

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, July 14, 1971

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

PETITION: LAND TAX

Mr. VENNING presented a petition signed by 1,027 electors who stated that factors beyond the control of primary producers, including low wool and meat prices and restricted cereal production, had contributed to primary producers' present unprecedented and depressed economic plight; and that these conditions, in turn, had induced uncertain overall sale prospects for rural properties and had reduced the expected current market realization of rural land by up to and in excess of 50 per cent. The petitioners prayed that the House of Assembly would immediately consider favourably a reassessment of the value of rural land in South Australia used for producing agricultural products, with the ultimate objective of rural land tax in this State being phased out and abolished in conformity with the practice in other States.

Petition received and read.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: ENTERTAINMENT TAX

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I ask leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government has reviewed the State's economic position and examined what revenue measures are necessary for this year. In addition, it has examined the cost of collecting entertainment tax as against the prospective revenue to be gained and, after a full review of the situation, it has decided that it should not proceed with collecting entertainment tax. This will mean that at the end of this month people who would otherwise be required under the legislation to make a return will not be required to make it, and legislation will be introduced as soon as possible to repeal the entertainment tax provisions. Also, revenue measures will be provided later this year that will take into account the prospective loss of revenue from this area. Those people who may have increased charges to the general public as a result of the imposition of entertainment tax will be expected to revert to the previously imposed charges. If they do not do that, they may find that the Prices Commissioner takes an interest in the charges they are imposing.

COMPULSORY UNIONISM

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That, in view of the intimidation of employees by union officials in South Australia, aimed at achieving union membership by compulsion and stand-over tactics, and the failure of the Government, and in particular the Minister of Labour and Industry, to protect these employees, this House condemns the Government, and calls for its resignation.

It is with much regret that I find it necessary to move this motion. I will anticipate some of the criticism of my motion that will be made by Government members by saying at the outset that it is not directed at unions as such; I have consistently supported the existence of unions and their work in relation to the employees in industry who are their members. In no way do I offer this criticism of union activities, and indeed of Government inactivities, as a criticism of the basic existence of the union movement: I want to make that clear now. When I first entered politics in 1959, the then State Government was actively engaged in promoting the physical build-up of this community, and it was extremely successful at doing that. The then Opposition (the Labor Party) was representing itself as the champion of the small man in this community. I remember the present Premier, who was then the back-bench member for Norwood, at various times championing the individual, whose lack of freedom in this community he regretted. Especially did the then member for Norwood criticize the Liberal and Country League Government of the day for its restrictions on social behaviour within the State.

Now we find the Premier leading a Government that is hell-bent on taking away the personal freedoms of the citizens of South Australia. I will quote a letter to illustrate the attitude of the present Government, for this is the attitude of a movement which has been generated through retail stores in Australia and which is now evident in the South Australian community. This letter, from a retail store to its employees, states:

After careful consideration, this company, together with the other major retailers, has now agreed to a change of policy. To all intents and purposes, this new policy means that the company must now expect you to join your appropriate union. The intent of this message is to convey to you the spirit of the company's decision to change its policy on unionism from one of "You may if you wish" to "You are expected to", and in so doing asks for your co-operation and support to save it from having to make embarrassing decisions. The employees of this firm were then asked to sign a card which states:

I hereby agree to become a member of the South Australian Branch of the Shop Assistants and Warehouse Employees Federation of Australia. I pledge myself to comply with the rules of the federation and its branches and with any amendments or additions which may be duly made to such rules.

Not only are employees in the retail trade in South Australia asked, at the penalty of embarrassing decisions, to join the appropriate union but they are also asked to commit themselves to unknown rules of the future, and there can be nothing more dictatorial and totalitarian than that. It is the same as asking this House to agree in blanket form, to proposals which may be put forward in three years time and which are as yet unknown to members.

Why is it that this is Labor's policy? If there is any doubt that it is Labor's policy, we can refer to the recent conference in Tasmania that the Premier attended on behalf of his Party, and I shall quote from the *Sunday Review* some comment concerning that conference. The report is written by a commentator who is known for his consistent support of the Australian Labor Party in this community. If the Premier requires from any other publication more support than he gets from the *Sunday Review*, he is greedy.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: The *Sunday Review*? You've got to be joking! Did you read the report about "Gorgeous Dunny" in it?

Mr. HALL: This writer who consistently favours the Australian Labor Party states:

But the major split was on the much-vaunted industrial policy and it was in this debate that it became clear that the unions, if they want to, still control federal conference and, through it, the Australian Labor Party. True, the majority was narrowed; it is probably as low as three votes in 47 now, and, true, they seldom want to use their majority. But in this case they did . . .

There is an extract that I will not provoke the House by reading, but I will paraphrase it. It states that they destroyed the Cameron-Hawke plan with considerable efficiency. The report also states:

It never came to a test vote. Bits were deleted by consent; other bits modified by consent and other bits referred to an outside committee by consent, but no-one had any doubt about who won.

I do not think the Premier can dispute that the union representatives on the Australian Labor Party Council at that particular conference carried the day by that type of decision. Therefore, we have an extremely good reason why the Labor Party in South Australia sup-

ports the type of compulsory unionism and intimidation that is proceeding in this community. There are other reasons, apart from the union control of the A.L.P. machine: there are financial reasons. The additional membership of unions attracted by these methods has a direct financial benefit for the Labor Party and, therefore, a direct financial benefit for this Government in its political activities. I draw attention to a notice of meeting of the Amalgamated Engineering Union issued last year. The heading on the notice states:

You are hereby summoned to attend the September star night meeting of your branch. The date, time and meeting place of each branch is set out on the back page of this notice.

The second page of this notice contains a reference to keeping financial:

To be financial and entitled to the benefits and rights of membership a member must have paid all contributions and levies due to the end of the quarter by the end of the first month of the quarter.

Under the heading "Levies" at the bottom of the page there appears:

Only adult members pay levies. The political levy is the only one chargeable in the October-December quarter and is 20c a quarter subject to the result of the ballot at the September star night.

The explanation given is that members are entitled to the benefits and rights of membership only if they have paid all contributions and levies, and the levy is 20c a quarter or 80c a year a member to the Australian Labor Party. It is not to the Liberal and Country League: I cannot imagine the Premier would want to claim that the levies go elsewhere. In the Amalgamated Engineering Union journal of July last year a reference to the political fund account states that for the half year ended March 31, 1970, receipts were \$20,927, plus a few other items, but on the payment side is shown a sum of \$18,783.88 as affiliation fees; election campaign expenses (I would not know where they were directed) is shown as just over \$1,000; and propaganda stands at \$1,000, which I take to be in the interests of union activities.

The interesting feature of that balanced account is the \$18,783 for affiliation fees. Obviously, this is money paid on behalf of the members of the A.L.P., and there is no doubt that the A.L.P. has a direct and vested interest in the increase of union membership. In fact, when we have a Labor Government we have only the Parliamentary wing of the Labor Party sitting in this House. We do

not have a group of members free to vote according to their deliberations at their Caucus meetings. We have members under the direct supervision of the outside Labor Party, and it is well to remember this chain of authority when one is considering compulsory unionism and its effect on management and the Government of the day. If we wanted any further example of how Labor Party members are directed from outside by the pledge they sign we have only to refer to the number of Labor Party members who stood on the platform at Elizabeth and said, in effect, how sorry they were that they were voting against the desires of the people of their district concerning shopping hours but that they had to do so because they had signed a pledge.

Three questions stand out from the present moves within this community. Should a person have to join an association against his will? Is this House to say that he should? Should he, against his will, be forced to support the A.L.P. through financial contributions? Under the rule of this union to which I have referred, if a member does not join he is not entitled to the benefits of that membership. If there happens to be a closed shop operating in an industry he would be denied employment and the right to earn a livelihood, because he refused to join that union. Previously, the Minister for Conservation, when Minister of Labour and Industry, was asked a question about the effect of political levies, but he denied any knowledge of such a levy and said he did not know what the questioner was talking about. Obviously, he was totally ignorant of the union movement or was being argumentative in his reply. So the question now to be asked is whether, if there is a closed shop and if an employee will not pay a political levy to that type of management of that type of union, he is to be without employment. Some unions have an escape clause in their rules. I think that the Electrical Trades Union has within its rules the provision that political levies may not be compulsorily collected, but it is obvious in the case to which I have referred that they must be; otherwise, on the union's own publication it is at fault.

One therefore must ask three questions: Should a person be forced to join an association against his will? Should he be forced to support the A.L.P. against his will? Should he be in a position of losing his employment if he does not do this? The answer to me (and the answer I believe for every member of the Opposition) is, "No, he should not." We

know that the A.L.P. itself is not a democratic body. It has its Federal conference not on the basis of participation of the population of each State, and the Premier knows that: it is on the basis of its membership regardless of the population of each State. Yet when a Labor Government is in office that conference is the effective Government of Australia.

One great fault in the claim for compulsory unionism today is the way some union elections are conducted (and I use the word "some"). I believe it is a fact that the Secretary of the Amalgamated Engineering Union is in his position with about 4 per cent support of his union membership at the last election. Members opposite can correct me if I am wrong, but I have been told that of the about 8,000 members of that union the number who voted was under 500. This does not present to those who are told they must join such an organization a basis for democratic decision and it is certainly no encouragement in this argument on compulsory union membership.

The unions certainly have an obligation in their own interests to present a much more co-operative and democratic front to the community they wish to serve. I had in my office yesterday a person who told me first hand that union representatives had come into his lunchroom and said bluntly, "You will join up, or this show will be closed." There was no approach on the basis of "We are here to represent the interest of employees and we offer you the services within our union." It was simply a blunt ultimatum to the people in that place, without any prior decent approach as we know it in business.

That type of attitude illustrates the distinction and the trouble around the position of union approach today. I believe that every union management should see to it that within the rules of the union a contract-out clause covering political levies should be provided. It should be impossible in Australia for any union to demand, as has been demanded, that a person, on the threat of not achieving full benefits and rights of a union, must contribute to a political Party. We should adopt the system applying in Great Britain where a contract-out clause has existed for some time, and the Royal Commission on Trade Unions and Employers' Associations, 1965-1968, had something to say about this matter. On page 240 of the document reporting the evidence of that Commission, there is a statement relating to the union situation at that time in Great Britain, stating that the average

annual contribution to unions' political funds in 1966 was 2s. 11d. for each member contributing. The following statement is made concerning contracting in and contracting out:

When contracting-in was substituted in 1927 for contracting out the result was to diminish very considerably the amount of money received by the trade unions' political funds; whereas when contracting out was restored in 1946 the contributions rose again. We have no doubt that this is due very largely to the innate reluctance of people to take positive steps involving the filling up and despatch of a form when only a very small sum is involved: and that the problem of contracting in or contracting out is not so much a question of industrial relations as a political question, namely, whether the Labor Party shall get the benefit of this reluctance or not. Parliament in 1913 enacted provisions (which were restored in 1946) in favour of members of trade unions who object to paying a political levy, enabling them to contract out if they wished, and we have no evidence to show that these are ineffective, and that the protection conferred by the Act of 1913 is illusory. In the circumstances, we do not recommend any change.

The essence of this is that a contracting-out arrangement is far more beneficial to the Labor Party than is a contracting-in arrangement and for that reason, and wishing to prevent any particular group from forcing people to contribute to a political Party in that most dictatorial way, I would support a contracting-in arrangement, wherein if people wanted to support the Labor Party the initiative would be on them to do so. However, in Australia we do not have a contracting-out arrangement by law, but we need one: Australia badly needs, on the industrial scene, to protect people who may well wish to join a union but who object to the political support they thereby give.

I urge that study to be made in Australia of the processes of creating at least a contracting-out arrangement, whereby all unionists (not just some) have the ability to avoid contributing compulsorily to a political Party, especially (in the most obnoxious way) contributing to a political Party they do not support. If people wish to support the opposite side, they must give two contributions to political funds. The Royal Commission to which I have referred goes into much detail. Although I do not know how much is based on this study, I notice that in recent times there have been moves in Britain to alter industrial legislation radically.

One proposal put forward by the Heath Government, I believe, is worth studying, namely, that agency shops be established on the majority vote of unionists within a certain shop and, if

the vote favours agency shops at the place of employment in question, all employees who are not members of the union concerned are expected to contribute to the union that acts on their behalf, but they are not expected to become members, and they are obviously exempt from making any form of political contribution. It seems to have been a worthwhile study in relation to this vexed question of compulsion, but it still requires a decision from the unionists in a shop, and I believe that it would obviously result in a middle course that could overcome the totalitarian methods being used today. What is happening at present? I am sure you will remember, Mr. Speaker, that last year the Minister of Roads and Transport became rather famous for the ultimatum he issued to the employees of his department, and I again quote from the directive he issued at that time, as follows:

To avoid the necessity of unions making direct contact with me in each instance, I would like you to arrange to appoint a departmental liaison officer whom the unions can contact should difficulties arise. It is my intention that such an officer would contact the employee concerned and offer him the necessary motivations to join the union by way of ultimatum.

It is history that following that release the Minister came under extreme pressure in this House and publicly, and subsequently rescinded these words, when he was deserted by his own Ministers who, having made public statements, would not support him at that time. Apparently, the Minister of Roads and Transport has been pretty effective in working on his colleagues, because there has been no public statement worth two cents from his colleagues in defence of the individuals who are being persecuted in this matter in South Australia today. By the silence of members opposite, the Government is guilty of neglecting these people and of abandoning them to what amounts to an industrial Mafia in South Australia today.

