

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

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

CASINO BILL

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

LIQUID FUEL (RATIONING) BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the introduction forthwith and passage of a Bill through all stages without delay.

In explaining this motion (and I regret the need to introduce the Bill in this way, without notice) I have to inform members that an urgent position has arisen in relation to petrol supplies in South Australia. The position could not have been anticipated previously, and it is so urgent that, for the protection of the public, it necessitates the suspension of all business in the House until emergency measures have been taken.

The SPEAKER: I have counted the House and, there being present an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House, I accept the motion for the suspension of Standing Orders. Those for the question say "Aye"; against say "No". As I hear no dissentient voice, the motion for suspension is agreed to.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I was on my feet and I think I was seen by you before you put the motion. I desire to speak to the motion, and I was certainly on my feet and saw you look at me.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has the right to oppose the motion to suspend Standing Orders, if he desires to do so. I put the motion in accordance with Standing Orders, and there was no dissentient voice. Therefore, I declared the motion to suspend Standing Orders carried.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I rose as soon as the Premier sat down and as you asked for a seconder and, naturally, thought that, under Standing Order 463, you would give me the chance to speak to it. I remind you, Mr. Speaker, that Standing Order 463 provides:

The mover shall in every case be limited to 10 minutes in stating his reasons for seeking such suspension and one other member may be permitted to speak . . .

The Leader of the Opposition did not rise, and I make no reflection on that, as he and the Premier no doubt discussed this matter before the House met. However, the Standing Order provides for one other member to speak, and I was on my feet. I am sure (and I say this with respect to you) that you saw me on my feet. The only reason I would have been standing was to speak to the motion, pursuant to Standing Orders. Having said "Mr. Speaker" perhaps not very loudly, I did not want to interrupt you, as I thought that when you saw me you would finish whatever you were saying and would not put the motion before giving me the chance to speak. I ask you to reconsider the matter. My point is a small one, but one that I wanted to raise before supporting the motion, because I wanted to know what the position would be.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has raised a point of order, and I uphold it. It is the duty of every

member to seek his rights when he wants to speak to any motion before the Chair, and it is the duty of every member to signify to the Chair that he wants to speak to any motion before the House. The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I appreciate your ruling, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps I should ask you afterwards how one best signifies one's intentions.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You've made your point!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The only point I want to raise is that I, and perhaps other members, have a petition that I particularly want to present today. I have been notified that I would be able to present it today and made arrangements to do that, as it might not be convenient for me to do it tomorrow. The only thing I want to ask of the Government is whether, when this matter is concluded, there will be a chance for the formal presentation of petitions and, in particular, my petition. That is the only point I raise: it is a small one, but to me and the 161 people who signed the petition it is an important one. Therefore, I ask whether, once we have disposed of the business that is to be brought before the House by the Premier on suspension, I will have the chance to present the petition.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will facilitate the honourable member's presentation of the petition.

Mr. Millhouse: Thank you.

Motion carried.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act relating to the rationing of liquid fuel during the present emergency and for other purposes. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I thank the House for its assistance in allowing this measure to be introduced and agreeing to its immediate consideration. I intend now to give the second reading explanation of the Bill and, in accordance with the request of the Opposition, to move at the conclusion of my second reading explanation that the sitting of the House be suspended for 15 minutes, so that there is an opportunity for Opposition members to examine the provisions of the measure. First, I need to report to the House on the present situation regarding motor spirit in South Australia. At the start of business yesterday, the total stocks of motor spirit in South Australia, excluding stocks in the refinery, were as follows: premium grade—16 000 tons (16 300 t), or about 6½ days normal supply for the State; and regular grade—24 000 tons (24 400 t), or about 40 days normal supply for the State. If one totals the two, there is about 40 000 tons (40 640 t), which one way or another would, if we had to use just that stock, approximate about 13 days normal supply.

There is no problem immediately regarding regular grade petrol but, of the stocks of premium grade, only 3 200 tons (3 251.2 t) is held in bulk terminals in Adelaide, and that is about 1½ days normal supply for the metropolitan area. In addition, there is at the refinery 12 000 tons (12 192 t) of premium grade, which cannot be pumped or taken out of the refinery during the strike. This is about one week's normal supply. Two tankers are scheduled to arrive in Adelaide over the coming weekend. It would be possible to eke out supplies until then if the oil companies continued voluntarily to ration stocks to their resellers, and this has been done since last Friday. The tankers are expected to bring a total of 14 600 tons (14 833.6 t) of premium motor spirit (equivalent to six days normal supply for the State).

However, there seems to be considerable doubt now about whether the Seamen's Union will permit the tankers to be berthed. That is the matter which has arisen since yesterday and which now causes us to introduce this measure, in order to be safe. If there is any chance that either or both of these tankers may be diverted from Adelaide or that they will not be unloaded when they arrive, the stocks held in the metropolitan area in South Australia will be critical. Stocks now held would be sufficient to last for three to four weeks on the basis of rationing adopted last year. At present, stocks in country areas are reasonable, so any rationing, if introduced, would initially be confined to the metropolitan area. The only other type of liquid fuel in respect of which stocks could prove inadequate is industrial fuel oil. Stocks in bulk terminals yesterday morning totalled 11 700 tons (11 890 t), with an average daily use of 1 040 tons, (1 060 t), or just over two weeks supply.

