

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, October 29, 1974

The SPEAKER (Hon. J. R. Ryan) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

INDUSTRIES DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

PETITIONS: COUNCIL BOUNDARIES

Mr. RUSSACK presented a petition signed by 633 persons stating that they were dissatisfied with the first report of the Royal Commission into Local Government Areas, and praying that the House of Assembly would not bring about any change or alteration of boundaries.

Mr. BOUNDY presented a similar petition signed by 124 persons.

Mr. BURDON presented a similar petition signed by 237 persons.

Petitions received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: CONSTITUTION CONVENTION

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. J. KING: As Chairman of the Adelaide session of the Australian Constitution Convention, I have been informed by the Prime Minister that the Australian Parliament will not be represented by a delegation (owing to the failure of the Senate to agree on a delegation), and by the Premier of Queensland that Queensland will not be represented owing to the forthcoming dissolution of the Queensland Parliament. As a meeting of the Executive Committee could not be arranged before Thursday or Friday next, I caused members of the Executive Committee (other than those from the Commonwealth and Queensland) to be consulted by telephone; eight favoured abandonment of the forthcoming Adelaide session, four were opposed, and one was undecided.

Catering, accommodation and security arrangements rendered an immediate decision imperative. I have therefore cancelled the arrangements for the session. I have also cancelled arrangements for the intended meeting of the Executive Committee on Sunday next. I will arrange a meeting of the Executive Committee when the new Queensland Parliament has been elected. As members have undoubtedly entered into commitments on the assumption that Parliament will not sit next week, it is intended that that arrangement will stand, and the House will not sit next week.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following written answers to questions be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

HOVERCRAFT

In reply to Mr. BLACKER (October 2).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The question of hovercraft and conventional ferry services in northern Spencer Gulf has been raised several times in the past few years. Preliminary studies carried out by the Development Division indicated that it was unlikely that a service would be viable,

but the whole issue was referred to the Transport Department for a comprehensive study to be undertaken. The results of the department's study should be available by the end of this year, although preliminary indications are that a hovercraft service would not be a financially viable operation.

BRANDY EXCISE

In reply to Mr. ARNOLD (September 18).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The matter of assistance to Co-operative Wineries to overcome their present liquidity problems is still being examined. The Minister of Irrigation has advised me that there have been no summons by the Lands Department in respect of non-payment of water rates during the present financial year or the previous financial year. The department has accepted procuration orders in lieu of cash for the past 35 years, and will continue to do this. Deferred payment of irrigation water rates will not be subject to an interest charge. This concession was also available for the past two seasons. In respect of council rates, this is primarily a matter between the relevant council and the ratepayer. However, most councils allow rates to be paid in instalments and, in cases where payment of rates would cause hardship, the council may, by resolution, postpone payment of the rates as provided by section 267a of the Local Government Act, 1934, as amended.

SHACKS

In reply to Mr. RUSSACK (October 16).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The terms of reference of the Shack Site Review Committee were as follows:

- (1) To define those areas of the public reserve along the sea coast, the banks of the Murray River and its associated lakes, from which shacks should be removed.
- (2) To prepare a programme for the removal of shacks.
- (3) To consider the provision of alternative sites for holiday home accommodation.

The Government has decided that all shacks of an acceptable standard will be allowed to remain. The terms of reference of the committee are therefore no longer relevant, and a report based on these terms of reference will not be submitted. The Government has, however, decided that the investigation commenced by the Shack Site Review Committee into the provision of suitable areas for the establishment and development of holiday home sites should continue. A report on this investigation should be available in the first half of 1975.

FUNERAL BENEFITS

In reply to Mr. SLATER (October 8).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Kent Town Sick and Accident Society is a voluntary organisation of employees of the Kent Town depot, formed about 40 years ago, when few social service benefits were available, to give mutual help during sickness, accident, and bereavement. When it was announced that workshop activities would gradually transfer from Kent Town to Ottoway over a period of five to six years, discussions were held between the committees of the sick and accident societies from Kent Town and Ottoway depots. It was agreed that, following the transfer of Kent Town employees to Ottoway, the two societies should amalgamate. As the existing society did not cover funeral benefits, it was further agreed that the new society would not provide these benefits.

In advising its members of these proposals the committee of the Kent Town Sick and Accident Society has indicated that, as the new society will not cover funeral

benefits, members may choose to resign from the fund. In so doing, they would lose all claims on the society. I understand that the society's President has stated that the society intends to honour its obligations to retired members, and to pay funeral benefits for as long as possible.

RABBITS

In reply to Mr. DUNCAN (October 16).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Because of favourable seasons, rabbit numbers in the north-east pastoral areas are the highest since 1969, and vegetation is being damaged. Any practical method of control must take into account the economics of low-carrying capacity land and the general lack of available manpower. Thus rabbit control methods used in agricultural areas are not applicable. Unfortunately, myxomatosis, although at times in evidence, does little to curb these high numbers. However, supplies of the virus are available free from the Lands Department, should requests be made by landholders. The department is concerned at the damage being caused by rabbits, particularly in the arid zone, and its research personnel, in conjunction with the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation, have been studying rabbits in these areas for some time. An economically practicable method of control has not yet been devised, but research is continuing.

DEPARTMENTAL TELEPHONES

In reply to Mr. ARNOLD (October 16).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The policy for providing telephones in residences of deputy headmasters has been re-examined, as I promised the honourable member when he asked his question. However, it is still considered not necessary to extend the department's policy to include the provision of telephones to deputy heads occupying departmentally owned residences.

PUBLIC TRUSTEE

In reply to Mr. MATHWIN (September 17).

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Public Trustee Department owns one car, which is changed after two years or 40 235 km, whichever is the sooner. The \$2 000 provided is expected to be sufficient to purchase a suitable new vehicle.

In reply to Mr. RUSSACK (September 17).

The Hon. L. J. KING: The proposal that officers of the Public Trustee Department should visit country areas to help people make wills is already being investigated. If an experimental visit to Port Pirie on a date yet to be fixed is successful, it is hoped to arrange for visits to other country centres.

In reply to Mr. EVANS (September 17).

In reply to Mr. BECKER (September 17).

In reply to Mr. DEAN BROWN (September 17).

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Public Trustee is satisfied that generally it is better to sell real estate by public auction, as only in exceptional circumstances will a better price be obtained by private treaty. Any suggestion that an officer of the Public Trustee has bought an estate asset and sold it at a profit is denied. There is an instruction in the office that an officer is not to bid for an estate asset without the approval of the Public Trustee. No sale is made by private treaty unless the beneficiaries agree. In the recent past, when prices were buoyant, many such sales were agreed to against the advice of the Public Trustee that the property be sold by auction. It is not correct that one agent handles nearly all the transactions for the Public Trustee.

During August, 1974, 60 instructions to value real estate were given to 31 different valuers. The appointment of the valuer is made in the name of the employer land agent, who then becomes agent for the estate and the auctioneer, if the property is sold by auction. As far as the Public Trustee is aware, it is not correct that in Mr. Becker's district there are two land agents who have suddenly not received the opportunity to act as auctioneers for various properties. It is known that, in the past, persons in the industry have bought real estate from the Public Trustee either at auction or by private treaty at a price agreed to by the beneficiaries, and later (after making repairs and renovations) sold it again at a higher price. Such sales are facilitated by the ability of those persons to provide finances, which the Public Trustee is unable to do.

The Public Trustee's aim is to carry out his duties as cheaply and efficiently as possible, but this does not mean that he bargains with agents or auctioneers over the commission paid. The commission allowed is that recommended by the Chamber of Commerce. The appointment of the Public Trustee as an auctioneer would be feasible. However, apart from the cost of engaging and training staff, this would be unpopular with the auctioneers now used, and there would be increased opportunity for people to allege collusion in some way or other. It is considered that the interests of beneficiaries are best safeguarded by the present system of instructing agents who are in private business.

TELEVISION RENTAL CHARGES

In reply to Dr. EASTICK (October 17).

The Hon. L. J. KING: Twenty companies or firms are regularly advertising the renting of television receivers. However, nine large companies account for the majority of television rentals. Information obtained from these companies shows the following rental reductions:

	A month
<u>Radio Rentals.....</u>	\$1.50
<u>Canberra Television Services Proprietary Limited.....</u>	\$1.50
<u>Hills Telerec.....</u>	\$1.50
<u>Rentlo TV Rentals.....</u>	\$1.58
<u>Rentelux Proprietary Limited . . .</u>	\$1.00 to \$1.25
<u>Baird Television Rentals Proprietary Limited.....</u>	\$1.00 to \$1.50
<u>Flinders Trading Company Proprietary Limited.....</u>	\$0.50 to \$1.00
<u>Pye Industries Proprietary Limited .</u>	No reduction
<u>Singer Australia Limited.....</u>	No reduction

The average monthly licence fee for a rental television receiver was \$1.58. A reason put forward by some companies for not reducing the rental by the full amount of the saving was that service costs had increased. Rental charges are not subject to control; however, explanations are being sought from all companies where reductions seem to be inadequate. Any specific complaints received will be investigated.

UNEMPLOYMENT

In reply to Mr. MATHWIN (October 9).

In reply to Mr. McANANEY (October 15).

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I point out that the retraining scheme referred to in the question is administered by the Australian Labor and Immigration Department. The scheme did not come into operation until October 1, 1974. Inquiries made of the Labor and Immigration Department reveal that information concerning the number of persons who have applied to each district employment office for

retraining under the provisions of the Australian Government's new labour market training scheme will be consolidated shortly after the scheme has been in operation for one month. When those figures become available, I will advise the honourable members.

MOANA SANDHILLS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): What action does the Government intend to take to preserve the Moana sandhills?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The large area of sand dunes existing on the southern side of the Moana township are on private property. I am advised that it is the Coast Protection Board's intention, as part of their metropolitan coastal management plan, to recommend that the dunes nearest to the sea and which are technically a part of the coast, remain in their natural condition.

LIBRARIES

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. What plans does the Government have for access to public libraries by citizens (both adults and children) living outside the 23 council areas in which the Libraries (Subsidies) Act has been implemented?

2. Is it the intention of the Government to implement the proposal made recently by the Chief Librarian at the South Australian Institute of Technology, that public library services should be developed on a regional basis, with enlarged regional headquarters libraries taking over some of the technical service functions now performed by the State Library?

3. What will be the future of the institute libraries?

4. Has the Government commissioned a report on the future development of public libraries in South Australia by a senior member of the staff of the National Library?

5. Is so, has the report been received and when will its recommendations and the Government's plans for their implementation be made known?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The replies are as follows:

1. A committee has recently reported on the establishment of community school libraries in country areas of the State where the population to be served would be fewer than 3 000. It is hoped to be able to implement the recommendations of this report as soon as practicable. Under these new arrangements, the initiative will still rest with the local community, namely, school councils, the local institute committees, and the local government authorities.

2. The matter is under discussion.

3. Government policy is to move towards a State-wide system of subsidised public libraries supported by the State and by local government and under the general supervision of the Libraries Board. To this end, substantial increased subsidies have been made available under the Libraries (Subsidies) Act to encourage councils to establish and operate subsidised libraries, and the Libraries Board has agreed to increase the range of books provided to the subsidised libraries so that the varieties of books previously only obtainable by the payment of subscription to institute libraries would also be available. The further implementation of this policy will be considered progressively including the need for any changed legislation. It is hoped that ultimately the institute libraries would phase out of existence.

4. Yes.

5. The report written by Miss J. P. Whyte (Director, Information Reference and Research, of the National Library of Australia) has been received. The report will be published as soon as appropriate arrangements can be made for its printing.

PUBLIC HOSPITALS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Has an offer been received from the Commonwealth Government of a five-year programme of capital assistance for public hospitals?

2. If such an offer has been received—

- (a) when was it received;
- (b) is it intended to accept it; and
- (c) how much is the offer?

3. Is it intended to establish a hospitals works council to plan public hospital development and, if so, who are to be the members?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. A formal offer of capital assistance has not yet been received from the Commonwealth Government. However, it is understood that a reply, shortly to be forwarded to the Premier by the Prime Minister, will indicate details.

2.(a) A formal offer has not been received.

(b) A decision will be made when a formal offer has been received and examined.

(c) See (a).

3. It is intended to establish a joint hospitals works council. An Interim Joint Hospitals Works Council met in Adelaide on October 8 and 9, 1974. Members attending were as follows:

From Hospitals and Health Services Commission: Dr. S. Sax, Chairman; Dr. J. Blandford, Deputy Chairman; and Dr. B. Hennessy, Member.

From South Australia: Dr. B. J. Shea (Director-General of Medical Services); Dr. W. A. Dibden (Director of Mental Health Services); and Mr. C. G. Rankin (Hospital Planning Consultant) Hospitals Department.

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. Does the Government intend to request or require private hospitals to provide standard bed accommodation and, if so, what will be the financial consideration involved?

2. As a result of any agreement made, will the Government require representation on the boards of control of those hospitals and, if so, what representation?

3. Will the Commonwealth Government also require representation and, if so, what representation?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The question whether private hospitals will be asked to make beds available for standard ward accommodation and, if so, under what conditions, cannot be answered at present. Until a specific agreement in terms of section 30 and schedule 2 of the Australian Health Insurance Act, 1973, is concluded between the State and Australian Governments, it is not possible to indicate what the effect is likely to be on the financing and other arrangements in respect of various types of hospital. It is possible that such an agreement will specify which hospitals are to be recognised hospitals for the purposes of the agreement.

MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. How many medical practitioners are now registered in South Australia?

2. How many of these are registered as resident in South Australia?

3. Will the Minister provide information on the number of medical practitioners who are on the South Australian Register, but who reside and practice in—

- (a) other Australian States; and
- (b) other countries,

and the States or countries in which they reside or practice?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. The figure as at January 31, 1974, is 3 154.
2. About 2 200.
3. These statistics are not recorded.

FLINDERS HIGHWAY

Mr. GUNN (on notice): Why has there been a reduction from \$695 362 to \$100 000 this financial year for the construction of the Talia to Streaky Bay section of Flinders Highway?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Expenditure during 1973-74 on the above road was \$557 918, bringing the total expenditure to June 30, 1974, to \$695 362. The allocation of \$100 000, which was made in the 1974-75 works programme, is considered sufficient at this time. Progress on this contract during the present year is expected to be minimal owing to liquidity and other problems being experienced by the contractor.

TRADE UNIONS

Mr. GUNN (on notice): Is it the policy of the South Australian Government to assist in the amalgamation of smaller unions and, if so, why?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: This is a matter for the unions concerned: (see section 136 (2) of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, 1972).

UNIONISM

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. Does the Government support the principle of compulsory unionism?
2. Is the Government in favour of closed shop agreements between trade unions and employers and, if so, why?
3. Is it still the policy of the South Australian Government to give preference to unionists?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The replies are as follows:

1. No.
2. This is a matter for the employers and trade unions concerned.
3. Yes.

DIRECTOR OF FISHERIES

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. When does the Government intend to appoint a Director of Fisheries?
2. Why has there been a delay in making this appointment?
3. How many applicants have there been for the position?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The replies are as follows:

1. The Public Service Board has made detailed submissions to the committee of inquiry into the Public Service and, amongst other things, has proposed to the committee that the number of departments in the Public Service be reduced, and several existing departments be amalgamated and/or regrouped with other departments. It is understood that the committee of inquiry intends to examine and report in detail on the departmental organisation of the Public Service and, until the report is available, it is intended that Mr. Olsen continue to fill the position of Acting Director.

2. No person suitable for the position has applied.
3. Twenty-seven applications were received during three calls for the position.

RAILWAYS

Mr. RODDA (on notice):

1. What is the cost, respectively, of—
 - (a) a diesel-electric locomotive; (b) a 250-class railcar; (c) a 280-class railcar; (d) a 300-class suburban railcar; (e) a 400-class suburban railcar; (f) an open waggon; (g) a cattle van; (h) a sheep van; (i) a hopper van; and (j) a louvred van?
2. What is the construction cost a mile of both broad and standard gauge railway track?
3. What is the total value of—
 - (a) the State Railways rolling stock; and
 - (b) the entire railway track of all gauges?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

	\$
1. (a) A 700-class diesel-electric locomotive . .	500 000
(b) A 250-class railcar.....	573 000
(c) A 280-class railcar.....	394 000
(d) A 300-class suburban railcar.....	297 000
(e) A 400-class suburban railcar.....	304 000
(f) An open bogie waggon.....	26 100
(g) A bogie cattle van.....	16 600
(h) A bogie sheep van.....	21 900
(i) An SHBX-class hopper waggon.....	25 400
(j) An SLX-class louvred van.....	37 800
2. About \$190 000 a kilometre. This figure is common to both standard gauge and broad gauge lines, and allows for the provision of normal facilities.	
3. (a) \$92 489 994.	
(b) \$89 361 725, including all normal facilities but excluding Islington workshops and similar depot buildings.	

PUBLIC BUILDINGS DEPARTMENT

Mr. EVANS (on notice): What was the total cost to the Public Buildings Department of overtime paid to its employees for each of the years 1968-69 to 1973-74, inclusive, and for the first three months of 1974-75, and what was the total wages and salaries paid for ordinary time for each of these periods?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The information required cannot readily be provided, as overtime costs are not segregated as a separate item in the mechanised accounting system, but are incorporated with other project and service costs. To compile the required information would be a time-consuming and costly process involving individual calculations for employees' fortnightly pay sheets (about 3 000 employees) over the past six years. It is considered that the expense of such an investigation is not justified.

STUDENT TEACHER ALLOWANCES

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (on notice): How many student teachers have been required to furnish details of their parents' taxation returns, group certificates, and statement of earnings to verify claims made for means-tested student teacher allowances?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: To date, 2 337 applications for additional means-tested living allowance have been processed, 1 430 of them on the income of the students' parents. These 1 430 students have been asked to submit verifying taxation documents. In the near future, those granted allowances on their own incomes will be asked to submit verifying taxation documents of their incomes.

CHILDREN OF GOD

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. Have complaints been received about the activities of an organisation calling itself "Children of God" and, if so, what has been the nature of these complaints?

2. Have investigations been made into the activities of this organisation and, if so, what conclusions have been reached?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. The organisation "Children of God" is a body originating in the United States, with its Australian headquarters at Kings Cross, Sydney. There were complaints at one time that certain pamphlets distributed by the organisation were obscene, but the Police Department did not think that action was justified. No other complaints have been received by the police, or, so far as I am aware, by any other Government agency.

2. There has been no investigation.

TAXES

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Will a new Government department be established to supervise and collect taxes in relation to the licensing of petroleum products outlets and franchise licence fee on retail sales of cigarettes and tobacco and, if so, how many additional employees will be required to staff this department or section?

2. What is the expected total cost to collect these taxes?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. It is not the Government's intention to establish a new department to supervise and collect taxes in relation to the franchise licensing arrangements for the retail sales of petroleum products and tobacco. The administration of these taxing measures will be the responsibility of the State Taxes Department. Proceedings are still in hand for the preparation of legislation and the development of detailed administrative procedures. Preliminary discussions have been held with the Public Service Board on staffing and accommodation requirements, and at this early stage it is not expected that the staffing level will exceed 20.

2. On that basis, and including some provision for printing, postal charges etc., it is expected that the total cost of collection is likely to be about \$170 000.

STATE FINANCES

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What were the findings of the Economic Intelligence Unit in trying to solve the State's budgetary problems?

2. What areas of Government charges and taxes were considered?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. The Economic Intelligence Unit, Premier's Department, was asked to give a preliminary report on certain possible alternative revenue-raising proposals and, following its report, Cabinet decided to set up a full working party to prepare a comprehensive analysis. The working party comprised representatives of Treasury, Economic Intelligence Unit, State Taxes Department, Public Service Board, Parliamentary Counsel, and Labour and Industry Department. The report is considered by the Government to be an internal working document.

2. All possible measures within the constitutional power of Government.

COUNCIL BOUNDARIES

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (on notice): Which councils agreed to the establishment of the Royal Commission into Local Government Areas?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I consider that I should not make public this information without the prior authority of the councils concerned. However, I am willing to provide an opportunity for the honourable member to peruse the information on a confidential basis.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (on notice): What are the itemised details of the expenses of \$36 845 spent thus far on the Royal Commission into Local Government Areas?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The principal items are: (1) printing of transcript; (2) printing of reports; and (3) travelling and sundry expenses.

REVALUATIONS

Mr. COUMBE (on notice): What districts in the metropolitan area have been, or are planned to be, subject to revaluation by the Valuation Department in the present financial year?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The districts in the metropolitan area under general valuation are Prospect, Enfield, Unley, Walkerville, Hindmarsh, and Noarlunga. The general valuations will be operative for rates and land tax from July 1, 1975.

THIRD PARTY INSURANCE

Mr. COUMBE (on notice):

1. What revenue was obtained from compulsory third party insurance by the State Government Insurance Commission for the year ended June 30, 1974?

2. What revenue was obtained from investment of the above funds?

3. What amount was paid out on claims?

4. What was the total of administrative and other costs incurred for this type of insurance for the same period?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. \$5 491 768.

2. \$283 681.

3. Claims paid, \$518 761. Claims incurred, 5 987 916.

4. Administrative costs—\$178 576. Excess of loss re-insurance—\$653 716.

To the above should be added unearned premium reserve of \$1 358 625, making a total of \$2 190 917.

PETRO CHEMICAL PLANT

Mr. BOUNDY (on notice):

1. What commitment did the South Australian Government make to the consortium before its decision to examine Redcliff as a site for a petro-chemical project?

2. Did the commitments include—

- (a) the loading jetty;
- (b) the power station;
- (c) housing; and
- (d) roadworks?

3. What was the original estimated cost of all commitments made by the Government?

4. What is the present estimated cost of these commitments?

5. What assistance has been promised by the Commonwealth Government on these commitments?

6. What is the weekly cost to the consortium while the project is being considered before commencement of construction?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1 and 2. The South Australian Government offered the following assistance to all companies studying the Redcliff petro-chemical project.

- (a) power station;
- (b) loading jetty;
- (c) pipelines;
- (d) housing.

3. The original cost of the infra-structure is a difficult figure to quantify, because of the changing size of the complex and escalation in price. The power station, for

instance, has risen in price because of these two factors from \$9 000 000 in 1971, to \$69 500 000 in 1977 price terms.

4. The cost of infra-structure at 1977 prices is about \$200 000 000.

5. The Australian Government has agreed to make finance available for housing under the normal provisions of the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, but has made no commitments on the remainder of the infra-structure.

6. The consortium has stated that its costs are escalating at \$2 000 000 a week.

STATUTORY BODIES

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. How many statutory bodies are currently established by and under the laws of South Australia?

2. What is the purpose and/or terms of reference of each body?

3. Who are the members of each body?

4. Have any changes to membership been effected in the last six months and, if so, what changes have been made?

5. For what reason has any member been replaced during this period?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member has available to him the Statutes constituting statutory bodies, and is able, through his research officer paid for by the Government, to do his own work.

MINISTERS

The SPEAKER: Before calling on honourable members for questions, I tell the House that any question that normally would have been directed to the honourable Premier may be directed to the honourable Minister of Education, as acting Deputy Premier.