Members opposite may laugh, but would they laugh at the female employee of a motel who telephoned me yesterday morning and said, "I will not join a union, because of the political implications, and I will lose my job if I do not. All the men in this particular motel have been told that they must join a union, and they have joined; I have been told I must join the Clerks Union (I think it was) or else this motel will be out of bounds in respect of any supplies."

Mrs. Byrne: The Clerks Union does not have compulsory unionism.

Mr. HALL: Let us not quibble about the name of the union. This woman has been told that the operation of this business will be totally prejudiced unless she joins the union concerned. Do members opposite laugh at that? Is it funny?

Mr. Jennings: We're laughing at you.

Mr. HALL: The people who wrote to me a week or two ago may have been a little old-fashioned, but they at least expressed their sentiments effectively, after complaining about the intimidation in industry of their daughter: they said, "I wonder what happened to that old song that said, 'Britons never shall be slaves.'" As I say, that may be a little old-fashioned, but, if it does not convey anything to members opposite who support these stand-over tactics, I can only say that the population of South Australia is in for a bad time in the next 12 months. I received yesterday a letter signed by 35 bus drivers in South Australia complaining bitterly through their spokesman of the attack on their industry by the union concerned. They have been told by union representatives that all fuel deliveries to their company will be stopped if they do not join the union, and all parcel deliveries have already been stopped from city stores to the depot in question. As of yesterday, all mail has also been stopped, I believe, through the action of the Transport Workers Union. Therefore, people in country areas throughout South Australia are receiving mail, but for how long will this continue? Are these bus drivers disobeying any law in South Australia?

Perhaps it may amuse the Minister of Education further (he seems to think this is funny) if I quote the relevant section of the Industrial Code. Members opposite having the numbers, they are able to crush the Opposition and the people it represents. I apprised employees of retail traders of their rights under the Industrial Code, section 91 of which provides—

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation.

Mr. HALL: Section 91 provides:

(1) No employer shall dismiss any employee from his employment or injure him in his employment, by reason merely of the fact that the employee—

(a) is or is not an officer or member of an association; or

(b) is entitled to the benefit of an award, order or industrial agreement.

There is a penalty of \$100 for such a dismissal. When I publicly drew the attention of employees in industry to their rights under the law, which were established in the new Indus-

trial Code in 1967 (under a Labor Government), the Minister said:

I suggest that Mr. Hall would do more good to improve industrial relations in this State if he encouraged employers and unions to enter into agreements on industrial matters.

The Minister said that provision for legislation for the Industrial Commission to grant preference to unionists would be among amendments to the Industrial Code that he intended to introduce into Parliament this year. That means that the Minister will take away the protection that employees have at the moment. There can be no other meaning. Therefore, when I apprised employees of their rights, the Minister simply said that he would take those rights away by giving preference to unionists instead of maintaining the law as it is framed today, whereby it legally prevents intimidation. What statement has the Minister made informing employees of their rights? Has he been to any group that has been threatened by industrial action and told it that the Government will stand by it?

The Hon. D. H. McKee: I haven't had to.

Mr. HALL: Of course he has not; he has stood by while people are being pushed, pulled and stamped into the mould desired for them. The attack is well planned. It is not just that the Minister is standing by: I believe the Ministry is fully aware of and concurs in what is taking place. Otherwise, the Premier, who has always made out that he is a champion of the little people, would take action. However, he is going overseas, perhaps like Mr. Whitlam to get preselection in China. As someone suggested the other day, if he gets that far, although he may want to take tea with the Opposition Leader there, he will have to look hard to find one in China. The other day, owners of a business, who want to tender for an important contract in South Australia worth hundreds of thousands of dollars not just to management but to employees as well, came to see me. They had been told that, if the goods concerned could not be delivered as a result of industrial trouble, they would not get paid for them, and this almost completely inhibited their interest in the matter; they could not stand the risk involved. It so happens that they have a mixed shop: some employees are unionists and some are not. These people do not discourage unionism, but approve of unions whose basic charter for operating is to improve the living conditions of their members. This company does not force its employees to join unions, so it has been put in a most difficult situation. If it does not succeed, the supply of these goods is likely to come from another

State, and South Australians will again suffer. In another document recently, the Government said that it pursues industrial development; but I say it has not caught it yet. What I am talking about has had wide ramifications. Dealing with Government policy, I recently received the following letter from the President of the Australian Federation of Civil Engineering Contractors:

A new clause is now attached to the contract documents of State Government departments, which reads:

"In engaging labour preference of employment shall be given to financial members of a union appropriate to the position of employment provided that the contractor shall not be compelled to give preference to any member of such a union who may have been discharged for dishonesty, misconduct, or neglect. In the event of no financial members of any union appropriate to the position of employment being adequately experienced in and competent to perform the position of employment, employment may be given to an unfinancial member or person being a non-member of a union and it is expressly agreed that in the event of the contractor sub-letting any part of this contract the contractor shall include this condition as a term of such sub-letting."

The Australian Federation of Civil Engineering Contractors strongly objects to the principle of having this clause inserted in contract documents and seeks your assistance in having it removed. It is our belief that such a requirement will be used to prevent employment of local or casual labour on country projects, will hamper the contractor's work progress by the possibility of having to import labour from distant places to find unionists with the right skills, and prejudice the employer's right to hire and fire fairly.

As far as I know, that condition applies to all Government contracts today, and I have read what the federation thinks about it. I have personally been involved in numerous instances that I have outlined, but I am sure that I have heard from only a few of these people affected. I have had an approach from shop assistants who believe they are being intimidated in a letter sent to them; I was approached yesterday by the girl from the motel who said how much her rights were being prejudiced by the demand to which I have referred; yesterday I was also approached by 35 bus operators, who gave me the right to use their names if I desired and who utterly rejected this industrial Mafia-type of attack on their freedom; and I have been approached by an industry whose large order is being prejudiced by this union demand. No doubt there are many other cases.

I have one case on my desk at present, but I have not followed it up, as there is no

need. We know (and members opposite know) that a consistent and concerted move is being made to force every employee into an association. The effects of this will be financially beneficial to the Labor Party, and all-union labour will be directed industrially much more easily than would be the case if it were non-union labour. The situation is that people in the community are hostile, believing that unions are stepping out of their charter and away from their objective, which is to improve the living standards of their members. They are stepping into the situation of running the State and the country. The position is that the Industrial Code may well be contravened by those employers who threaten those whose employment is affected. In spite of all this, the Minister's reply has been that he will take away the present protection in the Industrial Code. Where will this lead? Perhaps it will lead to the description of Broken Hill to which I shall refer, and all South Australian citizens would do well to consider the situation in that city. This description was given a few years ago and stands as true today as it ever did. The report, headed "Broken Hill: a benevolent union dictatorship", states:

One hundred per cent unionism lies near the core of Broken Hill's curious democracy-dictatorship pattern of life The B.I.C. has almost frightening control of Broken Hill; no individual escapes its scrutiny. It not only endorses the industrial agreements drawn up each three years to cover Broken Hill's 6,000-odd miners; it keeps a strict watch on every one of those miners—and the town employees.

We have a Badge Show Day for unionists every three months. No man, boy or girl can work on that day unless they are wearing badges—if they haven't got badges no other unionist will work with them; they're finished. If an employee in a shop isn't wearing a badge people will walk out; they won't buy. And if an employer wants to employ non-unionists, he'll be blackballed—Day shift miners wear big round red badges, afternoon shift men blue badges, and night shift men yellow badges. Town employees wear small green ones. Mine badge-show rules are plain: No man can start work without a badge Badges must be displayed on wearing apparel when passing stewards, and worn for the whole of the shift Men are asked to report to the stewards when they know of anyone who misses the badge show If you stay home on Badge Show Day, you have to have an all-clear from your union secretary within 48 hours.

If we want a picture of future South Australia, let us look at Broken Hill, and I guess that, under Broken Hill conditions, every person, as he walked up Rundle Street or Hindley Street or went through the factory gate, would have to show his badge. Is this what members opposite want? Do they want to reduce South

Australians to a sort of what they would call, I suppose, a benevolent dictatorship? They say, "We will be good to everyone as long as you like. You will like democracy our style." I call for the utmost condemnation of the desertion by this Government of the interest of hundreds of thousands of South Australians.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I second the motion and support what the Leader has said. The fundamental objections that we on this side have to the attitude and the action (or, rather, the lack of action, I am afraid, in many cases) of the Government is that it is encouraging compulsory unionism. The arguments in principle against compulsory trade unionism are overwhelming. Fundamentally, it is the denial of the right of a person to choose what he shall do, provided he does not break the law. That is the fundamental point at issue in this matter, and I consider that some members opposite would agree with me if they were free to give their own personal views. Let me enlarge on what I have said by quoting just one or two texts all of which I think members opposite will acknowledge should have some authority. First, I will quote again what I quoted last year. I refer to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Mr. Payne: What about—

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Let the member for Mitchell listen to what I have to say. Article 20 (1) provides:

Everyone has the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association.

Let the honourable member mark this particularly:

(2) No-one may be compelled to belong to an association.

I take my stand on that, as I consider every other member in this House should do. However, if that is not good enough for members opposite let us consider a few other comments that their Leader has made. About 15 months ago, when the present Premier delivered the policy speech of the A.L.P., in the first paragraph he referred to new freedom for the individual. That is what he was going to give South Australia. The complete statement was as follows:

Labor comes to these elections with the most comprehensive plan for change and growth any State has seen since Federation. It's a plan for action now—with new ideas in development, new approaches in education, new planning for the environment, new freedom for the individual, and new, real, strong economic and legal protection for everyone.

Well, that has started to ring rather hollow already. Members opposite may say, "Well,

that was Party policy then. It is rather different when we are in office. The Leader had to say that because it was what the Party wanted him to say." If members opposite say that, let us consider a report that the Premier wrote, entitled "Civil Liberties in the Seventies" in the Winter, 1970, issue of the *Australian Humanist*. In the report, which runs for several pages, the article canvasses the question of civil liberties in the community and I will read from the third paragraph of the report. I think that is enough. It is only a preamble to another in which he sums up the matter. The article states:

There are practical and moral arguments for those civil liberties which we should, ideally, all enjoy, and I think that recently we have also been given a scientific argument.

The article goes on to quote extensively from Arthur Koestler. The Premier sums it up when he is speaking as a legislator, and the article states:

Now, as a legislator, I believe that there are only two positions I can with honesty take when it comes to considering our civil liberties. The first is that the laws a community enforces should be designed solely to allow the members of that community to live together amicably, and the second is that no-one in the community has the right to lay down that a certain code of behaviour should be observed by everyone in the community, regardless of the effect such a code has on individuals in the community.

He then goes on to speak of censorship, and so on. That is how the honourable gentleman summed up his personal views on civil liberties and their importance, and I agree with what he said then. Unfortunately, his actions as Leader of this Government speak rather more loudly than the brave words that he used in his policy speech and in the report in the *Australian Humanist*. In past years the Premier was fond of addressing groups on a topic that he entitled "Why, as a liberal, I am Labor." He gave that address many times and it was, of course, a take-off of the Liberal and Country League. I can tell the Premier why, despite his words, he can never be a liberal. The reason is that his actions as Leader of this Government show that he does not believe in liberalism, because liberalism emphasizes the freedom of the individual. Liberalism means the freedom of people to associate or not to associate as they see fit. The Premier's Government, by its actions through himself, and more particularly through the Minister of Labour and Industry, betrays that principle.

Mr. Venning: They do not have any say.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will come back to that point in a moment. At present I am showing what the principle is, and showing that he and his Party give no more than lip service to that principle. If we want to go further and leave these principles, let us consider the law of this State, as the Leader of the Opposition has already done. In the Industrial Code, sections 91 and 92 protect people who are not unionists against damage or injury that may be done to them in their employment. It may well be that the Minister of Labour and Industry intends to introduce amendments to repeal these provisions and to replace them with others that provide for preference to unionists, which is the official policy of his Party, or for compulsory unionism; but I do not know. However, I remind Government members that the Industrial Code as it stands now is the law in South Australia, and the Government is not above the law, whether it thinks it is or not. It must observe the law until it is altered in Parliament. Section 91 (1) provides:

No employer shall dismiss any employee from his employment or injure him in his employment by reason merely of the fact that the employee (a) is or is not an officer or a member of an association.

The penalty for that offence is \$100. That is not the line of action being taken by the Minister and is not the line of action being encouraged by the Premier or any Government member. We have said these things in the House before: we said them last session when the incident to which the Leader of the Opposition has referred occurred and when the Minister of Roads and Transport used that most ill-advised phrase that people should be obliged by way of ultimatum to join a trade union. What we have said is absolutely true, and the only reaction we have had from the Premier is to totally ignore these matters and to say rather lamely that people should not have the benefits of trade unions without joining the unions. That is all he ever says or can say about this matter.

I believe the non-trade-union members opposite would agree with my point of view, and I believe the Premier, if he was a free agent, would like to agree, too, and that the Minister of Education and the Attorney-General, who would make up three Ministers on the front bench, would agree with what I have said if they were free to do so. I think the member for Mawson and probably the member for Playford would agree with what I have said if they were free to express their opinions, but they are not free to express their opinions

because they are a minority in their Party and the majority of the Parliamentary Labor Party has a trade union background. We know this: it is obvious by looking at them. The present Minister of Labour and Industry said that he owed his election to the Ministry to the fact that his was a victory for the trade union wing of his Party. He said that only a few months ago when, to the intense surprise of everyone else in South Australia, he was successful in obtaining the vacancy that had been created for a tenth Minister.