There is another 28 500 tons (28 960 t), at the refinery which is sufficient for a further five weeks; if this could be used there would be no problem. As South Australia is a net exporter of industrial fuel oil there is little, if any, likelihood of obtaining supplies from outside the State, even if supplies could be unloaded here. The position as to the unloading of the tankers is at present unclear. Statements have been made to the press, and the Government has spent many hours trying to get some kind of clarity in regard to the unloading of the tankers. However, it is now apparent that the question of whether or not the tankers will be unloaded will not be concluded before Friday. It may be that by Friday the actual base dispute will be settled, because the parties are already, in negotiation, closer to settlement than was previously the case. It would be unsafe in present circumstances, given the supplies I have outlined and the possibility that the tankers will now not be unloaded (a possibility we have not previously contemplated, since that course of action was not followed in the dispute last year, and the seamen are not directly involved in the dispute at all), to plan on the unloading of the tankers. If the tankers are not unloaded, supplies in the metropolitan area will be critical.

It would be remiss of the Government not to have taken the necessary action to protect the public and ensure essential supplies if that should prove necessary. I regret very much the need to introduce this Bill. On the information available yesterday I indicated that emergency legislation would not be necessary as there would be sufficient fuel available for at least two weeks, with the exception of fuel oil. That statement was based on the stocks of motor spirit known to exist in the State, and the fact that two tankers had been scheduled some weeks ago to bring products to Adelaide; one, in fact, to back-load fuel oil from the refinery. One of those two tankers was, in fact, in the course of being loaded at Kwinana as I spoke yesterday. It has not left, because of the uncertainty that developed last night and this morning about its unloading.

Now it appears that the position may not be as secure because of the likelihood of the refusal of the Seamen's Union to handle tankers in this State. If members of that union do, in fact, refuse to assist in discharging tankers at Port Adelaide, then the immediate supply position of motor spirit, at least in the Adelaide metropolitan area, is in real jeopardy. The strike of operators at the refinery is not confined to South Australia. In Victoria, where employees of the same company are also on strike, there are two other refineries that are operating and supplies are available to the public. There is no doubt that we in this State are in a vulnerable position, being in an isolated

State with only one refinery, which under normal conditions supplies only about two-thirds of our needs. There is no problem in any other State, either with refineries apart from Altona or with transporting fuel. Any refusal to berth or discharge the tankers will not affect the company that operates our refinery, but it will have serious repercussions on the public. Any such refusal would, in fact, produce results to the public quite disproportionate to the gravity of the dispute in this case.

Mr. Millhouse: Has that been pointed out to the Seamen's Union?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, it has. The Government believes that it is essential, to safeguard the interests of the citizens of the State, to have this legislation passed today, so that it can be proclaimed, and brought into operation immediately if this is necessary. If, in fact, it is necessary to proclaim it immediately because of what some members of the public do in failing to co-operate or to act in a public-spirited way in respect of their purchase of motor fuel, it may well be necessary to proclaim the Act before Friday.

We can but see what happens in respect of purchases of motor spirit and the rationing procedure adopted by the companies themselves in supplying their outlets. As to the industrial situation here, we have been in touch with the unions. The basic dispute which has caused this present position is a dispute that has arisen in Victoria, and the union concerned is negotiating with the head office of the company in another State. It is not possible here to determine that dispute at the moment. However, as soon as the dispute affects other unionists in this State it is the policy of the Trades and Labor Council that the matter should be referred to the Trades and Labor Council of this State, so that the disputes committee of the council can then involve itself in the dispute to try to get a settlement and ensure that other workmen are not placed in jeopardy in respect of their jobs and incomes by a dispute which is within a narrow compass. As a result of the Government's investigations, I met this morning with officers of the Trades and Labor Council, and I am informed that the matter of the dispute has already been referred by another union to that council. In accordance with its rules, the council will immediately be involved, in consequence, in endeavours to settle this dispute as a whole.

Clause 1 of the Bill is formal, but I draw members' attention to the fact that it is to come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation, and indicate that it will be brought into operation only if circumstances render it necessary. This will result from the constant reports that the Government will receive about the position of stocks held in the State. Clause 2 is formal. Clause 3 sets out the definitions necessary for the purposes of the Bill. Clause 4 gives the Minister an absolute discretion to issue permits under the measure to any person. Should it be necessary to bring the measure into operation, publicity will be given to the classes of person who will be able to obtain permits.

Clause 5 gives a power to revoke permits, and I would draw members' attention to the wide power conferred by subclause (2) of this clause. Clause 6 provides for a general authorization to sell or deliver liquid fuel to persons who are not permit holders. Based on our previous experience in an operation of this nature, it is thought that such a power would be useful. Clause 7 prohibits the sale by retail of any liquid fuel to a person who is not a permit holder, and this is, of course, the basis of the rationing system. Clause 8 enjoins a permit holder to use the fuel

supplied to him only for the purposes for which it was supplied, and provides a substantial penalty for a breach of this provision.

Clause 9 prohibits a permit holder from disposing of any fuel that has been sold to him under a permit. Clause 10 prohibits a permit holder from lending his permit to another person. Clause 11 prohibits a person other than a permit holder, or a person affected by an authorization under clause 6, from buying motor fuel by retail. Clause 12 enjoins a permit holder to carry the permit while he is in charge of a vehicle using fuel supplied under the permit. Clause 13 confers appropriate powers on the police to investigate and detect breaches of the Act. Clause 14 enjoins a person not to make a false or misleading statement in connection with an application for a permit. Sub-clause (2) of this clause provides an appropriate, defence.