PETRO-CHEMICAL PLANT

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Minister of Environment and Conservation say what the Government fears in the environmental clause of the Redcliff indenture document which members of the consortium tabled at yesterday's inquiry but which the Government had sought to have suppressed when the matter was raised at the inquiry last week? Is the Government as certain of the value of the document as an adequate safeguard as it has claimed in the past and, as the environmental clause now has been made public, will the Minister now table it in this House for the benefit of all members? A press report this morning indicates that this document was tabled yesterday by a member of the consortium. It was stated that it would be helpful (and the word "helpful" is in quotation marks in the report) if the proposed clause 15 was placed on record. The report went on to state that, since the formation of the consortium, the objective had been not to harm the environment and the aim had been one of non-impact. Further, it was stated that the clause required the company and the State Government to do their best to meet the requirements of a programme to establish discharge standards and procedures for the disposal of waste effluents and other emissions into the environment. The report goes on to indicate that last week Dr. Inglis stated that, so far as he was concerned, the clause could be tabled, but advice had been given that it was legally unsound to release the indenture before agreement was reached between the two negotiating groups. The impact of my question is in the number of areas of doubt that have been seeded because of this statement before the consortium inquiry yesterday, more particularly the revela-

tion that there is conflict within Government parties about relevance of material and its release.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I think that, broadly, what the Leader has said is true, except that he did not say that the Director of Environment and Conservation also made clear recently at a hearing of the inquiry that certainly I and the Government generally desired to be able to release the environmental clause at the earliest possible time. I think it should first be made clear to members that the indenture clause certainly was provided in the early stages of the hearing to the Commissioners involved in that hearing. As has been pointed out, for some time I have desired to give the terms of the indenture to as many people as possible. In fact, we have been doing that in a broad sense for some weeks. We have been making available to interested members of the community—

Dr. Eastick: Don't you think the Opposition is interested?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Certainly, regarding the offer to consider all these aspects associated with the Redcliff project (and I refer to both the indenture and the studies that have been undertaken), invitations have been extended several times to any member of this House who may be interested to contact my office to arrange to have these things made available to him, but I cannot recall such an approach having been made by the Leader.

Dr. Eastick: I can't recall an invitation.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: At least three invitations in those terms have been extended to the Leader in this House. If the Leader wishes, I will have extracted from *Hansard* the previous invitations and make them available to him. It has seemed at times in the past that, during Question Time, the Leader is not entirely awake, and that may have been the problem in this instance. Be that as it may, there has been no lack of desire by the Government to make the terms of the environmental clause of the indenture available to as many people as possible because, as was reported by the consortium's representative, the clause provides sufficient safeguards to ensure environmental protection in the area. It has been pointed out to me by Government legal officers that, until the complete indenture is ready for signing, the public release of any sections of the indenture could have legal complications for the Government. Therefore, I am pleased that the consortium saw fit to release the environmental clause, so relieving the Government of any legal complications that could have resulted had it been released before the indenture was signed. In reply to the earlier question and interjection from the Leader, I shall be happy to make a copy of the environmental clause available to him as soon as possible.

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Minister of Development and Mines provide further information about the Redcliff project, especially now that the environmental clause of the indenture is to be made available to members? In view of the amount of evidence presented to the Commonwealth committee of inquiry into the environmental clause and the delays that are likely to occur before the committee completes its hearings and submits its report to the Commonwealth Minister for the Environment and Conservation (Dr. Cass), I ask the Minister whether the Government still intends to introduce the indenture Bill in the second week of November as was originally planned and announced, or whether the measure is likely to be delayed as a result of the Commonwealth hearing.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: At this stage there is no alteration to the time table.

BOAT SPEEDS

Mr. OLSON: Can the Acting Minister of Marine say whether the 12.95 km/h speed limit for boats on the Port River is to be extended north of berth 29? Since the introduction of the boundary for the reduced speed of vessels some time ago, additional wharves have been constructed at the wheat silo opposite Metalcraft Constructions Proprietary Limited, and an additional container vessel berth has been constructed at Snowden Beach. Complaints have been received from sailing clubs and boat owners that water skiers are creating a hazard to sailing. Such a hazard could be eliminated if the boundary was extended about 0.4 km north of berth 29 or, alternatively, if the speed of pleasure craft using the lower reaches of the Port River was policed thoroughly.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will take up the matter with the Director of Marine and Harbors and bring down a reply as soon as possible.

STUDENT ALLOWANCES

Mr. EVANS: Can the Minister of Education say why colleges of advanced education students who do not receive support from their parents have to produce their parents' bank books and other financial details when applying for student allowances? I bring up this matter because two students in my area have raised the problem with me. The father of one of the students died about seven years ago and the mother is not very financial. The daughter, who is 20 years of age and an adult by law, is not dependent on her mother. The daughter survives on the allowance, meagre as it has been in the past, and, when applying for a new allowance, she was told that she must take her mother's bank book to the department so that the officers could verify the balance in it.

The other student, an adult by law, studies at a college of advanced education. The parents conduct a business, the income tax returns in respect of which are normally not presented to the Taxation Department until February or March of the following year. The department, which has refused to accept the 1972-73 returns, has stated that it wants the income tax details for the 1973-74 year, but the student cannot provide them without the parents' accountant doing much of the accounting work that is not done so early, and this could take several weeks.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am not at all clear why the bank book should have been asked for in relation to the first matter, because the assessment for the additional means test allowance is on income, either of the student if the student is independent, or of the parents if the student is not independent. In addition, it would seem that a bank book would not give the requisite information. However, I will see what is the position in this matter.

I can see that the student to whom the honourable member has referred has a problem if the parents cannot give an account of their 1973-74 taxable income at this stage. Possibly, we will have to make an assessment on the basis of the best estimate the parents can make in the circumstances, with an adjustment to be made later when they have completed the final details. That might be the simpler way around that problem. The Age of Majority (Reduction) Act does not apply in respect of wages and allowances. The general scheme followed by the department is similar to that followed by the Australian Government with regard to the tertiary allowance scheme. Although students are not treated as independent until they reach the age of 21 years, if any student can demonstrate that he or she has provided for himself or herself

for any two of the preceding five years such a student is automatically treated as independent. The general rules are the same as those applied under the Australian Government's scheme. The fact that students are not treated as independent immediately on attaining 18 years of age is at this stage very much a financial problem. However, it may be possible to reduce progressively the age from 21 years to 18 years but it is not possible to do so now. I will get a report as soon as possible.

TEACHER HOUSING

Mr. BURDON: Can the Minister of Education comment on the Government's policy of providing additional accommodation for teachers in country areas? As fresh appointments will soon be made to country schools, my attention has recently been drawn again to the problems associated with housing for schoolteachers appointed to country areas.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Teacher housing has been a growing and difficult problem for the last few years, particularly since we have increased the number of staff appointed to country schools, and also particularly as the result of the dramatic change in the attitudes of young single teachers teaching in country areas. Four or five years ago most young teachers in that category were willing to board with families, but attitudes have changed and most of them wish to share a flat or a house and thus gain a greater degree of independence. This attitude is not confined to young teachers: it is characteristic of young people generally. The extra demand for housing that both factors have produced is well beyond our resources to meet within a short space of time because funds for additional housing come out of the school-building programme. The teacher-housing programme for this year is \$750 000 and any further expansion in funds allocated for teacher housing will only reduce the funds available for the construction of school buildings. We have tried progressively to adopt other policies that give us a different approach to the problem and some hope of achieving a significant improvement. First, the Government has approved the establishment of a teacher-housing authority and legislation for such an authority is being drafted at present. Under the Commonwealth-States Financial Agreement, a statutory corporation can borrow up to \$500 000 a year without such borrowing affecting the State's entitlement to total borrowing under the Australian Loan Council, so a teacher-housing authority as a statutory corporation may borrow an additional \$500 000 annually to go towards teacher housing without that affecting the school-building programme. Secondly, over the years we have progressively tried to get maximum co-operation from the Housing Trust. The trust has been co-operative and some country teachers are now occupying Housing Trust houses and flats. From now onwards such flats will be rented by the department as a tenant and sublet to teachers on the same conditions as those applying to departmental houses. About 45 two-bedroom transportable flats will be provided by the Housing Trust this year.

Thirdly, we are reaching agreement with private people in certain places to provide accommodation to be rented by the Education Department over a guaranteed period of time and then sublet to teachers. We have reached agreement with owners of property in Murray Bridge, Renmark, Port Lincoln and other places, and the same arrangements in relation to the rental of those properties will apply as we have with the Housing Trust. To the extent that private people contribute funds to build houses and flats that are to be occupied by country teachers,

this is another source of housing funds which, if we use it, will not affect the school-building programme. We cannot solve the problem associated with teacher housing within the next year: it will take longer than that because the problem has suddenly become more difficult and intractable as a result of changing attitudes.

VEHICLE WEIGHTS

Mr. VENNING: Will the Minister of Transport consider extending, from January 1, 1975, to July 1, 1975, the date on which legislation dealing with gross vehicle weights and gross combination weights was to have become law? The Minister will recall that the date of operation of the regulations relating to brakes on trailers has been extended to this date. In view of the problems involved in setting up the relevant committee concerned with granting permits to people who are carting their harvest, and bearing in mind that the harvest time has now arrived, I ask the Minister to consider extending the operative date as I have suggested.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am surprised that the member for Rocky River has asked this question, as I would have expected the member for Eyre to ask it. On Thursday, I told the member for Eyre that the Government had already taken a decision on the matter and that today I would introduce legislation to give effect to that decision. I will do just that.

AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

Mr. McANANEY: I understand that the Premier is today making efforts to save the automotive industry in South Australia. In his absence, can the Minister of Education say whether he believes the Premier can succeed if the rapid rate of inflation continues, as inflation has already destroyed the ability of the industry to export or compete against imports? Have the present problems not been caused by greatly increased costs that have resulted from increased nominal wages (without any increase in real wages), improved workmen's compensation payments, four weeks annual leave, a 17½ per cent leave loading, and equal pay for equal work by women? This is the information I received from the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs, through the Attorney-General, on October 15 this year. The problems have therefore not been caused by excessive prices as determined by the Commonwealth Prices Justification Tribunal.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I should have thought that the activities of the Premier with regard to the automotive industry in South Australia would receive the full support of Opposition members. I think that, on an issue such as this, the Premier has demonstrated many times his determination to act in the best interests of South Australia, working on a basis designed to secure the employment base in this State. I think his record in this area is without compare.

Mr. Dean Brown: Without exception—

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If the honourable member—

The SPEAKER: Order! Replies to interjections are out of order.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Replies are out of order, but not interjections?

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order, too.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am glad to have that clarification. Regarding the automotive industry in South Australia and Australia, the size of the market has never

been large enough to justify four manufacturers, all producing for the local market and gaining economies of scale. That is the common knowledge of everyone who has been associated in any way with the automotive industry over a long period. The problem of imported cars depending on the level of protection provided by the Australian Government is therefore an especially sensitive matter. Any decline in the level of protection, be it owing to a change in tariff policy or revaluation of the dollar, is a situation that can create at any time serious problems for the Australian automotive industry. The arguments taking place at present relate to the degree of protection that should be given to the Australian automotive industry. I am a little puzzled by the honourable member's question, because the rate of inflation in Japan is higher than the rate in Australia.

Mr. McANANEY: That's connected with oil and wheat prices.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Heysen has asked a question. Standing Orders do not allow the honourable member continually to question the honourable Minister who is replying to his question.

Mr. McANANEY: I haven't got an answer yet.

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Heysen.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The rate of inflation in Japan is higher than the rate in Australia. In addition, the Australian dollar has recently been devalued. It seems to me that the problem of growing and competing Japanese imports is likely to be solved, particularly in view of the expected Commonwealth rejection of the Industries Assistance Corporation report and also as a result of the cost changes that have taken place in Japan in relation to Australia and the recent change in the exchange rate.

FISHING

Mr. RODDA: Can the Minister of Fisheries say what progress has been made or is being made in arranging for a vessel to carry out survey work in relation to the hake industry in this State? The Minister is well aware that, as a result of the safe mercury content requirement in Victoria, the shark-fishing industry in this State has collapsed. I understand that large hake-fishing fields exist in the deep water off the coast, but expertise is required in catching this fish, as well as heavy capital investment. I understand that discussions are being held about a vessel being provided from the Eastern States, with a Commonwealth and State subsidy being made available. By this means, necessary information and expertise can be passed on so that capital investment can be undertaken in relation to what could be a profitable industry. In this way, some of the fishermen who have suffered losses as a result of the situation affecting shark fishing could engage in this venture. They have the vessels now, but they lack the know-how and do not want to undertake the necessary capital investment without having some guidelines to follow.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: True, we are looking at several other aspects of fishing to make up for the deficiency caused by the Victorian requirement in relation to the mercury content in sharks. The honourable member said that fishermen could no longer profitably engage in shark fishing, but I think I should clarify that statement by pointing out that only large sharks are affected by the Victorian requirement; small sharks can still be caught and sold on the Victorian market particularly. For some months now, various research projects have been undertaken, not the least being research into the possibilities of a market for squid. Regarding the fisheries to which

the honourable member has referred, we intend to see what can be done to provide a suitable vessel that can be staffed by fishermen engaged in this activity and by officers of the Fisheries Department so that the necessary work can be done to ensure a profitable and viable industry from these fisheries. I am afraid that I cannot say exactly when this will be arranged but, as the Acting Director of the department may well know more about the matter, I will contact him and let the honourable member have any additional information that is available.

MEAT AUTHORITY

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister of Education ask the Minister of Agriculture whether he intends to proceed with his expressed intention of setting up a meat authority in this State? On October 10, 1972, when explaining the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Act Amendment Bill, the Minister stated:

The removal from office of members representing these sectional interests—

that is, those people who previously were sectional representatives on the board before the establishment of the corporation—

is not to deny the valuable part that they have played in the affairs of the board in the past. In fact, it is intended that many of the interests at present represented on the board will secure representation on a proposed authority that will ultimately have wide powers in relation to the meat industry as a whole.

My question relates to that statement by the Minister, and I point out that the producer organisations, having received the proposal well at the time, have looked forward to the establishment of such a meat authority. However, until now the producer organisations have waited patiently but to no avail.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will take the matter up with my colleague and obtain a reply.

RURAL ASSISTANCE

Mr. BOUNDY: Will the Minister of Education ask the Minister of Agriculture whether the State Government will promote the call for financial assistance that the South Australian beef industry has made to the Commonwealth Government and/or whether the State Government will permit the rural reconstruction scheme to be extended to allow short-term financial assistance to be given to these producers? The price for cattle that was quoted at the abattoir yesterday was \$10 a head lower than the price realised previously. That was because of our loss of export outlets for the beef production of this State, and all beef producers know that we have not yet got anywhere near the lowest prices for beef that will be realised on the South Australian market, because producers generally are holding their cattle, hoping to get better prices, and, given a severe autumn early next year, doubtless many cattle will come on to the market then. If export markets are not found in the meantime, severe hardship will be caused to beef producers by the low prices that will prevail then. Even if the position does not get worse, beef producers generally will be suffering severe liquidity difficulties soon, and certainly assistance is called for.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will refer the matter to my colleague and bring down a reply.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Acting Minister of Works ascertain when it is expected that landscaping at Modbury Hospital will be completed?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will get a report on the matter.

WORKER PARTICIPATION

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry say when the Government intends to introduce legislation to force the implementation of worker participation in industry in South Australia? It is reported in today's *Advertiser* that the Premier believes that there is a lack of enthusiasm in the private sector in South Australia. This is the second such outburst within a week. It is well known, as the Minister is aware, that within the trade union movement there is strong opposition to worker participation, and the Minister will agree that past experience in other countries (particularly in Europe, including Sweden) shows that the matter calls for patience and, above all, time: it is not a matter for compulsion.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: At this stage it is not intended to introduce legislation regarding worker participation. I consider that there is much support for worker participation within the trade union movement and within the private sector.

WHYALLA INDUSTRY

Mr. MAX BROWN: Will the Minister of Development and Mines ascertain what progress has been made so far on the detailed study of types of industry and availability of land in the zoned light industrial area within the city of Whyalla? The Minister is well aware of the situation to which I refer. It is desirable, in my opinion, to conclude this study as soon as possible so that the industrial needs, both heavy and light, in Whyalla can be planned on a proper basis.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The member would be aware that already much work has been done on this matter. I will get a detailed report for him, in addition to the information that I can give him now. However, I want to say that the Government is concerned about the situation regarding light industrial land in Whyalla. To put the matter bluntly, people are holding land that they are not using properly and they are preventing the setting up of light industrial establishments that would use the land in a proper and co-ordinated way. It will be a fairly delicate operation to rationalise the whole thing, but it is important that it be rationalised, otherwise the ability of the city of Whyalla to continue to attract the types of employment it requires to meet the needs particularly of women and school leavers will be reduced. I do not rule out the possibility that the Government will have to act drastically in this field if the people are not willing to be a little less selfish in using the land over which they have control by lease, or something like that.

Mr. Coumbe: What do you mean by "drastically"?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I mean as drastically as we must operate to get things working again, because they are not working that way now. We have industrial land to the north of the city which the Lands Department has developed and to which we should like to persuade the heavier industries to move. I have told the heavy industries that at present are occupying light industrial sites in Whyalla under existing uses that the Government will not force them, against their will, to move out of that area, but, if it is possible for some of these industries to relocate in the new heavy industry area, we shall applaud that move. I am concerned that vacant blocks of land scattered throughout the light industrial area are not being used for anything productive and are not available for anything productive.

BUSH FIRES

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Government take action to ensure that adequate publicity is given to the serious bush fire hazard that will exist this summer?

Bushfire Prevention Week has concluded recently, but it seems to me and to people with whom I have discussed the matter that this has had little impact on the community. When the Minister of Agriculture was questioned on the matter, he was not sure when Bushfire Prevention Week was. It seems that any action the Government may have contemplated and taken to alert the public to the serious bush fire hazard has been ineffective so far. I need not emphasise too much the serious fire hazard that exists in the outer metropolitan area and the large amount of undergrowth that will exist this year because of the wet season. That is obvious, and it seems that a most serious situation will develop soon and that certainly the people must be alerted more than they have been so far. It is not an understatement to say that Bushfire Prevention Week did not alert the people to these impending dangers.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: As I understand it, the Minister of Agriculture has stepped up his and his department's activities considerably in recent weeks in relation to this matter. Numerous statements, appearing in the press and broadcast on the radio, have drawn people's attention to the danger and, from my direct knowledge of what has been happening, the Minister of Agriculture has been assiduous in trying to ensure that people are fully aware of the danger.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Doing what?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If the member for Kavel insists on taking a sideswipe at the Minister of Agriculture and does not give credit where credit is due, it is difficult to exchange differences of viewpoint with the Minister, the member for Kavel or anyone else. I am stating the facts: the information given out by Government departments and the publicity given by the Minister of the bush fire danger which, to my knowledge, has been stepped up considerably this year. Whether the media has paid as much attention to the danger as should have been paid to it is perhaps another matter. I will certainly take up the matter with my colleague and ask him whether or not he believes greater efforts are necessary and whether any special efforts are required to ensure a greater degree of co-operation of the media on this matter.

RENTS

Mr. DUNCAN: Will the Attorney-General ask the Prices and Consumer Affairs Branch to investigate the activities of Mr. S. R. Madsen, landlord, who is refusing to return bond money to tenants vacating his premises? Can the Attorney also say what progress is being made in drafting the proposed tenants' rights legislation? My assistance has been sought by a young lady who was previously a tenant of a Mr. Madsen, of 13 Carnarvon Avenue, Glenelg North, concerning bond money she had paid when she signed a tenancy agreement. The agreement expired on August 31 this year, so she vacated the premises. The tenancy agreement provided that the bond money was to be returned within seven days of her vacating the premises; however, it was not returned, nor has it been returned since. When the young lady initially contacted Mr. Madsen's office, she was told he had not been in to sign a cheque and was later given various excuses of that nature. When she further pursued the matter she was told that the premises she had occupied had been left in an unsatisfactory condition and that complaints had been made about the condition of the premises by the new tenants. She subsequently contacted the new tenants and was told by them (and she has a letter from them) that they were completely happy with the condition of the premises when they took possession

and had no complaints. On receiving her complaint, I tried to contact Mr. Madsen on three occasions, but without success. I left messages with his secretary for him to telephone me, but it appears that he is keeping house. He is well known to the Prices and Consumer Affairs Branch and, in the opinion of an officer of the branch, he is the worst example of a rack landlord the branch knows in Adelaide. He is also well known for his exploitation of tenants in matters of this type, because this is not the first such matter that has been brought to the attention of the branch. In view of this situation, I ask the Attorney to have the matter investigated thoroughly.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will refer the matter to the Prices and Consumer Affairs Branch for investigation. The legislation to which the honourable member refers is being prepared and will be introduced this session.

PETROL TAX

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Can the Minister of Education, as Acting Treasurer (as I understand he is) among other portfolios, say whether, because of the announcement last week of the introduction of a State fuel tax and because of the low collection rate at present of the road maintenance tax, the Government will abolish immediately the road maintenance tax? Last week the Treasurer announced that the Government would introduce a tax of 6c—

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I draw your attention to Order of the Day, Other Business, No. 2, as set out in tomorrow's business on the Notice Paper.

The SPEAKER: During the initial stages of the honourable member's question I sought confirmation whether the subject matter of his question was the subject of a motion on the Notice Paper and, as it is, a question dealing with the matter is out of order.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate that the matter is the subject of a motion on the Notice Paper, but I wish to introduce entirely different evidence in saying why I have asked the question. I therefore believe the question is valid.

The SPEAKER: Order! I rule that the question is out of order because a motion being considered by the House deals with exactly the same matter as the question asked by the honourable member; therefore, the question is inadmissible.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Am I allowed to rephrase the question?

The SPEAKER: Not at this stage. I have ruled that the question is inadmissible and it therefore lapses.

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister of Education, in the Treasurer's absence, say whether the new fuel tax will be payable by oil companies or individual service stations and whether it will be payable monthly, quarterly or annually? I understand that some metropolitan service station proprietors are worried that, if they are required to remit the proposed new fuel tax to the State Treasury within seven days of the previous month's sales, they will suffer considerable liquidity problems. I have been informed that an average metropolitan service station has between \$7 000 and \$8 000 in trade debtors and that about 70 per cent of these sums is represented by the sale of fuel. My informant, an accountant for several service stations, claims that trade debtors pay their accounts between 45 days and 60 days and that, if this new tax is payable monthly, the average service station will have to supply between \$600 and \$1 200 in new capital in the first and subsequent months before business profits start to make up the leeway. Late last year, when the price

of petrol was increased by 3c, it took the average service station between three months and four months to absorb collection of the increases from profits. If the Government has not considered this matter, will an investigation be made with the industry, as well as a report being made available to me and other members, to ensure that service station proprietors will not be embarrassed by liquidity problems in meeting the Government's request if the fuel tax is to be paid monthly, quarterly, or annually?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will draw the honourable member's comments to the attention of the Treasurer and ask him to consider the views that have been stated in relation to the preparation of the legislation that is to be placed before the House. I could not give a reply today even if I knew what it was, which I do not. However, I will ensure that the views expressed by the honourable member are considered.