The trade unions and trade unionists do not agree with the argument I have advanced in favour of liberty and personal freedom, because they are interested only in the well-being of the organization that they represent in this place, in increasing the power of those organizations and their financial structure. They control the A.L.P. Last year I referred to the fact that the number of trade unionists and the proportion of them in the community was decreasing and that they were in trouble. This is one reason why, since this Government came to office, a campaign has been started to increase membership by compulsion. I was laughed at by Government members when I said that, but a few weeks ago I had confirmation of it from one who stands pretty high, I understand, in the Australian Labor movement—Mr. Clyde Cameron. The headline (and I do not know whether the Premier will say that the *Australian* is an anti-Labor paper) in the *Australian* of June 24 states:

Trade unions dying, M.P. warns Labor. The Australian trade union movement was dying and the time was coming when union officials would be reduced to the role of debt collectors, the Labor Party's Federal spokesman on industrial relations, Mr. C. R. Cameron, said yesterday.

That is one of the fears that undoubtedly is in the back of the minds of Government members and their friends in the A.L.P. That wing of the Party is led by the Minister of Roads and Transport, Mr. Virgo, to whom reference has been made already. His was the phrase (and I have used it before) to contact the employee concerned and offer him the necessary motivation to join the union by way of ultimatum. We have seen this in Government departments and we have seen it on Kangaroo Island in one incident last year, and in other incidents to which the Leader of the Opposition has already referred. If the Premier has his way the A.L.P. will gain a middle-class image, and it has had some success in doing this. However, it could never succeed in the long run, because of the deep

division between those who want this image (and the Premier is one of the most prominent) and the trade unions, which are the backbone of the Labor Party. The A.L.P. is a trade union Party and it is organized and controlled by trade unions. I can tell the Premier what he already knows in his heart of hearts: that he will never succeed in the long run in turning his Party into a middle-class liberal Party, which is what he would like to do if he were a free agent.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Not in your terms.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: And not in the Premier's terms, either. Many things are changing in our community and the rate of change is, if anything, accelerating. Some of these things are good but many are alarming, and one of the most alarming is the lesser value that is being put on human freedom and the freedom of the individual, and compulsory unionism is one of the worst manifestations of this. We on this side are not willing to stand by idly and see this happen without protesting. We will lose this vote for the reason about which we complain: that members opposite are bound to support their own Government. However, although we lose this vote we are confident that on this motion we are speaking for most South Australians.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): At the outset, I refer members to the wording of the motion and point out that this was a matter which, apparently, was one of grave urgency arising from immediate cases of compulsion, stand-over tactics, and the failure to protect employees, which led to a motion of no confidence in this House transcending all the other business of this House. We sat to listen to what were these instances of compulsion, stand-over tactics, intimidation and failure to protect employees by the Minister of Labour and Industry that would bring the Government down.

What did the Leader of the Opposition have to say on that score? The Deputy Leader had practically nothing to say, because most of his time was spent in offering an analysis of the Labor Party position. But what did the Leader have to say as the main gravamen of his argument that there were intimidation, compulsion and stand-over tactics in relation to employees in South Australia? He read out one letter, and that was not from a union at all: it was from an employer in South Australia saying to his employees, "In future we expect employees of our organization to be members of a trade union."

That, apparently, represents compulsion and stand-over tactics by a trade union. The Leader knows perfectly well that the union involved was the Shop Assistants Union. The last I heard was that its affiliation to the Labor Party was not extant, but, be that as it may, where were the stand-over tactics by the Shop Assistants Union? What had happened was that the employer organization involved had chosen to negotiate with the employee organization and to say that the best way in which to ensure that there were effective relations between employees and employers was to have all employees in the one organization so that effective negotiations regarding terms and conditions of their employment could be conducted. That is not new in South Australia: that is the position in much of the industry in this State. Indeed, it is the position under the Municipal Tramways Trust, originated under a Liberal Government. Indeed, Sir Thomas Playford set that up.

What is the Opposition doing in denying to employers in this State the right to arrange that the people whom they employ shall be unionists? Why is the freedom of contract to employers to employ those people with the qualifications that they expect to be denied to them? Why is this motion addressed to the Government and not to the employers concerned? We heard about that later in the Leader's speech, because what he is worried about is not whether there are going to be effective contracts between employers and employees to ensure that there are smooth methods of arriving at reasonable industrial conditions by negotiation, conciliation and arbitration: what he is worried about is that some of the unions in South Australia are affiliated to the Labor Party. He went on with the long diatribe on contracting in and contracting out of political levies made by trade unions. That is not a new thing in South Australia. In fact, the present system under the Industrial Code again arose from legislation introduced by an L.C.L. Government.

I am surprised that the Leader should be raising this matter of compulsory levies on people in organizations in South Australia towards political activity, because one needs only to look at the results of political levies on people involved in organizations to see where the money goes, and the money does not go to the Labor Party. Let us look at the number of employers in the Leader's organization in South Australia and at the employees we have: his organization has five times as many as has ours. Whence

does the money come? Not from the Leader's impoverished farmers, but from the commercial organizations, the employers, and how many shareholders get a direct vote or even any question put to them as to how much of the money earned by the company in which they have invested any money goes to the L.C.L.?

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Not one of them!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The matter is not even mentioned at the annual general meeting, nor is it reported. Members opposite know that in the company balance sheet it is not mentioned; nor is it referred to in the directors' report to the shareholders. However, we all know where the L.C.L. gets its money, and what right has any shareholder to contract out of having some profit from the company from which he has his money paid to the L.C.L.? Do we hear members opposite getting up and inveighing against the Government's failure to protect shareholders from this compulsory levy on their money!

Dr. Tonkin: You aren't compelled to become a shareholder.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: One is not compelled to work in a certain vocation, either. The honourable member knows perfectly well that he does not have to invest his money in something, and he does not have to work at anything either. The same choice exists in both cases!

Dr. Eastick: He just sits down and does nothing!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am sure the honourable member would not just sit down and do nothing. The extraordinary double values of Opposition members are evident from the way they have proceeded this afternoon. Where are the intimidation and stand-over tactics they have talked about? Certainly, this Government has a policy of preference to unionists, and this is a normal course that exists in a whole series of awards and decisions of arbitration and conciliation tribunals in Australia. It is perfectly proper for members of an organization engaged in endeavouring to improve the conditions of employees to say, "We do not choose to work with people who are not going to contribute to the gaining of better conditions but who are going to sit there and bludge on the rest of us by taking the benefits we get without making a contribution."

Mr. Mathwin: That's a weak argument.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I can assure the honourable member of that, as a union secretary myself. The Deputy Leader said that he knows those of us on the front bench who have never been trade unionists. I have

been a trade unionist, and I still am. I have had to take action as a union secretary when people chose to take advantage of the expenditure of their fellow employees in gaining good conditions and to make no contribution and say, "You can go ahead, but we will not pay anything towards it." They demanded to get the benefits all right, but they were not prepared to make their contributions. My attitude was plain, and so was that of the rest of my fellow unionists: "If that is your attitude and you will not join with the rest of us in paying your contributions towards getting these benefits, we are not going to work with you to see that you get the benefits." That is a perfectly reasonable attitude, but it is not confined to employee organizations. I do not hear members opposite rising and complaining of the situation existing in certain employer organizations in South Australia whereby entry to an industry of employers is refused unless the people concerned conform to the conditions of the employer and trade organization and make their contribution to it.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: How did Griffs get on?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. What about the Furniture Trades Association? Do members opposite get up and complain that there are stand-over tactics, compulsion and intimidation in this area of industry? I do not hear members opposite doing it, yet no-one can get into that area without conforming to the rules and making their contributions. It is perfectly reasonable that in each area of industry effective organizations should be involved in each section of conciliation, arbitration and conclusion of industrial matters, but it is not really this question of whether people should be involved in a social organization affecting their avocation that worries members opposite: having got a much larger sum of money to run political campaigns than the workers' organizations of South Australia have got, they are keen to see that the workers' organizations do not get money from those whom they represent.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Obviously, members opposite did not listen to the speeches of the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader, who bitterly complained that we should be getting money from political levies.

Mr. Millhouse: I didn't mention that.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I refer to political levies decided on by a majority of the organization concerned, and the majority of members have to decide where their money is

going for political purposes because, after all, they have to decide where their political advantage is. It does not always come to the Labor Party; it sometimes goes elsewhere. Members may recall that the South Australian Institute of Teachers spent much money in putting up a candidate against us at the last Commonwealth elections.

Mr. Hall: Against us, too.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: He was put up against you, too. I only know that in every district in South Australia one side of the card gave preference to the Liberals and one side gave preference to us. The Leader of the Opposition said that three questions should be answered: In relation to the membership of a trade union, should a man be forced to join? The answer is that, if he wants to work in an avocation with other employees and if he does not join the association representative of those employees he may well have to expect that the rest of the employees will not be willing to associate with him.

Mr. Millhouse: That's a long way of saying "Yes", isn't it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The next question was: Should he be forced to support the Australian Labor Party, if he is a member of an organization which decides in the majority to put its money to the A.L.P.? I should think that there was no more reason to condemn than there would be to condemn the directors of companies who decided, without consulting their shareholders, that the shareholders' funds would be spent to support the L.C.L. The next question was: Should people be in the position of losing employment if they will not join? If the employer has decided that the best course for him in the course of his business is to negotiate with an employee organization and to employ only members of that organization, I see no reason why the employer should not adopt that practice.

Indeed, that practice was widespread under Liberal Governments in South Australia. When it was instituted under Liberal Governments in South Australia, members opposite were completely silent, and their attempt to condemn the present Minister of Labour and Industry, who was in no way consulted about what was a free contract between employer and employee, for his failure to intervene and to deny to employers their freedom of right to contract is completely hypocritical.

The SPEAKER: Before the member for Torrens commences his speech, I draw honourable members' attention to the new timing

device, which is set for the commencement of the speech. I regret that I did not inform the member for Mitcham of this when he rose to speak, but I make it known to all honourable members now. The device indicates the time that honourable members have left to make their speech.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): We have just listened to the Premier putting up a poor defence to this motion. We have heard his usual mouthing of smooth evasions, and throughout his speech he was trying to sidetrack us from the real issue, which is directed against the Government, and against the Minister in particular. The Premier started by criticizing the Opposition regarding its democratic rights in this House, as an Opposition, to bring on this matter ahead of other business. These were the words used by the Premier. I believe the Opposition, as a Party, would be failing in its duty if, on the first occasion available to it after the opening of this new session, it did not bring this matter forward. As the Premier went on, it was noticeable that he gradually tried to shift the blame in this matter to the employer organizations. Who started the ball rolling?

The Premier tried to assert that it was the employer organizations, but let us not be quite so naive as the Premier. Who started the ball rolling, and who put the pressure on the employer organizations in the first place to bring about the situation being debated? Most of us have had sufficient experience in industrial matters to know where these things originate. The Opposition, in bringing forward this matter, speaks for the little man in our community; the individual; the man who cherishes his rights and freedom in this State; the person who is being pushed around more and more today and who is being pressured against his will, as has been illustrated in recent press reports and also as has been clearly shown by the matters referred to in the speeches of the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader. This is coercion, quite openly and blatantly, of employers and employees alike. Employers are being coerced because of the industrial action that will be taken and is being taken at present against those employers who do not agree that all their employees shall be members of the appropriate union, regardless of the wishes of the employees. If an employer does not agree, his shop will be declared black or his goods or mail will not be delivered; his services will be restricted. The Leader has mentioned one employer who is likely to have his purchasing rights or his ability to sub-let

contracts severely limited; in other words, he will not be able to run his own business, as he will have no say in what he can do. This may affect his ability to provide greater employment opportunities. Workers are being coerced to join unions; their jobs will be in jeopardy unless they join the appropriate union. What about an employee who does not want to join a union?

Mr. Langley: But wants the raise.

Mr. CUMBE: The honourable member might be able to join the shirt-tail wagers union. The person who does not want to join a union will not be able to get a job in any organization, irrespective of age, sex or qualifications. I hope we are not working towards the position that obtains at Broken Hill, which has been described as the walled city. Many of us who have been there know of the badge days, closed shops and other restrictions. As I know that the new member for Adelaide is well versed and experienced in union matters, I am glad that he is listening to this debate.

In South Australia today there are moves not towards preference for unionists but towards compulsory unionism, and that is the direct implication of what we have been discussing. As has been pointed out, this is directly against the law, as specifically expressed in the Industrial Code. Under his oath of office, the Minister of Labour and Industry must uphold the laws under his administration. If he wants to alter those laws subsequently, that is a different matter. However, he and the Government are responsible for upholding the present laws. Therefore, the actions we have been talking about are illegal. Not only are the pressures, which are being put on employers and employees, against our law but they are contrary to the Declaration of Human Rights of the United Nations, to which the member for Mitcham has referred. Workers are being forced to join unions against their will. This is just another freedom that this Government, which once proudly said "Labor is people", is whittling away. Last session we saw the Government introduce legislation that whittled away several other freedoms. In his policy speech in May last year, the Premier said that many freedoms would be introduced, but instead there are fewer freedoms today and more and more compulsions being introduced.

I believe the Government and the industrial wing supporting it are hell-bent on compulsion in many forms, but this compulsion stops short at a significant level. We do not find compulsory voting provided for union elections.

Employees are compelled to join unions, but there is no compulsory vote if a strike is held: it is one out all out. Reference has been made to the affiliation of unions to political Parties, but I do not want to develop that except to say that it is as plain as a pikestaff that one effect of increasing union membership is to tie more and more people to the influence of the Labor Party, whether or not those people want that to happen. Therefore, there is naturally an electoral advantage to the A.L.P. I have worked all my life with people belonging to several unions, and I am proud of that association. I have always supported the principle behind the trade union movement, and I believe in it.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Which union did you join?