Clauses 15 and 16 give the Minister, who is the Minister of Labour and Industry, the power to control movements of bulk fuel, and is in form and substance similar to the corresponding provisions of the measure enacted last year. Clause 17 enables authorized persons to exercise the powers of the Minister under this Act, and clause 18 gives appropriate protection for the Minister and such authorized persons. Clause 19 provides for certain allegations in a complaint to be *prima facie* evidence of the facts alleged, and in the circumstances of a measure of this nature I suggest it is not unreasonable.

Clause 20 will enable a selective application of the measure to be achieved. As was adverted to earlier, it is unlikely that the whole State will be affected by the present situation and it is far from the Government's intention that there should be any over-regulation in this matter. Clause 21 increases the fine for profiteering under the Prices Act if the offence is committed in relation to liquid fuel. Clause 22 provides that the consent of the Attorney-General shall be necessary for a prosecution under this Act. It is the earnest hope of the Government that prosecutions will not be necessary under this Act and that the people of this State will accept this measure for what it is, an attempt to ensure that, in circumstances of emergency, essential services are disrupted as little as possible.

Clause 23 provides for the forfeiture to the Crown of any liquid fuel in relation to which an offence was committed. Clause 24 provides for summary proceedings. Clause 25 provides a regulation-making power. Clause 26 provides for the expiry of the Act on November 30, 1973. This is a usual provision in emergency legislation of this nature and its effect is that the Act will be deemed to have been repealed on that day. If any emergency still existed, it would be necessary for us to return to Parliament to ask for an extension of the legislation. The schedule sets out the form of permit.

I point out that, as a result of our administration on the last occasion when it was necessary to introduce emergency control of fuel in South Australia, there are certain refinements in procedures and in the form of permits. These arose from the experience we had in administration of the previous emergency.

Mr. Coumbe: In other words, it is practically the same?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes.

[Sitting suspended from 2.25 to 2.40 p.m.]

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): In the interests of the people of South Australia, I support the Bill, but I do not support the action that has caused this situation to arise. That action can be sheeted home positively to the union hierarchy, or a small part of it. Pre-

viously, in this House we indicated that the people of South Australia were being held to ransom by the activities of a few. In the present situation, we have a new master of ceremonies, who has been imported from across the border and who is causing disruption to industry in this State and to the normal activities of our community.

It is an activity that neither we on this side of the House nor, I believe, any person in the community would accept as reasonable. It is certainly not profitable. We have a situation in which the activities of industrial unrest that were constantly causing difficulty in New South Wales have suddenly switched to South Australia, and one can conjecture why that may have happened. As a result of the indication of an election in New South Wales on November 17, suddenly it has become a matter of "Hands off New South Wales and intrude anywhere else you like, particularly into that area where, according to the belief of some, it will be easier to undertake the action, namely, where there is a Labor-controlled Government."

Members of this House, over a long period (certainly, since before the last Commonwealth election), were given to understand that, if there was a change on the Commonwealth scene and a new Party took control there, because of that Party's close association with the union movement there would be no further difficulties. What is the real situation? Since December 2, we have had nothing but an escalation of difficulties and confrontations between the union movement and the employers and amongst the unions themselves. Demarcation disputes have been responsible for a major proportion of the total number of man-hours lost.

At present, we in South Australia are being held to ransom by the ludicrous action of Mr. Apap and one or two others. He is completely intransigent. He has already caused disruption in recent weeks at the Gillman yards, and he has now intruded into affairs at Port Stanvac. Yesterday we were asked (I was asked particularly, because of an interjection I had made) not to exacerbate the dispute, because that might create greater problems. Why should there have been any need for the matter to be aired in the first instance, if the association that Government members claim that they have with the union hierarchy had been put into effect much earlier? I refer to the arrangement or agreement, and the supposed benefit to the community as a whole arising from having a Labor Government associated with a union movement that is also in Labor hands.

I do not deny the need for this legislation, and I look forward to its being passed through this House and another place without undue delay, not because we want it but because it has become necessary for the benefit of the people of this State. However, I should like to raise with the Premier and his advisers the matter of what has happened to the major supply of fuel that was to be held in stock in South Australia against any future problem of this kind. *Hansard* reports for July and August, 1972, contain several statements that the Government, in association with the industry, was considering various ways to ensure that in future emergency situations, and if problems of the kind we had in July, 1972, occurred again, an arrangement would be made so as to reduce the effect of any untoward or further union action. It would seem that those arrangements, if made, have been futile. If they have not been made, whose fault is it? Is it the fault of administration? Has the industry failed to comply with an agreement reached with the Government just 12 months ago? I believe that people in this State, who, potentially, have been

brought to their knees by such activity in the union movement, may now want replies to these questions. I cannot believe that it has happened to South Australia by any other means than design. I believe the Premier is truthful when he says that we in this State are particularly vulnerable: we are vulnerable not only because of our isolation from the supply (the Premier has indicated we may not see the ships, and there is no clear indication they will be handled when they get here) but also because in this State we are, unfortunately, controlled by a Labor organization that knuckles under to union pressure.