HOSPITALS

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Health, say whether Commonwealth Government approval has been obtained to build the proposed new hospital north of Adelaide; will the building proceed as planned by the State Government; or will the Commonwealth Government take over the project as it has tried to do in respect of similar projects in other States? It was recently announced that a 14 ha site just south of Sir Lyell McEwin Hospital had been purchased on which to build a hospital of the same size as the Royal Adelaide Hospital and the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, such hospital to serve the northern areas of Adelaide. The Prime Minister has shown that he has wanted in the past to assume control of other States' hospital projects at Westmead, Campbelltown, Mount Gravatt and Sunshine because he claimed, in the first instance, that the States were too slow in constructing the hospitals. He now says that the hospitals are being constructed in the wrong suburbs and, although this goes against his original theory that hospitals there should be projects of the highest priority, he now says he will build separate Commonwealth hospitals elsewhere in these cities regardless of the wishes of the States. It is feared that the continued construction of the four State hospitals referred to will be jeopardised by the threatened transfer of Commonwealth funds to as yet un-named Commonwealth hospitals. Can the Attorney indicate, therefore, what guarantee there is that this appalling situation will not be repeated in South Australia in respect of the new northern districts hospital?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The assurance is that the South Australian Government and the Australian Government will work together for the benefit of South Australians in this field as in other fields, and in that way—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. L. J. KING: —there will be a distinction between the Governments of other States to which the honourable member has referred and the Government of South Australia.

SCHOOL BOOKS

Mr. BLACKER: Does the Minister of Education condone the new principle of the payment for school books required by Aboriginal students and, if he does not, will he take up the matter with his Commonwealth colleagues? I have received a photostat copy of a letter circulated to the headmasters of at least some schools, stating that a new method of payment will be implemented next year. Previously, schools applied to the Aboriginal secondary

grants scheme for payment of Aboriginal student accounts. The proposed new scheme provides for payment to be made to students' parents, who are then required to pay the school. From the letter handed to me, obviously the Australian Education Department does not expect that parents will pass on the finance and, consequently, it has provided special forms for schools to make further application for direct payment. The principle involved is not only cumbersome but also provides for compensation should the scheme be abused. It also acknowledges the Government's willingness to pay double the sums ordinarily provided for specific purposes.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: As I am not familiar with the details of these proposals, I will have my officers investigate the matter and, if necessary, approach the Australian Government.

LAND VALUATION

Mr. CHAPMAN: Is the Minister of Education, in the absence of the Treasurer, aware that the State Valuation Department is failing properly to assess all improvements when determining unimproved land values and that its officers lack an appreciation of the value of the fostered and cultivated element of certain natural resources in country areas of the State and, by their actions, are destroying the incentive of landholders to promote the natural environment, thereby conflicting with the objectives of the Environment and Conservation Department in their attempts to grasp more land tax and other taxes? I bring to the notice of the House an example of evidence that has been given to me in support of the claims in my question. The area comprising part sections 143, 144, 145 and "T", totalling 461.3 hectares, hundred of Haines, county of Carnarvon, was a partly cleared rural property.

The owners, in their correspondence, who admit that it has never been highly productive land have, therefore, taken extreme care during their years of occupation to preserve, cultivate, fertilise and protect it from fire and to develop the natural growth thereon. Records show that the farm was subdivided into about 32 ha conservation units in 1973. On March 5, 1974, the total area carried an unimproved value of \$3 630. Following Lands Titles Office advice of the first unit sale, the balance of the land was revalued on June 4, 1974, at \$3 350, taking into account the above unit sale. During the past four months, additional units have been sold to conservationists, currently leaving only five units, namely B, C, D, J and O, totalling about 162 ha of the original property.

This remaining area is currently revalued at \$17 920. On the information received, this means that, between June and October, 1974, the total unimproved value of the original holding has been increased from \$3 630 to \$57 900, or an increase of about 1 590 per cent. That is the only example I will cite, but other examples have been cited by members in recent weeks. In the interests of genuine conservation development and public incentive, I seek the Treasurer's urgent intervention in this claimed destructive departmental practice.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The first thing I should say is that the Valuation Department's officers are a conscientious group and would not, nor would the Valuer-General, knowingly act in a way that contravened the law. Furthermore, in assessing unimproved land value they would be making what, in their view, was a genuine assessment. They know full well that any assessment they make is subject to appeal and, in common with anyone employed at Government level, they do not like having their decisions overridden by successful appeals. Apart

from the basic conscientiousness of the officers involved, that additional factor would govern their behaviour. Appeal procedures, which exist in order to protect the public, are part of the Act, and it may be that, in the instance to which the honourable member has referred, appeal rights should be exercised. However, in view of the honourable member's question, I will ask the Valuer-General to investigate the matter fully. I imagine that the case can be identified sufficiently from the question but, if it cannot, I will see that the Valuer-General contacts the honourable member so that he may pursue inquiries into the matter.

USED CAR EMPLOYEES

Mr. GUNN: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry say what action the Government intends to take to protect certain employees who work in used car yards in South Australia from the intimidation of Mr. Meehan, of the Vehicle Builders Union? In the *News* of October 18, the Minister is reported as supporting this union official's action. Because of the Minister's support, I take it that the Government also supports the tactics of this imported stirrer.

The SPEAKER: Order! That comment is out of order. The honourable member for Eyre.

Mr. GUNN: I have been reliably informed that Mr. Meehan has come from another State and is paid by an outside organisation.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The honourable member is not a bad stirrer himself. I made a statement when the union was trying to organise employees in the motor vehicle resale trade. I said that I defended unions that tried to organise people into their association, because the employees concerned accept all the benefits paid for by the financial members and therefore, on principle, should be obliged to make some contribution towards paying for the benefits they derive. I still stand by my statement.

MOONTA AREA WATER SUPPLY

Mr. RUSSACK: Can the Acting Minister of Works say what progress is being made to rectify the condition of the previously unacceptable mains water supply in the Moonta, Moonta Mines, Wallaroo, and Tickera areas? Also, can he say whether there will be an adequate and continuous supply during the coming summer? During recent years, because of the influx of tourists into the area and for other reasons such as necessary stock watering, steep increases in the use of reticulated water have drastically reduced the pressure in summer: in fact, sometimes the flow has ceased completely. Previously, the Minister of Works has indicated that a survey in the Tickera area was to be undertaken, and also an upgrading of mains in the other areas to which I have referred. Because of a grave fire risk and the general requirements of the permanent residents and tourists, I urge that any upgrading work be expedited.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will investigate the problem for the honourable member and obtain a reply.

BOATING BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the amendments made by the House of Assembly to the Legislative Council's amendments Nos. 9 and 19, and had agreed to the consequential amendment made by the House of Assembly to amendment No. 9 without amendment.

BUILDERS LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments and suggested amendments.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (RADAR)

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Road Traffic Act, 1961-1974. Read a first time.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

The main object of this Bill is to broaden those provisions of the principal Act that relate to the use of traffic speed analysers (more commonly known as radar). For some time now the Police Department has suspended the use of certain apparatus called amphotometers, because an opinion was put forward that they may not come within the strict meaning of the term "electronic traffic speed analysers" that is used in the Act as it now stands. It is therefore desirable to remove all references to the word "electronic" from the Act, so that amphotometers may once again safely be used by the Police Department in its very vital work of enforcing speed limits. It is also necessary to give the Governor power to approve the kinds of apparatus that may be used as traffic speed analysers, in the same manner as the Governor now approves apparatus that may be used as breathalysers.

I consider that this Bill is urgently needed, as the Christmas holidays, with their usual threat of high death tolls on the roads, are fast approaching. Everything that can be done to help the police to keep speeds down to safe limits ought to be done. I shall now deal with the clauses of the Bill in detail. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides a definition of traffic speed analysers. Clause 3 provides the Governor with the power to approve, and vary or revoke the approval, of different kinds of apparatus as traffic speed analysers.

Clause 4 amends section 147 of the principal Act by deferring until July, 1976, the operative provisions relating to the weight limits of vehicles as set out in subsections (4) and (5) of this section. The need for this deferral arises from the need to have further time available for assessment of weights and the desirability of ensuring that more time is available to consider exemption and develop a coherent policy thereon. Clause 5 removes all references to the word "electronic" from the evidentiary provisions of the Act.

Mr. GUNN secured the adjournment of the debate.

WHEAT INDUSTRY STABILISATION BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I ask leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

Honourable members having an interest in this matter will recall that there is a stabilisation system for the wheat industry in Australia that has been operating for several years. The purpose of this Bill is to continue this scheme in operation for the season commencing on October 1, 1974, and each of the next six succeeding seasons. The legislative scheme, of which this Bill is part, consists of a Commonwealth Act, which is presently before the Australian

Parliament, and a supporting State Act. It is unnecessary at this stage to outline the constitutional reasons for this approach. This Bill, which presages the supporting State Act, is based on a uniform Australian draft Bill, this being the practice that has continued in this matter for some time. In fact, with the necessary changes made, it is quite similar in form to similar previous Acts in this matter.

To consider the Bill in some detail: clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the Act presaged by this Bill to come into operation, or to be deemed to have come into operation, on the day that the corresponding Commonwealth Act comes into operation. Clause 3 is formal. Clause 4 provides for appropriate repeal and savings. Clause 5 sets out the definitions necessary for the purposes of the Bill. Clause 6 makes the temporal application of the Bill plain. Clause 7 sets out the powers of the board, which is continued in existence under the Commonwealth Act but which will derive its powers in relation to this State from an Act of this Parliament.

Clause 8 empowers the Commonwealth Minister to give directions to the board. This is consistent with the legal situation that the board is a Commonwealth instrumentality. Clause 9 provides for the licensing of receivers of wheat, and at subclause (2) preserves the rights of existing licence holders in this State. Clause 10 enables persons to deliver wheat to the board and, in certain circumstances, set out in subclause (2), compels them to deliver wheat to the board. The usual exceptions to this power of compulsion are contained in subclause (4). Clause 11 provides the method of delivery of wheat to the board that in this State is to a licensed receiver.

Clause 12 sets out the circumstances in which wheat may be lawfully dealt with. Clause 13 sets out the method by which the price of wheat of a season will be determined, and I would commend it to members' close attention. Clause 14 deals with quota wheat which, in this context, may be regarded as wheat in relation to which the application of a fixed minimum price is certain. In this regard I draw members' attention to subclause (3) of this clause which admits of the possibility of some non-quota wheat being admitted into the system. Clause 15 provides a method of payment by the board. Clause 16 provides for the separation of wheat of the various seasons.

Part III, clauses 17 to 20, sets out the stabilisation provisions, and again I would commend this Part to members' close attention. Clause 21 provides maximum flexibility in the use of the board's funds. Clause 22 is formal and provides for returns. Clause 23 requires persons having wheat, the property of the board, in their possession to keep it safe from damage. Clause 24 is an entry and search provision. Clause 25 is formal, and clause 26 is a usual indemnity provision. Clause 27 is a general penalty provision. Clause 28 is formal, and clause 29 provides an appropriate regulating power.

Mr. VENNING secured the adjournment of the debate.

HEALTH AND MEDICAL SERVICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I ask leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

It is one that is submitted to Parliament essentially by way of Statute revision to facilitate the preparation of the Act for consolidation under the Acts Republication Act.

The Act was originally and mainly intended to provide for the establishment of an Advisory Council on Health and Medical Services and for the appointment of a Director-General of Public Health and a Director of Tuberculosis. The advisory council has not met since 1965 and can no longer be constituted as provided by the Act, as the Act provides that the council be constituted by reference, in the case of some members, to the offices in the Public Service held by them at the time when the Act was passed in 1949. Some of those offices do not now exist in the Public Service and, as the provisions dealing with the council have been inoperative and incapable of application for such a long time, it would be misleading and serve no useful purpose to reprint the Act without removing the "dead wood" from it.

In view of the Government's decision to set up a working party and a project team for the progressive implementation of recommendations of the Bright committee, there is no point in retaining the council as constituted in this Act. The Bill accordingly repeals the provisions of the principal Act which deal with the council, makes a consequential amendment to the long title, and up-dates a reference to the old Public Service Act, 1936, which has been repealed and superseded by the Public Service Act, 1967. The Bill's objects are given effect in clauses 2 to 5.

Dr. TONKIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

NURSES' MEMORIAL CENTRE OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA, INCORPORATED (GUARANTEE) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 24. Page 1688.)

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I support the Bill, but I am not sure that the Minister, when introducing it, read the explanation or sought leave to have it inserted in *Hansard* without reading it. From memory, I think we were given a copy of the second reading explanation, and that is in direct contrast to the situation that has just applied in relation to the Health and Medical Services Act Amendment Bill. I make the point that, if a Minister seeks leave to have—

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. A copy of the second reading explanation of this Bill was given to the Opposition before it was introduced.

The SPEAKER: Order! Whether a copy of the second reading explanation has been given to anyone is not the concern of the House. This is a debate on the Bill now being discussed, and the member for Bragg has the call on the second reading.

Dr. TONKIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am making the point that we were indeed grateful to be informed of the contents of this Bill when it was introduced, which is more than I can say has happened at other times.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must speak to this Bill.

Dr. TONKIN: This simple Bill allows the guarantee, which the South Australian Government is extending to a loan from the Savings Bank to cover the costs of the Nurses Memorial Centre, to be increased from \$548 000 to \$663 000. These are considerable sums: obviously, this is a matter that will not cost the Government any money, but it has made a helpful gesture, which has been

appreciated by the committee of the Nurses Memorial Centre. It will not result in any lower rate of interest or in any way take away from the Nurses Memorial Centre the responsibility to pay back the loan. All the money must be raised, and this will be done in the next 20 years. However, because of escalating building costs in the past two years since construction began at the centre, the cost of the building has increased, I believe, far more than was expected in the first instance. As a result, I understand that the committee for the next three years will be completely without liquidity, and will be in extreme difficulties even with the increased loan from the Savings Bank, a loan that will be guaranteed, we hope, by the increased amount allowed by this Bill.

I refer to the situation that has beset the Nurses Memorial Centre from the outset, because this centre has had extreme difficulty in finalising its plans. Last month this fine centre was opened, and the committee can be very proud. It is a worthy memorial, and the Government should have some credit because it has supported the construction of the centre by guaranteeing the loan. This project has been actively under way since early 1970. The nurses were told wrongly in 1969 that their property on Dequetteville Terrace would be taken over because of transport requirements. They sold the property for \$35 000 following this information given by the Highways Department, and they still managed to raise over \$100 000 by 1972. In May, 1972, there began an extremely difficult situation that prevented the project from proceeding, and the nurses were not sure whether they would be allowed to build on the site they had acquired. They were offered alternative sites in the city and other areas (sites which, it transpired, it was not in the Government's power to hand over), and it was not until the matter was brought up in late 1972 and early 1973 that approval was finally given for them to commence building.

It is unfortunate that building costs have escalated so much; perhaps if the nurses had been allowed to have the building commence when they had their assets and their site ready, and when there was no suggestion of a housing development being built on the site instead, there would have been no need to introduce this Bill, because the funds they had would have been sufficient to cover the cost of building. Having expressed that slight regret, I am pleased that they have been able to build. I am pleased to see this Bill introduced, and I commend it to members.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I, too, support the Bill which, being a hybrid Bill, will go to a Select Committee. It will be seen in *Hansard*, when the Bill was introduced, that the Minister sought leave to have the explanation inserted in *Hansard* without reading it.

The SPEAKER: Order! We are discussing a Bill; we are not discussing any other circumstances whatsoever. The House has made a decision, and no member can make an adverse comment on a decision made by this House. The honourable member for Glenelg.

Mr. MATHWIN: I was not really criticising the Minister but—

The SPEAKER: The House made a decision, and the honourable member cannot comment on that decision.

Mr. MATHWIN: The Bill means that the Government is now guaranteeing not the original \$548 000 but \$663 000. In less than two years, costs have escalated by \$115 000, and that is a drastic increase. The organisation responsible for raising the money originally had \$40 000 cash in hand, and when it applied for a guarantee its assets totalled \$100 000. The acceleration in costs amounting to

\$115 000 in less than two years makes one wonder about the position of the building industry in this State. The record of the building industry and the record of the Minister who looks after that—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has surely studied the Bill, which deals with the Government's increasing its guarantee to a certain organisation. That is the subject matter of the Bill, and that is the only thing that can be debated.

Mr. MATHWIN: Having brought these matters to Parliament's attention, I would like to take the opportunity of complimenting the committee responsible for the building of this memorial centre, which is worthy of the profession for which it is being provided, namely, the nursing profession of South Australia.

Bill read a second time and referred to a Select Committee consisting of Messrs. Dean Brown, Dunstan, Langley, Slater, and Tonkin; the committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to adjourn from place to place; the committee to report on November 21.

ADELAIDE FESTIVAL THEATRE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 24. Page 1690.)

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I support this Bill, which is similar to the Bill recently considered relating to the Morphett Street bridge. I believe some of the comments made during debate on that Bill are pertinent to this debate. Under clause 2, the Adelaide City Council is relieved of a liability to make payments in connection with the Adelaide Festival Theatre amounting to \$2 261 a year. Secondly, the Treasurer will be authorised to reimburse the council in respect of payments it is required to meet on borrowings to the extent of \$158 529 a year.

Mr. Mathwin: Is there anything in the Bill relating to the buxom wenches we saw on Saturday night at the festival theatre?

Mr. COUMBE: Perhaps it will promote them! The reimbursement to which I have just referred will occur until the first of the borrowings has been discharged, and thereafter the Treasurer's liability will reduce as loans are repaid. The Minister said that the position regarding Carclew will not be affected. Having been on the original committee dealing with that matter, I remember the negotiations that went on at that time. If members refer to section 6 (4) of the original legislation, they will see to what I am referring. There is no doubt that the Adelaide City Council is facing severe financial problems. I am referring to the Adelaide City Council's total area, which includes Adelaide city square, as well as North Adelaide. These problems are different from those being faced by councils in other capital cities in Australia, because of certain works which the council has had the initiative to undertake in the past, the effects of which are now catching up with it. The city has not the population within it to generate the revenue necessary for the council to afford to work on the basis of a modest rate in the dollar.

The council recently experienced great difficulty in this respect. King William Tower, in King William Street, which would have returned a large sum in rates each year, has been bought by the Commonwealth Government, and there will now be no rates paid on it to the Adelaide City Council, because the Crown does not pay rates. Unless some relief is given to the Adelaide City Council as regards its financial problems, it is quite possible that Adelaide's development will be impeded and that we will be at a disadvantage compared to people living in the

other capital cities. I do not believe any member wants to see that happen. Being aware of the approaches made by the City Council to the Government, I support the Bill, which, in some respects, affords some relief. I am amazed to learn that, for some reason or other, the City Council (unlike councils in other capital cities and the three other municipal councils in South Australia) has not been successful in obtaining a grant this year from the Grants Commission, although it applied for a grant. I find it incomprehensible that a grant was not made, as it would have helped the council considerably.

I have seen no explanation offered why the council's application was turned down. The refusal of the application defeats the purpose of the amendment to the Grants Commission legislation that commenced operating last year. Under the Bill, the council is relieved of certain obligations, while oversight by the Treasurer is provided. No alteration is proposed in relation to the Carlew expenditure. Therefore, I support the Bill to the stage of its being referred to a Select Committee.

Bill read a second time and referred to a Select Committee consisting of Messrs. Coumbe, Crimes, Dunstan, Goldsworthy, and Simmons; the committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to adjourn from place to place; the committee to report on November 20.

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (HOURS)

In Committee.

(Continued from October 24. Page 1699.)

Clauses 9 to 11 passed.

Clause 12—"Duty to display names, etc."

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): I move:

In new subsection (2) (a) to strike out "his premises are open" and insert "he is required to keep his premises open".

This is consequential on earlier amendments.

Mr. COUMBE: I take it that, because of the publican's having an option in relation to the hours when he will open his premises, he will therefore be required to display a notice stating the hours. Will the notice have to be broadly displayed?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The requirement is that the notice be exhibited in some prominent part of the licensed premises so as to be conspicuous and easily legible to members of the public who may pass the premises on foot. That requirement could be variously interpreted by different licensees. The Superintendent of Licensed Premises keeps some sort of surveillance of these matters. Generally, the Australian Hotels Association produces a form of notice that is accepted by its members. However, in this case licensees may wish to exhibit not only the hours when they are required to be open but also the hours of trading that they will normally observe, so that their customers will know those hours. Therefore, some licensees may prefer to have their own notice prepared. I do not think we can lay down any provision better than the provision in the Bill. If there is a complaint that a licensee has not observed the spirit of the legislation, the Superintendent of Licensed Premises will be able to deal with the matter.

Mr. MATHWIN: The provision does not set out what form the notice should take. Therefore, some licensees may put up a small notice similar to that which contains the name of the licensee and which is placed over the entrance to the hotel. Surely we should indicate what is required, rather than leave the matter to be decided by the courts.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I think we would be descending to absurdity if we started to prescribe print size and the precise form of the notice. This sort of notice does not have to be forced on people's attention. Under the Consumer Transactions Act, for example, print size has to be prescribed, as the whole object is to ensure that something is brought to the attention of someone who may otherwise not see it. In this case, if a person wants to know at what hours an establishment will be open, he can read the notice; it does not have to be forced on his attention. The notice must be conspicuous and able to be read easily by someone passing. I think that is perfectly adequate for this purpose.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

New clause 12a—"Holder of club licence or permit must display authorised trading hours."

The Hon. L. J. KING: I move to insert the following new clause:

12a. The following section is enacted and inserted in the principal Act after section 118:

118a. (1) The holder of a club licence or a permit under section 67 of this Act shall cause a notice setting forth the hours during which the sale of liquor is authorised by the licence or permit to be exhibited in prominent letters and figures on some conspicuous part of the premises to which the licence or permit relates.

(2) Where a person fails to comply with subsection (1) of this section, he shall be guilty of an offence.

At the risk of once again incurring the displeasure of the member for Glenelg, I suggest that this provision is perfectly reasonable. It is surprising that it has not been put in the Act previously, but I suppose it was overlooked when the original legislation was prepared, or perhaps we did not realise then how flexibly the Licensing Court would use its powers. The court has used its powers flexibly and beneficially and, therefore, the clubs have enjoyed hours of trading that have been quite varied, to meet the individual needs of clubs. There is at present no way in which a club member or visitor will necessarily know the hours of that club: they are quite different from club to club.

It is important that the hours be displayed. It is important to police officers who may have the duty of enforcing the law, and it also is important to members and visitors to know whether they are drinking lawfully. For that reason, I think the provision ought to be inserted.

Mr. COUMBE: This is a logical provision. New subsection (2) provides for an offence, and I ask the Attorney what penalty is likely to be imposed on a person found guilty of an offence under this provision.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Licensing Act contains a general offence section, which is section 197.

Mr. MATHWIN: Does the Attorney intend that the notice will be on the exterior of the building, or will it be sufficient if it is inside the building? Several clubs are in beautification areas, and there has been much difficulty about placards and signs throughout the whole State. Groups have been trying to reduce the number of signs. These clubs may be located in park lands or near the Torrens River, and the notices could be displayed in many colours and of different sizes (because a size has not been laid down). Will it be preferable for these notices to be inside the club?

The Hon. L. J. KING: It would certainly be acceptable: whether it would be preferable I would not express an opinion. It is consistent with the provision that the signs be inside, in a place where they are conspicuous.

Mr. SLATER: In some situations, even though a permit club may obtain approval for the sale of liquor at certain hours, the club may not always open for

all those hours. I should like an assurance that, even though clubs display the hours, they will not necessarily have to trade for those hours.

The Hon. L. J. KING: That is the position. There is no obligation on a club under this legislation to open or serve liquor during authorised hours, and the notice required to be displayed is a notice of the authorised hours of trading. The fact that a club is authorised to trade for any particular period and the fact that it displays a notice, as it must do, do not place an obligation on the club to open or trade for that period.