Mr. CUMBE: Which one did you join? I have publicly stated my support of the trade union movement, and I supported it when I was Minister of Labour and Industry. No-one can deny that I have stated inside and outside of this House my support of the principles of trade unionism. However, I have never supported a person's being compelled against his will to join a trade union. A few years ago, under Sir Thomas Playford, South Australia had one of the best employer-employee relationships in the Commonwealth, as is shown by statistics. One result of this was that this State progressed and advanced remarkably in industrial expansion and establishment and we were able to secure markets in other States for goods produced in such quantity in South Australia that we could not sell them all on our home market here. Unfortunately, in the last year or so this advantage, which is so vital to South Australia, has been dissipated rapidly and thrown away.

Let us consider what is happening today in one or two of our unions in South Australia, to which this motion refers. The Shop Assistants Union has been mentioned specifically. I know the Secretary of that union and have attended many conferences with him. I consider him to be a responsible officer who does his job well. Unfortunately (and I am sure many members opposite will agree with me in this), responsible and democratically-elected trade union leaders are having trouble at present in some unions because of breakaway groups within the unions. These groups are not elected democratically at annual meetings and they are bedeviling the democratically elected officials.

One example is the trouble occurring in the Vehicle Builders Union. I know that the member for Albert Park would probably be the first to agree with me on that. We know the problems we are having at Elizabeth and, unfortunately, unions are squabbling among themselves. An example of this is the trouble between the Vehicle Builders Union and the Amalgamated Engineering Union. The member for Playford knows of the trouble with the famous Mr. Robinson in what used to be the Builders Labourers Federation. Of course, in South Australia, as elsewhere, we have had closed shops for many years. This was brought into operation some time ago and in this motion we are not referring to those shops. However, I consider that to tell an employee that, if he does not join the particular union, his employment will be prejudiced is to violate two fundamental principles of our Australian way of life and our Australian concept of fair play and justice. The first of these principles is the law itself and the second is the democratic right of the individual. The law is quite plain and the Minister's job is to uphold it. The democratic right of the individual is being whittled away in this case. To sum up, I say—

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Say something!

Mr. COUMBE: I was wishing that the Minister would say something.

Mr. Jennings: Well, sit down and give him a chance.

Mr. COUMBE: I am pleased to see the wandering member for Ross Smith back with us again and we await with pleasure the words of wisdom that he has gathered overseas. The Minister of Labour and Industry and the Government, by approving of the actions taken by unionists in this matter, stand condemned.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: How many times did you intervene on these matters when you were Minister?

Mr. COUMBE: I do not know what the Minister of Education is talking about. The Government, by its inaction in this regard and by not upholding the laws and the rights of the individual, stands condemned and is worthy of censure. That is why the Opposition has moved this motion at the first opportunity in this new session of Parliament. We believe in the rights of the individual and we speak on behalf of the little people in our community. We speak on behalf of people who have individual rights and who cherish a freedom that has been fought for for so many years. The Leader has moved the motion on their behalf, and I support it.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE (Minister of Labour and Industry): First, I should like to know just what the Opposition had in mind in moving this motion, which implies that the Government directs unions in respect of their activities. That is how I see it.

Mr. Rodda: That's how you want to see it.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: Members opposite continually tell us that we take directions from the Trades Hall, but the motion implies that the Government directs unions in respect of their activities. Those two attitudes are direct opposites. Previously allegations have been made that the trade unions direct the Government in regard to its policy. The Opposition is hardly being consistent. One minute it says that the trade unions are directing us and, when it suits the Opposition, it says that the Government is directing the trade unions. Members opposite are having 20c each way.

The Leader and those who followed him in this debate have spoken such foolish drivel that a person in the street could hardly believe that members who have been here for so long, representing the people of this State, would speak on such a political gimmick as this. It is astounding. Unless he was in the House, a person would not believe that members opposite would make such statements. I can imagine what would happen if I told a person in the street about this great nation rocker in Parliament House this afternoon. The *Advertiser*, which supports the Opposition so well, hid the report that this motion would be moved today in a report about 1in. long. Members opposite could buy a better gimmick than this at any supermarket.

The Leader, by his own foolish actions since he has been in this House, has put the nail in the L.C.L. coffin for many years. He has admitted already that the L.C.L. will be out of office for 12 years, and the period will be much longer now. None of his supporters could honestly say to him "Steele, you did a good job down there today." If I was the Leader, I would take to the bush: I would not go to that club on North Terrace. The Leader wanted a peg on which to hang his hat and he hates the trade union movement. He said he was jealous because the trade union movement made contributions to the Australian Labor Party funds.

Mr. Jennings: He was envious.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: Yes. He has acted from pure hatred of unions. How many times did Sir Thomas Playford say, "If a

unionist walked on to my property, I would consider shooting him"?

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Sir Thomas Playford did not say that.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: He did say it, when we were discussing awards for rural workers. The honourable member would always support Sir Thomas, I am sure!

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: You know very well he did not say that.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: Would the member for Alexandra support an award for rural workers? Of course he would not, and I would not expect him to. The Leader said that, when he became a member in 1959, democracy prevailed as did the freedom of the people. How could he say such a thing when there was no equality of voting for members of this House? How can he justify the situation in the Legislative Council today when he is speaking about democracy? I remind him that he is now living in the 1970's with a democratic Government in power, and that he has to accept the opinion of the people that the principle of trade unions is here to stay, and that trade unions are accepted by employers. Agreement has been reached with the Australian Council of Trade Unions, and employers have accepted that fact, and no force has been placed on anyone in this State to join a trade union.

Mr. Evans: You'd be joking!

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: What complaints has the honourable member received?

Mr. Evans: Why not be honest about it?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The Industrial Code provides that no employer shall dismiss an employee from his employment or injure him in his employment by reason merely of the fact that the employee is or is not an officer or a member of an association and entitled to the benefits of any industrial agreement.

Mr. McAnaney: Isn't that the provision you are going to alter?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: This legislation protects people, and I have not received any complaints about it. The people who have complained to the Leader have been disgruntled Liberal supporters, who would not join a union in South Australia but expect to receive the privileges gained for them by their fellow workers. I see no point in belabouring this issue further, because I support the Government's policy of preference to trade unionists. The Leader said that out of 8,000 unionists only 5,000 voted, and he claimed that this situation was undemocratic.

Mr. McAnaney: He said 500.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: All right, but he said it was undemocratic. How can he compare this situation with that of voting for the Legislative Council?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Or with local government, for instance.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: Of course. Has he informed these people of their rights? Of course he has not. If they have told him their problems, he has not told them that they have privileges, that they have a right of appeal, and can even bring their complaint to this House and have a question asked. Fancy trying to hang his hat on a political issue like this!

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: The Deputy Leader was embarrassed.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The member for Mitcham claimed that the Premier supported liberalism. I notice he has ducked out again. As a commissioned officer in the Army, he has spent much time in, and gets well paid for, training young fellows in the Army. He has been training soldiers since the Korean war broke out. I have told him these things before, and would be delighted if he came in now to hear me or if someone told him what I was saying. I think he is eligible (and I am sure he is physically fit) to go to Vietnam.

Mr. Gunn: What has this to do with the motion?

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: Of course there is no worse compulsion than the conscription legislation, which some opposition members support.

Mr. Rodda: You don't support that?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: Of course not.

Mr. McAnaney: You don't believe in compulsion when it suits you.

Mr. Rodda: But you believe that everyone should be in a union?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: Of course. I think that anyone who accepts privileges that have been gained by his fellow workers should make a contribution. I would expect the honourable member to agree with that, but I know that he does not. I know that if Opposition members had their way they would do all in their power to have unions deregistered.

Mr. Gunn: Come off it!

Mr. Coumbe: You should retract that statement. It is completely unworthy.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. McAnaney: Union organizers are not doing their job.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: Although the motion set out to deal with stand-over tactics

and make severe charges against the Government, we have not heard about these matters. It is a purely political gimmick, because Opposition members cannot think of anything else on which to attack the Government, and have tried to put over this motion like pulling a rabbit out of a hat. I am sure the debate cannot continue much longer, because there is nothing in it.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): Mr. Deputy Speaker—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Which union were you a member of back there?

Mr. MATHWIN: I support the Leader and his motion against compulsory unionism, because I think that compulsory unionism is most unfair and lends itself to stand-over tactics. The Socialist Government of South Australia has failed to protect the workers of this State from the high-handed tactics and bullying of union bosses. I say clearly that I fully support all trade unions.

Members interjecting:

Mr. MATHWIN: As a past member of a union—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: No wonder they threw you out!

Mr. MATHWIN: Knowing that Government members have had to wait most patiently to find out what union I used to belong to, I can say that had they not been so rude last year I would have told them. As they are beginning to be perhaps better behaved than they were then I will tell them: I was a member of the Painters, Decorators, and Sign-writers Union of Great Britain, and, I may say, a very good member of that union. If I had stayed longer in the United Kingdom I might have been a union secretary, and then I would have done all in my power to assist the workers, as I still believe I can do now. I am always sincere in what I say about the workers of this State, and I believe that the unions are as important today as they ever were.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Then why do you condemn them?

Mr. MATHWIN: I am not condemning them: I am condemning this Government. Every worker should have the right, if he wishes, to join the trade union of his choice and to take part in its activities. He should also have the right to refuse to belong to a union, if he so desires. Also, it would be most unfair for an employer to prevent a worker from having a job or to dismiss him simply because he belonged to a union or because he did not belong to a union.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Why didn't you join the Painters Union when you came here?

Mr. MATHWIN: Because I started business on my own account.

Mr. Langley: You could still join the union.

Mr. MATHWIN: Why did you not join a union?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: He did, and he has never been out of one.

Mr. MATHWIN: I know that the honourable member joined the kindergarten union and is still a member! Here in South Australia the unionist's rights are taken away. We are back again to this compulsion racket that has been forced on us by the Government. Practically every Bill introduced involves compulsion. Why is the Government proceeding in this manner? What happens to some workers when they join a union? Take the case of the 12 watchmen who joined the Miscellaneous Workers Union some time ago. The press report states:

Watchmen's move against union. It claims that since joining the union members have been deprived of their rights to work free from union interference. It demands the Minister's protection. The author of the letter says the Industrial Commission under Judge Olssen has ruled that members cannot strike for three months. Members were being asked to contravene the law and fined and victimized for not doing so. The letter calls on Mr. McKee to clarify the members' rights and to make a public announcement. Mr. McKee said last night he had not seen the letter.

Perhaps if members opposite tell me when the Minister returns to the Chamber, all the better. I also mention the matter of the Amalgamated Engineering Union. Last year when I was elected to this House I asked a question of the then Minister of Labour and Industry, formerly secretary of a union. I had to ask my question three times, on two of which occasions he said that he did not know what a political levy was. This is all recorded in *Hansard*. Rule 22 of the A.E.U. rule book (and some members did not agree with this when it was mentioned earlier in the debate) provides:

Every member of the union has a right to be exempt from contribution to the political fund. To become exempt he/she must inform the State Secretary in writing that he/she does not desire to pay the political levy.

I take it that this money is stopped from the wages of these people whether or not they want it deducted. The only way they can refuse to pay this money is to write to the secretary, thus leaving themselves wide open to victimization, particularly in a factory, by the shop steward or the union secretary. The

Leader referred to contracting in and contracting out. I agree that this matter is most important and should be well considered by the Government. A person should not have to contract out or inform the secretary that he wishes to stop paying the political levy. Why should he have to do this? Would it not be more right and proper, if he wished to make a donation or pay a levy to any Party, for him to ask the secretary to stop this money and he would then be contracting in?

I believe that the Government could do well for its workers, whom it always says it protects, by taking this matter to the unions and suggesting that this be done. The *Handbook of Australian Trade Union and Employees Associations* contains further information on money matters and unions. It states:

In South Australia, Western Australia and Tasmania the Australian Labor Party's rules make it clear that a union is normally expected to pay affiliation fees on behalf of its total membership . . . Even when and where unions do not pay affiliation fees for full membership, it may be assumed they pay them on behalf of many unionists who support Parties other than the Australian Labor Party. Very few Australian unions maintain separate political funds to which members are not obliged to contribute. A.L.P. affiliation fees and other political expenses are generally paid out of the general funds of the union.

Here we have the position of the Government supporting and compelling all workers to join a union. It has taken away from them their right of choice. Why should the Government be doing this? It is not to help the workers, but to control them and to deprive them of money. Many of these people are not Labor Party supporters, yet part of the fees they pay to the unions supports the Party. Who has the right to direct how much of a worker's pay packet a man should contribute? This is money he has worked for, and he has the right to say whether he will pay into a fund, whether political or otherwise. The vast sum held by the unions for political benefit is certainly derived from a great number of voters other than Socialists. Hundreds of thousands of Liberal voters and members of other political organizations are union members. The Democratic Labour Party has many men and women union members who, in a roundabout way, pay money to the Labor Party.

This is the very essence of the whole basis of compulsory unionism which, as far as the Labor Party is concerned, is a matter of finance. In Tasmania, the Herseys were expelled from a union since the other members

would not work with them because the Herseys refused, on political grounds, to pay a political levy to the Labor Party. They were told that, if they wished, they could donate the same sum to any charity. It is a poor state of affairs when anyone can direct a person, before getting his pay, that a certain part of that pay must go either to a political Party or to any charity he wishes to nominate.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: You claim to be a unionist.

