGO: Yes. The Premier even went so far as to say:

Take no notice of the sceptics who say we cannot do this.

Who were the sceptics? They were the people who were realistic enough to know that the Premier, in delivering his policy speech, either had his tongue in his cheek or was deliberately misleading the public.

Mr. Hudson: Only misleading?

Mr. VIRGO: Well, Standing Orders preclude my using the word I should like to use, and we all know exactly what it is.

Mr. Ryan: What is the first letter?

Mr. VIRGO: I have already used the word. I have already accused the Premier of being a certain type of person, and that applies also on this occasion.

I also draw the Opposition's attention to *Hansard* of August 15, 1967, at page 1271. On that day the Leader of the Opposition said on television that he had tried to get both sides of Parliament united in its approach to the River Murray Commission about the Chowilla dam. The then Leader of the Opposition who is now the Premier, moved an amendment in order to achieve that.

Mr. HUDSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think the member for Gumeracha is mistaken regarding the day: this is Tuesday afternoon and the Bill before the House is the Stamp Duties Act Amendment Bill. We are not dealing with the motion about Chowilla dam, which will be debated tomorrow. I ask that the honourable member speak to the Bill.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I ask the honourable member for Gumeracha to come back to the Bill.

Mr. GILES: I have been saying that, in the debate on this Bill, we were accused of misleading the public, and I considered it wise to prove that we were not doing that. The Opposition was entirely wrong in saying that, and I can prove that the Labor Party has been misleading the public. Have I permission to refer to a previous debate, Mr. Deputy Speaker?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member cannot refer to a previous debate of the same session.



Mr. GILES: It is not a debate of this session.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member will be in order if the matter is relevant to this debate.

Mr. GILES: I am trying to prove a point. The then Premier, in 1967, moved a motion, to which amendments were moved by the then Leader of the Opposition, the then member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon), and the member for West Torrens (Mr. Broomhill). The last of these amendments was carried. On television the Leader of the Opposition said he would have achieved what he desired to achieve but for an amendment that deliberately misled the people and told only half of the truth. This proves that we cannot have any faith in the Opposition's statement that we are misleading the public because the Labor Government itself misled the people.

*[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.]*

Mr. GILES: Before dinner I had just proved that the Labor Party had been misleading South Australia and, because I was able to prove that convincingly, I had proved also that we could not take any notice of what it was saying at present. When in 1965 the previous L.C.L. Government left office, Sir Thomas Playford left the Treasury in a very healthy state with a credit balance of \$1,163,000. Since then, statements from the Treasurer have shown conclusively (and nobody can dispute this) that there has been a downward trend in the State's economy.

Mr. Virgo: And particularly since April.

Mr. GILES: In its first year, the Labor Government overspent by \$9,000,000, which left a debit balance of just over \$8,000,000. This trend continued for the full three years.

Mr. Broomhill: Do you think this money should not have been spent?

Mr. GILES: It should have been spent more wisely.

Mr. Broomhill: How?

Mr. GILES: When the Liberal Party won the last election the present Treasurer did not know the exact state of the Treasury, so he did not know the exact taxation measures necessary. Then, when he discovered the exact position, which was very worrying, he found that to put South Australia back on its feet he had to impose extra taxes, and he took courageous steps to balance the Budget. I do not know whether any members opposite can overspend every month and continue that practice year after year, and think it is a good practice for their own kind

of business. They would not remain in business very long if they acted like that. The Government is spending South Australia's money in a businesslike way; it cannot continue to overspend. If people want extra concessions and more social amenities, they have to pay for them, and the only way they can pay for things like an extra week's leave is to pay more taxes. We did not know the exact state of the Treasury before the elections, so how could we know what was necessary to be done? What is more, we cannot afford to pay nearly \$1,000,000 a year in service fees and interest on loans. This sum represents keeping 500 workers in a job for 12 months, and it is what we are losing each year because of the deficit. This is a retrograde step. We have to reach the stage where we do not owe money, and then we can spend this sum of almost \$1,000,000 in South Australia, which will help us to progress more favourably.

Mr. Virgo: Why don't you sack some Government servants? That would save money.

Mr. Rodda: That is an irresponsible interjection.

Mr. GILES: Obviously; I do not take any notice of it. The very fact that the Labor Party is attacking this policy shows how farcical the attack is because it knows it would have had to introduce a similar policy (and, possibly, it would have carried it a little further and increased succession duties) had it been returned to power.

Mr. Virgo: That's right.

Mr. GILES: It is also obvious that the Opposition has no appreciation of the situation; otherwise, it would not suggest such a ridiculous move. If succession duties are increased, what will happen to the primary producer? All his incentive will be taken away. He is earning less than 3 per cent of capital value.

Mr. Ryan: Going broke, is he?

Mr. GILES: He has a large turnover and a very small profit. This is where the Bill affects the primary producer to a large degree, but he is big enough at heart to take it. He has a big outlay, his cost structure is high, and the Bill is designed not to tax his profit but his turnover.

Mr. Virgo: You ought to vote against it.

Mr. GILES: The member for Edwardstown is, I think, acting as Leader of the Labor Party at the moment, and it is most encouraging to hear his interjections. I oppose succession duties, as I believe they have a crippling effect on the primary producer's initiative.

Mr. Ryan: Why don't you abolish them if you don't agree with them?

Mr. GILES: I would if I could.

Mr. Ryan: You are a member of the Government Party.

Mr. GILES: Another point is the reflection made on Government members by the member for Edwardstown, who said:

I completely agree with it. I said "more power to the Minister's elbow", but let us not be hypocritical in saying that the State's finances are in a poor condition because of the conditions given the workers. If we had no workers, we would not have a State and members of this House, including me, would not be sitting where we are sitting today.

The member for Burra interjected, "Who are the workers?" The member for Edwardstown replied:

I am sure the member for Burra is not one of them. Every hive must have its drone.