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Attorney indicate to the body administering these matters that it could be preferable that the notice be inside the premises, particularly in the case of clubs in beautification areas? Councils, including the Adelaide City Council, have had the problem of getting rid of signs, and the Government also must be concerned about them. It has been recognised that they spoil an area.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I do not know that a sign of this kind, even if displayed on the exterior, need necessarily affect adversely the aesthetic character of the area. I think the matter is one to be resolved between the Superintendent of Licensed Premises and club managements. I would not try to interfere with the Superintendent in this regard. He administers the Act, and I would not lay down any general rule or offer any suggestion.

Mr. Mathwin: A nod is as good as a wink.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I do not intend to either nod or wink; I will leave it to the Superintendent to work it out with the club manager.

New clause inserted.

New clause 12b—"Clean glasses must be used for the supply of liquor."

Mr. BECKER: I move to insert the following new clause:

12b. The following section is enacted and inserted in the principal Act immediately after section 142 thereof:

142a. (1) Where the holder of a licence or permit under this Act supplies liquor in pursuance of the licence or permit in a glass, the glass must be a clean glass.

(2) Where a contravention of subsection (1) of this section occurs, the holder of the licence or permit shall be guilty of an offence.

(3) In this section—

"clean glass" means—

(a) a glass that has not previously been used for the purpose of drinking;

or

(b) a glass that has been washed and has not been used for the purpose of drinking by any person (including the person to whom liquor is supplied in the glass) since being washed;

"glass" means any drinking vessel.

The new clause provides that clean glasses must be available for the supply of liquor; in other words, each time a person goes into a hotel, licensed club or other premises and returns a glass to a bartender, he is issued with a clean glass. I believe that all members have received a copy of a letter from the Australian Institute of Health Surveyors, pointing out that, in July, 1972, the institute held a divisional meeting where it was recommended that this provision be incorporated in the Food and Drugs Act, which provides that a person can request a fresh glass if he so desires.

Having consulted the Parliamentary Counsel about this matter, I believe it is desirable that new clause 12b should be incorporated in the Licensing Act as well as in the Food and Drugs Act. South Australians should upgrade their drinking habits and standards and insist on

receiving a fresh glass. I can go back many years to the time I helped by aunt in her hotel in the country. She had a permanent boarder at the hotel who suffered from cancer of the mouth and later contracted tuberculosis. Patrons who attended her hotel were worried that they might contract either disease, so my aunt introduced a code for the glasses so that everyone could identify his own glass. Unfortunately, the code system was not satisfactory and her trade was adversely affected. She always provided clean glasses if requested, particularly when there were large schools of drinkers. Unfortunately, supplying clean glasses for each drink makes extra work. It worries many people, when they form part of a large drinking school, that they may confuse which glass belongs to which drinker, but, having for three years lived in Sydney where one is automatically given a fresh glass for each drink, I know that the problem does not occur.

I believe that beer poured into the same glass on perhaps the third occasion tastes better than beer poured into a fresh glass but, for health and psychological reasons, and because South Australia is the only State that does not have legislation of this nature—

Mr. Kenelly: Have you noticed any demand for clean glasses?

Mr. BECKER: I believe the community is divided on the question, although most people do not mind one way or the other. Having been on both sides of the bar, I believe it is just one of those things about which one does not really worry. South Australia tries hard to promote tourism; indeed, it enjoys a large influx of visitors from other States who cannot understand our law in respect of this matter. It must be remembered, however, that if one wants a fresh glass one can have it. I have never heard of anyone being refused a fresh glass if he has asked for it. Legislation of this nature should be incorporated in both the Licensing Act and the Food and Drugs Act so that both areas are covered and so that the provision can be policed. Under existing legislation it is difficult to prove an offence, because how does one prove that a person did not ask for a fresh glass? The best way to avoid confusion would be to make it mandatory that a fresh glass be given to each person who buys a drink, particularly for health reasons.

Mr. EVANS: I do not support the amendment. "Clean glass" is defined as follows:

(a) a glass that has not previously been used for the purpose of drinking;

The glass could have been used for any other purpose and could still be considered to be a clean glass. If the State Premier was at a great height over Canberra trying to direct fluid at the Prime Minister and that fluid was caught in a glass to save the Prime Minister from being wet by it, and then the fluid was thrown away, the same glass could then be used as a clean glass under this definition. The definition continues:

(b) a glass that has been washed and has not been used for the purpose of drinking by any person (including the person to whom liquor is supplied in the glass) since being washed:

A glass is defined as being any drinking vessel. One could use a stein if he wanted to give his family pet a drink and he could then use the same stein to serve a drink to a customer. A licensee could say to a customer in that case, "It is a clean glass; no-one has drunk from it, except for half a dozen dogs at the back of the hotel." I believe the definition is bad because it provides that a glass is clean if it has been used for any other purpose than for drinking. I believe that any person who wishes to have a clean glass in a club or hotel, a glass not used

for any other purpose at all, would receive one if he asked for it. To write into legislation a measure such as this is ridiculous. It might be all right for some of the smaller hotels, but it would mean much work for the larger hotels.

Some people demand that their original glass be returned; however, I do not know whether it makes a difference or not, although they believe there is a difference. The member for Bragg would argue, as indeed the member for Hanson argued, that there is an inherent health risk in using the same glass more than once, but I believe the chances are fewer of transmitting germs from a cold glass to one's body than from hot lips to one's body. No doubt most members have practised the art of kissing with at least more than one person; this involves a greater risk of transmitting germs than using a glass someone else has used, without washing it. Although the Victorian legislation contains a similar provision, can any member prove that Victorians are any healthier than are South Australians or that the incidence of tuberculosis is lower in Victoria? The new clause is too vague, and I do not support it.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I, too, oppose the new clause, but I am not sure whether I do it for the same reasons as the member for Fisher has given. I know that I do not adopt all the reasons he has adopted. I oppose the new clause because I think it may be based on a misapprehension of what the present law provides. In any event, I do not think that this is the place in which to deal with the matter. The present law requires that a clean glass be provided, unless the glass is filled in the customer's presence; even then, it requires it only if the customer requests it. So, the only case in which it is lawful to use the same glass again is when it is refilled in the customer's presence and when he does not request a clean glass; that provision is contained in the regulations under the Food and Drugs Act. However, I do not know that that is necessarily the beginning and end of the matter.

The Government has no evidence of the communication of disease resulting from glasses being refilled in hotel bars in these circumstances; but that is not to say that disease does not result in such circumstances. The officers of the Minister of Health are now examining this matter and the Government's mind is by no means closed. Initially, the matter must be resolved by the Public Health Department, then by the Government on the department's recommendation and, ultimately, by Parliament. If the matter is to be dealt with, it should be dealt with by the health authorities and by an appropriate amendment to the Food and Drugs Act. The provision should apply not only to glasses containing alcoholic liquor, which is dealt with under the Licensing Act, but also to other drinks, such as cups of tea and milk shakes. I do not think that the Licensing Act is the proper place for the provision.

I was surprised at the remark made by the member for Hanson that the new clause was decided on after he had consulted the Parliamentary Counsel. I do not know what he meant by that, but I am sure that the Parliamentary Counsel would not express a view on the merits or otherwise of any amendment moved in the House. The Parliamentary Counsel serves the wishes of all members and drafts legislation on their instructions, but he takes no responsibility for what is moved in, or adopted by, the House. I hope that the member for Hanson did not intend to convey that impression. I am sure that the Parliamentary Counsel would not express a view on this matter.

I consider that we have before us insufficient material on which to decide the question at this stage. There is a

strong argument for saying that, if a glass is filled in the customer's presence, and if he wants to have his glass refilled, he should be allowed to have this done. Unless I have evidence that that would bring about communication of infectious disease from one to another, I oppose the new clause. If a person drinking with a group in a hotel bar is uncertain—

Mr. Coumbe: What about in a hotel lounge?

The Hon. L. J. KING: Rarely is a glass filled in the customer's presence in the lounge. The existing law provides that a clean glass be provided every time in the lounge.

Dr. Tonkin: It's not always done, though.

The Hon. L. J. KING: If the present law is not being obeyed, we cannot amend it in this way.

Dr. Tonkin: We should, by establishing a routine.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The routine is there now. The present law requires that, if the glass is filled other than in the customer's presence, a clean glass must be provided, and that position will still obtain if the new clause is passed. The only case in which the new clause will apply is the case of service over the bar, where the customer is present and where, under the present law, it is unnecessary to provide a clean glass unless the customer asks for it. However, under the new clause, the customer must be given a clean glass.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Must the customer see what is being done?

The Hon. L. J. KING: Yes. I do not think that we should amend the Licensing Act in this way, but there may be a case for amending the Food and Drugs Act to contain this provision. The matter could be resolved when the Public Health Department officers have made a careful study of the matter and have recommended a provision that would apply generally. I ask the Committee to oppose the new clause. It would be a pity to write one rule, regarding liquor glasses, into the Licensing Act while a different rule applied in respect of other glasses. It would be much more satisfactory if we left the matter to be dealt with generally. I am not entirely convinced that the change is a desirable one, or that the customer who wants his glass refilled should be precluded from having it refilled. However, that matter can be decided on a future occasion.

Mr. VENNING: I, too, oppose the new clause. The licensees I have approached in my district oppose the provision because of the amount of work it would involve. I have also approached the hotels' customers and have concluded that the Government which governs the least is the one we need in the State. To govern to the extent the new clause will require would be to over-govern.

Mr. SLATER: Although I agree in principle that clean glasses should be provided, a provision for this should be included in the Food and Drugs Act and not in this legislation. Another aspect to be considered is the upgrading of facilities in drinking establishments in order to safeguard public health and hygiene. I oppose the amendment.

Dr. TONKIN: Throughout history, progress in public hygiene and health has been limited by ignorance, superstition, and old wives' tales. I congratulate the member for Hanson on moving the amendment, because this subject should be discussed thoroughly, and I am pleased that the Attorney-General has intimated that officers of the Public Health Department will inquire into it. The member for Fisher referred to osculation, or the act of kissing, which involves a calculated risk. However, drinking from a dirty glass involves an unexpected and unwarranted risk. Although this matter could be dealt with in

the Food and Drugs Act, it should not be laughed out now. The use of dirty glasses must present a risk of transmitting many diseases, a matter that cannot be ignored. In a situation in which many drinkers are around a bar, the barman cannot keep all glasses separate, and a person could not be sure that he had received his clean glass.

Mr. Venning: Have you suffered infection in this way?

Dr. TONKIN: That attitude will torpedo this amendment. When the honourable member has his next bout of influenza, he should try to recall whether he had a fresh glass for his last drink.

Mr. Venning: The beer kills germs.

Dr. TONKIN: That is another myth. If the honourable member believes that an alcohol content of 5 per cent is bactericidal or germicidal, he had better think again. I commend the book written by Dr. John Birrell, *Drinking Driving and You*, at page 78 of which we read:

Myth: Australian beer is the best (after all, the advertisements say so) and also the strongest. A devoted beer drinker can recognise his favourite beer—other beers give him indigestion or make him “feel funny” or whatever. It has been suggested that people believe that, if they have a fresh glass each time, something is done to the flavour of the beer and they do not enjoy it in the same way. That is a load of rubbish. I commend the book’s appendix to members, because it compares the alcohol content of some typical beers obtainable throughout the world. Dr. Birrell states:

As to recognising one’s favourite brew it is found when the matter is actually put to the test that few if any drinkers can identify their favourite brew blindfolded. Under such conditions indeed they have trouble sorting out beer, stout and water if all are chilled to the same temperature. Certainly they are unable to differentiate a Carlsberg from a Bass from a Carlton Draught.

I think that is fair comment. Dr. Birrell also states:

The Commissioner was obviously amused with the very definite and dogmatic comments—
we have heard those sentiments this afternoon—
by both a brewery representative and a prominent hotelier that if a lower alcoholic strength beer was to be produced it must be clearly labelled as such, otherwise the drinker wouldn’t know what he was drinking.

I think that sums up the matter well. I believe a serious drinker who says he knows his beer—

Mr. Evans: Bob Hawke?

Dr. TONKIN: He would do admirably from what I know of his reputation. If he was blindfolded and given a beer in a fresh glass and then another beer in a glass that had not been washed, he could not tell the difference. I believe there is a significant risk involved re-using glasses that have not been washed after being used by other people. It may not be a big risk but it is a risk big enough to be considered, and I am pleased it is to be investigated. I look forward to amending the Food and Drugs Act if this amendment is not carried.

Mr. ARNOLD: I thought the member for Bragg was making a good speech until he ran off the rails and said that a seasoned beer drinker would not know the difference between a fresh glass and the glass from which he had already drunk. That is entirely beside the point. If that beer drinker believes he is gaining an advantage from using the same glass he should not be denied that privilege. I move to amend the new clause as follows:

In new section 142a (1) to strike out “where” and insert “Subject to subsection (1a) of this section, where”; and to insert the following new subsection:

(1a) Where a person requests that liquor be supplied in a glass that he has previously used it shall be lawful for the holder of the licence or permit to comply with that request.

I believe this amendment virtually covers what the Attorney-General said earlier in this debate. It will give the individual drinker the right to continue to use the glass he started with, while at the same time requiring fresh glasses to be supplied unless otherwise requested.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I oppose the further amendment moved by the member for Chaffey because it seems to me that it differs only in a very slight degree, if at all, from the existing law and it seems pointless to put into the Licensing Act a section which, if it changes the law at all, changes it in only a minor degree and expresses the rule in slightly different words in respect of a hotel or licensed premises than the general rule which applies under the Food and Drugs Act to other premises. I will read the relevant regulation. The preceding subparagraphs of this regulation make it clear that vessels have to be clean. Paragraph (d) provides:

Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraphs (b) and (c) above any vessel which has been used by a person for the immediate consumption in any place of any alcoholic liquor, milk drink, aerated water, summer or temperance drink, fruit drink or similar beverage may be refilled without prior cleansing for use by the same person if such refilling is carried out in full and clear view of such person standing at the counter or bar and in such a way that there can be no confusion of such vessel with that previously used by any other person. Provided however, that if he so requires, such person shall be supplied with a clean vessel in lieu of refilling his used vessel.

First, one can only give the drinker the same glass if it is filled in his full and clear view while he is standing at the counter or bar. Even then, if he asks for a fresh glass he must be given one. I really do not see what the amendment of the member for Chaffey does. It seems to me to be wrong to write into the Licensing Act a special rule, in relation to licensed premises, which changes the law in a minor and obscure way, if at all, unless one goes the whole way the member for Hanson suggests so that a person must be given a clean glass in any circumstances. It seems to me that the existing rule covers the situation admirably and I think it would be very unfortunate to carry the further amendment of the member for Chaffey, because it merely does what the existing law does.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Like the member for Rocky River, I am getting a bit worried because I find myself in agreement with the Attorney-General. That does not happen very often. The member for Bragg highlighted the only point at issue and that is the matter of hygiene. He then went on to make a few statements about the tastes of beer drinkers and the fact that he doubted whether they could recognise what they were drinking. He also made passing reference to the alcoholic content of beers. Statements have been made from time to time about the desirability of reducing the alcoholic content of beer. An article with the heading “Problems of Lower Alcohol Beer” appears in this month’s edition of the *Hotel Gazette*. I commend it to the attention of members because it compares the alcoholic content of Australian beers with beers in various parts of the world. When I was in Germany last year it became apparent to me that beers vary considerably. I oppose the new clause and the subsequent amendment to it.

I have been to other States where clean glasses must be provided for each drink. Perhaps the current practice in this State leaves something to be desired. Invariably, a barman puts a glass over the neck of the tap as he refills the glass, but if people want beer with a head on it this practice is necessary. There is a theory that the more infection a person faces the greater his immunity. In

many circumstances, I do not think that the method used in other places for washing glasses is very clean. I am inclined to oppose both the new clause and the amendment.

Mr. HARRISON: As a professional beer drinker, I think I should point out something that members seem to have misunderstood. What people object to is drinking out of wet glasses. In most hotels, glasses are washed under the bar, with a tap dripping all the time. The barman runs the glasses through, and puts them on a tray alongside. If it is a busy period, he will use glasses while they are still wet. That is why people object to having a clean glass for each drink, as nothing is worse than beer with a little water in it. I do not think the amendments go far enough. However, I appreciate what has been said about the need for glasses to be washed hygienically. I hope that eventually better methods of washing glasses in hotels will be found.

Mr. MATHWIN: I support the amendment of the member for Chaffey, as I think the new clause of the member for Hanson is too wide. I do not agree with the member for Bragg that a beer drinker who was blindfolded could not tell the difference between beer, stout, and water. A similar statement has been made in connection with the difference between butter and margarine. Any beer drinker could tell the difference between beer and stout. In the new section sought to be inserted by the member for Hanson, the provision in subsection (3) (b) is far too wide. It has been said that beer in the various States has a different taste. I believe that South Australian beer tastes much better than United Kingdom beer.

Mr. EVANS: I support the amendment of the member for Chaffey to the new clause moved by the member for Hanson, only because that would make the new clause better than if it were unamended. I do not like the provision in the new clause of the member for Hanson, as I think it is not clear and that lawyers could have the time of their lives arguing about what was a clean glass. I will vote against the member for Hanson's new clause, whether or not it is amended.

Mr. RODDA: The health of the nation should be our first concern. My district borders Victoria, in which State clean glasses are supplied for each drink. I was sorry to hear the member for Kavel cast aspersions on the practice in that State. In Victoria the Country Party and the Liberal Party have been arguing and eyeing one another off.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I think the honourable member ought to deal with glasses in hotels.

Mr. RODDA: I ask what about the droolers and lip-scrapers, as they ponder issues in the bar. A health hazard is involved in this matter, and last week some people from Victoria had the hide to tell me that our glasses were bath tubs. I do not think the member for Rocky River is qualified to give an opinion on this matter, and there is a real reason why the new clause moved by the member for Hanson should be supported. Tests made on beer have been referred to, and I understand that a test was made of the quality of a New South Wales beer and a Victorian beer. I think the samples were from Tooths and Carlton. They were sent to the laboratory, and the report that came back stated that both horses were unfit for work.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member to link up his remarks with the Bill.

Mr. RODDA: What I have said is as forceful as what the member for Glenelg has said, and I have not been

impressed by the progressive arguments from the progressive members on my side in opposition to a progressive provision.

Mr. BECKER: I moved this new clause sincerely, to try to resolve the situation. The debate started on a serious note, but the member for Fisher advanced a stupid argument about the definition of "clean glass". I have never before heard anyone go to such extremes to try to destroy an argument. If we are to have laws governing health as it applies to licensed premises, the provisions ought to be in the Licensing Act as well as in the Food and Drugs Act.

Any person who wants a clean glass in a hotel can get one now. The member for Albert Park has said that a wet glass sends beer flat, but towels that have been washed in some kinds of detergent also cause beer to go flat. I do not agree with what the member for Rocky River has said. I have visited hotels in his district, and I doubt that he is an authority on the quality of liquor sold. I am not reflecting on any publican, because publicans are anxious to give a good and efficient service and take their responsibilities seriously. Even if my new clause is not accepted, I hope the Australian Hotels Association will ask its members to display notices to the effect that, if people want a clean glass, their request will be met.

Mr. GUNN: In this debate, far too much time has been wasted on nonsense. I agree entirely with the Attorney-General on this occasion and I think that the member for Hanson, if he read his new clause, would agree that it was not well drafted. It is open to several interpretations, and I oppose it.

Amendment negatived; new clause negatived.

Remaining clauses (13 and 14) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (FEES)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 15. Page 1459.)

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): At the outset, I point out that the Leader of the Opposition (and not I) is leading for the Opposition in this debate. From time to time, in the Budget measures the Treasurer has introduced we have heard, as his Party's philosophy, that it will tax the wealthy and the tall poppies, although he criticised trenchantly the Liberal Party Government, when it introduced any of its budgetary measures, for its whole range of taxation provisions, because he said that they were aimed at the poorer people in the community. As this Bill seeks to increase the fees for liquor licences, can any member suggest that, in the long term, these increases will not be passed on to the consumer? It is often said that beer is the average Aussie's drink, and I have no doubt that, in the long run, all these budgetary proposals will be passed on to the consumer, that is, the very person the Treasurer has time and again said he aims to protect.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Are you knocking wine?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: No, I am criticising the Treasurer for the hypocrisy and two-faced attitude he adopts on all financial measures. We remember the blast delivered at this Government when a wine tax was imposed by the Commonwealth Government and the depredations made by that Government on various sections of the industry, with results that were much more serious than

anything imposed by a Liberal Government. I am not at all enthusiastic about these measures, and I will leave it now to the Leader to continue the debate.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): This Bill, which deserves to be opposed, is a revenue-raising measure which, one can appreciate, is incapable of being—

The Hon. L. J. King: Improved on!

Dr. EASTICK: I am glad that the Attorney-General has said that, because much could be improved on as regards the management of the State. This Bill does nothing to offset the gross mismanagement of the State that is now taking place. Unfortunately, the Bill will be passed and, as my colleague has already pointed out, it will increase costs to many people in the community. Unfortunately, the greatest cost will be borne by the large mass of people in the lower-income bracket, who are in that bracket because of the strictures resulting from the economy. The State Government and the Commonwealth Government, which have shown their inability to contain wage increases, have in no way offset the constant attack on wages, so there remains a relativity (which I accept as important) as between skill and lack of skill. I believe that an urgent need exists for a minimum wage that would ensure that every person and his family had the opportunity—

The SPEAKER: Order! Although I realise that the Bill is a budgetary measure, at the same time I point out that we are discussing a certain Bill, and any remarks made must be linked up with the Bill.

Dr. EASTICK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Payne: This tax already applies in Victoria.

Dr. EASTICK: The Bill is a taxing measure that will disadvantage many people in the community. In his second reading explanation, the Treasurer said:

The Government regrets the necessity of having to raise extra revenue in this manner, but the present decrease in State revenue makes it unavoidable.

Whose responsibility is it that the Government has miscued on what revenue it would obtain? Who is responsible for the deficit, in the first two trading months of the financial year, of over \$4 000 000 in conveyancing fees and stamp duties?

Mr. Boundy: The Government!

Dr. EASTICK: Yes, because it has failed miserably. Let us consider all the known factors, including the effects that this legislation and the legislation introduced by this Government's Commonwealth colleagues will have on the State's revenue resources. Nowhere in the statement I have just quoted is the real situation outlined. Long before the Commonwealth Government failed to meet its responsibilities and provide \$6 000 000 to supplement the Budget, this Government had decided to increase income from this area as the upper limit of its taxing measures against the people of the State, having been given a Commonwealth Government promise that other funds would be made available to obviate the need for additional revenue-raising measures.

Anyone who takes the trouble to examine the Treasurer's statements when introducing the Loan Estimates and the Budget will find that he believed that the increases under this financial measure would be the maximum the Government would need to take from the South Australian people. That is along with pay-roll tax, stamp duties, motor vehicle registration and licence fees. The Government has not only

miscalculated in its understanding of the whole financial situation but has also been denied access to further funds from the Commonwealth Government, so it has imposed on the people of South Australia additional costs yet to come before this House.

I make the point now, as I have made it previously, that many areas of Government mismanagement and over-spending, if curbed and controlled, would allow a more rational approach to increased State taxes. By letter, the Treasurer has answered a question I asked on notice on October 15, relating to the cost of telephone services for the South Australian Film Corporation. This shows that in one brief period of four months over \$13 000 was incurred in telephone calls from one office.