Mr. COUNBE (Torrens): We support the Bill (and hope it has a speedy passage through the House), but only because of the emergency that has occurred. The Bill seems to contain the same basic provisions as those contained in last year's amended legislation. Members will recall that two Bills were considered last year. Having said that, I must emphasize that one or two aspects are apparent. The first relates to the very startlingly low level of reserves now held in the metropolitan area, not only at garages and outlets but more particularly at Port Stanvac and Birkenhead. I understand that the situation in country areas is not so bad. However, in reply to a question I asked the Premier yesterday he indicated what the reserves were, but now we have received further information on this point and it is obvious how low is the level of reserves available in the case of the emergency we are now facing. This aspect should be a matter of concern not only for the people but also for the Government.

I realize that this dispute has been going on for some days and is, I believe, another example of the unfortunate type of dispute that is plaguing Australia and South Australia at present. It seems that the object of some people (and I say "some" advisedly, because I believe a most irresponsible gentleman is concerned in this dispute) is to hamper our vital industries. The victims are his own workmates who are the people of this State. This point has to be brought home clearly, because it is the people of this State who will suffer.

In his second reading explanation, the Premier has referred to the dire possibility (and the regrettable possibility) of the Seamen's Union of Australia becoming involved. The matter has been referred to the Trades and Labor Council, and I should like to know what approaches the Government has made to that union, because I believe that the Government has a responsibility to South Australia. However, I realize that both unions are under Commonwealth jurisdiction, and that this matter is outside the jurisdiction of the South Australian Industrial Commission. I think it is only fair that the Government should make clear to the House what action it has taken either to settle the dispute or to suggest, perhaps through the Trades and Labor Council, that the Seamen's Union use some common sense and stay out of this dispute. I realize the difficulties here.

Dr. Eastick: Bring the member for Florey back!

Mr. COUNBE: That may be a good idea. The people of South Australia are the ones who are suffering in this case and they will continue to suffer. In supporting the Bill, I echo the plea made by the Leader regarding future reserves. Is there no way of ensuring that greater reserves are available? Once the dispute is settled, rationing may apply for some time, even if the dispute is resolved this afternoon. It would take some time before adequate supplies were available even assuming (and hoping) that the Seamen's Union did not become involved in this

matter. I suggest that the Government explore the possibility of ensuring that adequate reserves exist so that, once a dispute is resolved, fuel will be readily available. Although we regret the need for this Bill, we support it in order to meet this emergency. The importance of the measure is apparent and, of course, the inclusion of November 30 as the date on which this legislation should cease to apply is an important provision, as is the clause enabling the Government to call off the measure. Once fuel is available, the Government can remove the restriction and people can resume their normal activities.

Mr. HALL (Goyder): We are seeing yet another example of the Government's treating the results of a disturbance instead of getting at its root cause. By the stance it has taken in this Parliament and in the community, the Government has encouraged this type of industrial dispute, and it now introduces rationing, taking no action to help South Australians meet their needs fully. In 1972, at page 411 of *Hansard*, the Premier said that he was in favour of a 35-hour week, and this matter is one of the causes of the dispute. This Government and members of the Labor Party, as well as the Commonwealth Government, have encouraged the introduction of a 35-hour week long before it is a viable proposition in Australia, and they have done this deliberately in order to curry political favour with the community. Labor members stand guilty of causing this type of industrial dispute, which impacts so heavily on South Australian citizens. I put the blame fairly where it belongs (on the State Government) for this rationing. It may well be that the seamen will not handle the ships bringing supplies to South Australia.

What is the action that we are considering under this Bill doing to get petrol supplies to South Australians? This measure will ration what we have, because it involves what I regard as a rationing mentality and, indeed, we have dealt with other legislation in the House this session which has done virtually the same thing: do not increase the supply, but ration what we already have! What has the Government said about the activities of the union? Has it criticized the union? The Government is the first one to criticize the other side of industry if it is at fault: there has been no dearth of criticism by this Government of ownership and management of industry. However, where is the Government's criticism of a union that takes the law into its own hands and holds to ransom the public of South Australia, in order to meet the requirements of 60 people? I refer to the reported demands by the union on the owners and management of the refinery in respect of what is being offered to the workers by that management. There is a contest between the two groups on what should be paid to those operatives. The report of October 23 states:

The strikers are seeking a \$10 weekly pay rise, a 12 per cent loading a \$12.50 weekly environmental allowance and a 35-hour week. The company offered an \$8 increase to the base rate with penalties equal to a \$12.90 a week increase, bringing the average earnings of operators to \$87.60. The strikers rejected the offer and will meet again at 9 a.m. on Monday.

There has been a demand and a substantial offer to meet that demand but, because the two parties cannot agree, there is to be a major disruption of South Australian industry and much inconvenience to the South Australian public. The sad thing is that this happened last year, and South Australia is again found wanting, having little in reserve and being unable to obtain supplies that would otherwise come in by sea. The Government does nothing to alter the situation. It does nothing to criticize those

who have brought it about, and it does not suggest that an arbitrator be appointed in this dispute. For all I know, the Government is not taking a leading part in the arbitration of the dispute: it just rations supplies. Last year when the Government resorted to this action the South Australian public roundly blamed it. It did not take the Opposition in this Parliament to tell the public who was at fault: the Government stood condemned by its own statements over the years and its encouragement of conditions that cannot be met by industry at present.