I consider this is a reflection on Government members. It has been said previously that Government members are drones, capitalists, etc. The workers on this side would outwork any man on the Opposition side. Any primary producer who has a place of his own works up to 80 hours a week during his busy period. We are trying to keep our workers in jobs. The man on the land has to do his books after everyone else has knocked off. Members opposite do not realize the situation. When a man is in business he has to take half his work home at night to catch up. An attack on us as workers is a scurrilous reflection.

I agree with certain portions of the Bill, but I believe the primary producer will be adversely affected by other portions. However, he is big enough at heart to take it: instead of working 16 hours a day he will have to work 17 hours a day. I support the Treasurer in introducing the Bill, and I support the Bill.

Mr. HUGHES (Wallaroo): I have listened with interest to members opposite because the statements made by some of them are not in keeping with the manner in which they will vote. I think it was the member for Albert (Mr. Nankivell) who said that he disliked this type of taxation very much. However, when challenged by interjection to say whether he would vote against the Bill, he said that he would prefer to vote for it than to have, as an alternative, a Labor Government. It is staggering to hear such a statement because it shows that the honourable member is so selfish that he would rather impose on the people of this State such a vicious taxation measure as this than see this State functioning under a good Labor Government.

The member for Gumeracha (Mr. Giles) said that neither this Bill nor Government members' statements had misled the people. Later, I will prove that this Bill certainly does mislead the people. Also, many statements made by members opposite, including the policy speech of the present Premier, were very misleading to the people. On the Notice Paper this Bill is named the "Stamp Duties Act Amendment Bill", but in my opinion it should be named the "Snatch and Grab Bill". Later I will refer to the Premier's policy speech and show that there is no reference in it to this rock-throwing, club-swinging, extreme measure to raise finance from the people of South Australia. It has already caused the transfer of industry from this State and it will also endanger the livelihood of people on lower incomes. Apart from dampening this State's industry and business it will hurt the person on a lower income whenever he purchases an article. The housewife will eventually be affected, and it is amusing that, in his policy speech, the Premier said that the housewife knew she must plan her budget to enable her to put her books in order. The Premier said:

When we are elected to Government our first task will be to restore stability in the State's accounts. Every housewife knows that before you can plan your future spending you must first put your books in order.

The Premier, prior to March 2, when he was mentioning the need for the housewife and the State to plan their future spending, did not indicate that it would be necessary for them to plan their spending throughout the year to provide for such a vicious tax as this, which affects the housewife in every way. Every time she goes down the street to buy a pair of shoes or a school uniform for one of her children she will be affected.

Mr. Broomhill: And the more children she has the more she will pay.

Mr. HUGHES: Exactly. When she goes to the grocer's she will find that the goods she buys will cost her more.

Mr. Jennings: It is 1c for every \$10 or part thereof.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, every small part thereof.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: Even the little one.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, even the goods she buys for the smallest child in the family will be affected. Every time a housewife goes to the butcher's she will have to pay more for her meat. The Premier said that, before they could plan future spending, housewives must put their books in order, but he did

not refer to this tax. He should have been man enough at that time to warn the people of what the Government intended to do. However, he did not do this, and these provisions will affect not only goods purchased but also materials used in house renovations and in the building of new houses. I have been criticized harshly for the length of time I took, during the Budget debate, to bring matters before the Government.

Mr. Clark: That's jealousy.

Mr. HUGHES: I know that it was jealousy on the part of members opposite.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is out of order in referring to a previous debate.

Mr. HUGHES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, but I was referring to a point made by the Minister, the full gist of which I did not get.

Mr. Clark: They get a bit edgy.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, members opposite get edgy when we refer to matters about which they are worried. I have touched a sore spot, and this tax will touch everyone, whether the sum involved is \$10, \$100 or \$1,000. However, it will affect people receiving lower incomes more than those receiving higher incomes.

Mr. Burdon: Including the small business man.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, he will be hit. These smaller businesses, particularly in the country and in the more remote parts of the metropolitan area, provide a real service to the community that is greatly appreciated, but they will be hit so hard that the majority will be forced to close down—

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: What is the tax on \$1,000?

Mr. HUGHES: —because they will be unable to compete with the bigger business organizations. The point I am making is that the people on lower incomes will be hit hard. Small business men will be hit, and they provide a service to the community. If the member for Angas (Hon. B. H. Teusner) interjects now, I will listen to him.

The SPEAKER: He will be out of order if he does.

Mr. HUGHES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was not inviting him to interject but I could have helped him if you had allowed him to interject.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not think the honourable member needs any help.

Mr. HUGHES: I appreciate the help of members on both sides. On the day on which the Treasurer announced these imposts, by

coincidence many items were released from price control, and this decontrol affected persons in the lower income group more than those in the higher income group. I dealt with that matter previously and I gathered from interjections that I dealt with it very extensively and effectively. I do not intend to refer to that matter again, although that will dissappoint members on this side and please members opposite. The impost in this Bill hits mainly the people I represent, the people in the lower income group. Members opposite represent big business and are not concerned with people in the lower income group or the person who conducts a small business on the corner and gives service to the people. If that were not so, members opposite would not have introduced such a severe tax as the one we are considering.

Mr. Jennings: They told us today they were workers.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes. I think it was the member for Eyre who tried to interrupt one of the speakers on this side this afternoon by repeatedly claiming to be a worker.

Mr. Burdon: He wouldn't work in an iron lung!

Mr. HUGHES: True. It would need to be a fairly good iron lung to keep him working, and it would want to be in better hands than the Treasurer's. Otherwise, I would be sorry for the member for Eyre.

Mr. Burdon: He's got a lot of wombats to keep him going.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, and crows that hold up telephone communication.

Mr. Edwards: We've got more than Wallaroo has.

Mr. HUGHES: Many things at Wallaroo are the envy of the honourable member. Some of his relatives are my constituents.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not think that this is in the Bill. Will the honourable member get back to the Bill?

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, Mr. Speaker. It is merely that I take a delight in replying to interjections from members opposite. It seemed strange that this afternoon members opposite talked about the Australian Labor Party, or about superannuation, without linking their remarks with the Bill, yet were allowed to continue. However, as soon as I depart from the Bill for just one second I am called to order.