Mr. MATHWIN: I am a better unionist than is the Minister. Last year when I had something to say on union matters I told the Government that if it wanted members to join a union it should encourage them, not force them, to do so, and to take notice of the reasons why many people did not wish to join a union. Why does the Government not admit that some workers find it distasteful to affiliate to a Socialist Party? If the Government were able to put in this clause or to think and talk about the matter of contracting in rather than contracting out, I think it would gain much. People do not object to paying money to a union; but they object to having part of this money paid to a political Party.

Mr. WRIGHT (Adelaide): One thing that is certainly unique about coming into Parliament for the first time is to be given a lesson in trade unionism by non-unionists. To the best of my knowledge, not one member of the Opposition is currently a member of a union. Certainly, the member who has just resumed his seat said that he had been a unionist in the past, but he would know full well that he has now resigned and that trade unions and similar organizations cannot exist on the strength of resigned members or past members. What unions must have, of course, is current financial membership; otherwise, they will soon become non-existent.

This motion is designed to condemn the Government, yet the only proof we have in this matter is that an agreement has been reached between the shop assistants' organization and the big stores in this State. I support that agreement, as should everyone in this House, because it is nothing more than an agreement between employer and employee. I do not know what this Government can do about it: members opposite certainly have not told us what to do. I have often heard the Leader criticize the Premier and Mr. Whitlam for playing politics, but if the Leader is not playing politics over this matter I am not in this House!

There is no way to describe this motion other than to say that the Opposition is playing politics and trying to use an agreement between employer and employee in order to criticize and condemn this Government. For many years, one of the poorest unions in this State (and for that matter, in all States) has been the shop assistants' organization. I cannot accurately say what it costs the union in this State to keep its awards current, but it would certainly be about \$10,000, \$15,000 or even \$20,000 a year. This organization has had to exist on the meagre membership of about 2,000 members, with no more than two officials and no more than two staff members in the office. The Secretary of this union (Ted Goldsworthy) is, without doubt, one of the best court advocates in this State, and he is able to provide an excellent award and conditions for his members.

Although the membership of this union is about 2,000, it ought to be 30,000; so, in fact, there are 28,000 free riders in South Australia, these people riding on the backs of 2,000 trade unionists. If that is fair, I am a bad judge of what is fair. It must be remembered that the agreement to which I have referred applies not only in South Australia: it is a national agreement which applies in all States (except for the northern part of Queensland) and for which the Australian Workers Union is responsible. However, the Opposition condemns this Government for not interfering in a managerial decision. This managerial decision was taken after consultation with the shop assistants and the Australian Council of Trade Unions, and the Opposition has not told us where pressure was exerted by any organization in Australia. The Opposition has said that no doubt an agreement is operating, but it has not told us of any pressure exerted by this Government on the big distributors in this State. It is purely voluntary, nothing more or less.

I congratulate the shop assistants' organization and the employers concerned on entering into such an agreement, which in my view will assist the industry in question. One thing which employers do not want, but which they will have if the Opposition has its way, is trouble in industry, including strikes in industry over non-union labour. It may be of some benefit to members if I point out that more man-hours were lost in Australia last year through either victimization or people refusing to join a union than through money matters. Here is a step forward in South Australia, in my view, that will prevent that happening in the shop assistants' industry.

One example of the organization that shop assistants have had in this State is that for many years there was no right of entry; the union could not talk to members, or ask people to join; it was getting awards that were difficult to police. There was no freedom, and the employer made no concessions; he did not say, "You can come and talk to employees in the lunch hour"; he merely said, "Get off my property." That is the sort of freedom that members opposite talk about! The shop assistants' organization ought to be praised for being as tolerant as it has been. There could have been gross industrial trouble in this State; union members used to pretend they were customers in order to approach prospective members. What a way for a union organizer to do his duty! He would go inside a store and pretend to be a customer so that during a slack period he could talk with a prospective member and ask him to join the union. If the floor walker had seen this, the union representative would have been ordered off the property and told never to come back. If he had returned, he probably would have been recognized and ordered off again. That is the humiliation that the shop assistants' organization has had to face.

The situation in South Australia is so backward that it needs examining. While the present policy, reaffirmed at our recent Commonwealth conference (which the Liberals seem to know so much about), is for preference to unionists, there is nothing like that situation in this State at present. No-one can point the finger of scorn at any member of this Government and say that a person has been asked to leave his employment because he has not been a member of a certain organization. If this situation has existed, neither the Leader nor his cohorts have cited a case today. The following is an award (not a policy or something determined by a conference) of the Western Australian Industrial Court:

PREFERENCE TO UNIONISTS

(1) In this clause—

“the union” means the Australian Workers Union, Westralian Branch, Industrial Union of Workers;

“unionist” means a worker who is a member of the union;

“non-unionist” means a worker who is not a member of the union.

(2) Subject to the provisions of this clause it is a condition of employment under this award that each non-unionist shall—

(a) unless he has already applied for membership of the union in the manner prescribed by the rules of the union, apply for such membership in the manner so prescribed within seven

- days of receiving from an accredited representative of the union, a copy of those rules, a copy of this clause and an application form for membership;
- (b) upon being notified that he has been accepted as a member of the union, do such things as may be required under the rules of the union in relation to his admission to membership; and
- (c) thereafter remain a unionist while so employed.
- (3) Subclause (2) of this clause does not apply to any worker—
- (a) who holds a certificate of exemption from membership of the union issued and in force pursuant to section 61B of the Industrial Arbitration Act, 1912;
- (b) who, prior to the expiration of the seven days referred to in that subclause, has applied for such a certificate of exemption, unless and until that application is finally determined under that section;
- (c) for the unexpired portion of any period in respect of which he has, prior to commencing employment under this award, paid membership fees on his own behalf to another union; or
- (d) who has been employed for less than 10 weeks.
- (4) (a) Where the secretary of the union has notified an employer that a non-unionist to whom the provisions of subclause (2) of this clause apply has failed or refused to comply with those provisions, that non-unionist shall not be retained in employment by that employer for more than 24 hours to the exclusion of any well-conducted unionist who is employed by, or who applies for employment with, that employer and who is adequately experienced and otherwise competent in the work performed by the non-unionist, and is of the sex to which that work is allotted by this award or where the award makes no such provision, by custom.
- (b) Where paragraph (a) of this subclause operates so as to require the dismissal of a non-unionist by his employer the provisions of subclause (1) of clause 11 of this award are hereby declared inoperative in respect of that dismissal but only if—
- (i) a unionist is engaged to commence work in place of the non-unionist; and
- (ii) that the dismissal does not become effective before the unionist has so commenced.
- (5) A non-unionist shall not be engaged for any work to the exclusion of a well-conducted unionist if that unionist—
- (a) is adequately experienced in and competent to perform the work;
- (b) applies to that employer for employment on that work—
- (i) not later than the time at which the non-unionist applies; or
- (ii) within the time specified by that employer in any adver-

tisement calling for such application whichever is the later;

- (c) is able to commence work at the time required by the employer; and
- (d) is of the sex to which the work concerned is allotted by this award or, where the award makes no such provision, by custom.
- (6) Subclause (5) of this clause does not apply to a non-unionist—
- (a) who holds a certificate of exemption from membership of the union issued and in force pursuant to section 61B of the Industrial Arbitration Act, 1912;
- (b) for the period between the date on which he applies for such a certificate and the date on which that application is finally determined under that section; or
- (c) who has been employed for less than 10 weeks.

That preference clause first came into operation in Western Australia in 1963, when the Liberal Party was in office there. It has done nothing to remove that clause from the awards. In fact, the situation now is (and cases have been taken on this following the insertion of that clause in the awards) that, if any employee refuses to abide by the conditions of the award, he can be taken before the court and summoned for non-compliance with the award. It is usual for the magistrate, the industrial registrar or whoever hears the case to fine an employee the exact amount of the union fees; and in most cases he forwards the fine to the trade union secretary so that he can write out the membership ticket. The fine is of a recurring nature, so it is imposed until either he gets off the job or he joins the union.

There has been criticism of my good friend the Minister of Roads and Transport for the statement he made last year. The Leader of the Opposition never lets up on it and the Deputy Leader keeps on about it. If everyone adopted the same sensible attitude as the Minister did, there would be no industrial stoppages because people were not members of a union. There was a stoppage last week in the Highways Department when some 40 men decided they would not work with non-unionists. There is talk of another stoppage there before very long. If some members support that sort of thing in industry, I am surprised. They should do the sensible thing, as some employers in this State have done, and say, "Very well. We will solve this problem. There will be no more industrial trouble here about membership. We will see that the men are all members of a union." Has not any employer that right? Has not

the employer the right to lay down conditions of employment? He lays down other things quite easily. Surely he can lay down whether or not his employees shall be in a union. That is all the Minister set out to do, to see that the employees of the Highways Department were members of the organization that covered them. If all employers followed suit, there would be no difficulty.

In America there is 100 per cent trade unionism in all areas. I do not want to be taken to task by someone saying that there is only 35 per cent organized labour in America. I know that. However, where labour is organized, there is 100 per cent trade unionism, supported by the Government and by the employers. I consider that the motion is nothing but a tactic in playing politics by the Opposition merely because it had nothing else to raise.

I checked at lunch time exactly how long this Parliament has been in recess: it is some 16 weeks, and in all that time the Opposition has not been able to dig up anything other than this matter, about which the Leader said a few letters had been written. He did not name any of the people who wrote them. When dealing with a matter relating to bus employees, he said he had a letter from 35 people about it. I say they are 35 non-unionists who are now enjoying the fruits of one of the best awards brought down nationally in this country. There may be better awards in the skilled grades, but for the semi-skilled and unskilled grades there was a 12½ per cent increase in wages last year, which the non-unionist drivers have been receiving since January 1, yet they have not paid one cent into trade union funds. The Leader of the Opposition says that, although a trade union was responsible for that award, men should not be asked to join the union, and he wants to criticize this Government. He has no right to criticize anyone, let alone this Government. I praise the activities of the Transport Workers Union in trying to ensure that all prospective employees are members of that union.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I should be failing in my duty if I did not congratulate the member for Adelaide on his maiden speech. He stood up and spoke with some authority. I am sure he will make his voice heard in this House. I take issue with him on one or two things he said, as undoubtedly he would expect me to do. He said the Shop Assistants Union was one of the poorest unions in Australia, or in South Australia, with two officials,

two staff and 2,000 enrolled members when there should perhaps be 30,000. I put it to him that perhaps there is something wrong with the union and with the services it is gaining for its members. Perhaps its members do not want to be members; perhaps the other shop assistants do not want to be members of the union. I see no reason why they should be compelled to be.

The member for Adelaide urges us, as an Opposition, to do the sensible thing. He wants us to support compulsory unionism. This, of course, would be selling out the little man and the rights of the individual. Although it may seem eminently sensible to the honourable member, it is abhorrent to this Party or to anyone who subscribes to the principle of the freedom of the individual and freedom of choice. It is abhorrent to anyone who supports the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Nevertheless, I congratulate the honourable member on his speech.

I refer now to the speech made by the Minister. Apart from his saying that we were belabouring the issue a little, I think the less we say about the Minister's speech the better. He has not seen fit to stay in the Chamber for very long during this debate, and I can understand why. The Premier was at his plausible best, as he needed to be, for he had a shaky case to put. He is noted for choosing his words with great care, and this afternoon he did just that. He said that shop employers chose to negotiate with employee organizations, and "chose" is the operative word. However, what alternative was open to them if they did not choose to co-operate with the unions, because clearly from the Premier's words, that they chose to negotiate, there was an alternative offered or threatened. Employers are being put into an impossible position. The Premier spoke of donations to political Parties, saying that shareholders of large firms did not have any say in this. Does he expect us to believe that companies do not make donations to both political Parties? I notice that he got off that track quickly when I pointed out that it was not compulsory for a person to be a shareholder in a company. Although the Premier did his best, I do not think it was good enough, as there was an undercurrent of hypocrisy throughout his speech.

Rightly or wrongly, many people in the community, especially shop assistants, believe that they are being intimidated, and I think they have reason for this belief. In recent weeks I spent a little time taking exercise at Kurralta

Park, where I spoke to many people, among whom were many unionists. Several of them expressed concern at the direction unions were being taken in at present. They were not greatly concerned with what unions had done or should be doing: they were concerned to know where union officials were taking those unions now and what they were using the unions for. Naturally, the way they are using unions affects union members. Frequently, out of 1,000 or 2,000 members of a union, only about 100 or 200 will vote to elect officers. Like the member for Glenelg, I have no quarrel with unions, but I have a quarrel with union officers who are concerned only with holding office as a step on the way to personal political advancement. Again, I do not say that this is always the case. I suppose we would not have the pleasure of the company of some members opposite if they had not started off in this way. There is nothing wrong with a union official's coming into Parliament, but there is a great deal wrong with a union official's using his job and union to advance his personal ambition, regardless of the welfare of that union. This is what is happening: office in a union is being regarded as a short cut into politics. We have only to look at Mr. Hawke's being considered a future Prime Minister of Australia to see this, and that is what we are being told about him. Heaven help the country if that comes to pass!

A career union official who is looking for advancement must hold his job. To do that, he must continually find issues to prove to union members that he is indispensable to the union. This is similar to one of Parkinson's laws. He must manufacture issues, if they are not there, and drag out negotiations, so that he becomes indispensable. He must sometimes make pronouncements on things that are completely outside the ambit of his union activities. Obviously it is in the interest of a politically ambitious union official to increase the membership of his union, as that gives him more voting strength when it comes to pre-selection ballots. Also, it increases the funds available to him to fight an election, and it increases the funds available to the Party that he will inevitably represent. There has been a precedent for compulsory unionism. In New South Wales, compulsory unionism was introduced in 1953. In the resultant court action, it was ruled that this should apply only at the time of engagement or dismissal of an employee. The 1957 conference of the A.L.P. deleted compulsory unionism from the platform of the Party. The system of absolute preference to unionists was

introduced by the New South Wales Labor Government in 1959. In spite of everything which has been said and which may be said by the Minister about his intentions, this is nothing more or less than compulsory unionism by another name and by a back-door method. What is absolute preference if it is not compulsory unionism?