The SPEAKER: Can the Leader link this up with the Bill?

Dr. EASTICK: Yes, by saying that, had there been a more responsible attitude by the Government to financial affairs, that sum would not be a charge against the State's funds.

Mr. Becker: The total is \$35 000.

Dr. EASTICK: Yes, \$35 000 in 18 months for telephone charges for the South Australian Film Corporation. Unfortunately, I do not have with me at the moment the letter giving this detailed information, but I will certainly make it available for any member to look at. I cannot table it but I shall ask that it be inserted in *Hansard*, so that the details provided by the Treasurer will be made known. There is a massive loss in respect of the Railways Department; there is an opportunity to reduce expenditures by many millions of dollars and so help to offset the charges on the people of this State. The Treasurer states that for the balance of 1974-75 there will, as the result of the passing of this Bill, be an income of \$540 000, and in a full year it is expected that this extra 2 per cent will raise for the Government \$1 460 000. That is not a small sum: it represents a sizeable income and the wages and salaries of many people in this State. One must question, in respect of wages and salaries and the income of this State, whether an increase in the Public Service of 12½ per cent during 1973-74 was necessary and whether restraints in that area would not have improved the situation so that we would not now be looking for sums of this nature to bolster the Government's spending machine.

I return to the letter I have mentioned dealing with telephone accounts for the South Australian Film Corporation, for each of the completed charge periods for its various departments. I point out that the original answer to my question was given by the Treasurer on October 15, 1974, whereas this answer is dated October 28. It gives the breakdown of telephone expenses in respect of administration, at 59 King William Street, Adelaide, where the total expenditure incurred was \$9 424. For production at 80 Currie Street, Adelaide, and for production and distribution at 64 Fullarton Road, Norwood, the total cost for telephone calls and rental amounted to \$22 845. Between January, 1974, and July, 1974, the cost of telephone calls was \$13 840. There was no telephone account in respect of 1A Gray Street, Norwood, but at 230 The Parade, Norwood, the telephone costs totalled \$1015. At 164 O'Connell Street, North Adelaide, the total cost from earlier this year was \$2 987. I seek leave to have this table incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it in full.

Leave granted.

TELEPHONE CHARGES FOR SOUTH AUSTRALIAN
FILM CORPORATION

(i) Administration—59 King William Street, Adelaide.			
Rent to October, 1973	\$ 205		\$
Calls to March, 1973	73		
Installation.....	404	682	
Rent to February, 1974	31		
Calls to July, 1973	369	400	
Rent to April, 1974	191		
Calls to September, 1973	3 735	3 926	
Rent to August, 1974	27		
Calls to January, 1974	704	731	
Rent to December, 1974	357		
Calls to May, 1974	2 904	3 261	
Rent to February, 1975	28		
Calls to July, 1974	396	424	
		\$9 424	
(ii) Production—80 Currie Street, Adelaide.			
Rent to November, 1974	268		
Calls to July, 1973	1 075	1 343	
Calls to November, 1973	2518		
Production and Distribution—64 Fullarton Road, Norwood.			
Rent to August, 1974	504		
Calls to January, 1974	2 829		
Installation.....	1 025	4 358	
Rent to February, 1975	786		
Calls to July, 1974	13 840	14 626	
		\$22 845	
(iii) 1A Gray Street, Norwood.			
Nil.			
(iv) 230 The Parade, Norwood.			
Rental adjustment.....	4		
Calls to April, 1974	642		
Installation.....	369	\$1 015	
(v) 164 O'Connell Street, North Adelaide.			
Rental to February, 1975	745		
Calls.....	1 810		
Installation.....	432		
		\$2 987	

Dr. EASTICK: There is a way of attacking the gross increases in costs in the management of this State, but the State Government has refused to accept any tangible approach to this problem of empire building. Some of the charges being levied on the people of this State are ridiculous. I oppose the measure.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I, too, oppose the Bill. Any Government that turns around and claims it has a mandate from the worker and then levies the worker, as this Government has done, deserves the strongest condemnation. Unfortunately, it takes the people of this State a long time to feel the impact of the irresponsible handling of their money before they decide to change the Government. This Bill amends various sections of the Licensing Act: it increases the fees for liquor licences, as was briefly explained by the Treasurer. It also changes the wholesale storekeeper's licence, the brewer's Australian ale licence, the vigneron's licence, the distiller's storekeepers licence, and so on. For the financial year ended June 30, 1974, the Licensing Court was paid \$4 186 000 in fees. Administrations costs were \$294 000, leaving a surplus of \$3 892 000. There were other sundry payments, and the net return to Revenue Account was \$3 886 000. That is not a bad sum to

take from those who are licensed to dispense liquor in this State.

Dr. Tonkin: It's a slug.

Mr. BECKER: It is. It is the greatest impost that could be made upon the workers. Most people in the community enjoy the opportunity to partake of alcoholic beverage, whether beer or various types of wine. The hotel industry has served this State well; it has provided amenities and facilities for those people wishing to use its premises, such as licensed and permit clubs. From his capital, the publican must provide larger premises, accommodation and meals, and many other things. To find out the cost of operating a hotel, let us take an average suburban hotel which now has to bear this extra 2 per cent impost, which is severe. In the past few years provision has been made for workmen's compensation, long service leave, sick leave, holiday pay, and so on. No-one can deny that those employed in the hotel industry should not enjoy reasonable working conditions, but one wonders how long taxes can be imposed without some impact on the community, because that is what is happening. Inflation is running at the rate of about 20 per cent, and, from the way in which the Commonwealth Government is handling this problem, it will burst through the 25 per cent barrier by the middle of next year.

Mr. Evans: It is not handling it: it is creating it.

Mr. BECKER: Yes, the Commonwealth Government is creating it, and so is this Government. If a person criticises the Government for increasing taxation and imposing taxes such as those we are discussing now, that person is challenged and asked, "As the Government needs money, what would you do?" Does the Government need the money, and should it spend money in the way it does? That is the real challenge to the Government. It is all very well for the Treasurer to say, "You want me to balance the Budget and cut down on this and that, but tell me what areas you would cut down on and whom you would sack." It is not necessary to sack anyone employed in the Public Service, whether a public servant or a daily-paid worker. It is all a matter of priorities, and of working within the limited means the community can afford.

Mr. Arnold: Getting value for money.

Mr. BECKER: Of course, and I use the slogan, "We will give you value for your dollar." The problem is the way the Government raises money, what it does with it, and whether it is necessary for the Government to spend money as it does. If the Government wants money, it merely imposes another tax: the legislation we are discussing should raise \$540 000 this financial year and \$1 400 000 next financial year. With inflation as it is, the \$1 400 000 estimate will be greatly exceeded, because the wholesale price of alcohol will be increased. The brewing company in South Australia has a monopoly, so it will increase the wholesale price of beer. Wineries are working together in a cartel (there are few South Australian family wineries) and they will increase prices. Automatically, this tax will be of greater benefit to the Treasurer in a full year than he has suggested. If the rate of inflation reaches 25 per cent, about \$375 000 will be added to the estimated \$1 400 000. Where will all this finish?

It starts here, because it is simple for the Government to say, "We need the money." I have yet to see a Government that has stated, "We need the money, but, instead of slapping on taxes, we will use common sense and try to rearrange our priorities in order to save the taxpayers' money." Why was it necessary for the Government to increase its payments for this financial year at the ratio at which it did?

The Government seems to estimate what something will cost, and then it increases taxation in order to balance the Budget. It is about time that State Treasury officers, who are public servants, protested and said, "Let us use common sense and, instead of imposing taxes, try to reduce payments." I know that every Minister demands what he needs for his department and his portfolio, but we have seen no evidence that the State has tried to curb its spending and give taxpayers value for money. What does the Government do? Obviously, it considers taxation that will hit most people in the community (in this case, those who enjoy an alcoholic drink from time to time, and such people are expected to bear this burden).

It has been suggested that a possible way out of the present difficulty would be to reduce income tax and indirect taxation, thus helping those who contribute in this way. From a Socialist point of view, if the money is to be turned over as many times as possible, a "popular" tax is imposed, such as this tax, which affects the average man in the street who uses the facilities provided by organisations that are being taxed. By using that method a wide coverage is obtained. If one considers present society, one will find that the needs of the average man in the street, including a motor car, cigarettes, football, films or some other form of entertainment, beer and wine, are heavily taxed. Although these items are not luxuries, they are taxed as if they were. For many years the Party in Government at present has delighted in describing former leaders of my Party as wowsers. If any Party is driving a person from drink, it would be the present Government, because it is imposing taxes that will prevent the average man from enjoying one pleasure in life to which he is entitled.

Mr. McANANEY: He would drink more, because this crowd would drive him to drink.

Mr. BECKER: He would not be able to afford to drink more. That person is being denied a basic freedom and a chance to share in what should be available and within the reach of every citizen in the community, irrespective of his position and how much he earns a week. If we consider the mean as the average wage, a person receiving that wage should be entitled to fair and reasonable benefits and be able to enjoy himself, but this Government has unfortunately done nothing to give him any incentive to save, let alone to enjoy the benefits he once enjoyed under a Liberal Government. Fortunately, the situation will be changed in 1976, and we will give that man value for the dollar.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): When introducing the various forms of taxation that have been levied this year in order to raise additional funds, the Treasurer explained that these impositions were necessary because, if they were not imposed, unemployment would be created, and he said that, if we suggested reducing expenditure, we were the wicked Liberals trying to create unemployment.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That's the first time you have admitted that you are wicked Liberals.

Mr. McANANEY: I was merely referring to what the Treasurer said in the House last week. I thought the Minister got into enough trouble this afternoon when he floundered all over the place and dodged the issue.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Heysen must speak to the Bill.

Mr. McANANEY: The Treasurer has said that, if he does not impose these taxes, unemployment will result and people will have to be sacked. However, if the growth rate of the Public Service was reduced from 12.6 per cent to 8 per cent (the figure which obtained for the

previous three years but which was still too high), it would help to balance the Budget. If a certain sum is taken from the private sector and those involved do not give up drinking, they will have less money to spend on other things. If they do not spend it on those things, or put their money into a savings bank, the result will be less demand for goods, which will cause unemployment. The Government will not gain anything by taking money from one person and giving it to another; it certainly will not increase employment opportunities in that way.

As the Government knows, its weak financial management has created excess demand and inflationary pressures that have increased costs in Australia to an extent that we cannot now accept without suffering losses. Indeed, some industries will become bankrupt as a result of this. Despite the actions of the Industries Assistance Corporation or the experts from the Premier's Department, when Australia's costs increase above world levels we experience difficulties. Indeed, this is causing unemployment now, and it is nonsense for the Treasurer to say that, if he does not impose those taxes, unemployment will result. In reply to a question I asked recently, the Treasurer said that I was irresponsible. As Leader of a Party (albeit not a good Party), the Treasurer said:

I do not believe the Government's action in raising taxes will cause unemployment.

If it is to balance its Budget, the Government must do what a person in his home or business must do.

Mr. Venning: Tighten the belt!

Mr. McANANEY: That is so, and spend money on the essential things from which the people will get most value. However, we in South Australia are not doing this at present. No-one believes in education more than I do. Indeed, it still makes me cry to think of the many sacrifices I had to make in order to send six children away from home to get an education, merely because no State school was available in the area. The Government recently allocated another \$100 for facilities for a school in my district.

Mr. Venning: And they don't know what to do with it!

Mr. McANANEY: That is so. This is being completely irresponsible; by pruning down these non-essential expenditures, savings could be effected. No nation can grow if its people are heavily taxed, and we cannot get ourselves out of trouble by spending more money. If taxation must be increased, what is proposed in the Bill is possibly one of the best ways in which to raise money. People can avoid this tax, if that is what they desire, without destroying their way of life. This tax is not as bad as some other taxes that have been imposed. I now refer to the railways. It is completely ridiculous to keep certain unprofitable railway lines open. These lines must be closed, and fees and charges must be increased. Although some of my constituents will growl when I say this, I believe that—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must link up his remarks with the Bill.

Mr. McANANEY: Taxes should not be increased in this way. The Government could save much money by increasing railway charges and closing certain lines when a reasonable alternative service was available. Such action does not cause unemployment in country towns, as people must be available to service transport systems. In this respect, it is ridiculous for us to carry on in future as we have been carrying on in the past.

Mr. Venning: Do you think it will ever be possible for this Government, which is supposed to represent workers, to have enough money?

Mr. McANANEY: The member for Rocky River referred to the representation of workers. The Government has suggested that it should take part in worker participation schemes.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Heysen must link up his remarks with the Bill.

Mr. McANANEY: The money that is raised as a result of the passage of this Bill will be spent on the pursuits to which I have referred. Things must be produced to enable living standards to improve. I do not know that worker participation schemes will be that successful. However, I believe that workers should share in the profits made by companies.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must return to the Bill. If he continues to roam all over the place, the honourable member will be dealt with accordingly.

Mr. McANANEY: Although I used the word "profits", the Government would not understand, because of its values, what that word meant. I have criticised the imposition of this taxation and the reasons the Treasurer gave for having to raise additional revenue. He blamed the Commonwealth Government for having to impose this form of taxation. I am sure the Treasurer has not looked at the "supplementary payments to the States", and seen the handouts that the Commonwealth Government has given, directly or indirectly, to this State. No Government, unless it is a Socialist Government or one that wants to drag industry down to the lowest possible level, can continue spending at this rate and take from the people the right to spend their own money. That is one of the most crucial things that is happening in Australia at present. Fortunately, young people are getting fed up with it. They like doing their own thing, and they will demand money to spend in the way they wish. However, we must go through this painful experience before people wake up to what is happening.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): In introducing this Bill, the Treasurer has been caught up with. Many times in the House he has stated his support for the Prime Minister. However, on this occasion he has been let down and must share the responsibility for the economic situation in which we now find ourselves. The Treasurer is part of a machine that is inflicting regressive taxation on Australia. He is trying to get himself off the hook and he is blaming the Prime Minister. We know that the Treasurer is leading up to the Federal Labor Party conference.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GUNN: You would know that, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must speak to the Bill.

Mr. GUNN: Certainly, but the points that I have been making are quite relevant, and the Minister of Education knows that.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Don't point your finger at me.

Mr. GUNN: I will point my finger at the Minister again, if I want to. This Bill increases the licence fee from 6 per cent to 8 per cent so that the Government can raise more revenue. I think the member for Hanson referred to a figure of about \$1 400 000.

Mr. Keneally: Are you agreeing with him now?

Mr. GUNN: As the member for Stuart does not belong to a democratic Party, he is not allowed to think for himself. That is why he does not offer one word of criticism when regressive taxation of this type is foisted on the South Australia public. The hotel industry will not carry this taxation: it will pass it on, and the tax will be

inflationary. It would not be so bad if we were getting value for money, but the Government, a typically Socialist Government, is not efficient.

Has the Government ended the spending spree and called on Government departments to show some restraint? Nothing like that has been forthcoming in this House. The Government has not considered the South Australian Railways, and I ask how many of the more than 190 recommendations in the Lees committee report have been put into effect. Those recommendations would have saved the State many thousands of dollars, but virtually none of them has been put into effect, because the Minister of Transport is dictated to by an outside body that will not allow us to have efficiency in the Government service. This Government and the Prime Minister have asked private industry to tighten its belt, but they are not willing to reduce their own expenditure. If this Government is sincere, it will consider ways in which it can reduce expenditure. The Leader gave one of many examples today.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You give us some more.

Mr. GUNN: I ask why the recommendations of the Lees committee have not been carried out.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Where is the reference in the Bill to the railways?

Mr. GUNN: This is a taxation measure, as the Minister knows. We are always being challenged by the Treasurer, or whoever is acting for him, to say where we would reduce expenditure. Let the Minister justify why the Government has not carried out the Lees committee recommendations.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: The Leader of the Opposition made a mess of his suggestions, didn't he?

Mr. Goldsworthy: No, he didn't. It's just that you have no reply to him. When you're cornered, you get personal.

Mr. GUNN: One could criticise the Government at length about taxation measures. However, I do not intend to do that. On far more important occasions, when we are dealing with other revenue measures that the Government will put before the House, members on this side will tell the people where we stand on the issue and how we, in Government, would spend the money collected. We have been challenged publicly, and we will certainly accept that challenge. If the Treasurer and his Government are not able to submit realistic financial policies, we are willing to accept the challenge to occupy the Treasury benches. I support what the Leader of the Opposition has said.

Mr. COUNBE (Torrens): This financial measure was forecast in the Budget that the Treasurer introduced a short time ago, but since then significant changes have taken place. Other measures, in the form not of a mini Budget but of amendments to the Budget, have been introduced. Responsible people in the community have asked (in fact, people have pleaded) for restraint in the community, but this Bill completely ignores any restraint on inflation. In fact, it does nothing but generate inflation, as the Minister knows.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: A Liberal Government would never do it, would it?

Mr. COUNBE: The Tasmanian Labor Government has done it.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: A Liberal Government would never do this, would it?

Mr. COUNBE: It would not do it in the way in which this Government is doing it. In this case the Government is attacking the little man, the worker, of this State. The Party opposite claims to represent that person, but it intends to slug him. This impost on the retailers, whether

of wine, spirits or beer (and I am referring particularly to beer), will be passed on, as the Minister in charge of the Bill knows well.

I warn the Minister and the Government that resentment is building up rapidly in this State, not only against this Government, which is imposing tax after tax after tax, with more to come, but also against the Commonwealth Government because of that Government's mismanagement and the taxes that it is imposing. I almost wept when I saw the hypocrisy in the Treasurer's explanation of this Bill. He states:

The Government regrets the necessity of having to raise extra revenue in this manner . . .

This is not an ode; I suppose it is a lament. It is the most hypocritical statement that I have ever heard in this House.

Mr. Keneally: Do you think we delight in doing it?

Mr. CUMBE: Why is it necessary to do this? In his explanation (page 1459 of *Hansard*), the Treasurer states that he is doing it because the present decrease in State revenue makes it unavoidable. Why is it unavoidable? Why is State revenue down? When the Treasurer introduced the Budget early in September, certain forecasts were made. Since then he has stated that there has been a dramatic down-turn in revenue from conveyances and stamp duties.

Mr. Becker: Didn't we warn the Government?

Mr. CUMBE: We did: many members sounded a note of warning in the Budget debate. Why have decreases occurred in those two areas?

Mr. Becker: It wouldn't be because of the Land and Business Agents Act, would it? Not much!

Mr. CUMBE: It could be because of that. There has been the most dramatic down-turn in house building and land purchase in this State that we have ever had, except during the depression. On several occasions the member for Fisher has cited the recent decrease in the number of houses built.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must link his remarks to the Bill.

Mr. CUMBE: The Treasurer has said that the Bill is unavoidable because of the reduction in revenue from stamp duties and conveyances, as a result of the sudden down-turn in the number of houses built and in sales of land. We are getting to the stage where fewer houses are being built by the present Government than were built when Sir Thomas Playford was in office, and he retired at the end of the 1967 Parliament. The Government is supposed to be progressive, but let us look at its results. The young couples and the small people are suffering—the very people whom this Government says it wants to help. This impost will raise \$540 000 in the remainder of this financial year and \$1 460 000 in a full year. That is an estimate. However, the amount raised will not fluctuate in the same way as have returns from stamp duties and conveyances; we must remember that the measure is connected with liquid assets! By this Bill, the Government is generating inflation, and it will defeat the ultimate purpose of the call for restraint made by responsible members of the community, including Mr. Hawke.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: And Mr. Hamer.

Mr. CUMBE: The call for restraint was also made by Mr. Clyde Cameron and other prominent members of the community on both sides of politics. I believe it is time for the call for restraint to be made and observed, yet the Government is asking us to pass a fiscal measure that has arisen from the Budget.

Mr. Venning: The Government goes from one crisis to another.

Mr. CUMBE: The honourable member means that the Government is lurching from one measure to another, and these measures are coming from the leaderless Government that we have today.

Mr. Becker: Where has the Treasurer been?

The SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members must confine their remarks to the Bill.

Mr. CUMBE: A hotel licensee will have imposed on him an increase in the liquor licence fee from 6 per cent to 8 per cent. Naturally, in many cases this will be passed on to the consumer, as a result of applications that will be made to the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs. This is a solid increase. It is all very well for the Minister of Education to imply that this is going on in other States. I thought the Treasurer had said that this State was a pace-setter. What about pace-setting in connection with restraint in this State? Actually, we are being a pace-setter in the taxes we are imposing on the people of South Australia.

Mr. Becker: This is supposed to be a model Socialist State.

Mr. CUMBE: The Bill increases the liquor licence fees, which are based on the amount paid by the licensee for liquor disposed of in the preceding financial year. There will be considerable problems when licences are transferred, as frequently happens. A person may have a certain turnover, and I use the term loosely. When a licensee takes over, he may be confronted with a problem. I have in mind an operator, who will remain unnamed, and the volume of sales he has been handling recently. The person who takes over from that operator will cop it.

Mr. Evans: He's warming up now.

Mr. CUMBE: The Bill provides for exceptions in the case of wholesale storekeepers' licences, brewers Australian ale licences, distillers storekeepers' licences, and vigneron's licences. In this Bill we are dealing mainly with retail outlets; we must consider this section of the community which, although it provides a valuable service to the State, is getting hit for six. It needs encouraging, instead of being slugged at every opportunity. Apart from the Bill's being inflationary, it will ultimately hit the working man. From comments made to me not only in licensed premises but also while I have moved around my district, I believe that consumers are getting fed up with extra imposts. The Attorney-General has introduced all sorts of consumer protection legislation, some of it quite good, but this Bill is the antithesis of that type of legislation. The Bill is a fiscal measure that has arisen from the Budget, and I oppose it because I find it repugnant.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): I oppose the Bill. Having listened with much interest to my colleagues, I welcome the opportunity to express some well chosen words. I am very sorry that the situation has arisen that has caused the Government to introduce this legislation. The people of this State normally do not mind paying some tax as long as they can see that their money is being wisely spent and as long as they can consider it to be an investment in their country. Unfortunately, in much taxation introduced nowadays they are being imposed on time and time again. I wonder where the Government will strike next in drawing off the people's money. As an honourable member said earlier today, and as you, Mr. Speaker, know, if we get into financial difficulties, we have to say, "How can I tighten my belt?" However, the Government has not done this. I fear the Government's

next step, for it will never have sufficient money. I believe that the sooner the people of the State have the chance to change the Government, the better, because that is the only way out of our present problems; we must change from Socialism to free enterprise and give people the incentive to work to produce something for the State and the country.

Mr. Chapman: Put value back in the dollar.

Mr. VENNING: Yes. As the Treasurer seems to perform well in other States, some people think he is doing a good job, but anyone who thinks about the situation knows that, as a member of the Australian Labor Party, he must be condemned along with other Party members.

Mr. Chapman: He's the No. 1 actor.

Mr. VENNING: Yes, and I do not believe that he is doing any better than his Commonwealth colleagues are doing. I oppose the legislation and sympathise with the licensees, who provide a service to the community. As this ruthless Government is imposing an increase in fees with this legislation, I oppose the measure.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): The Bill provides for an increase in taxation that will affect the people.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Are you aware of the deputation at 7.30 this evening?