Mr. Burdon: That's a reflection on the Chair.

Mr. HUGHES: No, it is not. However, I am beginning to get sick and tired of it.

Mr. Burdon: You have our permission to go the whole hog.

Mr. HUGHES: During the election campaign there was allegedly much criticism from anonymous people of the Australian Labor Party because of the taxes it levied during its term of office. However, they were taxes that the people knew about and expected. The A.L.P. was honest and did not try to mislead the people. In fact, it told the people during the election campaign that it would be necessary to increase certain taxes. However, after the Succession Duties Act Amendment Bill passed this House it was thrown out in the other House, yet we are told this afternoon by a member opposite that there are other ways of raising revenue. That honourable member said that he would vote for this Bill. I will be honest with the House, which is more than some honourable members opposite can say. I maintain that the people who have the money and can afford to pay taxes should be the ones to pay them, and that taxes should not be levied overall so that the man in the lower income group pays equally with the man in the higher income group. I was rather surprised this afternoon to hear the member for Light (Mr. Freebairn) criticize the Superannuation Fund.

Mr. Jennings: He has not seen the light yet.

Mr. HUGHES: He certainly has not. He was criticizing something to which he is a party, something for which he signed his name on the dotted line to accept, yet he saw fit this afternoon to criticize superannuation. I was waiting for the honourable member to have the courage to repeat something he said during the debate on the Loan Estimates: that if one or two things were not amended he would vote against them. Those things were not amended, and I do not think this Bill will be amended, either. I think the honourable member was drawn into line on that occasion, and he was very careful not to transgress during his speech this afternoon, for although he was supposed to be debating stamp duties he kept talking about the great Australian Labor Party.

Mr. Burdon: He was told to toe the line.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes. I think the greatest compliment ever paid the A.L.P. by any member in this House was that paid today by the member for Light. If it were not such a good Party and if it were not a Party that could handle its finances, it would never have drawn the attacks that it has drawn from the honourable member, so, although he was criticizing the A.L.P. for the way in which it levied

its taxes, in my opinion (and in the opinion of most honourable members of my Party and also at least one member of his own) he was unwittingly paying a great compliment to the A.L.P.

As I said earlier, I could not find anywhere in the Premier's policy speech any warning to the people that taxes would be levied against the people. I find it rather amusing to hear the statements made from time to time by members opposite, because although they undoubtedly would have heard the Premier give his policy speech they obviously have short memories when it suits them. So far, we have not heard one member in this House point out to me or to any other member where the Premier in his policy speech gave prior warning to the people of South Australia that stamp duty would be levied. Neither can they point to any other reference to increased taxation. When questions were asked during the election campaign to the effect, "How will you do all these things unless you increase taxation?" (those may not be the exact words used, but that was the meaning) the Premier replied, "I do not know."

Mr. McKee: And he still does not know.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, and he still does not know many things, as is evident from the replies given to questions from members on this side of the House during Question Time.

Mr. McKee: And do not forget he was going to build the Chowilla dam. What about that?

Mr. HUGHES: I am not allowed to talk about that. I would be pulled up as there is nothing about taxes that affect the Chowilla dam. I do know, however, that during the election campaign the Premier said (and this was supported by members opposite), "We shall be able to spend more money and balance the Budget, and we shall not increase taxation." Yet what happened? Within a short time of the Government's assuming office, we were advised that there would be seven taxation increases; and it was indicated at that time that more were to come.

Mr. McKee: And fees, by regulation, are being increased.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes. There is an old saying, "The best is yet to come." I doubt it on this occasion because I think the Government is now treading warily. Although it has introduced some nasty medicine by way of taxation, the worst medicine is yet to come. However, I hope I am proved wrong in the long

run, because I do not want to see further taxes of this type levied on people in the lower income groups.

I come to housing, and mention it because of the tremendous cost that will be involved in renovations or additions to people's houses. Also, people will be vitally affected in building new houses. It is strange that the Premier (then the Leader of the Opposition) said this in his policy speech: "Let us now move on to housing." He criticized the Labor Government for the way in which it handled its finances. Still, he had not told the people anything about increasing taxes. He said:

South Australia has a unique housing problem. We have houses without people and people without houses.

What a remarkable statement to make! He continued:

We will encourage the Housing Loans Insurance Corporation to do more in South Australia.

He was going to encourage people to do more. If one took the time to quote the whole of this speech, one would find that the Premier referred to the fact that there would be such a huge amount done by other people in this field that there would be no need to increase taxation; yet one of the first things with which this House is presented is a proposed increase in taxation. The Premier made a number of points in his policy speech, but still did not say anything about taxation. He said, regarding hospitals, "Our talkative opponents cannot be expected to fool you all the time. They pose as humanitarians." I am proud to pose as a humanitarian, and every Opposition member is proud to pose as a humanitarian. This cannot be said of the Government, which supports this Bill. In addition, there is an extra charge to be levied against people who, through no fault of their own, have to be hospitalized. The increased charges will operate from November 1, but the Premier did not say a word on this matter during the election campaign when he spoke at length on hospitals: not once did he indicate that it would be necessary to increase hospital charges. Again I say he was misleading the people.

The Premier dealt with social services, pensioners, payments to widows, youth training and industrial development, which is the sweetest job that could fall to any Minister. It is a vital job, yet the manner in which the Premier is handling it is making it one of the best jobs in the Cabinet, because he was not prepared to accept the full responsibility of the Minister of Industrial Development. The Premier

broke up a department that was functioning most successfully, and not one honourable member can deny this. At its head was one of the finest industrialists in South Australia. The Minister of Works is an honest man and would agree with this but, apparently, he does not. We had a very learned man in industrial development, but what happened? His job was taken away from him and another man who, one would have thought, was already holding a full-time position, was given the job. All the Premier does is to sit on the outside and let others do the work. Once again, if one reads the Premier's remarks on industrial development, one finds that not once did he say there would be an increase in taxation. The Premier said that the following would be some of the things the Government would do: get on with the Chowilla scheme; take every sensible action to safeguard the quality of Murray River water; investigate the site of an additional reservoir on the Onkaparinga River; complete the Swan Reach to Stockwell pipeline designed to relieve the load on the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is not in order in pursuing that line of argument.