This whole business of compulsory unionism strikes at the fundamental rights of human beings. I understand that the Labor Party supports the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; one of its distinguished members, Dr. Evatt, described it as the Magna Carta of the present day. I believe reference to it still appears in the preamble to the Labor Party booklet. Yet this Government supports compulsory unionism; it has promised to change the present Code so as to provide for preference, which really amounts to compulsion, and it condones the present approaches being made, not at the time of engagement or dismissal, by employers to employees, at the instigation of unions. We know what is the Government's policy when it comes to the Public Service. I cannot let this occasion pass without once again referring to the Minister of Transport's "the necessary motivation by way of ultimatum", and that is not the last time that phrase will be spoken in this House. Although I think the member for Mitcham has already referred to it, I will read again article 20 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which states:

(1) Everyone has the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association.

(2) No-one may be compelled to belong to an association.

The A.L.P. professes to support that article entirely. Will some member opposite deny that?

Mr. Slater: We'd be out of order.

Dr. TONKIN: I realize that, but my statement certainly did not get much of a reaction. The A.L.P. supports that article, yet it favours compulsory unionism; it favours forcing people to join a union under penalty of losing a job and the wherewithal to obtain the things listed in article 25, which states:

Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well being of himself and of his family, including food, clothing, housing and medical care and necessary social services, and the right to security in the event of unemployment, sickness, disability, widowhood, old age or other lack of livelihood in circumstances beyond his control.

That is exactly what this would mean—"circumstances beyond his control". This is

where the hypocrisy comes into the matter with the Party opposite. On the one hand, the Government supports the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and, on the other (perhaps it hopes that it does not know what the first hand is doing) is applying pressure and condoning compulsory unionism.

Doubtless, red herrings will be dragged in but we cannot get away from those fundamental facts, and I hope that members opposite feel as embarrassed as they look. I have spoken of the fears that unionists have expressed to me when I visited the Kurralt Park district, a district, I may add, in which the voting figures at the recent by-election favoured the L.C.L. for the first time for many years. It was home territory, where voters expressed concern about unionism and how the unions were being used. These people made their presence felt and many of these workers said that they blamed themselves.

Admittedly, many unions are conducted moderately. I do not think there is anything to say against the aims and objectives of unions. Unions are good institutions but they are being used. Moderate unions gain the support of their members in their own right and do not have to force membership: they attract it. This is what should be happening in all unions. They should be of such a nature that people would want to join them and take part in the activities. An extract from a publication by one of these unions states:

You and democracy: the democratic process only functions in a society or organization when the people who constitute that society or organization adopt the required application to make the procedures operate.

That is true. I would say to all unionists, "If you wish to join a union, if you are a member of a union, or if you are obliged to join a union, take an active part in union affairs and do not be afraid of stand-over tactics. Press for secret ballots if they are not being held at present and prevent union exploitation by officials." As long as the A.L.P. and the Government support these moves to establish and perpetuate compulsory unionism, by whatever name it is called (whether we call it preference or, as it is, compulsory unionism) in direct contravention of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, I do not consider this Government fit to govern. I support the motion.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I cannot let one or two points made by Government speakers go unchallenged. The Premier made

two basic points, as well as introducing many irrelevancies. I think his first point was that no union pressure was being brought to bear in this matter of compulsory unionism and the introduction of compulsory unionism was by way of an agreement that had been negotiated in the normal peaceful way between employers and their employees. The Premier must think this House comprises many gullible members if he wants them to swallow that. Members on this side know (and members opposite also know) that what the Premier has said is not so. He has said that this agreement has been cooked up by the shop assistants and those who employ them.

We know very well that, if employers do not accept these conditions, the unions will apply sanctions against those employers. We have much evidence of this. What the Premier has said is that unions have nothing to do with this arrangement. The Premier must think members are particularly naive if he wants them to believe that this arrangement has just been cooked up by the management (in this case, the owners of departmental stores) and their employees.

I draw attention again to the matter that the Leader has raised. If agreement cannot be reached, what will the sanctions be? In the case of the bus companies, they will not get fuel. Who is putting the heat on, and what is the basis of the argument? The action is being taken by militant unions, and the bus companies could be put out of business. The Government is trying to tell us that employees are not applying pressure, but that is nonsense. I think the Premier was a member of Actors Equity and, if he was, he was certainly in the right union.

The second major point discernible from his argument was that it was a perfectly reasonable attitude to deny employment to someone who did not want to join a union. They were his words. However, he can argue all day and all night, using all his debating skill and legal training, but he will never convince me that this is not an infringement of a basic human right.

I thought the member for Adelaide made a good contribution to the debate, but one of his points was that we on this side had no association with unions and were not competent to speak on this matter. I point out that the vast majority of the people of Australia have not been associated with unions but these people are vitally concerned in this matter. The nearest I got to a union was when I was a member of the South Australian Institute

of Teachers, and doubtless the member for Elizabeth also was a member of the institute. As a result of my observations, I can say that, if it had been compulsory to join the institute, I would have resigned from it, as many other members would also have done.

Mr. Keneally: But you would accept all the money they got for you.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The honourable member has missed the point. While membership was voluntary, I was willing to be a member but, if membership had become compulsory, I would have resigned. We will discuss the matter of accepting the fringe benefits later.

Mr. Keneally: They're not fringe benefits: they're basic benefits.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Well, I will call them basic benefits if that is what the honourable member would like. I turn now to the Minister's contribution to the debate. I was trying to find the point in it.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: I was trying to find the point of the motion.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The only point that I could find in the Minister's speech, other than personal abuse of the member for Mitcham, was that members on this side hated unions. I deny that categorically, as would most other members. We do not hate unions. Unions have made tremendous contributions to the welfare of the people of this and other countries, beginning with the industrial revolution in Great Britain. However, much of the power and value of these unions has resulted from their being conducted on a voluntary basis. Persons have got together and sought to associate for the mutual benefit of members. I do not have much contact with unions and would not profess to have had. We have not come up through the trade union movement.

Mr. Keneally: That's a pity.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I have pointed out to the member for Stuart that, by the very nature of things, we cannot all be members of a trade union. Even if there is 100 per cent membership of unions, those members will be in a national minority. I wish the honourable member would see that point. Nevertheless, I know persons who are members of unions and are Labor Party members. I think I can honestly say that these people would be traditional Labor voters. When I asked one such person what he thought about the introduction of compulsory unionism in the shops, he said, "I think it stinks." That would be the attitude of the average John Citizen in this country. The Premier can talk

until he is blue in the face, but he will not convince me with the type of argument he has used.

The member for Adelaide made some good points in his contribution to the debate, and that is more than I can say for the Minister of Labour and Industry. The member for Adelaide said that the Shop Assistants Union had obtained great benefits for shop assistants. He said that, although the union had only 2,000 members, it should have 30,000 members. His statement indicates that the vast majority of shop assistants do not want to belong to the union, and I cannot see why they should be compelled to join. If shop assistants experienced today the extremely difficult conditions that obtained at the turn of the century, when working people had great difficulty in looking after their families, these people would join the union. However, the truth is that such conditions do not obtain today and, consequently, there is a much poorer case for compulsion than there was at the turn of the century. If injustices were being perpetrated, shop assistants would flock to join the union.

The member for Adelaide said that, if the terms put forward by the union were not accepted, there would be industrial strife; in saying that, he was advocating that we bow to blackmail. However, I say categorically that that would be the first step towards anarchy. The honourable member said that, if we did not compel people to join the union, we would have industrial strife, but what sort of an argument is that? Members opposite object to the term "stand-over tactics", but can the union's attitude be described in any other way? Fall into line—or else! I have much sympathy for unions.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: We realize that!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Minister of Education likes to joke about these things, but as soon as he is put on the spot he is the first to bristle.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I wasn't even listening to you.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Minister likes to laugh things off. The gist of the matter is that people are being compelled to join a union against their will. If that is not a basic denial of their rights, I do not know what it is. I observed the Minister's behaviour when the Deputy Leader was speaking, and I know that he loves to laugh these occasions off, but this is one of the most serious matters that have come before this House. Because a basic human right is involved, I support the motion.

Mr. WELLS (Florey): Members will be pleased to know that, because I have a sore throat, I shall be brief. I am shocked at the motion. Nothing substantial has come from the Opposition during this debate to justify the view the Opposition has attempted to force on the Government. Of course, the trade union movement is a fundamental part of the A.L.P. However, some Opposition members seem to be under the impression that we, as members of the political wing of the A.L.P., are ashamed to admit that the unions are a fundamental part of the Party. Every member knows that the political wing of the Party was born of the trade union movement and will retain its ties for as long as the Party exists.

The member for Mitcham said that the Premier was trying to turn the political wing of the A.L.P. into a middle-class Party, but the assumption behind the honourable member's statement was incorrect. We already represent the middle class (I am assuming that the honourable member wants to recognize such a division in our community). Is it suggested that the workers of this country are second-rate citizens? The A.L.P., in both the State and Commonwealth spheres, is seeking to promote the well-being of every citizen, irrespective of the class to which he is said to belong. I was pleased to hear the member for Glenelg explain that he had been a trade union member; I thought he was still a union member. He said that, if he had remained in England much longer, he would possibly have been appointed a trade union secretary; if he had been, it would have been to his undying credit. I do not mean to be offensive, but I was amused at a thought that crossed my mind: had the honourable member been appointed a union secretary and had his activities been transferred to South Australia, perhaps the honourable member and I and other Government members would have been seated together at a congress of the A.C.T.U., and that would have been a pretty good experience.

I want to take issue with the honourable member on his statement concerning the notorious Hersey case in Tasmania. I do not think any member knows more about that case than I do, and I can assure the honourable member that his contentions are entirely erroneous. He should remember that the High Court of Australia upheld the position of the Waterside Workers Federation in the Hersey case, but I do not want to say anything more about that matter at this juncture.

The member for Bragg spoke in his usual capable manner about the Shop Assistants Union. He said that there were 2,000 financial members and that there should be 30,000, but that shop assistants who were not members of the union but who would want to be were not satisfied about the attainments or the leadership of the officers of that union. This statement is entirely incorrect. The position was clearly stated by the member for Adelaide, whom I congratulate on a magnificent maiden speech, and who as a member will certainly make his weight felt in this Chamber in more ways than one.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: He will have some competition from you.

Mr. WELLS: The fact is that the Shop Assistants Union could not organize the shop assistants, not because they did not want to be organized but because the union was denied the opportunity to go to a cafeteria or a lunch room in order to meet the employees and tell them of the benefits to be derived from union membership. That is why the membership of such an organization is so low, but I assure honourable members that this situation has been rectified. The member for Bragg said that the breach of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights had occurred when employees had been requested by their employers to join a trade union. I maintain that this motion breaches the Declaration of Human Rights, because members opposite are trying to interfere in a matter that is no concern of this Chamber or of this Parliament. We are trying to breach an agreement that was made between the employers and the Shop Assistants Union.

The member for Kavel said that repercussions would have resulted from resistance by the employers to this move, but I assure him that that statement is wrong and that the agreement reached between the employers and the officers of the Shop Assistants Union was negotiated at top level for more than two years in a most amicable way. Never at any time was there a threat of industrial action if the employers did not accede to the requests of the union. Employers generally recognize the value of an organized labour force, and they recognize the fact that if they have various factions within their employ who vary in their opinions, determinations, and desires as to the standard of their employment, there will, without doubt, be trouble within the shops.

They sought, with the trade union movement and the Shop Assistants Union, to organize the labour force so that they could have direct

negotiations and consultations one with the other. I think this is a most desirable situation. No shred of evidence has been produced to indicate that compulsory unionism has been introduced or that anyone is trying to introduce it. To associate the Government's policy of preference to unionists with compulsory unionism is completely unfair and certainly incorrect. I oppose the motion.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): The member for Florey, who has just taken his seat, would seem to be astray in his view about human rights and the aspects he has debated. He said that the Government was unable to interfere with the employer-employee relationship, yet he must accept the fact that the South Australian Government is an employer, and that this Government has given certain directions since it came into office. The letter forwarded from the South Australian Railways, dated March 13, 1971, in which certain directions were given, surely indicates the Government's interfering at this point. I suggest that the honourable member's argument loses force immediately. He also said that the Government's attitude had not been one of compulsory unionism but had been one of unionism by preference or preferential treatment for unionists. I do not doubt that this may be the idea in the minds of some, but I ask him point blank what is the situation in respect of the unions themselves.

They have been intimidating people, as the new member for Adelaide and the member for Salisbury well know, concerning a situation involving gardeners in a branch of the Lands Department. The gardeners were informed that they would not get a signature to an award providing them with an increase in wages until every member who was a gardener at that establishment had signed as a unionist. They had been approached by a union organizer and given a chance to elect to join the union if they so desired, but the result was very poor, as the member for Salisbury well knows. The next attack was one of intimidation, whereby it was suggested that until there was 100 per cent unionism in this establishment the document, which gave those who were prepared to join the chance to get their just wage, would not be signed.

Mr. Groth: A union secretary has no right to spend money on non-unionists.