This morning the Commonwealth Minister for Labour (Mr. Clyde Cameron) has been saying on the radio that he accepts inflation as just one of the evils existing in the community. Would he say that we should put up with these disabilities and that next year we should re-introduce petrol rationing? Will the Premier continue in this vein and introduce another petrol rationing Bill? Indeed, why does not the Premier make this legislation a permanent feature and keep it going? Are we to live under national security regulations in respect of the sale of land? The situation is not far removed from the 1949 mentality when Labor was thrown out federally on its ear because of this factor: because of the controls and controls built on controls.

In South Australia we have a Government that will see no evil in the people and apply no blame to the people who support it, even though they may be completely blameworthy, as Mr. Apap and his unionists are. I make no apology for that statement. It is inconceivable that they should hold this State to ransom by their irresponsible actions. We might see better results if a lead came from the Government. Why does not the Government give a lead in this way? Does the Government believe that the union is right in this matter? All the Premier will say is that we are anti-union and then he will go back to his old emotional scourge of the Opposition. Will the Government continually introduce on an annual basis petrol rationing in tacit support of union demands? What would happen if petrol rationing was not on the Statute Book today? Chaos would result and the Government would be seen for what it is. Although the Government is dealing with the result of the action and not the cause, to a degree the Government's reputation will be saved because of its action in this matter. However, I will ask the people on every occasion to ask the Government what it is doing to mediate in this situation. Whose side is it on? Is it on the side of 60 people who are holding the State to ransom, or is it on the side of the people who are being held to ransom? This legislation does not show that the Government is on the side of the people generally; it simply shows that the Government is protecting its own. It is a sad day when Parliament has to approve legislation such as this for the second consecutive year.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I entirely support what has been said by the member for Goyder about this matter. It was noteworthy that, when the Premier was giving his second reading explanation, his criticism (if there was any criticism) of those involved in the dispute was extremely muted, in stark contrast to what the situation would be if he were dealing with people who were not his political friends. This is what we always find from the Premier and the Government. If they are dealing with trouble caused by their political friends they go easy on them, and we do not get even one word of criticism.

Mr. Chapman: They would protect them.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the honourable member wants to say that, I will adopt it: they are protecting them. Instead of looking at the causes of the problem in this case, the

Premier and the Government are dealing only with the results of the problem. During the Premier's explanation, by interjection I asked whether the gravity of the situation, which he had eloquently outlined, had been passed on to the Seamen's Union, because I believe that this moment of crisis has been caused by that union. He said "Yes", but he did not go on to say what was being done. To the best of my knowledge the Minister of Labour and Industry was not even in the House. I am glad he is here now. I hope that, in the debate, he will say what steps he and the Government are taking to resolve the dispute. We want to know particularly what he has been doing, in the many hours to which the Premier referred, to persuade the Seamen's Union to unload the tankers. These are matters that we are entitled to hear about.

My own view is that some unions in Australia and in South Australia are intent on disrupting the community and our economy. They will take any opportunity to disrupt the economy, because that is in line with their political, as well as their economic, objectives. I believe that the Seamen's Union is one of those unions; this opportunity was too good for it to miss. I should like to hear from the Government, and particularly from the Minister of Labour and Industry, what is being done to see that rationing is not necessary in South Australia for that is the real point. It is most important that we obviate the necessity for this Bill's ever coming into operation. I regret very much that the Government has not been successful in avoiding the crisis so that it would have been unnecessary to introduce the Bill. One can imagine the sort of thing the Premier would have said if he had been dealing with those who were his political enemies, instead of with his political friends. This is yet another example of the way in which he and his Government put Party interests ahead of the interests of the community.

I first heard of the Bill only about a minute before the Premier sought the suspension of Standing Orders, when the Liberal and Country League Whip told me what would happen. When a measure like this is introduced in such circumstances it is hard to resist being swept off one's feet: it is hard to look at the provisions of the Bill in the atmosphere prevailing and in a short time to see whether those provisions are really justified or not. I have tried to do that in the time I have had. This Bill is, as has been said, in much the same form as the Act which was passed last year to deal with the previous crisis that occurred with regard to liquid fuel. I object to some provisions in the Bill. I acknowledge that, if there is a crisis (for the purposes of discussing the content of that Bill I make that acknowledgment), drastic powers are justified certainly if, as here in contrast to the Bill introduced last session, there is a time limit incorporated. Nevertheless, I think a number of the provisions go beyond the justification of the present crisis. Clause 13 provides:

(1) A member of the Police Force may (a) request the driver of a vehicle on a road to stop that vehicle; or (b) ask a driver or the person apparently in charge of a vehicle (whether on a road or elsewhere) questions for the purpose of ascertaining the name and place of residence or place of business of that driver or person or of the owner of the vehicle and questions relating to any liquid fuel in or on the vehicle including questions relating to the circumstances in which the liquid fuel was obtained.

Obviously the draftsman acting in accordance with his instructions, has gone as wide as he can in these matters. Clause 13 continues:

(2) A person shall forthwith (a) comply with a request made to him under subsection (1) of this section to stop the vehicle; and (b) truly answer all questions put to him under subsection (1) of this section.

There is a penalty of \$200 if one does not do it. That is a negation of the general principle of law which states that a person should not be obliged (and he is obliged under this Bill) to incriminate himself, and it is one of the powers I do not like. I like even less two other clauses in the Bill. Clause 17, referring to the powers of the Minister, provides:

The powers of the Minister under this Act may be exercised on his behalf by any person for the time being so authorized by the Minister, and where the exercise of those powers is expressed to depend on a discretion or a state of mind of the Minister that reference shall be read as if it referred to a discretion or a state of mind of the person authorized to exercise those powers.