Mr. HUGHES: I thought I was.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is not!

Mr. HUGHES: All right. If that is the attitude you are adopting, Sir, I will accept your ruling. In pursuing the argument, I was trying to outline the number of things the Premier said during the election campaign the Government would do, yet not once during the policy speech did he say that his Government would increase taxation. However, apparently, the argument I was trying to pursue is not acceptable to you, Sir, and is distasteful to members opposite, so I will not follow that line any further. I hope I will be able to refer to some of the things that the Liberal and Country League was responsible for putting out in a pamphlet on State taxation. In it an 81-year-old retired South Australian said that State taxation was too high. The Opposition at that time took great delight in issuing a series of pamphlets to South Australians that contained anonymous statements. Because the statements were anonymous, they were useless and did not carry any weight at all.

Mr. Rodda: Are you talking about the golden *Voice of South Australia*?

Mr. HUGHES: No. The honourable member had better be careful or the Speaker will rule him out of order.

The SPEAKER: Yes, he is out of order.

Mr. HUGHES: I thought you would say that, Sir. Liberal and Country League members took great delight in printing a number of pamphlets that were placed in my letterbox. In fact, one would have thought that they had many pamphlets to waste. I do not think that the executive members of the L.C.L. would appreciate the fact that some letterboxes in Wallaroo were stuffed full of the same type of pamphlet. Apparently, the distributors were trying to get rid of them as quickly as possible.

Mr. Clark: You cannot blame them for that.

Mr. HUGHES: No. Apparently the Young Liberals in my area were so disgusted with the contents of the pamphlets that they were anxious to get them off their hands by putting them in as few letterboxes as possible. Fancy saying this in a pamphlet:

"State taxation is too high," said an 81-year-old retired South Australian.

It is amazing that anyone would lower himself to go along to an 81-year-old person to obtain an indication whether State taxation was too high.

Mr. Ferguson: Experience!

Mr. HUGHES: My father lived to the age of 95 years, and I have great respect for the aged, but I would consider it an insult if the Labor Party had used a statement of my father, when he was 80, to illustrate support for my Party. I would have thought the L.C.L. should look to the people who will be accepting responsibility for the State.

Mr. McKee: Perhaps Sir Thomas Playford made that statement.

Mr. HUGHES: No. He would not have made such a stupid statement as that. I wish to refer now to the statement of a 38-year-old teacher that is quoted in the pamphlet. I have known many teachers and I find it hard to believe that one South Australian teacher would lower himself to the extent of having such a statement inserted in the pamphlet, which says:

A 38-year-old teacher: "Labor puts up rates and prices which hit the little man they are supposed to protect."

Mr. Broomhill: Do you think that such a person really made that kind of statement?

Mr. HUGHES: No, and this is the reason I want to bring this matter before the House. Whilst in Opposition, L.C.L. members did not have a hook to hang their hats on in respect

of this State's finances. If the present Premier could manage this State's finances in the manner in which the previous Premier managed them, he would be regarded very highly by South Australians today. I realize that members opposite are tittering, but I challenge them tonight, as I have challenged them before, to hold a new election. Then they would soon see what the people think of the Premier's handling of this State's finances, compared with the achievements of the previous Premier. I wonder what the student teachers of today think of the idiotic statement attributed in this pamphlet to a teacher. I venture to say that members opposite could not produce this teacher or give me his name, even if I undertook to keep his identity a secret (and my word is my bond). I challenge them to name this anonymous person. I wonder what the person who wrote the statement attributed to this anonymous teacher would think about taxes now, because during Labor's term of office taxes were increased overall by less than 4 per cent as compared with a 20 per cent increase in this Government's first year of office.

Mr. Clark: Shocking!

Mr. HUGHES: Of course it is, and it makes this statement in this pamphlet all the more ridiculous. The pamphlet quotes a 33-year-old record librarian as saying, "The Labor Government has increased taxation, including stamp duties and land tax." Never at any time did the Labor Government increase stamp duties so viciously as they have been increased in this Bill. Of course, the anonymous person to whom this is attributed did not know what he was talking about or he thought the people of South Australia were rather foolish. All members know that the formula for land tax was introduced by the Playford Government, which provided that land tax be reviewed every five years, and one of those reviews became due during Labor's term of office. The pamphlet states that a 58-year-old engineer said: "They're all out to raise money at the expense of the public." What is this Government doing? It is doing the very thing which that statement condemns, and the statement was included in a pamphlet sent out to the people by the Party opposite. The pamphlet quotes a 29-year-old housewife as saying (and the Premier used housewives in his policy speech to illustrate an argument which fell flat), "I don't like the Labor Government because it didn't mention before the

election the putting up of land tax and then blaming the other Party for its mistakes.”

Mrs. Byrne: That's laughable.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, all members must know that.

Mr. McKee: Was she a waitress at the Adelaide Club?

Mr. HUGHES: I do not think so and I do not think she was a 29-year-old housewife.

Mr. Clark: She didn't exist.

Mr. HUGHES: That is so. Perhaps she is someone from outer space, but all I know is that such a 29-year-old housewife would not exist in South Australia, for I have too much respect for the housewives and mothers of South Australia to believe they would make such a stupid statement.

Mr. McKee: Whom do you think would be responsible for thinking this up?

Mr. HUGHES: I do not know, but it was some hare-brained person.

Mr. McKee: Do you think it could be the member for Light?

Mr. HUGHES: The wording of the statement is a bit like his speeches. It could be so, and the honourable member is not denying it. Perhaps that is an indication that he was responsible for this tripe. I have already said that the land tax formula was introduced by the Playford Administration. What is laughable is that it was said that the Labor Government did not mention this higher taxation before the election. The Labor Party did not have to mention it, because everyone in South Australia who had to pay land tax knew that this formula had been introduced by the Playford Government. There was no need to tell the people that, but there was a need for the L.C.L. to tell the people that, if they elected it to office, it intended to increase taxation. That is only a fair thing to expect from any Party.