Dr. EASTICK: I congratulate the member for Adelaide on the frankness of his speech, a fact that created some embarrassment to the front bench, the same as the member for Albert Park embarrassed his colleagues when he told us

about the real aims of the Vehicle Builders Union concerning its claims. The member for Adelaide indicated plainly this afternoon that the aims of the unions are not entirely those of Cabinet. He spoke of bus drivers who had received benefits, and I suggest that this was a happier situation than the one that I have outlined concerning the gardeners in another establishment where they were denied a similar chance.

I had the chance in this House to be congratulated from the Government front bench when I tried to obtain union membership for a constituent of mine. The Minister of Labour and Industry knows that on February 23 last, when the House met for the first time after the Christmas recess, I asked him to consider the needs of this constituent. The member for Tea Tree Gully, when she was the member for Barossa, had undertaken to help this person, but without avail. I received a letter written on July 7 saying that this person had at long last, on July 6, 1971, been admitted to union membership, even though an attempt was made by the Minister, commencing on February 23, to arrange for him to become a member much earlier. I wonder how the union can spend so much time chasing around to force people to join when such people do not want to join and when those who want to join a union are being denied that opportunity.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): The member for Florey asked whether South Australian workers were second-class citizens. In reply, I can only say that some of them are, and I refer to those persons who do not enjoy the rights of democracy and freedom because they are denied, by the inaction of this Government, the basic human rights involved in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights under the United Nations Charter. As pointed out by other members, initially by the member for Bragg, this Government has abrogated that right of individuals. The member for Florey admits that we have second-class citizens, who are being represented by the Labor Government and the policies it follows. It must have been very difficult for the Premier, a well-known intellectual, to defend something that was imposed on him by the Labor Party. I remember reading about the Premier's advocacy at the Launceston conference of the A.L.P. In referring to this, an article headed "A.L.P.: Looking like a Government" states:

He could tell some of the principles—
that, of course, refers to all who dealt with principles, come hell or high water—

just why their principles wouldn't work in the unlikely event that the public ever voted into Government a Party subscribing to them.

Regarding the Premier's dress, the article continues:

Dunstan also unquestionably won the best dressed award, which led to some speculation as to how many suitcases he had brought with him.

At the Launceton meeting the Premier could apparently indulge in explanations based on a reasonable assumption and some rather deep thought on why the Labor Party would have to throw overboard some of the things which it would like to do but which would obviously be rejected by the Australian public. However, he has not, with all his eloquence and advocacy, been able to convince the A.L.P. that it should support the Declaration of Human Rights, because it does not do so. And this is a black mark against every member who sits opposite and supports this Government in office. We have seen this in operation today. All those people who had complained to the Premier that they had lost their freedom and who were being dragooned, frightened and threatened with the loss of their employment, he called bludgers. Someone else on the other side also called them that.

Mr. Wright: I called them "free riders".

Mr. HALL: Will not these people who come to me seeking help be happy to know that in the eyes of the Government they are less than decent, responsible human beings. These people are being told that they are bludgers, and I shall have much pleasure in telling those people who resent this interference in their private lives that this is what the Premier and his Party think of them. Let the Premier and his Party go to the public and tell them this is what they think of these individuals. The Premier has the effrontery to say that these things have been arranged by negotiation, conciliation and arbitration. He says that those three things are the basis for what is happening in South Australia, when union officials barge into the lunch room of a certain bus company and threaten to close the company down unless its employees join a union. Under which of those three headings does that sort of activity come? Is it negotiation, conciliation or arbitration?

Mr. Venning: They're silent.

Mr. HALL: Of course they are, because they know that the Premier's explanation is false. The Premier made great play about the funds of the A.L.P. and the L.C.L., the latter of which he said gets its support from the great businesses of Australia. Does not the

A.L.P. get any funds from big business? Will it deny that it does? Of course it cannot! Indeed, I have spoken to senior business men who have told me directly that they have made large financial contributions to the A.L.P.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: That upsets you, doesn't it!

Mr. HALL: Why, therefore, do members opposite say that the L.C.L. is the only recipient of such funds. One such company to which I have referred has since fallen on its face as a result of the intimidation by Mr. Hawke and the A.C.T.U. The Premier also says that members of the public are not compelled to work at their avocation. In other words, he says that, if they do not agree to join a union after such a demand is made of them, they can change their employment and work somewhere else. Would it not be delightful to tell a man who has served a four-year or five-year apprenticeship, who knows no other type of work, and who may be supporting a family, that he must get a job elsewhere if he sees fit not to join a union? Where else could he work with a Labor movement devoted to the idea of making sure that every worker is a unionist? The Premier well knows that such a man could go nowhere else than to the unemployment queue.

These are, no doubt, stand-over tactics and, if members opposite cannot see this, they cannot recognize a crime when it is being committed, because this is a crime as threats are being made to people's employment, threats which contravene section 91 of the Industrial Code. Government members care not a hoot for the people involved. I find it hard to believe, when people come to me to complain about their loss of freedom, that in a British society such as ours people are being faced with demands like these and with a Government that will not support them—a Government that laughs at their plight and calls them bludgers. For what it is worth when I am in Opposition, I stand behind these thousands of people who are being intimidated in an effort to make them contribute towards the Labor Party through the unions.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: It's not worth much.

Mr. HALL: I fully agree with the Minister—

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Well, that's something.

Mr. HALL: —because the Minister will undoubtedly crush this move.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: No, he won't

Mr. HALL: The Minister does not care for these people; he agrees that they are bludgers.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: I do not.

Mr. HALL: Then he is disagreeing with his Leader. I take it that he does not so disagree. He will join in and call them something else. I think "scab" is his favourite word.

Mr. Wright: They're free riders.

Mr. HALL: The new member for Adelaide calls them free riders. It is this Government's attitude that they are not to be tolerated and must be put down. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights is not to apply to them, because this Government says it shall not. This is a shameful day on which the Premier has said "Yes" to the three questions I have posed. The Premier has said "Yes" to my question, "Should a person have to join an association against his will?" He has said "Yes" to my question, "Should a person have to support the A.L.P. against his will?" And he has said "Yes" to my question, "Should a person be able to be hired or fired by a union?" No matter how the Premier puts it in intellectual phraseology, his reply is "Yes" to every one of those questions. It is a black day for South Australian citizens when the Premier, the Leader of the Government, deserts any of them, be it one or 1,000. They must now know that they stand alone and no longer have the protection of the Government that some of them helped to elect.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (18)—Messrs. Becker, Brookman, Carnie, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Ferguson, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Hall (teller), Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Rodda, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Noes (24)—Messrs. Broomhill, Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark, Corcoran (teller), Crimes, Curren, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, Langley, McKee, McRae, Payne, Ryan, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.

Majority of 6 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

INDUSTRIAL SAFETY

The Hon. D. H. McKEE (Minister of Labour and Industry) moved:

That the Select Committee on Occupational Safety and Welfare in Industry and Commerce have power to continue its sittings during the present session.

Motion carried.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Deputy Premier) brought up the following report of the committee appointed to prepare the draft Address in Reply to the Speech of His Excellency the Governor:

1. We, the members of the House of Assembly, express our thanks for the Speech with which Your Excellency was pleased to open Parliament.

2. We assure Your Excellency that we will give our best attention to all matters placed before us.

3. We earnestly join in Your Excellency's prayer for the Divine blessing on the proceedings of the session.

Mr. WRIGHT (Adelaide): It is a great honour for me, the newest member of the House, to have the opportunity to move the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I understand that the Governor's Speech is an account of the Government's performance and an indication of its legislative intentions. In those two respects, the Governor's Speech merits the overwhelming support of all members. His Excellency drew attention to the death of four past members of this Parliament, three of whom I did not know except by repute; but I have no doubt that they served the State well according to their own lights, and we express our sympathy to their families. The other deceased member is my own predecessor in the District of Adelaide, my long-time friend Mr. Sam Lawn. Mr. Lawn had an outstanding career in both the industrial and political spheres of the Labor movement and he was for a long time the Secretary of one of the largest unions in this State; his stewardship in this position was exemplary.

As a representative of his own union, he achieved the highest position possible in the trade union movement and was regarded in many circles as one of the best trade union advocates in this country. When Mr. Lawn became more directly involved in the political wing of the Labor movement, he also made his mark quickly and, above all, he made his mark for his sincerity, his forthrightness and his kindness. Although I had hoped at some time to represent my Party in Parliament, one of my regrets at this stage is that I am here earlier than I had hoped, because of the untimely death of my late colleague. However, I am now able to renew my long acquaintance with you, Mr. Speaker, in a different capacity.

I congratulate my colleague the member for Price on his election as Chairman of Committees, and I am certain that he has the qualities to fulfil his new role with distinction. I will enjoy the privilege of working more intimately with the Premier and his Ministers, as well as with Government members, all of whom I have known and worked with over a long period in the Australian Labor Party.

I express my appreciation to the electors of Adelaide for the magnificent vote they gave me on July 3. I am confident that my appreciation will be demonstrated by my representation on their behalf. I thank my Party and those people who gave their time, assistance and advice at the by-election; I am deeply indebted to them for their assistance. I also take this, the first opportunity I have, to thank all the officers and staff of the House for the courtesy and assistance they have shown me so far.

I congratulate the Government on its active endeavours to promote the development of industry in this State and on the initiative it has shown in appointing agencies in Tokyo, Singapore, Hong Kong and Djakarta, as well as a roving trade officer in each of the Northern European and South-East Asian zones. Because of our small population in South Australia, we depend for our prosperity on sales in other States and other countries, and these moves illustrate the statesmanship and forward-thinking of this young dynamic Government. Further illustrations of this dynamic statesmanship can be seen by reference to the Industrial Development Act and by examining the activities of the Industries Assistance Corporation, which are both designed to assist (and will assist) this State.

I am exceedingly pleased to learn from His Excellency's Speech that this Government is concerning itself with the tourist industry. Without going into detail, I am sure most honourable members know of the beautiful scenic spots existing in this State which should be developed to attract people from other parts of Australia and, indeed, the world. I congratulate the Government on this forward move.

The successful completion of an expanded housing programme for the year ended June 30 is very encouraging. I look forward to this programme being continued, and I hope that sufficient finance is available so that more rental-type houses may be built by the Housing Trust. Prices today have reached such proportions that many of the people I represent

cannot afford the higher interest rates charged, and these people deserve some assistance whereby they may obtain cheaper rental houses.

In regard to pollution, conservation and our environment generally, I congratulate the Minister for Conservation on the interest he is taking in this field. Indeed, I should welcome the Commonwealth Government's taking a greater interest in it by providing the States with the necessary finance to deal with this problem adequately.

I come now to workmen's compensation. I have heard it said (and I want to make it well known to members opposite) that workers in South Australia are continually expressing extreme gratitude for the recent Workmen's Compensation Act passed in this Parliament. I have been told many times that, if the A.L.P. Government during this term of office had done nothing else, it would be returned to the Treasury benches merely because of that Workmen's Compensation Act. There is no doubt that the protection afforded the average worker in this State bears favourable comparison with that applying in other States. In fact, to the best of my knowledge, the only Workmen's Compensation Act in Australia that is more beneficial to the working class is that of New South Wales—and that only in sections. Recently the arbitration court there awarded a complete make-up of pay for anyone injured in the building industry. This House should be warned that at some time in the near future we should be attempting to legislate for such a programme here.

I am also able to tell the House that a Royal Commission in New Zealand, after a full and extensive inquiry into workmen's compensation, recommended recently that there should be full pay for anybody absent from work for periods of two months. That recommendation was accepted on the basis of after the first month's absence. I congratulate this Government on its magnificent Act, comparing it with what the Liberals were able to provide in their many years in office. It is hard to believe that we enjoy such standards today because in one short term we were able to revolutionize the Workmen's Compensation Act. I can remember the Liberals refusing even to consider the right to workmen's compensation for employees injured while travelling to and from work. That has long vanished, owing to the actions of the Labor Government. This is a good Act but we should not stop there. This House should be warned that we shall be trying to improve it for workers in South Australia and give them the protection

that the Liberals could not give them when they were in office.

Minerals are playing a much greater part in the economy of this State. One has only to look at the recent developments at Kanmantoo and Burra, and Mount Gunson in the Far North. Those three projects will produce great revenue for the State. At Kanmantoo, by the time the whole production unit is in operation, employment will be found for some 170 men. All employees are financial members of their respective unions, the policy of that company being that everyone must join a union. Another good policy, in my view, is that the company employs local labour. The whole work force is drawn from the vicinity of Kanmantoo. Already some 70 to 80 people are employed there. Many farmers and farmers' sons have for the first time been asked to join a trade union. They have joined it and have enjoyed joining it. Now they are appreciating the benefits of it, because the union is active in the field at Kanmantoo.

At Mount Gunson, a similar situation applies: employment is being provided for people living in the area. Some 60 local people are employed there. Burra is a smaller project but it is a good and strong project. It will probably have a lot longer life than the other places, unless they go underground at Kanmantoo. The surface working will provide employment for only eight or nine years. It is different from Burra, where they can go on working for some 12 to 15 years. This development is good for employment and for revenue for the State.

I come now to prices. I appreciate price control is mostly a Commonwealth matter. Price increases are causing inflation; prices, not wage increases, are causing it. I know there are certain articles and items that can be price-controlled in this State. Irrespective of which Party we belong to, if we want to protect the working class and the community we all know we must control prices. We must put more power into the hands of the Prices Commissioner so that he can control prices and stop them escalating, as they do now. There are some things that are controlled in the State and some that are controlled on a Commonwealth basis. In 1972, when the A.L.P. comes into Government and occupies the Commonwealth Treasury benches, it will introduce strict price control, which will add to the protection of the community. I conclude by congratulating the Government on its past performance and its

bold and enterprising proposals as indicated in the Governor's Speech.