Mr. EVANS: Yes, but if I cannot be there the Minister is capable of keeping those people occupied with vague promises. When this Government came to office, it promised the people that it would look after their interests, that they would have a better way of life under an A.L.P. Government and that, by voting for such a Government, their future would be secure. This Bill is not one of the extremes in legislation to which I would object strongly. The legislation concerns the drinking of alcohol, which some regard as a means of relaxation and others regards as a luxury. I do not object strongly to an increase of taxation in this field. However, I am surprised that the Government has faced a situation in which the Treasurer has had to say in the House that he has regretted having to introduce such legislation. The A.L.P. should say at the next Commonwealth or State election, "Support us and we will bleed you of every cent you've saved and every cent you might want to retain."

This Government and its Commonwealth colleagues have removed all incentive for thrift and the use of initiative. The people are being taxed out of existence and their normal way of life. The Treasurer has thrown down the challenge "Where would you make the savings to avoid increased taxation?" However, the Opposition does not have the opportunity to gain all the necessary information to make a fair assessment of every situation, because this Government has broken a promise to the people of South Australia, including Opposition members, that it would be an open Government; it is not an open Government. I have asked the Acting Minister of Works questions about the sum paid in overtime and the overall wages bill in the Public Buildings Department. I received a reply that it was difficult to assess how much overtime had been paid to departmental employees over the past four years. I accepted the reply with regret, but I am unable to accept another reply the Minister gave, namely, that he could not supply me with the department's total wages bill. That was the Minister's written reply to me.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must link up his remarks with the Bill.

Mr. EVANS: I will do so. We are facing an increase in taxation, and the Treasurer has challenged us to say where savings can be made. The Opposition would be willing to

say where savings could be made if the necessary information were made available, as the Government promised it would be when it took office. Back-benchers and John Citizen have been denied by the Government the knowledge of what is the total wages bill of the Public Buildings Department. To me, that is a disgrace.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: To you, and you know what's a disgrace.

Mr. EVANS: If the Minister were to say that he did not support open Government, I would welcome his statement. One Government member has said, "What about Victoria?" One of the problems South Australia faces is that, at one time, its cost structure was lower than that of any other Australian State. Admittedly our wages were lower, but so were our overall costs. The purchasing power of our money was equal on average to that in the Eastern States, but we had a marked advantage in the export of our goods to other States and overseas because of our low cost structure. However, that has been ruined by this Government's taxing methods, and its way of squandering the people's money. This is another means, minor though it may be, by which the Government moves along the path towards destroying South Australia's economy. The Treasurer has been making strong representations in trying to save employment in this State's motor vehicle industry, but it is he and those who sit silently behind him who have created the situation the industry faces today.

The Treasurer says, "What does the Opposition suggest we should do to improve the State's economy?" I suggest that he and his Ministers support the Opposition in saying that every one in the State should start to work harder for the State. We should not attempt manipulation so that we will have more overtime, and this applies to everyone, whether business managers, employees, Government departmental officers at the top, or lower-paid tradesmen down the line. We must start working harder for the State and improve our position as a State, whether we be individuals, business enterprises, or State Government departments.

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

Mr. EVANS: The Minister of Education has gone to settle my deputation problems, but there is one more area to which I shall refer in the context of saving money: that is, the amount of overtime being worked in our State Government departments. I know that many employees have built up their commitments in life to the point where they rely on overtime payments to foot the bill. However, in a crisis situation where the Government must introduce legislation such as that now before the House, the Government must look to its priorities. When we have unemployed tradesmen and others in the community, we must see whether it would not be better to work normal hours instead of working overtime with resultant penalty rates. That is one way in which we can tighten our belts.

The increase in the Public Service has been stated to be about 12 per cent. That is not necessarily objectionable if overtime can be reduced and the overall wage bill reduced. Unfortunately, however, we have had a massive escalation in the number of people employed by the Public Service as well as a massive escalation in the amount of overtime. If any Government member wishes to challenge me on the amount of overtime being paid, I ask him to bring forward the figures in relation to each Government department. Members opposite will not have the courage or the honesty to do that, nor will they have the common sense to say that they have promised open Government, and that they will attempt to practise it. They will

walk away from the situation. In a recent documentary film produced by the Shell Company of Australia for public view and for screening on television, the Cleland National Park was referred to as the best planned wildlife reserve in Australia. That is a credit to our State. However, the person in charge of the area is to retire at the end of this year, and a plan is afoot to redesign the total area.

The SPEAKER: Order! Does the honourable member intend to link up these remarks with the subject matter of the Bill?

Mr. EVANS: Yes. We are spending at least \$50 000 of the taxpayers' money on this project, and part of the tax we are discussing tonight will be used in that way. Why should we have some grandiose scheme to improve something that is already the best of its kind in Australia? The Minister of Environment and Conservation was not keen to hear what I had to say, but he should take note of that and make sure his department does not spend that money. I do not object to this type of tax as much as I object to some others, because drinking alcohol, in the main, is a luxury. However, I oppose the form of government we have, because the Government is squandering the people's money. I oppose the Bill.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): I oppose the taxation measures before the House at present. It is time someone in South Australia started to fight the increased taxation South Australians are having to pay, and I am pleased to see that Opposition members in this State are prepared to fight those taxes. There is an old saying that, the more the Government does for one, the more it necessarily takes. That could be extended: the more the Government takes from one, the more it can do to one. That is happening in South Australia at present.

Mr. Crimes: Are you suggesting private enterprise—

Mr. Gunn: Private enterprise is more economical than the Socialist tripe the member for Spence talks about.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: This State is suffering—

Members interjecting:

Mr. Crimes: There is stupidity in private enterprise all over Australia.

Mr. Coumbe: That is where you get your taxes from.

The SPEAKER: Order! I thought we were going to have a speech from the honourable member for Davenport.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I am sure the member for Spence can air his views. Apparently, he is trying to defend the taxation measures of this Government, and he should be ashamed to do so. The people in South Australia are suffering from an extreme case of acute excesses as a result of actions of both the South Australian and the Commonwealth Governments. The people are facing the effects of extravagant and wasteful expenditure by both Governments. Despite his attempts to dissociate himself from his Commonwealth colleagues, the Treasurer in this State is carrying on exactly the same techniques here. I shall prove that, if the member for Spence will listen. Although the Treasurer is willing to comment about certain taxation imposed on the people of South Australia, he should look to his own actions, especially where people are being taxed. One has only to look at the increased water and sewerage rates and the increased land tax. Those increases are breaking the backs of the people and destroying their ability to pay. The other day, a gentleman telephoned me after he received his land tax assessment. It had gone up from \$113 on an annual basis to more than \$1 300.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must link up these remarks with the Bill.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I am doing that; this Bill is yet another taxation technique on the part of this State Government. Let us not be fooled. To start with, it is a very moderate tax, a little more than \$500 000, but we will watch it increase to more than \$1 000 000 next year.

Mr. McRae: Will you produce that account of \$1 300? Where does the man live?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: He lives in Burnside, and the case was quoted in the press, so the member for Playford need not jump up and down. The people can no longer bear these tremendous taxes. Let us examine the record of the Dunstan Government. In its 4½ years in office the State revenue, through taxation, has increased by 258 per cent.

Mr. Crimes: Will you tell us how you arrived at that percentage?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: That is taken from the figures presented in the Budget of total moneys collected from tax revenue.

Mr. Crimes: By whom?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: They were presented by the Treasurer, and I suggest the member for Spence should read the document. During the same 4½-year period the minimum wage has increased by 49.8 per cent; in other words, increases in taxation have been five times the increase in the minimum wage. That clearly demonstrates the crisis faced by the people in South Australia; their taxation is increasing at five times the rate of increase in their earnings. That is why the people of this State are at last standing up and screaming: no longer can they face the burden of these increased taxes, which are, of course, reflected in this State's consumer price index. For the four quarters to the end of June last year, this State's consumer price index went from 123 units to 131.6 units, an increase of 7 per cent.

Mr. Keneally: You compare that with the position in the other States.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I will do so, as during that year South Australia's consumer price index increased more than that of any other State. What has happened in the 12 months since then? In that time, we have had an increase of just over 16 per cent—again, the highest of any State in Australia. Let us not be fooled; this State is now paying heavily, as its taxes are increasing more rapidly than those in any other State. This is reflected in our consumer price index. In the last quarter to the end of September we have had further evidence of increased rates and taxes in this State. Again, South Australia's consumer price index increased more than that of any other State.

Let us not be foolish; let us work out what contributes to a higher consumer price index. It is either Government taxation, be it direct or indirect taxation, or legislation that the Government introduces. It is Government legislation such as that relating to workmen's compensation, and particularly that relating to taxation, that increases this State's consumer price index so much. We have seen, at least for the last 21 years, our consumer price index increase more rapidly than that of any other State. Let us see how our incomes have increased in the same period. If one examines the figures for April and May, 1974, one sees that (and I am referring to the average weekly earnings for each employed male unit), except for Tasmania, South Australia has the lowest weekly earning of any State in Australia.

Mr. Slater: Does that please you?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: This does not please me at all, as I can see the effect of this situation in my district.

Although South Australia has one of the lowest rates of earning in Australia, it has the highest consumer price index figure. What better example could one have for the motto "The more the Government does for you, the more it takes from you." However, because of the Government's bureaucratic system, Government inefficiencies and poorly directed expenditure of funds, the money that the Government takes from the people is greater than what it returns to them.

Mr. Crimes: You know that—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I think the member for Spence missed the point I was making: the Government takes far more from the people than it returns to them. This is obviously because of the inefficiencies of a large bureaucracy and because of its poor direction of funds in relation to the necessities of the community. I am now drinking a glass of water, and water is one of the most expensive commodities in this State. Indeed, I think Max Harris worked out that in South Australia a glass of water will eventually cost more than a glass of champagne.

Mr. Payne: Can you name any commodity other than water that you can get more cheaply?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: If the member for Mitchell wants to get on to water rates, I should like dearly to take him up on the Government's absolutely ludicrous water rating system. It upholds that stupid system whereby one pays not according to the quantity of water one uses but according to the value of one's property.

The SPEAKER: Order! I remind the honourable member for Davenport that he has a notice of motion on the Notice Paper and that that precludes him from discussing that subject.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I must apologise, Mr. Speaker, as I digressed solely because the member for Mitchell interjected. I have made the point that by the end of this year the tax we are now debating will have raised \$540 000. Let us examine what the State is getting for that sum. First, it is getting excessive and expensive overseas Ministerial tours. One needs to think only of the tours that the Treasurer has made: he is back and forth between here and Europe and, in his rather flippant use of this State's money, has spent over \$60000.

Mr. Crimes: Why don't you tell—

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I am having tremendous difficulty in speaking above the rabble of the member for Spence. I am simply pointing out the benefits that the people of this State are getting for their \$540 000. In this respect, I referred to Ministerial tours overseas. Of course we are also getting a media monitoring system so that Ministers can sit back and look at and listen to themselves on the media. Perhaps the people of this State like that sort of thing! They are also getting the benefits of a Public Service, which according to last year's figures is growing at a rate of over 12 per cent a year.

Mr. McRae: Whom will you sack from the Public Service?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I am not sacking anyone from the Public Service. That is the most insane, stupid, and ridiculous interjection I have ever heard from the member for Playford. The Treasurer came out with the same stupid interjection recently, merely because the Opposition suggested that the growth rate of the Public Service should be reduced to about the same rate that applies in the rest of the community.

Mr. McRae: Why don't you tell us about his income tax? How much is he earning?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I would appreciate it if Government members could at least have the courtesy of listening to and absorbing my argument. I know that it hurts them and that they now realise they have misused public funds. We have not advocated that anyone be sacked. We are merely saying that the growth rate of the Public Service should be about the same as that of the private sector, and that is a growth rate of about 3 per cent to 3.5 per cent a year. There is a big difference between 12 per cent and the 3.5 per cent in private enterprise.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Whom would you sack?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I thought the Minister was intelligent but, obviously, from that stupid interjection, he is not an intelligent man. When there is a positive growth rate of 3.5 per cent, no-one is being sacked and people still are being employed. If the Minister cannot see that, I suggest that he do not interject further. What is the South Australian public getting for this \$540 000 that will be raised under this Bill? It is getting the excesses of the South Australian Film Corporation. The Leader of the Opposition already has pointed out the tremendous wastage there in telephone calls. I forget the exact figure, but I think the cost for telephone calls for the film corporation was \$1 300.

Mr. Becker: That's for one section of it.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The corporation must be doing all its voice recordings by subscriber trunk dialling from Adelaide to Melbourne.

Mr. McRae: Right, the film corporation goes first. What will be next?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: These are the kinds of areas in which we would say that we would not waste funds and that we would continue an annual growth rate of 3 per cent to 3.5 per cent, but we would not misuse public funds in the way the Government of this State has done in the past 4½ years.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Second reading speeches by interjection are out of order while another honourable member is speaking.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Despite the Treasurer's performances in the past week, there is no difference between his action in increasing taxation and the action of the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. Payne: Or Mr. Hamer's action, in Victoria.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Gough Whitlam and his Government are the problems, and we are all stuck with them.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member for Spence wants to speak in the debate, he had better put his name on the list of speakers.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I look forward to hearing him speak. He is willing to make inane interjections from the back bench.

Mr. Crimes: I appreciate your insult.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: We seldom hear him express any positive ideas. This Bill is yet another nail in the coffin of the South Australian taxpayer, and the Treasurer of this State can now be called the official executioner of the South Australian ratepayer and taxpayer. I hope the Government will realise that it has now reached the point where, in collusion with its colleagues in Canberra, its taxes are so high that many businesses and individuals in this State can no longer carry those increased taxes.

For this reason, we see the sort of newspaper editorial that we saw in the *Financial Review* yesterday. The Editor of that newspaper stated that South Australia now had lost its entire advantages as a manufacturing State. I would

not say that we have lost all our advantages, and I think that in a report in the newspaper this morning Mr. Scriven pointed out one or two advantages. However, we have lost our most important advantage. This State has had one of the lowest cost structures in Australia.

Mr. Keneally: You know why.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: While we were in that position, we could manufacture goods here and still afford to export them to the Eastern States markets.

Mr. Crimes: Do you want the Playford era back?

Mr. Keneally: Did you use the word "exploit"?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: No, I said "export".

Mr. Keneally: You should have said "exploit".

Mr. DEAN BROWN: South Australia already has lost most of that cost advantage. We have the second highest inflation rate and we will soon be in the same position as the Eastern States. As an example of that, I should like to quote a comparison of the consumer price indexes at the end of the March quarter this year for Melbourne and Adelaide.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! We are debating the Licensing Act Amendment Bill and I suggest that the honourable member get back to the part of the Bill that presumably he was discussing. I suggest that he keep to the confines of the Bill.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I was merely pointing out the effects of this increased taxation on the consumer price index, and I wanted to point out that already the figures for South Australia and Victoria are almost identical. The figure for Victoria is 145.2, while that for Adelaide is 145.4. We already have a higher cost of living than Victoria, and that State is one of the most important Eastern States markets. How can we compete as a manufacturing State when we have a higher cost of living and lower salaries and cannot afford the transport costs of getting our goods to the Eastern States markets? Our petrol tax will further increase those transport costs. I make a plea to the Treasurer. I am sorry that he is not here. I hope the Acting Treasurer is listening on his monitoring system.

Dr. Tonkin: Where is the Treasurer?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I understand that at present he is in Canberra giving evidence and trying to protect this State from the economic policies of the A.L.P. Commonwealth Government.

Mr. Keneally: Say something snide about the Treasurer.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Members of this Government seem to spend much time in Canberra defending and protecting themselves against the economic policies of their Commonwealth colleagues. I have made my point. The more the Government tries to do in this State, the more money it will need to do it, and the more it taxes the people, the more it can then do to the people of this State. We have seen a complete lack of confidence in South Australia, particularly in the industrial field.

Mr. McRae: In Burnside?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I said that there was a complete lack of confidence in the industrial field. I oppose the Bill.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I must congratulate the member for Davenport. If one wants a barometer of the way in which the Government finds itself on the defensive, one can get it through the reaction of the member for Spence. One watches the depth of colouring of his forehead. It is fascinating how Government members have been reacting.

Mr. Crimes: The member for Davenport distorted the figures.

Mr. Coumbe: When the cat is away the mice will play.

Dr. TONKIN: They may be playing, but I do not think the Minister of Development and Mines knows how to play, other than the brass instrument. I listened to the puerile interjections that came from the other side while the member for Davenport and other Opposition members were speaking. For example, one Government member interjected, "Whom do we sack now?"

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I have called for order, and the honourable member will resume his seat. The Bill under consideration is the Licensing Act Amendment Bill, and the honourable member should confine his remarks to it.

Dr. TONKIN: I can assure you, Sir, that that is exactly what I am going to do. I am discussing the response made by Government members to criticism of this measure. If this measure had not been introduced, there would not have been any need for this criticism and there would not have been the futile display, the facile comments and the interjections from the other side. No matter what members opposite say and no matter how stupid their interjections are, we will continue saying that we oppose the Bill because it is not necessary. I intend to answer some of the interjections hurled across the Chamber by members opposite; for example, "Whom do we sack if we do not impose this tax? If we cut the growth rate of the Public Service back to the corresponding level of the private sector, as the member for Davenport suggested, whom do we sack?" What a facile and stupid interjection! It is absolutely typical of Government members, who do not understand the situation. Either they are completely thick-headed (and I do not believe they are) or they are deliberately trying to obscure the true issue, which is that they have no intention of cutting back the growth rate of the Public Service. I stress that I have not referred to cutting back the Public Service: I have referred to cutting back the growth rate of the Public Service.

Mr. Payne: There is a difference?

Dr. TONKIN: A real difference. Perhaps the Minister of Development and Mines will take the honourable member aside and explain the difference; I see that the Minister is now doing exactly that. In the face of proposed taxes, we have seen Government extravagance the like of which this State has never seen before. Other members on this side have detailed the extravagances. We have seen overseas visits by the Treasurer and other Ministers, the establishment of a media monitoring system, and extravagant telephone accounts. All these extravagances have occurred at a stage when the Government is introducing legislation to raise a further tax.

Members interjecting:

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

Dr. TONKIN: This is happening at a time when the Government finds it necessary to introduce measures to increase State taxation. I am glad to see that the Government members who were interjecting so vigorously have left their seats. The member for Playford asked, "When should we abolish the Film Corporation?" No-one has talked about abolishing it; we simply say that, at a time of financial tightness, the Film Corporation should, as should every Government department, act with a lack of extravagance, indeed, with a degree of austerity.

Mr. Crimes: You want private affluence and public squalor.

Dr. TONKIN: I do not think a little austerity would do anyone in the public sector any harm. The people of Australia have had to abide by an imposed system of

austerity; they have had no option. The Commonwealth Government is levying so much income tax and the State Government is hopping in for such a large share that the people are being bled. If it is good enough for the people, it is good enough for Government departments, too. So, this is a very hypocritical Bill, and we are going to see a whole series of such Bills; indeed, we have already seen some such Bills. The Treasurer has said that we must accept special grants in respect of housing. He has come back from Premiers' Conferences saying, "I did not get all the money I wanted to get. I would like to do something to the Prime Minister." We know perfectly well that the Treasurer will fall into line and make a public noise—

Mr. McAnaney: He called Whitlam a liar.

Dr. TONKIN: Yes, but when it comes to the point the Treasurer will say, "I have no option. I must impose these taxes." He will make this claim irrespective of whether the tax under consideration is stamp duty, pay-roll tax or, in the present instance, liquor fees. Presumably the Treasurer of a Labor Government in South Australia has some degree of influence (at least, we understood so) with a Commonwealth Labor Government. In fact, I seem to remember it being said that South Australia would never have it so good if we had a State Labor Government and a Commonwealth Labor Government. Opposition members are told that, if they do not accept special grants and if they do not agree to the petrol tax, the licensing tax, and the tobacco tax, the Opposition will be putting people out of work. The Opposition has also been asked, "If you do not accept these taxes, what do you want us to do?" I presume that the Treasurer would be saying this tonight to the Opposition if he were here, because he has said it before: "Do you want us to cut down our spending on hospitals and community welfare? That is what we would have to do if this legislation was not passed." This Government is already cutting down on hospital and health spending, and I think it is doing it deliberately. The Government is already cutting down on allocations for health services. For instance, this year's grant to the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science has been reduced by almost \$1 000 000 and, as a result, tests that should be done on patients are not being done.

Mr. Dean Brown: What about the Premier's Department?

Dr. TONKIN: Is he cutting down in his own department? No; all the Treasurer can do is introduce this kind of Bill. There is no need for licence fees to be increased by this Bill. The extra \$1 500 000 a year that will be brought in could easily be saved by a little commonsense economising: by getting value for money from the Government's activities. It is about time that the people of this State woke up to this fact.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask honourable members to conduct themselves in a more dignified manner, because it has become extremely difficult for the speaker to be heard and for the reporters to hear. The honourable member for Bragg.

Dr. TONKIN: I heartily concur in everything you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, have said about the Government side. I heard a remark from across the Chamber a short time ago that all other States have the same problems. They do: they have the problem of the Commonwealth Labor Government, which is starving the States. What is the idea behind calling it the Australian Government?

Mr. Crimes: If you have the answers, why not tell the Australian Government?

Mr. McAnaney: Which Leader would he have to tell?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. TONKIN: I am sorry that members opposite are not obeying your ruling, Mr. Deputy Speaker. All States indeed have the same problem: the Labor Government in Canberra, which is pulling in from income tax and other measures more than twice as much revenue this year as it pulled in two years ago and which is giving back to the States a far smaller proportion of it. There would have been no need for this legislation to be introduced if the Commonwealth Government had given the State its fair share of the income tax and other revenue it received.

Mr. McRae: That's about the first constructive remark I've heard all day.

Dr. TONKIN: I am pleased that the member for Playford has resumed his seat.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! As the honourable member for Davenport has had his chance to speak for 30 minutes, I ask him to refrain from interjecting.

Dr. TONKIN: While the Treasurer is now in Canberra, window-dressing, stomping around, making noises, and charging up and down the lists like the shining white knight on the shining white charger—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's last remark has nothing to do with the Bill under discussion. If he does not confine his remarks more strictly to the Bill, I shall have to take other action.

Dr. TONKIN: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I should have thought that the Treasurer would like to think of himself as a shining white knight on a shining white charger. I have no doubt that you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, are correct in your ruling. Nevertheless, while the Treasurer is in Canberra, presumably fighting with the Commonwealth Labor Government, we are considering yet another Bill to increase taxation on the people of this State. I am the last person to believe that beach protection, for instance, which is a most vital aspect of our conservation programme, should suffer because of the lack of funds, but I almost suspect that the Treasurer believes that it is no longer necessary, because, like King Canute, he will sit on the shores and say to the sea, "Don't come." I oppose the legislation, which is totally unnecessary. However, it has become necessary because of the Commonwealth Government's actions in not giving us money that is rightly ours. The Treasurer has agreed to the deliberate policy of the Commonwealth Government's withholding funds from State Governments and dishing them out in section 96 grants.

Mr. McRae: Not on your life.

Dr. TONKIN: The Treasurer was one of the architects of the scheme and the member for Playford knows that. If he does not know that, it explains many of the things I have been wondering about lately. The Treasurer endorses completely the Commonwealth Labor Government's activities in this matter; otherwise, he would not be introducing these increases.

Mr. McRae: How do you reconcile that with his actions?