The Labor Party warned the people during the election campaign that it would be necessary to increase certain taxation in order to run the country. I know that the Government cannot run the State unless it has adequate finance. With costs increasing everywhere, the Government has to have more money. However, why did members opposite not tell the people that they would do this? They tried to prove, by putting out fictitious pamphlets, that the Labor Government had been responsible for increasing taxation, and at the same time said to the people, "Elect us and leave everything to us." The pamphlet also states that a 67-year-old retired fruitgrower said, "The Labor

Government has upset the basic principles of fair taxation." That is the daddy of them all! If anyone has upset the basic principles of fair taxation, it is this Government, because in its first year of office it is taxing people by an extra 20 per cent.

The pamphlet goes on with fictitious and anonymous statements. If the people that put out the pamphlet had any stomach and backbone, they would not withhold the names of the people who made the statements, and if those people themselves had any backbone they would not object to their names being given. The Liberal Party had no right to put out these pamphlets and mislead the people into thinking that, if it became the Government, there would not be any increase in taxation.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Treasurer): I want to refer to only a couple of matters in closing this debate. First, I want to clear up a misconception about the incidence of this tax on certain people. The Leader of the Opposition, I think, mentioned this, and reference was also made to it by the member for Glenelg. If I understood the Leader correctly, he said that this tax would be applicable to every little transaction, regardless of the amount involved, and that people would be licking and sticking stamps every time they bought something in a shop. They may not be his words, but that was the effect of what he said. If the Leader will look at new section 84e and also at exemption 21 he will see that people who are not engaged in a business or profession and who are in receipt of moneys not exceeding \$10 are not required to issue a receipt. Therefore, such a transaction will not be taxable.

That new section to which I have referred sets out a wide group of persons who may, on application to the Commissioner, be given a serial number to identify them in his records and they may then pay their tax on the bulk system rather than on the individual transactions, in which case they will pay a tax on the total amount received in their business during the period of the return, whether it be one month, two months or 12 months. Therefore, they will pay a tax not on each individual transaction but on the total of their receipts for the period of the return. This will, of course, save the businessman concerned a considerable amount of taxation, because in effect he will pay 1c on each completed \$10, notwithstanding that his receipts may be made up of a number of transactions of less than \$10 in each individual case.

Of course, it is obvious, from the Treasury point of view, that we shall lose some money because of this. On the other hand, there will be a considerable saving in administration and in the amount of bookkeeping and record keeping required by the person conducting the business. Therefore, both parties will save under this system in the administrative costs incurred in the collection of the tax. I make that point quite clear because it is important in considering the incidence of the tax on small transactions.

The member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) went rather further, and although I did not hear all his remarks I heard him commenting on the tax as it applies in some parts of the United States of America, where transactions are often subject to a State tax. In moving around the U.S.A., a person might find himself paying a tax on his lunch in one State and then, on crossing the border into another State for dinner, find that that State did not impose such a tax or, if it did, it imposed a different amount of tax. We do not have this problem with this tax because, first, the bulk return applies and, secondly, unless a person is in a profession or business otherwise than as an employee he can elect to pay on the bulk system. Furthermore, if he is not such a person, any amount received which is less than \$10 is not taxable.

The member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) made the observation that he thought this tax was inequitable in some respects. He thought, for example, that it was not a fair thing that a tax on a kitchen suite should be applicable in order to pay for losses on water supplies. I have not at any time set out to defend this tax on the score of its absolute equity, because this is not a tenable proposition. This tax contains a number of inequities, and I have quite freely admitted that to all who have discussed it with me. For example, I think anyone would agree that it is inequitable that a person whose income is derived from a business is taxable as a business undertaking whereas a person who derives his income from a wage or salary is not. It is not equitable that a person who conducts a small business up the street and derives his living therefrom should pay a tax whereas members of Parliament, for example, do not pay it; so I do not pretend to defend this tax on the score of equity. However, it is the only kind of tax to which we have recourse, apart from one other tax that the Opposition has canvassed assiduously in this debate. The taxation fields open to the States are limited. This has been

chosen not only by South Australia but also by at least four other States as being the kind of tax they must impose to attract the revenue they are forced to obtain. There was no other tax available that I could discover in my deep research into this matter.

I tried to find some other form of tax that would yield an equivalent amount of revenue in order to avoid the imposition of this tax, but I was unable to find one. If honourable members generally are honest with themselves and with the House, they will agree that this is so. However, the member for Stirling had a point when he asked, "Why should we pay for losses on water by taxing sales of kitchen furniture?" However, it is not a principle that taxation is returned to its source. It is not reasonable to say that we should make all charges for our public services fully economical in terms of their costs. We would not suggest, for example, that even though we have increased hospital charges by \$1 a week we should increase hospital charges to the point where they returned their cost. Members opposite will agree that this is not a proper thing to do. Whereas the cost of hospitalization runs to about \$22 or \$24 a day (and, depending on the hospital, as high as \$30 a day) we should not charge the people for the cost of it. However, if we do not so do, it follows that some other tax must be imposed to make up the leeway. That is the position we face here.

That is all I wish to say. I hope the House will accept the principle of the tax and the matters appertaining to it because, as I say frankly, it is a revenue tax and the only tax I could discover likely to return to us anything like the sum we need. I ask the House to approve the second reading.

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (18)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Brookman, Coumbe, Edwards, Evans, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Pearson (teller), and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Teusner, Venning, and Wardle.

Noes (18)—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Dunstan (teller), Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Riches, Ryan, and Virgo.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Giles. No—Mr. Hutchens.

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



The question therefore passes in the affirmative.

Second reading thus carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—"Interpretation."

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Treasurer):  
I move:

In new section 84f (2) after "imprint" to insert "or in such other manner approved by the Auditor-General as shall be notified by the Commissioner in the *Gazette*".