That wording is extraordinarily wide and loose. I know that the Executive loves power. That statement applies not only to this Executive. We have others (Lord Acton, for instance) but Parliament should scrutinize these provisions thoroughly before it gives this power, as we are being asked to do here.

I oppose clause 18 outright because it puts the Minister and any person authorized by him above the Law. The provision is bad and utterly unjustified, even by this crisis. Clause 18 provides:

No proceedings of any kind shall be instituted or heard in any court in respect of any act or decision of the Minister or any person authorized by him in the exercise or purported exercise of his powers under this Act.

Why is it necessary to put such power into the hands of the Minister or a person authorized by him? I can think of no reason why that power should be included in the Bill. Why are we going to the trouble of passing a detailed Act of Parliament at all if we are simply going to say that the Minister can do what he likes, because that is what it does say? I think that is thoroughly bad and unjustified and the Bill will stand up perfectly well without it. I hope clause 18 will not be proceeded with.

I notice that under clause 24 proceedings for an offence shall be summary. I do not agree with that. I consider that, when we are creating offences and weighting the Statute against the defendant, as we are doing here in regard to the onus of proof and in other ways, it is only right and proper that a person should have the opportunity to say that he at least wants to be tried by a jury, not have the charge disposed of summarily by a magistrate. I hope that at least that safeguard will be put into the Bill.

If, as the Premier has said, we do not have any prosecutions, it will not matter. However, if there are prosecutions, because of the sweeping nature of the powers and penalties (including imprisonment) in the Bill it is surely only fair that the decision on innocence or guilt should rest with 12 citizens, the men or women of a jury, not with a magistrate. That would be a safeguard against an abuse of the power, certainly in the case of a prosecution, and I cannot see that it could possibly do any harm or affect the powers of the Minister or the Government generally if the measure was passed in that form. I hope that members will consider the various clauses, not skip over them, being borne along because of the excitement and the suddenness with which the measure has been introduced. We are dealing here with fundamental rights and we are interfering with them in a way that I consider is not justified, even by the crisis that has been explained to us.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I am grateful for the Opposition's support for the Bill. I point out to members that there are provisions in the law of this country for the settlement of industrial disputes. It is sometimes inevitable that industrial disputes will produce some disruption. I regret that, and I point out that this Government has been more successful in avoiding dis-

ruption of this kind than has any other Government in this country or in any comparable country.

Mr. McAnaney: Have you read the latest statistics?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, I have. The statistics show that 3.7 per cent of the national time lost in industrial disputes occurs in South Australia compared to our 9.7 per cent of the national work force. Significantly, under this Government, industrial disputes have been settled with the assistance of the Government, when all that could happen when members opposite were in office was that the then Attorney-General used to get up in the House and ask the Opposition to use its good offices to settle disputes. He did that time and time again, yet he has the gall to get up now and ask what we are doing about an industrial dispute. I ask the honourable member what he did.

Mr. Millhouse: What are you doing this time?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member had listened, or if his Leader had been in the House to find out what had happened in the dispute, he would know—

Mr. Millhouse: Tell us now.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I suggest that the honourable member read *Hansard*, because obviously he did not listen when I was speaking previously. The basic dispute is before the industrial tribunal in Melbourne. The South Australian Industrial Court has no jurisdiction—

Mr. Millhouse: What have you done?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member will not listen to an answer that he has asked me to give, what is the use of my giving the answer? Constantly I have tried to give the answer to the honourable member, and he has interrupted me before I can give it. If he does me the courtesy of listening instead of trying to make political points in a political way, as he does here constantly, he may get somewhere. If the dispute becomes an interstate dispute, the Australian Council of Trade Unions will be involved, and the South Australian Government, through its offices with the A.C.T.U., will be in a much better position in relation to that dispute.

As regards the dispute, we have inquired and have tried to keep constantly in touch with what is occurring. Regarding the Seamen's Union, from the outset of any suggestion that that union may be involved in this matter (and I point out to the honourable member that it was not involved previously and would not be involved normally if the rules of the Trades and Labor Council were complied with), that union did not approach the Trades and Labor Council. This Government tried to get in touch with the Seamen's Union to point out what the position was and to make representations that there was no basis for its involvement in the dispute. Those representations have been made.

We have tried constantly to get settlement as far as is within the competence of any Government in this State and, as soon as it seemed that the dispute would broaden, I got in touch with officers of the Trades and Labor Council. I did that last evening and they met me first thing this morning. As a result of that meeting, the reference of the dispute to the Trades and Labor Council, in accordance with the council's rules, has been made. We have taken action of a kind that was never taken in this State, under the honourable member's Government, to settle a dispute. All the honourable member could ever do was ask the Opposition to use its good offices with the trade unions. He told us to confer with them. This afternoon I have heard the two members of the Liberal Movement speaking here. In this House, they do not bother about responsibility to the

public. All that they ever do is try to make political points, regardless of fact or responsibility.

Mr. Hall: We don't run to the Government for its praise.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member never bothers about facts or truth in what he says in this House or elsewhere, and it is so well known to the people of this State and to members of this House that it is not surprising that the honourable member is hitching his bluey to go to fresh fields, he hopes, and pastures new.