Mr. WELLS (Florey): I second the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I congratulate the member for Adelaide on another sterling effort in this House at such an early stage in his career. It augurs well for the future of this House that, when he becomes accustomed to our procedures, he will enter into debates on many other topics. I express my condolences to the families of the deceased members of Parliament. With some past members I was not acquainted, but Sammy Lawn, in particular, was a close friend of mine and, I am sure, of most people in this House, irrespective of political affiliation.

I want at this stage to join with His Excellency in expressing pleasure at the visit to South Australia of His Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh. This was a very good thing. I hope that some people will note the remarks of His Royal Highness in London about Britain's entry into the European Common Market. The Duke, of course, can at times make remarks that are pungent as do members of this House, and often I find I am in accord with his views. It can be said, of course, that the Common Market is Britain's pigeon, despite those remarks, but we must remember that tomorrow, apart from its being Britain's pigeon, it can be Australia's beef, lamb, wool and wine. I believe that the Duke of Edinburgh should be commended for his opposition to Britain's joining the Common Market.

It is widely acknowledged that congratulations are owing to the Government under dynamic Cabinet leadership, previously unequalled in ability and drive in this State. It does credit to a progressive Party. Something has been said about the amendments that have been made to the Workmen's Compensation Act. I agree with what the member for Adelaide had to say and I add that, although great improvement has been achieved in respect of payments to injured workmen in this State, the improvement has not gone far enough: the time is approaching when we must seriously consider providing that workmen who are injured in the course of their employment are reimbursed to the full extent of their average wage. Although the improvement made by the Government has eased the situation for an injured workman, it is still undemocratic that a man injured should be forced to live on a sum less than he normally receives as his wage.

The Government also deserves credit for the improvement in the housing situation. However, although more than 500 more rental houses than last year have been made available, more must be provided. The Government will continue to press for additional Commonwealth finance and will not be satisfied until all families requiring rental houses at reasonable rents are accommodated. All members will recognize that this is a basic necessity, as I am sure they have been inundated with requests from constituents for rental houses to be provided by the Housing Trust. The question of pollution arose rather abruptly, with people becoming concerned about eradicating many of the causes of pollution in the State. The Government was equal to the task, quickly appointing a Minister, who at once actively dealt with this menace in all its forms. As well as dealing with pollution, the Minister will capably deal with conservation and other urgent problems concerning the environment. As this is important to the State, it is gratifying to see that large sections of the community are becoming increasingly conscious of environmental problems that confront communities, and of the extreme dangers inherent in unchecked pollution. I am certain that the Minister will handle this portfolio to his credit, proving in due course that this appointment was wise. We can look forward in future to further achievements by him and his department.

The member for Adelaide also referred to mineral wealth. In 1970, the total value of minerals produced in South Australia exceeded \$104,000,000, and natural gas sales amounted to \$6,000,000. The fact that \$104,000,000 worth of minerals was taken from the natural resources of the State clearly highlights the plunder of these natural possessions of the State by private organizations and combines. I will have more to say about this in future. The Government also deserves credit for giving some justice and sense of belonging to our Aborigines. The name of the Social Welfare and Aboriginal Affairs Department has been changed to the Community Welfare Department. This great step forward by the Government will not only assist the assimilation of Aborigines but will ensure that they have adequate legal and other protection in their affairs. Despite the fact that a referendum in this country vested in the Commonwealth Government the power to deal with Aboriginal affairs and to legislate on a Commonwealth basis on behalf of Aborigines we find that

little has been done. To the shame of the Commonwealth Government, it has facilitated the poaching and theft of Aboriginal tribal grounds that have belonged to these people for centuries. Again, this has been done in the interests of combines and monopolies. The Commonwealth Government will not live down this disgrace in a short time. I am certain that, when the A.L.P. Government is installed in Canberra in 1972, we will have adequate legislation passed to protect and raise the status of Aborigines throughout Australia.

One important matter discussed at great length last session was that of adult franchise and compulsory voting for the Legislative Council. On occasions there were bitter debates on this matter. The policy of the Government is that there shall be full adult franchise for the Legislative Council and that voting shall be compulsory; the same system of voting that applies to this Chamber should apply to the Council. I believe that procedure is correct. Although Opposition members do not fully agree, to their credit at least they acknowledge the fact that there should be full adult franchise. I hope (perhaps I could say that I am confident) that possibly this session we shall see members opposite having the wisdom to support us in introducing compulsory voting for the Legislative Council, and perhaps they will use their influence with members in another place so that that Chamber, too, will support the measure. I am confident that this session will see the accomplishment of the A.L.P. Government policy of full adult franchise and compulsory voting for the Legislative Council.

Increases in wages are inevitable while wages chase prices. Of course, the unchecked spiral of prices, as has been said, is the cause of any major inflationary trend in Australia today, and the workers, in their present mood, are willing to indulge in industrial action to force from dollar-hungry employers an amount of money that will give them and their families a satisfactory standard of living.

Mr. Venning: Have you ever tried to run a business?

Mr. WELLS: No.

Mr. Venning: Well, you try.

Mr. WELLS: I have never conducted a business, but I shall tell the honourable member later in my speech how to conduct his business, as a farmer, so he should be pleased about that. If the honourable member listens, he will learn how to put his business on a proper basis. I am earnest in saying this, and I shall give concrete proof that this can be done

by taking my advice. The matter of wages is always a contentious issue. Wages are placed in a category that produces the greatest hoax ever perpetrated on a body of workers, because the workers are told that the gross national product can be related directly to their take-home pay and, as a result, to the standard of living for themselves and their wives and families. I repeat that this is a myth and a hoax: productivity increases under this system have nothing to do with the living standards of the workers of this country.

Every time there is an application or demand for an increase in wages, the work force of the country is told that the gross national product will determine whether they get an increase. Then they are told that they must visualize the productivity of a country or of a State as a big cake. Everyone in the community must get a slice of this cake, including the Government, the financier, the employer and, of course, the worker. However, if the workers want an increase in the size of their piece of cake, they are told that the cake has been divided and that they cannot get more. They are told that the economy of the country will not stand it and, therefore, they do not get a larger slice.

However, they are told that, if they work harder and increase the productivity figure, the cake will be larger and they can expect a larger slice, so the worker sweats and labours even harder and the gross national product figure increases. Then the time to cut the cake up comes but the workers are told, "We are sorry. We have had a terrific amount of expense, the employers have a larger capital outlay, and interest rates have increased. We would like to give you more, but be satisfied with this slice now and next time make the cake a little larger." This is the myth that has been perpetrated on the workers of this country for generations, but the workers know now that this is a fallacy, so what do they do? They see the employer with his nice slice of cake with passionfruit cream in the middle and walnuts on top. The workers get a piece of cake that has not much cream and certainly has no walnuts on it.

Mr. Nankivell: They get a piece with all the icing on it.

Mr. WELLS: No, the icing has been nibbled off it. The workers must try to sink their teeth into some of the employers' cake. This is the equivalent of seeking over-award payments. What a squeal and what a howl there is then! What a calamity it is that the workers want a bigger slice of the cake and

want to take the employers' piece! This is terrible: the workers have bitten into the piece of cake belonging to the employer! The workers are sharpening their teeth and will have a bigger piece of cake in future. Is it any wonder that there is industrial unrest in this country and that unions are stopping work in protest? They are not going on strike: there is a difference between a strike and a protest. The workers are protesting because they now recognize the injustice that is being perpetrated on them.

Mr. Venning: What about the problems of the rural industry?

Mr. WELLS: Those problems will be solved before I sit down. Recently, wages were increased by 6 per cent but the increase should have been 7 per cent, related to current prices. This was a decision by the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission but the Commonwealth Treasurer (Mr. Snedden) said, "This is no good. We are ruined." The employers also said that they were ruined and could not carry the burden of a 6 per cent increase. They said it was a terrible thing, although the application had been justified in argument before the Full Bench. I suggest that the Full Bench, with tongue in cheek, had no alternative but to come down on the side of the workers, with a 6 per cent increase. However, that increase is being blamed for every evil in this country, and that is a lot of tripe.

Mr. Becker: You remind your Treasurer about that, won't you?

Mr. WELLS: The Treasurer recognizes that the labourer is worthy of his hire. Although the Treasurer has troubles, he does not deny the workers, whom we represent, the right to earn a decent equitable living. Recently, the greatest alligator in Australia commercially, Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited, decided—

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Deputy Premier) moved:

That the sitting of the House be extended beyond 6 o'clock.

Motion carried.

Mr. WELLS: This alligator bobbed up with an 8 per cent increase in steel prices. To me, one of the worst aspects of the situation has been that the television viewers in this State have been insulted by that company's attempt to justify an increase in the price of steel. In a television commercial we see a man, who is possibly represented as a worker, putting a little money in the bank, and he is depicted as lying in a hammock for 12 months. We are

told that he gets 4c on every dollar in the bank. He is doing all right! What about the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited? It blows up hills and mines the country, we are told, but it really rapes the country. That company claims that it trains people, employs people, spends millions, and gets only 4c in the dollar. It did not convert those figures to a percentage, which the normal person would expect it to do. The television viewers were told that the B.H.P. Company was getting 4c in the dollar—an absolutely insulting exercise.

I shall now turn to the rapacious activities of the Australian Medical Association. Members of the A.M.A. say, "We do not like going out as general practitioners to see people in their homes: we prefer to operate a clinic and run the people through it in the same way as sheep are run through a shearing shed." And the people must pay plenty for that treatment: it is a damnable attack on the workers of this country and on people with fixed incomes.

Mr. Venning: They have never been better off!

Mr. WELLS: The honourable member may never have been better off. What happened when the A.M.A. asked that medical fees be increased by 15 per cent? The Prime Minister said, "We will examine the situation and we will ask the A.M.A. to reconsider." The A.M.A. waived the 15 per cent increase in specialists' fees but, in respect of other fees, it said to the Commonwealth Government, "It must be 15 per cent, or else the medical scheme will be wrecked." There was no outcry about that, but it was murder! Statistics in the *Australian Economic Review* show that between 1965 and 1970 wages, as a proportion of the gross national product, fell from 63.2 per cent to 61.7 per cent. Over the same period the proportion of the work force receiving wages and salaries increased from 89.6 per cent to 91 per cent. So, more employees are sharing less of the national productivity.

The pressure for wage increases and the strong dissatisfaction with the arbitration system stem from the well-based knowledge of the trade union movement of this country that it is not getting a fair share of the national income. I will now cite the profits obtained by some firms in this State. The *Advertiser* of April 7 reported that the disclosed profits of General Motors-Holden's amounted to \$27,800,000. Not a bad chop, but they cannot afford to spend \$1,000,000 to allow the workers to get a raise! The profit for B.H.P. was \$68,459,000: how is that! Yet it wanted an 8 per cent increase in the price of steel,

and got it. We could liken this position to that of John Martin and Company Limited. B.H.P. is making astronomical profits in every sphere but it claims that steel is giving only a 4 per cent return, so it increases the price of steel by 8 per cent. John Martins could say that the whole store was profitable except the shoe department, which is making only 4 per cent, so the company puts up the price of shoes a couple of dollars a pair. The Myer Emporium (S.A.) Limited made a profit of \$9,600,000 in the first half of 1970-71, and John Martins made a profit of \$913,708 in the same period. The profit for Adelaide Steamship Company was \$1,521,268 for the year ended June 30, 1970.

Mr. Venning: What would you expect to be a reasonable profit?

Mr. WELLS: Does the honourable member say that the workers of this country can be honestly and genuinely castigated when they are confronted by gains and profits of this nature and when they stand up on their hind legs and say that they want a bit of butter on their bread while the companies are getting the cream? This Government is aware of the sad plight of primary producers in South Australia, and His Excellency's Speech stated that legislation would be introduced early to bring a relief valuation to primary-producing land because of the decline in values of such properties. Primary producers are now becoming aware that the group of people they have largely supported in the past (and I refer to big business again) has been responsible to a large degree for their unfortunate position, and for this reason they are recognizing the value of affiliation to the A.L.P. and are joining the ranks of the A.L.P. in droves. They are flocking to the A.L.P. banner, and rightly so, because they recognize the value of associating themselves with a Party such as ours. To indicate the way in which the blood suckers have latched on to the primary producers in this State, I will cite some statistics; my authority is the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, which states:

Farm costs over the past 10 years have escalated alarmingly by the following factors:

- (1) Insurance on farms has increased by 37 per cent.
- (2) Farm rents have increased by 23 per cent.
- (3) Rates and taxes have increased by 57 per cent.

Mr. Nankivell: There is your answer.

Mr. Hall: That is why you are putting on land tax.

Mr. WELLS: That is why His Excellency stated that, as the Government was aware of the plight of the farmers, it intended to assist them greatly by relieving them of this taxation burden.

Mr. Venning: What about succession duties?

Mr. WELLS: The other factor that has helped to escalate farm costs was an increase of 28 per cent in interest costs. The average price of many farm products over the past five years shows no increase; indeed, some prices show a decline. However, big businesses involved in steel, aluminium, oil and petrol production, car manufacturing and chemical production show in some cases a 40 per cent increase in profits over this period, representing an 8 per cent average annual increase. How

does the poor old farmer stand up to this? The solution is that the primary producer should consider two factors: first, he should pledge and give his allegiance to the Australian Labor Party, which is the Party concerned with his welfare; and, secondly, he should get rid of the leeches and the blood suckers (the Rundle Street farmers, who are profiting as a result of his efforts). Also, he should set up an organization that will deal with primary producers generally and enable them to enjoy the fruits of their labours.

Mr. HALL secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 6.11 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, July 15, at 2 p.m.