The purpose of the amendment is to meet the requirement of the Auditor-General, who has the duty of approving the State's accounting procedures. He has suggested that the clause as drafted is inadequate in one respect. The administration of this Bill's provisions will be carried out largely by data processing machines, so the cash register probably will not be used. My amendment will overcome the present rather strict wording of the clause. There is no significance in the amendment other than to meet the Auditor-General's wishes in regard to accounting procedures.

Amendment carried.

Mr. CORCORAN: The Treasurer was good enough to supply me this afternoon with fairly detailed replies to questions I raised last Thursday about certain organizations, and it appears that the Commissioner will have wide powers of discretion on whether some of the organizations I have mentioned will have to pay this tax. I am particularly concerned about tuition fees and board paid to private schools. The Treasurer has pointed out that certain private schools have very large investments from which they receive income, and I expect that this income would be taxable. On the other hand, I wonder whether tuition fees and board paid for a student could be put in a separate category.

If a private school received income from its investments, would the tuition fees and board paid for students also be subject to the tax, by virtue of the fact that there was another source of income to the school, or would they be separated and treated differently? I cannot give a specific instance because some private schools may have no investments, but some schools may make a profit that is paid into a common pool. Schools, of course, have the aim of advancing education, which is one of the four things mentioned as determining what is a charitable organization.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I think the matter raised by the honourable member should more properly be examined under clause 6. He raised the point that wide discretions were required to be exercised by the Commissioner

in borderline cases in determining what moneys would and would not be taxable. They all come under what is accepted in case law as the general category of charitable organizations. Moneys received for the advancement of education are considered to be within that category. However, I cannot say positively how the Commissioner will rule. This is not a new factor to introduce in legislation. Commissioners have always been clothed with discretionary powers to determine each specific case.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: Especially income tax.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes. In all cases of taxation, discretion must be given to the Commissioner. This is inevitable because it would be impossible in a Bill to cover every eventuality. If we accept the principle that the Commissioner must have discretion, then we go on to the point of how he will exercise that discretion and what determinations he will make. I expressed the view today (and the Treasury expressed this view) that if schools were not run for a profit the payment would be for educational purposes and the receipt would be exempt. I do not know of any private school in this State that is run for profit.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: It could have income, though.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes, but the income, together with the fees received, is devoted to the purposes of the school, which does not make profits.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: If a school made a profit, it would pay company or income tax.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: That may be, but these schools are not profit-making organizations. I have expressed my view, based on the information I have received, that these fees would be exempt. However, I cannot make a determination for the Commissioner.

Mr. CORCORAN: I agree that it is necessary for the Commissioner to have fairly wide powers. On the other hand, if we are not completely satisfied we must see that our intentions are protected. That is simply what I am attempting to do. I understand that one church, as a result of State aid to private schools, will establish a series of boards that will be responsible for handling payments by the Government and sums raised by committees for facilities in the schools. I do not know any private school that is conducted for profit in the sense that the profits are paid to some other organization, although

money paid to one school may be used for the advancement of education at another school. What I have said applies also to community projects. Swimming pools may be conducted at a profit, but I suppose the profits would be used to improve the facilities. If the articles of incorporation of an organization could not cope with this, they could be changed to meet the requirements of the Commissioner.

Clause as amended passed.

Clause 6—"Amendment of Second Schedule to principal Act."

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): On behalf of the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson), I move to insert the following exemptions:

29. Receipt for any payment made to a society as defined in the Friendly Societies Act, 1919-1966, as amended, or to any association, society or trade union composed of representative of employees or for furthering or protecting the interests of employees.

30. Receipt for any payment made to a society as defined in the Industrial and Provident Societies Act, 1923-1966, as amended, all the members of which are engaged in the business of primary production as defined in the Land Tax Act, 1936-1967, as amended, and the objects of which include the storage, marketing, packing or processing of the produce of such members derived from such business.

The amendment adds an additional two exemptions. At present payments by friendly societies of benefits are exempt but subscriptions paid to friendly societies are not exempt, and these societies are not basically established for trade. They are co-operative organizations aimed at mutual self help. Consequently, it seems that they come within the category of people who ought to be exempt. In the same way, trade unions or organizations representing employees, such as the Trades and Labor Council and the Australian Council of Salaried and Professional Associations, are not basically carrying on a business but operate for the mutual self help of members and to achieve an object entirely in accordance with public policy. Therefore, I do not see why they should have to meet an impost of this kind, which is aimed basically at turnover. It does not seem to me that these organizations conduct a business of the kind aimed at by the legislation, but it catches payments of either of these kinds, because any person or incorporated or unincorporated association is obliged to pay the amount, unless exempt.

The second extra exemption I propose is for a receipt for any payment made not to general trading co-operatives but to pro-

ducers' co-operatives where the payments to the society are a necessary part of the operation of the society. It might be contended that this is catered for by the proposals in relation to prescribed marketing schemes, but in fact producers' co-operatives in themselves are not marketing schemes of the kind dealt with in section 84i. Winegrowers' co-operatives are cases in point. In those cases one would not find the scheme fitting into the scheme in the way prescribed in section 84i. In consequence, and as a result of representations from winegrowers' co-operatives, I consider that this also is a class of business which it was not intended should be "got at" in this particular way.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I am not at the moment in strong disagreement with the Leader. However, as I am not quite sure of the total scope of these exemptions and as there are one or two doubts in my mind, I should like to study this matter overnight. I therefore ask that progress be reported.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

### STOCK DISEASES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Lands): I move:

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

It makes a number of significant amendments to the Stock Diseases Act, 1934-1962, to extend and improve its operation in the control, and matters ancillary to the control, of animal diseases. Perhaps the most significant amendment is the inclusion of a provision dealing with the control and eradication of rabies. Australia is fortunate in being free of this disease, which is of such a deadly and infectious character that, in countries where it does occur, an outbreak can lead to public hysteria. The rabies virus is extraordinarily versatile and can adapt itself to many kinds of adverse environments. In countries with an extensive wildlife population, the infection may establish itself to such an extent that it cannot be eradicated. It is thought that dog rabies was introduced into the Antilles and the southern states of the United States of America by early Spanish and English colonists. It has now established itself among various species of feral and domestic animals from the Arctic to South America. It is found in a wide variety of ecological forms and has so far resisted intense efforts to eradicate it.