Mr. Hall: Have you asked yourself why we didn't have to ration petrol?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The reason was that the honourable member did not encounter a dispute at the refinery, but I point out to him that disputes involving inconvenience to the public of South Australia under his Government were far greater than they have been under this Government.

Mr. Hall: Deal with the petrol position.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am dealing with matters the honourable member brought into this House. What did he do about any industrial dispute, except exacerbate it?

Mr. Millhouse: What did you do?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The member for Mitcham did not do anything except get up and say, "Go and speak to the trade unions on our behalf, please." What a statesmanlike attitude that was! I shall now deal with the matter before us.

Mr. Millhouse: It's about time, too.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I want to deal with the action taken by the Government in relation to reserves, because we have kept a close note of reserves and we have been in constant touch with the companies since last year. The reserves at Birkenhead are more than twice what they were at the time of the dispute last year.

Mr. Hall: Then we need not have rationing for a long time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I hope that the rationing will not be necessary, but I will take precautions, and in relation to that matter I do not believe that the Seamen's Union has any basis for involvement in this dispute. The honourable member has accused me of not standing up to unions when this Government considers that they are acting contrary to the public interest, but apparently the honourable member is ignoring what happened last year on the front steps of Parliament House.

Mr. Hall: The corollary of what you are saying is that you support—

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member has had his say, and I am trying to reply to the wretched claims he makes in the House on a personal basis against the Government, continually disregarding the benefits to the people of this State, in order to make petty, personal, and political points, which is his "hallmark" in politics in this State.

Mr. Hall: Then why do you support (he present dispute at the refinery)? You have not said that you do not.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not support the present dispute: I have never made such a statement, and the honourable member cannot quote me.

Mr. Hall: Your attitudes show that you support it.

Mr. Millhouse: Why don't you—

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member made an accusation here, and was followed by his cohort, or whatever else he is, that this Government did not oppose unions when it believed that the unions were not acting in

the public interest. The honourable member knows (and it has been proved publicly time and time again) that that is not true and that, when this Government believes a union has acted improperly or irresponsibly, I have said so.

Mr. Millhouse: Do you say so now?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have said already in this debate what I believe is proper to say in relation to this dispute. I have said that I do not believe the Seamen's Union has a basis for involvement on the factors as they are known to the Government, and that the involving of other unions in the dispute should be taken in the proper course to the Trades and Labor Council.

Mr. Millhouse: Have you anything to say about the Storemen and Packers Union?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In relation to this matter, members have made accusations and I am replying to them. Members cannot get me away from the point by their petty interjections.

Mr. Hall: You won't come back to it!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member has said that this Government does not take a responsible attitude on behalf of the people of this State when it disapproves of the action of trade unions. However, in the case of the strike by builders' labourers in South Australia I bitterly condemned, on the steps of this House, that union for what it did. In the case of a dispute in which the Miscellaneous Workers Union was involved at the rubber works, I condemned that union.

Mr. Mathwin: What about the Kangaroo Island job: how did you go with that?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I believed the union was right, and I stood up for it. Let us ask the converse: when, in any dispute on any basis of an industrial nature, has the member for Goyder or the member for Mitcham suggested that the employers might have been unreasonable? I do not remember one single case, and it does not seem to matter even in a case in which the courts have decided that the employers were wrong and the workers were right. Never have they suggested anything other than that the workers were wrong, rapacious, and taking the community for a ride. Their hatred for trade unionism is evident, and has been so clear to the people of South Australia for so long that they are utterly discredited in making these statements.

Mr. Hall: We will see about that!

Mr. Millhouse: What are you going to say about the Storemen and Packers, Union?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have said what I have to say about that union.

Mr. Millhouse: That's Nothing: you won't condemn them.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Storemen and Packers Union has a dispute that I believe has to be settled in the proper course of industrial negotiation.

Mr. Chapman: Just by giving in!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Not necessarily.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You wouldn't know.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member would starve them into submission and gaol them.

Mr. Chapman: I would not.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Yes, you would.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I point out that the employers have already agreed that many claims of the Storemen and Packers Union were right.

Mr. Hall: Why don't you—

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No doubt the honourable member would not agree that any claim by any unionist was right, but we are now faced with an emergency situation about which the Government must take some action. We are taking that action, and the only proper and reasonable course for members to take is to act in the public interest on that basis.

Mr. Hall: That's what should be done.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member has made that comment on the basis of his own attitude in politics, clearly indicating that the attitude he has is constantly anti-unionist. The actions of this Government are in stark contrast to those of members of the Liberal Movement and of others who have interjected on that side. We believe that industrial disputes should be settled by the proper and established means of settlement, that action should be taken by Governments to facilitate those means of settlement so that everyone gets a fair go, that the rules of trade unions have been designed to ensure that proper actions for settlement are taken, and that if the trade union movement rules are abided by we will maintain in South Australia the kind of responsible union leadership that is required and a very small amount of disruption of the public that occurs in industrial disputes, which is a record for any comparable situation anywhere.

Mr. Millhouse: Are the rules of the Trades and Labor Council being abided by at present?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, they now are.

Mr. Millhouse: They now are!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member has not listened to what I have said, and does not care, either. I believe it is necessary for us to obtain as speedy a passage as possible of this Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Interpretation.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): No definition of "distillate" appears: is there any reason for it having been omitted?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): So far as I am aware from the reports received, distillate is not a problem at present, but, if we find other forms of motor fuel becoming a problem, we can, under the proposal, immediately declare them.

Clause passed.