Dr. TONKIN: The Treasurer and the member for Playford know that talk is not worth much when made in this kind of context. In other words, it is not what the Treasurer says that really matters but what he does and achieves, and that, I hope, is what the people of this State will take into account during the coming 12 or 18 months. The Treasurer can talk until he is blue in the face but, unless he can show concrete evidence that he is doing something other than increase State taxes (as in this legislation), the people of this State will finally wake up to him. It will have taken them a long time to do so.

Mr. McRae: I hope you are supporting his activities in Canberra.

Dr. TONKIN: I would feel more reassured by his activities in Canberra if we were not considering this Bill to raise just under \$1 500 000 and if I could see some tangible cut-back in spending in his own department. People are going to start judging by actions and deeds, not words, and that is exactly what they will be looking for. Certain economies could be made in every Government department (and I think that the Minister of Education would agree with me) without seriously hampering the activities of any department. I believe that economies could and should be made before the people of this State are lumbered with this kind of taxation and that in his heart the Minister knows that, too. I believe he is an honest man. I do not believe there is any real need for these charges to be increased. If the Treasurer and members opposite were really concerned about the welfare of the people of South Australia, they would not just talk about the Commonwealth Government but would do something active about it. They would not continue to support its activities, and they would not continue to employ public relations officers, part of whose duties it is to publicise the activities of the Labor Party in other States. Certainly members opposite would not go to other States to support election campaigns; they would not go to Coogee, or anywhere else where there happened to be an election, to fight for the return of a Labor Party candidate in the Commonwealth sphere; they would be honest and say, "We do not believe that our Labor Party colleagues in Canberra are doing the right thing." We have said that they are not doing the right thing and, if they were honest, members opposite would say to the people of South Australia, "Do not vote for our colleagues."

Mr. Mathwin: Like Mr. Hawke.

Dr. TONKIN: In many ways Mr. Hawke has a degree of honesty that is amazing.

Mr. Becker: No way.

Dr. TONKIN: Perhaps it suits him. I do not believe that the tax imposed by this Bill is necessary, and I greatly deplore the fact that it was ever introduced. Certainly, I deplore the fact that the Treasurer and his Government do not have the courage of their stated convictions; the only conclusion I can draw is that they do not hold their convictions strongly, and that all the representations and all the hoo-hah (if I can borrow that phrase) being undertaken by the Treasurer at present does not mean a thing. I oppose the Bill.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I oppose the Bill for several reasons. Although I have not heard all of the speeches made in this debate, it is clear that the Bill has been introduced as a result of the Government's mismanagement of the affairs of this State. The Government is responsible for the situation now faced by South Australia. It is also responsible for the cost-push inflation which now faces South Australia in particular and which has been aggravated by the mismanagement of the State. In his small second reading explanation, the Treasurer said that the amount he expected to raise through the imposition of this tax in the remaining part of the 1974-75 financial year would be \$540 000, and in the next full financial year the sum of \$1 460 000 would be raised.

This tax is merely an additional burden placed on the small man and the ordinary people of South Australia, as it imposes a levy on beer drinkers and people who seek entertainment by attending certain organisations, for example, sporting clubs or any other clubs having a liquor licence. These are the people who will pay this additional tax. The Treasurer said that he regretted having to increase these fees. Every time the Treasurer makes a statement

about increased taxes that hit the small person (and there have been many of them recently) he makes the same comment. Of course, anyone knowing the ethics of Socialism knows that Socialism means high taxes, because that is the only way that philosophy can work: the other man's dollar in the Government's pocket. Constantly we see this same situation arising. The Treasurer has often accused the Opposition of not saying whence it would get the extra revenue necessary, and he has asked, "Whom would you sack?"

Dr. Tonkin: It doesn't make sense, does it?

Mr. MATHWIN: It doesn't make sense, because one does not have to sack people: one must pick one's priorities.

Mr. McRae: What would you do?

Mr. MATHWIN: First, I would ask how \$30 000 could be spent on the telephone account for one office. I want to know a little more about that. Other questions were answered today about exceptionally high telephone accounts, and I believe that all of these should be researched. We must know what is going on. This activity should be stopped. The expenditure to which I have referred was incurred by the South Australian Film Corporation. Also, although I suspect the reason, I cannot see why the Government should at this time establish its elaborate monitoring system.

Mr. Becker: Was it because Kevin Crease couldn't do anything else?

Mr. MATHWIN: I would be the last one to say it, but that gentleman is the chief monitor, and I presume chief monitors have something special about them. This gentleman is responsible for operating this expensive monitoring system, which is really for propaganda, as it merely assists the Labor Party at every turn, enabling it to reply at any time to any criticism of the Government.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to come back to the Bill under discussion. The matters he is discussing are wide of the Bill.

Mr. MATHWIN: I was merely pointing to areas where economies could be made to assist in remedying the shocking financial situation the Government has created in South Australia. I refer to the many boards, the members of which are all paid. These boards would operate well as voluntary bodies, but the Government sees fit to pay all their members. In many areas money can be saved. Thirdly, I refer to the suggestion of the member for Bragg, who commented on the large public relations staff assisting the Government. I refer also to the colossal expenditure in the Premier's Department and the colossal expenditure for research trips. I have nothing against the practice of Ministers and members of Parliament going on a study tour. I believe it to be imperative that they undertake such tours, because this is one way whereby they can extend their experience and bring back to South Australia the best they see in overseas countries. I have nothing against this or against a Minister's taking his wife with him, but I certainly argue against the way in which the finances of South Australia are wasted on some trips. I refer to recent trips by the Treasurer, who went overseas to study worker participation. From what I gather from his subsequent statements, there is little worker participation elsewhere in the world. Indeed, the Treasurer should know from his study that such a thing cannot come about hurriedly: it is a long process, and it is an educational process that must be gradually implemented.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I remind the honourable member for Glenelg that worker participation is not referred to in this Bill. This Bill deals with the Licensing

Act, and I ask the honourable member to confine his remarks to the subject matter contained in the Bill.

Mr. MATHWIN: The matters I have mentioned deal with revenue, and I have been linking them with the revenue measure before the House at present. The Bill provides for increases in licence fees, in some cases from 5 per cent to 6 per cent and in others from 6 per cent to 8 per cent. Clause 2 contains 10 subclauses all providing for the addition of at least 2 per cent to licence fees. I oppose the Bill. It is completely wrong that any Treasurer should approach the people of any State, tongue in cheek, saying how sorry he is to increase taxation, when other methods are freely available to raise the money: for instance, by cutting down on the colossal expenditure of the State. When one considers the amount of revenue the State Government is collecting from direct taxation, one realises the tremendous sums the Government must find to run the State. In many cases, the Government is becoming involved in expensive matters that could well be left alone.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): One or two matters that have been raised during the debate should be clarified. The basic background to the State's Budgetary position should be understood by honourable members, even if not all members are willing to recognise the situation in public. There may come a day when they have to deal with it themselves, so at least they should know about it.

Mr. Goldsworthy: It will not be far away.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I think it is a long way away, but we will not get into that argument. Certainly, I suggest the Opposition must become much less irresponsible if that day is to be as close as members opposite may think.

Mr. Goldsworthy: But you—

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I supported a number of revenue measures when I was in Opposition. I remind the member for Kavel of that. He was not here at that time, but we supported some matters when I was in Opposition.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You didn't support too many.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member can look back in the record if he wishes. The general position facing this State during a period of inflation (and this position varies slightly from State to State) is that, for every dollar spent in wages and salaries, we get back in pay-roll tax at the 5 per cent rate and tax reimbursement grants about 80c. So, with every addition to inflation, the State is further behind in meeting its existing commitments, quite apart from any extension that may or may not be desirable and about which there could be arguments as to the priorities that should apply. The more rapid the rate of inflation the more every State in Australia is faced with a situation where the amount recouped in pay-roll tax and tax reimbursement grants falls short of the amount paid out in extra wages and salaries. Every State, therefore, is faced with the problem of getting additional revenue.

The States worst off in this regard (and which therefore have made the biggest inroads in extra tax) are New South Wales and Victoria; the State that is best off is Tasmania. South Australia falls somewhere between the two extremes, but certainly the amount the South Australian Government gets back does not meet the extra cost of wages and salaries. The problem arises of what the State has to do to meet the situation. Should it run down its services, having made economies that the Government of the day considers suitable? That is a continuous pro-

cess demanded of Government departments, and it is being demanded of Government departments at present.

Mr. Goldsworthy: There is only one thing to do.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The question of raising charges is always a thorny question and one about which an Opposition may think it can score a political advantage. Nevertheless, the Government must face the decision. We have at present, because of the period of inflation, the traditional situation of Commonwealth-State financial relations that has plagued this country since the Second World War. It has been a continuing problem for Government after Government.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Ha!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I seem to remember the difficulties that were experienced under Mr. McMahon and Mr. Gorton.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I realise Opposition members have been told they must be more aggressive. They cannot say anything intelligent, but they have to start jeering: I realise that. However, the facts of the matter are that every Government—

Mr. Goldsworthy: When was the rate of inflation 20 per cent?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Back in 1950, under Sir Robert Menzies, it was 23 per cent. Past history of that nature is not a productive exercise. It may be of interest to the Party-political backing, but the ordinary citizen in any State could not care less. I am stating that the problem of Commonwealth-State financial relations has been a serious problem in every year since the Second World War. There has never been a period of time under any Government, Liberal or Labor, in any Australian State or in the Commonwealth, when the State has not been forced to review the charges it makes. The basic fact of the matter is that most of the charges levied by State Governments tend to be regressive, as they tend to hit across the board in a way that is not satisfactory. Few State taxes are progressive, and it would not be possible to place full reliance on them anyway, because the capacity to pay in these areas is limited.

Mr. Goldsworthy: In what year was the inflation rate 23 per cent?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If the honourable member wants to live in the past, by all means let him do so, but I wish he would not intrude. The rate of inflation was 23 per cent in 1950-51, from memory. That is quoting off the top of my head. It was after Sir Robert Menzies, in December, 1949, had promised to put value back in the pound. That sort of argument is completely valueless and useless and does not prove a single thing.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You ask the Australian people.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I have never heard of a worse policy than that put forward by the Commonwealth Leader of the Opposition to counter inflation.

Mr. Coumbe: The Government is taking it up now.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If the honourable member wants to argue that point, the inflation rate has not come down. If he wants to live in cloud cuckoo land he may do so.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I do not know whether "cloud cuckoo land" is Parliamentary or whether it is not. However, the only State taxes that contain elements of a progressive characteristic to any significant degree (and there will be arguments about this) are land tax and succession duties. Most of the other taxes that are collected by State Governments are regressive in character. The

argument has been put to successive Commonwealth Governments that, if the States are forced to impose extra taxes, they will be forced into imposing taxes which are regressive and which tend to increase production costs. That is certainly not a new argument. I happened to be at the last Premiers' Conference and listened to the submissions made on this point by each Premier. I should like to place on record that the best statement of the case—

Dr. Eastick: Were you there as a possible Treasurer?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I was there as Acting Deputy Premier, in case the Treasurer was delayed in his return from overseas—as he was by the fog at Canberra, when he was thinking about dropping things from a great height! Be that as it may, and despite the jeering garbage that we get from members opposite who have nothing else to say, the submission made by our Treasurer was the clearest and the most effective and forceful one that was made.

Mr. Goldsworthy: With what effect?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: None as yet. Members opposite, including the member for Bragg, were trying to suggest that the Treasurer was going on with a lot of hoo-hah. I know that sounds well, and that the honourable member can say it in the kind of voice which booms out and which makes it sound dramatic. I know, too, that he has to contrast himself with the Leader of the Opposition. I also know that we will probably get a contribution from the Leader of the Opposition on the third reading so that everyone will think he is on the ball. It is a nice old seesaw going on between the two of them. The truth of the matter is that our Treasurer has nut gone on with hoo-hah. He was the most effective of the State Treasurers in putting a case to the Commonwealth Government and, indeed, he has done a fine job as a distinguished South Australian in this respect.

Mr. Coumbe: What happened to the \$6 000 000?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Members opposite can ask all those sorts of questions, but I intend to proceed with the next point.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I do not hear any Opposition member saying that, if business costs increase, the costs of the products of business should not be increased as well. I have not heard the member for Hanson suggest that it would be wrong for the Bank of Adelaide to increase its charge when its costs rise. Nor have I heard the Leader of the Opposition suggest—

Mr. Nankivell: There's a consumer resistance level that does not apply here.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: There are all sorts of area in which there is no consumer resistance, and charges are passed on. One of the greatest complaints about the vulnerability of the rural industry that we hear in times of inflation from members representing rural districts is that they are not able to pass on increased costs and that, when they get favourable prices for their products, as they were getting—

Dr. Tonkin: What's that got to do with this?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If the member for Bragg cared to listen and ceased demonstrating this capacity to be dead from the neck up, he might understand. I have heard members opposite say in years like 1972-73 when prices are good, "Do not knock the rural industry." When there are high prices that the consumer must pay, and inflation, they say, "It is a good year for the rural industry." However, I never hear members opposite, at least in this

Parliament, say that the Government, when its costs increase, should act responsibly and obtain extra revenue, even though at the same time it is carrying out economies that it considers appropriate according to its priorities. I have never heard an Opposition member say that any increase at all in taxation is justified.

Dr. Eastick: The Government should reassess—

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Leader of the Opposition will no doubt outdo the performance of the former member for Goyder in 1968. He will get up at the next State election and say to the people of South Australia, "Look, I am going to spend more, but I will tax less and balance the Budget, too." That is the kind of irresponsible idiocy that members opposite think will get them back into office. But it certainly will not do so.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Goldsworthy: That is the sort of policy that got the present Commonwealth Government into office. Spend more money and tax less! That's Whitlam's policy.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It has never been the policy of the present Government (and it has never been suggested at any election in South Australia when the Labor Party has been re-elected) not to say that certain extra revenue will have to be obtained. In the years that it has lost State elections, the Liberal and Country League has always been silent on this matter. So let us not talk about who acts responsibly!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: This Government has been critical of the actions of the Commonwealth Government.

Dr. Tonkin: Not critical enough.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Nothing would satisfy jeering knockers. I realise that. I am not speaking particularly to Opposition members: I intend to speak for the record. We have acted responsibly in this matter, and have made our submissions to the Commonwealth Government. Indeed, we have continued to do so, and this State's Treasurer has risked criticism and the wrath of the Commonwealth Government in making the statements that he has made. No-one can deny that. The facts of the matter are that, if members opposite wish also to criticise the State Government for increasing these charges and have a bob each way on the matter, to the extent that they can get away with knocking the Commonwealth Government they will do so. To the extent that they can knock the State Government and get away with it, they will do so, too. However, they should pay at least some attention to the fact that every State in Australia is, to my knowledge, either increasing this licensing fee or has already done so. I now refer to the sort of statement that one comes across:

Fees payable under the Liquor Control Act will be reviewed and, for those licences where the existing fee is based on 6 per cent of the gross amount paid for liquor by the licensee during the 12 months ended on the previous June 30, the new fee will be 8 per cent. The estimated additional revenue in 1974-75 is \$5 000 000.

That is not even for a full year: it is \$5 000 000 for the remainder of this year. That was a quotation from Mr. Hamer, the Liberal Premier of South Australia, and the Liberal Premier of New South Wales has done the same sort of thing. We hear no criticism from members opposite of the increased charges that have been imposed in other States.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Of which State is Mr. Hamer Premier? You just said "South Australia".

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am sorry, I meant the Premier of Victoria. Even the member for Kavel—

Mr. Goldsworthy: What State are you in?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The pathetic behaviour of the Opposition continually degrades this House and its standard of debate. The member for Kavel is yet another example of the same sort of thing.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You aren't doing very well yourself.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: One would never do well with the kind of behaviour in which members opposite indulge. It is impossible to make any kind of statement in debate or to get anyone on the Opposition side to listen. All one does when one takes part in a debate like this is speak entirely for the record, not deal with the arguments of members opposite. Regarding revenue measures—

Mr. Goldsworthy: You opposed them all.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: That is a lie. The honourable member is a liar on the first count and also on the second count that I opposed most of them. He is a liar on both.

The SPEAKER: There is no need for that.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: That is the score, and the honourable member had better check his facts on that matter. The South Australian Government is in the same kind of position as every other State Government in Australia.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You're a liar, too, aren't you?

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no need for hate or personalities in this debate.

Mr. Goldsworthy: He called me a liar, so I can call him a liar. The place is full of liars!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member in the first place made a statement that was grossly untrue.

Mr. Goldsworthy: I think you're a liar, too.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: This year every State is in difficulties.

Dr. Eastick: For the same reason.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is for much the same reason, and in previous years every State has been in similar difficulties under former Liberal Governments.

Dr. Eastick: No.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I know it is impossible to get members opposite to listen, but the amount of money involved in the problem is higher this year because of the difference in the price level.

Dr. Eastick: That's because—

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Will you let me finish a sentence? You need not be so rude all the time. I know you do not want to listen, but I listened with courtesy to what you said in this debate, so perhaps you could extend a courtesy to me.

Dr. Eastick: Do you think—

The SPEAKER: Order! Order! There are too many cases of members both speaking and interjecting, ignoring the Chair, and entering into personalities with one another. Those things will cease.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: This situation to which I have referred has been repeated many times since the Second World War, and at no time since the war has a settlement been reached in the troubled area of Commonwealth-State financial relations that has put the Australian States in a position of being able to manage their affairs effectively.

Mr. Goldsworthy: It's never been worse than now.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: That has applied to every Premiers' Conference that I have read about, attended, or heard anything about, when we have had either a Liberal Premier or a Labor Premier coming back. We have had the same problem year after year after year in this and every other State.

Dr. Eastick: Mr. Hamer—

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: One thing ought to be recognised—

Dr. Eastick: Mr. Hamer—

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Are you willing to allow someone to speak, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. Eastick: Where did—

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I insist on my right to be heard.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have warned the honourable member for Rocky River previously. That warning still stands and, if the honourable member wants to take over the authority of the Chair, he will have to try to do it from outside the Chamber.

Mr. VENNING: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I want to know to what statement you are taking objection.

The SPEAKER: It is the same complaint as I have made and taken objection to previously.

Mr. VENNING: On a point of order, I said nothing like that—nothing whatsoever.

Dr. Tonkin: He never said a word.

The SPEAKER: The point of order is not upheld.

Mr. VENNING: I take another point of order. I believe that every member of this House should be treated justly by the Speaker. There may have been occasions when I stepped over the line, but I have not done so on this occasion, and I suggest that you withdraw the remark.

The SPEAKER: The point of order is not upheld.

Mr. VENNING: I wish to disagree to your ruling.

The SPEAKER: Order! I thought I heard the honourable member say that he disagreed to the Speaker's ruling. There is no ruling before the House and, therefore, I cannot uphold the dissent.

Dr. TONKIN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, if you rule on a point of order and do not uphold it, that in itself is a ruling.

The SPEAKER: The point of order is not upheld.

Dr. EASTICK: On a point of order, the member for Rocky River has made clear three times that at no stage had he opened his mouth when you called him to order. The honourable member has stated (and every other member in this House knows) that on many occasions he has interrupted and tried to usurp the authority of the Chair, but I accept the statement by the honourable member that on this occasion, before he was called to order, he had not participated in the debate. I make the further point that I acknowledge that I was interjecting, for just reason, when the Minister of Education was speaking, but I was not called to order then, whereas one of my colleagues was called to order when he was not guilty.

The SPEAKER: During the course of this debate, the honourable member for Rocky River did interject; therefore, the point of order taken by the honourable Leader is not upheld, because the honourable member for Rocky River did interject at that time.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I rise on a point of order. I do not want to delay the workings of the House, but you may recall that only minutes ago I entered the Chamber after having been outside momentarily. When I came in, the Minister was on his feet and—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Alexandra has raised a point of order. Now he is starting to debate. The point of order cannot be upheld.

Mr. COUMBE: I rise on a point of order similar to that taken by the Leader. I certainly did not hear the member for Rocky River utter any word at that time. You have given a ruling on this case and, whilst you were correct in regard to previous occasions, on this occasion the honourable member did not interject. He did not open his mouth. Therefore, I suggest, with due respect, that you reconsider your ruling.

The SPEAKER: During this debate, there has been much persistent interjecting. It is extremely difficult to hear what is being said in this Chamber but, in view of the remarks that have been made, I will give the honourable member for Rocky River the benefit of the doubt.

Mr. Venning: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I think it needs to be understood clearly that this country is crying out for an effective settlement of the problems concerning the financial relations between the State Governments and the Commonwealth Government. This situation has persisted ever since the Second World War. Indeed, it has probably been a characteristic of the federal system since its very beginning. The problem has never been solved. This year the tax reimbursement formula comes up for review, and I earnestly hope that it will be possible to secure a revision of that formula which, together with the States' use of pay-roll tax, will give a permanent solution to the rather unseemly and disgraceful problems that have bedevilled Commonwealth-State financial relations. It is not attractive for a country like Australia, with such a significant future ahead of it, to have the continual fighting and bickering that goes on all the time, irrespective of which Party is in power. During most of the debate that I heard while I was in the Chamber, as the Minister responsible for the Bill, I listened to the points made by members opposite. I am sorry that members opposite have not seen fit to return the courtesy.

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

STATUTE LAW REVISION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 9. Page 1392.)

Mr. NANKIVELL (Mallee): Like most members, if not all members, I am anxiously awaiting the completion of the consolidation and reprinting of the South Australian Statutes. Any member who has to follow some of the amendments to legislation that come before this House will know precisely what I mean in regard to their attempts to follow through from the principal Act to the amending Act. Unfortunately, some Acts are not annotated correctly, and some annotations are not to the point. One can reach the stage where one does not know what legislation means. I strongly approve the course of action taken under the present Commissioner of Statute Revision. That the momentous occasion when a new consolidation replaces all the present volumes is only slowly approaching is something we will have to accept, but the fact that it is approaching is borne out by this Bill.

The first schedule to the Bill repeals eight redundant Acts. I think all members will agree that there is no sense in wasting print and paper on Acts that are of no use. The second schedule amends or repeals a further 19 Acts. When we had a similar type of Bill before us last year, the member for Gouger and I did a lengthy exercise and checked out every Act in detail, and I have done the same kind of

exercise again to the best of my ability. As I cannot find anything irregular in the amendments, I recommend the speedy passage of the Bill. I take this opportunity, on my own behalf and, I hope, on behalf of all other members, of thanking Mr. Ludovici for undertaking this tremendous project of consolidating the Statutes of South Australia. I support the Bill.

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

HIGHWAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 24. Page 1690.)

Mr. RUSSACK (Gouger): I support this short Bill. Another Bill, introduced in the House on August 15, provided among other things, for an increase in the driver's licence fee from \$3 to \$5, and the Minister of Transport said that 50c of the \$2 increase would be appropriated in the cause of road safety. When the previous Bill was being debated in Committee, I asked the Minister whether he could give me details of his plans for road safety, and he replied:

I will introduce legislation to amend the Highways Act, and road safety will be dealt with there. Of the \$2 increase in the licence fee, 50c will be devoted to road safety.

During the Minister's second reading explanation of the Bill now before us, he referred to Project 329, which would be introduced to curb the road toll. A report in the *Advertiser* of October 24 states:

The Government will launch a \$50 000 publicity campaign aimed at reducing the State's rising road toll. The Minister of Transport (Mr. Virgo) gave details of the campaign in the Assembly yesterday. He said the campaign would be called Project 329 and would be the largest publicity campaign S.A. had seen. It takes its name from the 1973 toll of 329 road deaths, and Mr. Virgo said it would be launched when this year's toll reached that level. Up to last night, 314 people have died on South Australian roads this year. Mr. Virgo said officers of the S.A. Road Safety Council were drafting the campaign. The Government would place advertisements in metropolitan, suburban and country newspapers and on television and radio. There also would be public displays and literature. The campaign was being launched in an endeavour to keep some people alive who perhaps otherwise would be killed.