An outbreak of rabies in Australia could have a disastrous effect upon the livestock industry. The present Bill embodies one measure designed to prevent the growth of this problem in this country. It provides for the application of certain specific controls over dogs and cats, which are, of course, potential carriers of the disease and, because of their frequently close association with human beings, abnormally dangerous if infected with the disease. It is thought that the existing provisions of the Act provide adequate power to deal with the disease, as far as other animals are concerned.

The Bill empowers the Governor to prevent the use of sprays, dips and medicines that may have an adverse effect upon stock or the carcass or animal product of stock. The use by some stockowners of dieldrin, prepared for white ant control, for the treatment of lice in sheep has been causing some concern. Dieldrin preparations of this type, diluted for use on sheep, can result in a high level of residue in meat, and residues have in fact been detected upon a random sampling of mutton by an inspector of stock. The sale of preparations containing dieldrin for use on stock is prohibited in South Australia but there are at present no provisions preventing the use of such preparations. The Bill remedies this deficiency.

Another provision of the Bill is designed to deal with the problems raised by the establishment of diagnostic laboratories by certain drug manufacturers. These laboratories present three main dangers to the stock industry. First, it is likely that diagnosticians employed by a drug manufacturing firm would recommend a preparation marketed by the firm whether or not it was the best treatment available. Secondly, the proper diagnosis of disease demands the availability of a number of scientists from different disciplines such as histopathologists, bacteriologists, virologists and biochemists. A private laboratory with a small staff could fail to make proper diagnoses of serious diseases. Thirdly, the use of such laboratories could lead to the suppression of any publicity that could give competitors of the firm an advantage. The Bill meets these problems by providing that diagnostic laboratories are not to be established in this State without the permission of the Minister and it prevents diseased stock, or stock suspected of being diseased, from being sent out of the State without the permission of the Chief Inspector for diagnosis by such laboratories in other States. The Bill provides for certain amend-

ments to the provisions of the Act dealing with foot and mouth disease and other serious diseases. The amendments ensure that, where foot and mouth disease is suspected, the provisions are capable of effective operation, and that adequate power exists to enable disinfection and disinsectization to be carried out. The provisions of the Bill are as follows:

Clause 2 amends the interpretation section in the principal Act. The definition of "destroy" is struck out. The definition is redundant and to some extent in conflict with subsection (3), which also deals with the manner in which stock is to be destroyed. In fact, that subsection is repealed by the Bill and a more comprehensive provision dealing with the destruction of stock is inserted in lieu thereof. The words "infectious and contagious" in the definition of "disease" are struck out, as that terminology is now outdated and misleading. The definition of "stock" is amended to include animals and birds which were not previously specified in the definition but which have been declared under paragraph (b) of the definition to be stock for the purposes of the Act. New subsection (2) is a re-enactment of the previous subsection (2) which is necessary because of an error made in the consolidation of the Act and its amendments in 1964. New subsections (3) and (4) deal more comprehensively with the destruction of stock.

Clause 3 expands the powers of the Governor under section 6 of the principal Act. He is empowered to prevent fodder and fittings from being moved into certain areas of the State, in addition to his present power of preventing such movement from or within those areas. An amendment of similar effect in relation to quarantine areas is made to section 6 (1) (d) of the principal Act. Clause 4 amends section 8 of the principal Act. At present the Governor has, under section 8, power to prevent only the introduction of stock into the State "by land or water". It is clearly necessary to extend this power to cover introduction by air, and the provision is amended accordingly. A new paragraph VIA is inserted to enable the Governor to prevent the use of sprays, dips, vaccines and therapeutic substances that might, in his opinion, have an adverse effect on stock, or the carcass or animal product of stock. This is necessary to prevent the use of medicinal preparations that may ultimately be injurious to human life or health. A new paragraph XV is inserted, giving more extensive powers of inspection. Clause 5 extends section 8a of the principal Act to enable the Governor to give the Chief Inspector power to destroy farm fittings, insects and

vermin, if such destruction is necessary to prevent the spread of foot and mouth disease.

Clause 6 enacts new section 8b of the principal Act which deals with the prevention and control of rabies. The Governor is empowered to make proclamations:

- (a) requiring the owners of dogs or cats within an area specified in the proclamation to confine them within enclosures or to exercise such control over their movement as may be specified in the proclamation;
- (b) requiring the owners of dogs to muzzle them;
- (c) authorizing the destruction of dogs and cats that are not under the strict control of any person;
- (d) requiring the vaccination of dogs and cats; and
- (e) authorizing the destruction of dogs and cats that have not been vaccinated or do not bear a mark indicating that they have been vaccinated.

Clause 7 amends section 10 to provide that quarantine grounds should be under the control of an inspector, rather than of the Chief Inspector, as at present.

Clause 8 amends section 10a of the principal Act which at present provides that diagnostic tests, biological tests and inoculations given for the purpose of discovering whether stock is diseased must be given by a veterinary surgeon. The tests in question are pullorum tests, and these may be given properly and safely by persons not fully qualified as veterinary surgeons, and the amendment thus provides that such tests may be given either by a veterinary surgeon or by an inspector acting under the authority of the Chief Inspector.

Clause 9 expands the kinds of marking that may be employed to indicate that stock has been examined under the Act. Clause 10 enables an inspector to place stock in quarantine in the place where they are found to be diseased; at present, they must be quarantined on the owner's property. Clause 11 re-enacts section 16 of the principal Act. The powers of the inspector are expanded to enable him to subject stray stock to treatment designed to prevent or eradicate disease. Clause 12 makes a decimal currency amendment.

Clause 13 amends section 19 of the principal Act. The owner of diseased stock is required to notify an inspector who is an officer of the Agriculture Department of the existence of disease rather than simply to notify an inspector, as at present. This is necessary in order

to overcome administrative difficulties that have been experienced. A new paragraph (b) is inserted to require the owner of diseased stock to comply with oral or written directions given to him by an inspector for the purpose of controlling or eradicating disease. A new subsection (3) is inserted to overcome difficulties in prosecuting a small minority of stock-owners who have proved unwilling to give the prescribed notification when their stock is found to be diseased.

Clauses 14 to 16 make a decimal currency amendment. Clause 17 makes a drafting amendment to the principal Act. Clause 18 enacts new sections 28a and 28b of the principal Act. These are provisions designed to deal with the difficulties encountered in relation to commercial diagnostic laboratories. New section 28a prevents diseased stock from being sent out of the State without the approval of the Chief Inspector. This section thus imposes restrictions upon diseased stock (or the carcasses of diseased stock) being sent to laboratories in other States for analysis. New section 28b provides that diagnostic laboratories are not to be established without the approval of the Minister.

Clauses 19 and 20 make decimal currency amendments. Clause 21 repeals sections 35 and 36 of the principal Act. Section 36 is now redundant in view of a provision in the Justices Act, and section 35 is re-enacted by the Bill in a more general form as new section 45a. Clause 22 makes a decimal currency amendment. Clause 23 enacts new section 45a. This new section is substantially a re-enactment of section 36 but its provisions are widened to embrace stock generally. Clause 24 makes a decimal currency amendment. Clause 25 makes a drafting amendment to the principal Act.

Mr. CASEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### FRIENDLY SOCIETIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

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

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*  
The principal object of this Bill is to resolve difficulties which have arisen in relation to the application of the Friendly Societies Act to some of the operations of friendly societies in this State. As honourable members will be aware, some of these societies, which make available medical and hospital benefits to their members, have sought and obtained registration under the National Health Act of the

Commonwealth, thus ensuring for their members the payment of an additional (Commonwealth) benefit in appropriate cases. In consequence of this registration the Commonwealth Government maintains a very close watch on the activities of these societies so far as those activities relate directly or indirectly to the payment of Commonwealth benefits. In addition, by virtue of their incorporations under the Friendly Societies Act, these societies also come under the supervision of the Public Actuary of this State.

This Bill, therefore, amongst other things, proposes amendments to the principal Act to ensure as far as possible that the respective responsibilities of the State and Commonwealth authorities are delineated and duplication of effort is avoided and conflicts are resolved. To consider the Bill in some detail:

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 is intended to resolve a conflict. This turns on the provisions of the principal Act which set out the purposes for which societies may, under the law in this State, make payments from their medical and hospital funds. Under the Act these funds must be kept as separate entities since it is possible for a contributor to contribute to one and not to the other. The purposes for which each fund may be expended are set out in section 7 of the principal Act at paragraphs v and vii. However, recently the Commonwealth Government decided to allow a payment, from the funds which it supervises, in respect of artificial heart valves where that payment could be made out of a hospital benefit fund. However, under the law in this State, payments could not be made from such a fund although they could have been made from a medical benefit fund. Fortunately in this case it was possible by other means to secure the payment of such a benefit but it seems desirable to ensure, as far as possible, this situation does not recur. Accordingly this clause in substance amends section 7 of the principal Act by extending the purposes for which payments may be made from hospital benefit funds.

Clauses 4 and 5 propose amendments consequential upon the adoption of a system of decimal currency. Clause 6 is intended to recognize the extent of Commonwealth supervision over the activities of friendly societies registered under the National Health Act and to avoid the necessity of the Public Actuary being obliged to examine any matter which has already been examined and approved by the Commonwealth authorities. Clause 7 is

one of a series of measures designed to give effect to the Government's policy of ensuring that there are no obstacles to the diversion of available funds for the purposes of home building. In 1966 amendments were made to the principal Act to permit friendly societies to establish permanent building societies so that not inconsiderable funds could be released for home building purposes. The amendments provided that the only shareholders of these permanent building societies were to be the friendly society or societies which established them. In practice, however, it has been found that when the friendly societies attempted to establish such permanent building societies they found that they would be liable to lose significant income tax concessions in their operation, income tax concessions which arise from the general co-operative nature of friendly societies' activities.

Accordingly, it is proposed to extend the limitation on the shareholding in the proposed permanent building societies by including as well as the establishing friendly societies the members of those friendly societies and this is effected by this clause. As a corollary, lending by these permanent building societies will be confined to shareholders, thus reinforcing the co-operative nature of the enterprise and preserving the taxation concessions.

Clauses 8 to 13 propose amendments consequential on the adoption of a system of decimal currency. Clause 14 is intended to permit a society when it so desires, and to require a society when directed by the Public Actuary so to do, to appoint a firm of registered company auditors in the place of the "two or more" auditors at present provided for. This recognizes the fact that the complexity of the business of some societies demands the attention of formally qualified auditors and will guard against losses consequent on additional expenses being incurred when a single auditor or one of two auditors dies during the progress of an audit. Clauses 15 to 19 again are consequential on the adoption of the system of decimal currency.

Mrs. BYRNE secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### BUILDING SOCIETIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

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

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*  
This Bill, which is one of a series of measures designed to give effect to the Government's policy of ensuring that there are no obstacles

to the diversion of available funds for the purposes of home building, is complementary to clause 7 of the Friendly Societies Act Amendment Bill, 1968, and makes amendments to the principal Act consequent on the amendments made to the Friendly Societies Act by that clause. Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends section 4 (10) of the principal Act by providing that permanent building societies may be established by friendly societies so long as shareholding in those building societies is confined to the friendly societies and their members. Previously, shareholding was limited to the friendly

societies only and in practice this proved to be impracticable. Clause 4 is consequential on clause 3 and is intended to ensure that the rules of permanent building societies, established as permitted by these amendments, will provide for the necessary limitation of shareholding.

Mr. VIRGO secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 9.20 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, October 23, at 2 p.m.