It is a pity that this campaign must be delayed until we reach the total of 329 deaths registered on South Australian roads last year. As the Minister has suggested, every member of Parliament and all others concerned about the road toll are interested in methods that might save the lives of people who travel on our roads. I notice from the 1974 Auditor-General's Report that the sum received for licence fees in 1973-74 was \$1 726 986. By simple arithmetic I find that there are about 600 000 licence-holders in South Australia. Now that the sum to be contributed for road safety will amount to \$1 each licence-holder, the Government can now appropriate about \$600 000 towards road safety each year.

I do not know how much it costs to run the Marion safety centre or the driver education centre. Page 173 of the 1974 Auditor-General's Reports indicates that last year the Road Safety Council had allocated to it, \$166 000, of which \$147 000 was recouped from fees for drivers' licences and \$19 000 from the Commonwealth Government. Other money must have been appropriated during the year but not shown in the items to which I have referred.

I have said before in the House that the Marion safety centre serves a useful purpose, and I understand that plans are afoot for another school in the Elizabeth area. However, I believe that a need exists for education in other

fields. An enlightening report in the *Medical Journal of Australia* of September 28, concerning the hard facts of the influence of alcohol on serious road accident casualties, states:

This paper reviews the hard facts that have been obtained in Australia and elsewhere concerning the influence of alcohol in fatal and serious casualty road accidents. It is estimated that alcohol is responsible for between 40 per cent and 50 per cent of the fatalities and serious crippling injuries. It is concluded that, as it has been established that alcohol constitutes half of the causes of the most serious epidemic which faces mankind in the developed countries, the public should be persuaded that stern counter-measures must be enacted, many of which will involve curtailment, to a degree, of the individual's freedom when he takes advantage of the road systems in Australia.

All members will accept the report as factual and acknowledge that alcohol has a considerable effect on a driver's ability and is responsible for many road accidents. However, I am sure that many people are not aware of the minimum consumption of alcohol necessary to produce a blood alcohol level of .08 per cent. I stress again that there is a need for driver education. Undoubtedly education is being provided in the driving area, but there is an ever-increasing need for education on the consumption of alcohol in relation to the driving of a motor vehicle. This is a serious matter with which we must all be concerned. In this regard, I suggest that an education programme—

The SPEAKER: Order! Too much audible conversation is taking place. Too many members are in the aisles of the Chamber, which is not permitted, and too many are where they should not be.

Mr. RUSSACK: I suggest that every possible opportunity be taken to formulate educational programmes in this sphere so that people will be aware of the effect of alcohol on the road accident problem. This is necessary to a greater degree, because of the Bill dealt with by this House this afternoon seeking to extend hotel trading hours. If the Bill dealt with this afternoon is ultimately passed, hotels will be permitted to trade until midnight on Friday and Saturday. However, according to a medical officer to whom I spoke last week, it is at night, especially during the weekends, when most accidents occur. Therefore, I stress that, in the safety programme to be undertaken, efforts should be made to educate not only at the adult level but also at all other levels.

I refer to the summer, 1973, edition of *Road Alert* in which the Governor (Sir Mark Oliphant) contributes an article under the heading "A Road Safety Message from the Governor", with the subheading "Parents, schools 'must share responsibility' ". The Governor suggests that it is especially important for young people to be educated in every aspect of driving, with emphasis on the importance of not drinking and driving. In the spring, 1973, edition of the same publication, there appears a safety slogan for drivers, as follows:

Always drive so that your licence expires before you do.

Do not drink to the health of so many people that you lose your own.

Being in the right does not depend on having a loud voice.

If you want your life to be like sweet music, do not be too sharp or too flat—Be natural.

I commend the fact that \$1 of the increased licence fee provided by the Bill is to be appropriated for the development of road safety. In this regard I stress the importance of the continuation of driving schools, and the need to provide a greater and wider sphere of educational instruction on drinking and driving. It appears that speed is an important contributing factor in many accidents. Certainly, I do not suggest that country drivers are better than city

drivers, and I know that most fatal accidents occur on country roads, but there are some drivers (and this includes city drivers) who have been taught to drive on city streets where road surfaces are good, smooth bitumen. When these drivers go into country areas and drive on dirt roads, they often get into slides and skids, and it is in such a situation that trouble can begin.

Therefore, I suggest that, in driver training, any situation a driver might be confronted with in an emergency such as this should be the subject of intense and detailed education. In supporting the Bill, I accept that the total sum appropriated for this purpose will be used to promote road safety; indeed, if ever there was a time when the community needed this education and help in developing their road safety skills, now is that time. In commending the appropriation of \$1 from each driver's licence fee, I appeal to the Minister to ensure that the funds appropriated are used in the best way to develop greater road safety.

Mr. CUMBE (Torrens): I support the Bill. Normally, I would have some hesitation in supporting a Bill to increase the driver's licence fee, but in this case I believe it is the unanimous desire of all members to commend the purpose to which the main part of this increase in fee is to be directed. Unfortunately, I have seen and have suffered from the effects of road accidents, and all members, having seen some of the carnage resulting from road accidents, will support anything that can be done (certainly, it should be done) to improve road safety.

Sincere efforts have been made in the past by several organisations in South Australia to undertake road safety retraining or other preventive road safety programmes. Despite these sincere efforts, the road toll continues to increase year by year, and this is a great tragedy. Many reasons have been advanced to explain the cause of accidents. In his fine speech, the member for Gouger touched on several of these, but I refer now to the inattention of many drivers. The member for Gouger referred to training drivers, but it is easy to see how saints can fall; indeed, I refer to the case of Mr. Marples, the British Government Minister, who fell in related circumstances.

I believe that inattention on the part of many drivers is an important factor causing road accidents. I refer to boredom and the fact that many drivers believe that tragedy can never happen to them, although they believe it will happen to the next chap. Unfortunately, I have seen this sort of attitude. I now direct one or two comments to the Minister's attention so that, when he replies, he can provide the House with the correct information, because it will be most relevant during the later stages of the Bill. The Minister made a public statement, which has been referred to by the member for Gouger, concerning the direction the road safety programme will take. First, what funds, if any are being made available by the Commonwealth Government to augment the funds being provided under this Bill? This is important, because I believe that Commonwealth funds are available for this purpose, and I should like the Minister to elaborate on this matter. If we are to run a road safety scheme, it must be run properly. It must be a first-rate show.

Secondly, I am sure that the Minister, when devising the scheme to be introduced, worked with his departmental officers on the introduction of the programme, and I am sure he has already taken cognisance of the information available and has obtained advice from the many road safety organisations in South Australia. Certainly, I know of the liaison between such bodies, and I cannot speak too highly of the fine work they do. Has the Minister talked to his Commonwealth colleagues about this matter, because

there are many similar road safety organisations in other parts of Australia? I understand much research has been undertaken into road safety and the prevention of accidents on the road. In fairness to the House, I should like the Minister to say whether he is taking advantage of the research in this State, as well as the research at Commonwealth level. I include the official research as well as that done by voluntary bodies. We should be taking advantage of that, so that the project can go ahead as we hope. I commend the Bill to honourable members and I hope that, when the programme gets under way, it will do the job for which it was intended and that it will not get into the realm of earlier drives which, unfortunately, failed miserably because of the nut behind the wheel.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): Although I support the remarks of my two colleagues, I wonder if this legislation in one respect is not too late. One of the great problems facing any Government is to try to curb the actions of people on our roads. It has been a sad year in South Australia. *Road Alert*, the journal of the Road Safety Council, in its autumn edition editorial, states:

Monday, February 11, 1974, was just another day to most of us, marred only by a tragic and fatal shooting. However, there were no major fires and no hint of famine. There was a cool change on the way but there was no fear of heavy rain such as that which devastated Queensland. Monday, February 11 (the day this editorial was written) was, however, the 43rd day of the new year, and it was the day the State's road toll for the year reached 43 dead—14 (54 p.c.) higher than for the same period last year.

Unfortunately, this pattern has prevailed throughout the year, although we cannot explain why it has happened. In the same issue, under the heading "Police and publicity keys to fewer deaths", the journal states:

The Combined Operations Committee, comprising senior officers of the South Australian Police Department, the St. John Council, the Road Safety Council and a representative from the R.A.A., has proved that the presence of police vehicles combined with intensive publicity can reduce the road toll.

We hope that, with the launching of the \$50 000 campaign, every effort will be made to keep the road toll at the minimum level.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Do you agree with that?

Mr. BECKER: I do, and I support the legislation. The figures I have here are those for 1973. The committee went into action in the period of the Easter and Anzac Day holidays, the Labor Day holiday, and the Christmas and New Year period in 1973. For the Easter and Anzac Day period the predicted number of road deaths was 14 but, because of the tremendous effort by the police, the publicity, and the concentrated blitz, only two road deaths occurred. The prediction for the Labor Day holiday weekend was seven deaths, and three occurred. For the Christmas and New Year period the prediction was 14 deaths and, regrettably, six occurred.

A marked decrease was obvious in the number of fatal road accidents over these three holiday periods when the blitz went into full operation. Everyone concerned should be highly commended. The situation would have been ideal if the result had been no deaths on each occasion. One wonders how it is possible to bring in legislation to control the activities of people who are not willing to conform to the traffic laws. Those laws are designed to ensure that people can travel on the roads in safety. In the same issue of *Road Alert*, Mr. Donald Beard, the Australian Medical Association representative on the Road Safety Council of South Australia, states:

I never use the term "road accident"; in my opinion car crashes are due to bad driving—in one form or another. Personal negligence; not some quirk of fate, is the basic

cause for the terrible road toll which currently runs at 4 000 killed and 85 000 injured every year . . .

Mr. Beard quotes the various points he considers cause accidents. He states:

. . . the causes of bad accidents should be placed in the following order: Speed; alcohol; careless, selfish or foolish road behaviour—best summed up under the general heading of "bad driving"; unroadworthy vehicles. Apart from the obvious factors of bad brakes and tyres, these include new high-powered vehicles which have poor stability when driven at speed. "There is a tendency for people involved in a crash to try to divert the blame from themselves," Mr. Beard said.

The points he has made are quite valid. Speed is a major factor contributing to the road toll; people drive at speeds at which they cannot control their vehicles. Alcohol plays a major part in the road toll, but the most important point is careless, selfish, or foolish road behaviour. The careless person aims his vehicle along the road, not caring what is going on as long as everyone gives way to him. The selfish person demands the right of way and believes he is the only one who should be driving his car on the road; everyone else should get out of his way. Foolish behaviour, of course, is self-explanatory. Generally, bad driving can be seen on our South Australian roads. Even though I consider this campaign to be a little late, I hope it is not too late, because we could be starting a pattern to attack the road toll positively. I hope the campaign will not be a flash in the pan, but that it will continue and that the message will get through to the public that the holding of a licence to drive is a privilege, not a right.

The public must realise that the vehicles they drive can be lethal weapons; everything possible should be done to ensure that South Australian motorists are aware of the privilege of driving a car. I hope that Project 329 will be a major education programme. The Government, the Road Safety Council, and other bodies involved will receive the full co-operation of the media, which must be complimented on the responsible role taken in the past; no doubt that responsible role will continue. It has been said that the presence of marked police cars on our roads will cause motorists to observe the rules. However, I believe we should do as is done in New South Wales, and that the Police Department should be equipped with motor vehicles of various makes and models, painted in different colours, no different from other cars on the road. The car following any driver could be a police car. Although the Commissioner of Police keeps telling me that he has unmarked vehicles, he has not told me how many there are.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Should he?

Mr. BECKER: I do not want to know numbers, makes, or models, but I believe the department has a few cars which do not have the word "Police" on them and which are used for Criminal Investigation Branch work, as well as for other departmental work.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Bill contains only one major clause, on which the honourable member should concentrate his remarks. Anything outside of that is not permissible in this debate.

Mr. BECKER: Thank you, Sir. The whole point is that we are increasing the levy from the driver's licence fee that is allocated to the Road Safety Council. Last year this amounted to \$260 000, and in a full year one would expect it to be about \$550 000 to \$600 000. Undoubtedly, Project 329 will receive the co-operation of the various departments to which I have referred, including the Police Department. If we are to spend this \$50 000 wisely (and I have no doubt that we will get good value for it), part and parcel of that expenditure should involve the role that Government agencies can play in curbing our road toll. One

of those agencies is the Police Department, and the presence on the road of an unmarked police vehicle, which looks no different from any other vehicle, can be a great deterrent because, if one looks in one's rear vision mirror, one will not know whether that vehicle is a police vehicle. However, if one sees a police car in one's rear vision mirror, one immediately reduces one's speed and obeys the rules of the road, and when that vehicle turns off the road one returns to one's normal driving habits.

I hope that the committee responsible for this campaign will explain the give way to the right rule, about which there is much confusion. One move the Government has made is an in-depth study of autopsies of persons killed in road accidents. At last, we are obtaining statistics that will show the causes of road accidents. This is indeed a wonderful start, and it is a pity that we did not have this information in the past. Someone complained to me recently that he had failed his written test for a driver's licence three times because he had been unable clearly to explain this rule. That is fair enough. The complaint I received was that the examiner was being tough, but I do not think he was because, if a person cannot answer that question orally or in writing, he should not be able to drive. I believe that, in the interests of road safety, all motorists should undergo a practical and written test at least once every 10 years.

We should also examine the "stop" sign system and make drivers yield; in other words, a driver should have to give way to vehicles on his right and left in certain circumstances. I believe the Government is examining a priority road system that will assist traffic flow and improve road safety. One could go on all night making various suggestions. This campaign will not be successful unless all members, not only in this House but also in another place, as well as members of interested organisations and service clubs that have contact with the community, give it their whole-hearted support. Everyone should do what he can to ensure that our road toll is kept to an absolute minimum.

No-one would begrudge \$1 of his licence fee going to the Road Safety Council for the purposes outlined in the Bill. I notice in the journal to which I have referred that a driver's licence in Victoria costs \$12 a year, so perhaps we in South Australia are a little lucky having to pay only \$5. I do not think anyone would mind paying a little more, provided that that money was spent on road safety matters. It is a shame to think that we must go to this expense and trouble to ensure that motorists do not abuse the privilege they have been given.

Mr. Evans: By drinking?

Mr. BECKER: Yes, or by any other means. Perhaps unroadworthy vehicles should also be examined. Many vehicles involved in road accidents have various parts (such as lights) damaged and not repaired. This is indeed something on which we should crack down. I commend the Bill to all members in the hope that it will save many valuable and precious lives in this State.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I, too, support this worthy Bill. The purpose for which the money will be raised is a good one, and I commend the Government for taking this action. This is one of the few times when one can speak on a matter in this House in a non-political way, as everyone is concerned with road safety and the road toll. I should like the Minister to know that I am not in any way trying to be political when I say that it was a little unfortunate that Project 329 was set down to start at a time that coincided with what we all know will, unfortunately, be the 329th road fatality to occur in this State. In some ways, it is a pity that it was designed this way.

Perhaps it was done for shock effect. If so, I have no doubt that it will have that effect. However, it seems to me to be a little cold-blooded.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: You like to play politics.

Dr. TONKIN: I do not, and I do not think it does the Minister much credit to suggest that. I really consider that this could have been introduced in another way. Nevertheless, it is a good scheme. Education is most necessary today. Many points, which have been covered fairly extensively, have been made. I should like to make another two points. First, although education of young people is terribly important, we must not forget that older people also need to be educated. Indeed, we all need to be educated about our own capabilities and in relation to self-assessment. We must educate young people that to be able to drive a motor car is not just a status symbol or a manifestation of their adulthood. The permission to drive a motor vehicle that is granted by a driver's licence carries with it the responsibility to drive that motor car properly and to consider the safety of everyone on the road. This is important, as there are still people, young and old, who do not realise that they have a responsibility to everyone else on the road. For that reason, I think the second need (that of enforcement) is tremendously important.

I endorse what the member for Hanson said about unmarked police cars. If this money is to be useful in educating people effectively, there must also be a campaign of enforcement, such as that which has applied for two Easter weekends, when every available member of the Police Force has been put into his own vehicle (which has therefore become a "Q" car) and given his own stretch of highway to patrol, with great publicity being given to what was being done. In that way, our road toll has been significantly reduced. If that can be done over the Easter period, it could be done permanently, although not to the same extent. A big effect could be achieved by few police officers.

As honourable members may know, for one reason or another I have been driving on the Port Road between Port Adelaide and Woodville often during the past week and I have become sick to death, when driving in a traffic lane, of being passed on both sides by highly powered cars. I do not mind cars travelling more quickly than I am travelling. That is fair enough: if they want to break the speed limit, they can do so. However, I object to cars weaving in and out and lane jumping, to the definite danger of many other persons driving in that stream of cars, obeying the rules, and trying to travel safely. I am fed up with what is happening. That is not a reflection on the Police Force, as policemen cannot be everywhere at the one time. There would be psychological value in having police patrols in unmarked cars of different makes so that those people who now drive dangerously would think carefully before showing off and driving in a way that is a real danger to other road users.

The member for Gouger has dealt very well with the alcohol problem. I make the point that this scheme of education, worthy though it may be, will be of no value if we do not apply funds to research. Research is absolutely essential. We have had in this State a system whereby blood is taken from the victims of road accidents and the blood alcohol level is assessed. We have had progress reports from the Minister. I think the scheme has been in operation now for about a year, and I am looking forward with interest to the figures obtained from this scheme. If the figures are anything like those for Victoria, more than 60 per cent of all road accidents will

involve blood alcohol in excess of the legal limit. Until we have definite figures (and this was why the legislation was introduced), we cannot come to any firm conclusion about the relationship between alcohol and road fatalities. Having worked in a hospital casualty department and also having seen many other accidents, I have no doubt that alcohol is the major factor in road accidents at present, although many other factors are involved.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: There are other drugs, too, of course.

Dr. TONKIN: Yes, the Minister is right. It is just as easy to drive under the influence of marihuana, and with much the same effect. Nevertheless, the alcohol problem must be tackled effectively, quickly, and with vigor. The effects of alcohol on driving must be tabulated and the information must be absolutely clear, as I believe it will be. Then the situation must be dealt with firmly, and that comes back to enforcement. Basically, it goes back further, until we arrive, full circle, at education again, because the responsibility for the safety on our roads depends on every individual more than on anything else. All the education campaigns in the world cannot substitute the realisation that it is our responsibility to maintain our own safety, as well as that of passengers in cars that we drive and of everyone else on the road, pedestrians or otherwise. Basically, it is very much up to everyone in the community. I support the Bill.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport): The four Opposition members who have spoken in the debate have supported the Bill, and I thank them for that. The member for Bragg made a point about the name of the project, and the member for Hanson made an identical point when he purported to be the Liberal Party spokesman on road safety. A report in the *News* of October 25 states:

Liberal Party spokesman on road safety, Mr. Becker, said he was staggered that the Government was delaying the start of the campaign until this year's total reached 329. I regret that the member for Hanson and, apparently, the member for Bragg got the wrong idea. When launching the campaign last Thursday, I stated that I hoped that the backroom work necessary to get this campaign operating could be achieved so that it would be launched concurrently with the road toll figure being 329. It was not a matter of waiting. I think all members appreciate that campaigns of this kind just are not available on the shop shelf: they must be built up.

Dr. Eastick: The way your position has been promoted is unfortunate.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The way my position has been promoted by those people who either have not heard or understood what I have said is unfortunate. The Leader of the Opposition has been reported as stating that he was amazed when he read the Government's decision. If he had been in the House and had heard what I said, he would not have made that statement. We do not buy this kind of campaign like we buy a motor car, a washing machine, or a bale of wheat. The Chairman of the Road Safety Council gave instructions to the publicity agents.

Dr. Tonkin: The point is that I think it was a pity to fix on 329.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I suppose it is a pity to put any figure on it. The pity is that 329 people have been killed.

Mr. Venning: I agree.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: We agree on one point, so let us go ahead and stop trying to take political points. In that way, the Government will be able to proceed with its campaign.

Mr. Coumbe: Is there Commonwealth assistance?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I cannot give the honourable member precise figures, but I think the point is well taken. The Australian Government provides funds for publicity purposes, but I will seek the information and give it to the honourable member, rather than guess at this stage.

Mr. Coumbe: Is there a Commonwealth Government committee to help you, or have you had help from such a committee?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I fear that there are far too many committees that want to tell us what we ought to be doing and too few committees that are willing to do what should be done, if I may answer the honourable member in that way. I have an extremely high respect for the Road Safety Council and its officers. The Chairman, Bruce Boykett, is absolutely good news as far as South Australia is concerned; that would be the unanimous view of this House. Further, Mr. Plew and his officers are equally good news, and that, too, would be the unanimous view of this House. The fact that we have a statistical record that none of us is happy about is in no way due to the efforts of those gentlemen and the officers.

Mr. Venning: We're lucky to have them.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I agree.

Mr. Venning: But I do not know whether they're lucky

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am sure that the Chairman and the Secretary will make up their own minds without my prompting them at all. A very harmonious relationship has always existed and will continue to exist between those officers and me. I thank members opposite for their support, and I look forward to the speedy passage of the Bill not only through this House but also through the other place so that we may give effect to it as soon as possible.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Application of Highways Fund."

Mr. RUSSACK: What sum will be appropriated for the purposes of this Bill? It has been suggested that \$50 000 will be made available for the publicity campaign. In what other areas will money be made available in connection with the road safety programme?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport): The Bill will appropriate about \$270 000 or \$280 000 in a full year. The legislation for the increased licence fees became operative from October 1. Between October 1 and December 31 about one quarter of \$270 000 will be available; so, I suppose there will be about \$60 000, if there is a steady flow of funds. We expect to spend about \$50 000 on the publicity campaign. We hope to expand the activities of the Road Safety Council. At present, the only centre is in the southern suburbs, but we want almost a replica of that in the northern suburbs. We also want to expand our activities into the country. Next Friday the member for Mount Gambier will represent me at the opening of a road safety centre at Shepparton, in Victoria. It is a replica of what the people of Mount Gambier want to establish in their area. The same kind of centre could be established in other parts of the State. In the next three months we will concentrate on the publicity campaign.

Mr. RUSSACK: Is the driving school near Oaklands Road controlled by the Road Safety Council? Is money appropriated for the Road Safety Council used for that school?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Yes.

Mr. RUSSACK: I commend the Road Safety Council and the Police Department for their work. Does any money from this allocation go to the Police Department or is it financed from normal departmental sources?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not have the legislation before me at present, so I shall speak from memory. I think there is provision for about 6 per cent, up to a maximum of \$1 000 000, which the Treasurer can transfer from the Highways Fund to offset the cost of policing the roads. There certainly is a figure which this Government introduced to provide for the cost of policing roads. Of course, if there were no motor cars there would be no need for highway patrols. If the honourable member would like me to get more information, I shall be happy to do

so. I do not know how many members have seen the Road Safety Council's establishment in operation. If members would care to look at it, I am sure the council would be honoured to have members present. If the Opposition Whip informs me that Opposition members are interested, I shall be happy to make the facilities available.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.10 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, October 30, at 2 p.m.