Clause 4—"Power to issue permits."

Dr. TONKIN: As the means used when a similar Act was operating were rather clumsy, can the Premier say what arrangements will be made to issue permits?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the Bill is proclaimed, there will be several points at which permits may be obtained, not from the State Administration Centre only. Arrangements have been made to ensure a wide distribution of places at which permits may be obtained, so that the delays apparent last time will be avoided.

Mr. BLACKER: As it is only eight days before the start of the crayfishing season, crayfishermen have expressed concern about fuel supplies. In addition, we are virtually at the start of the harvesting season. Will these areas be considered?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes.

Clause passed.

Clauses 5 and 6 passed.

Clause 7—"Prohibition on the sale of liquid fuel."

Mr. MATHWIN: I believe this clause will cause great hardship on some petrol resellers, especially in the metropolitan area. When the previous measure was operating,

some metropolitan service station proprietors who sold petrol were regarded as rebels. I draw the Premier's attention to a report that appeared in the *Advertiser* at the time stating:

Metropolitan service stations today ignored the South Australian Government's ban on the sale of petrol except for emergency cases.

This was before the legislation was enacted. The report continues:

In a protest at what they describe as "Government victimization" three garages at Cross Road, Goodwood, sold petrol non-stop this morning. "It's become a question of sell or go out of business," said garage owner, Frank Jelen.

These people have petrol supplies and, as they have commitments to meet, they would be faced with terrific problems in meeting their commitments if they were unable to sell their petrol. Mr. Frank Jelen, the spokesman referred to in the report, said that he and the others concerned had received support from the Royal Automobile Association of South Australia Incorporated.

Clause passed.

Clauses 8 to 12 passed.

Clause 13—"Power to stop vehicle and ask questions."

Mr. MILLHOUSE: This clause gives great and sweeping powers of interrogation to the police, and it puts an obligation on persons to stop their vehicles and to answer questions asked by the police. The first point I make about this is that it is in complete contrast to the situation or the law as it stands at present, namely, that no-one need answer any questions (certainly no questions that will incriminate him). If a person is stopped now, under the Road Traffic Act he has to give his name and address and say whether or not he was driving the vehicle; that is all he has to do. Normally, one does not have to answer any questions put to one by a police officer or anyone else. As this is a severe provision, I ask the Premier for an explanation of and justification for its necessity.

The other point I make is that I do not believe that the police enjoy having powers of this nature. I do not believe that any body of persons would enjoy being foisted with a job like this, so that when I criticize the provision I certainly do not criticize the Police Force, because I believe the provision has not been asked for by the police, nor will they want it or enjoy exercising this power if it is given. Because, as the Premier will understand, it is such a grave departure from the general outlook of the law, I ask him to justify the necessity for this power.

Dr. TONKIN: I think the points made by the member for Mitcham were succinctly made by the former member for Alexandra (Mr. Brookman) in the last Parliament, when the previous measure was considered. I also view this clause with some disquiet, for this is not a common practice, and I sincerely trust that it will not pave the way for similar legislation. However, it is some measure of the crisis that is now being forced on the community and of the present circumstances in which the measure has been introduced. Although I regret that it has been necessary to introduce this provision, I consider that we have little option but to support it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As has been stated, this is not the normal thing that would be done in legislation operating within the State. However, the normal thing is not what happens in urgent legislation when we are faced with emergencies. We found on the last occasion that people were willing to cheat on the rest of the community in a crisis situation, where we might not have had sufficient petrol to cope with basic public essentials and emergencies. In these circumstances, one requires

that the police should have power to obtain information in order to enforce these provisions—and to obtain that information from the people within whose knowledge it alone is. As the member for Mitcham knows, that is normally the basis on which there is a departure in law from the general principle that the Crown has to prove everything and that no-one is required to supply information to the Crown. The honourable member knows that there are certain areas in the law where, in fact, some onus is put on a defendant, simply because it would be impossible to prove matters that it is necessary to prove in the public interest in criminal matters, because they are peculiarly within the knowledge of the persons themselves.

Mr. Millhouse: Can you tell me of any other similar provisions in another Act? I doubt whether you will find them. This goes much further than we should ever go.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member already knows that, in relation to certain matters under the Road Traffic Act, people are required to answer questions of police officers as to who was driving their vehicle.

Mr. Millhouse: This is far too sweeping, and you know it

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is sweeping, simply for the basic reason that, in this case, unless police have these powers it will be extremely difficult to enforce these provisions. It is for no other reason than that.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I cannot really see how these powers will bring about the control over these provisions that the Premier expects. The member for Mitcham has validly pointed out the excessive powers that the police will be given under this clause: it is unfortunate to see this sort of power introduced and given to anyone in the community. An innocent person might be driving along a street in, say, three weeks time when fuel supplies might be very low, and he could be stopped simply because he was driving a private car that still had plenty of fuel. He could immediately be suspected of having broken the law in relation to this Bill. The purpose of introducing this clause is to attempt to remove the underhand selling of petrol but I believe that this provision will not work and that it will unfortunately reflect on the persons concerned.

Mr. BECKER: I oppose this clause. Have we any civil liberties left? Is such a clause necessary? Although the Premier has stated that some people will cheat, I ask how many cheated in a similar situation last year and how many prosecutions were launched. Although we have more than 9 600 000 gallons (43 642 000 /) now in store in comparison with the 1 500 000 gallons (6 839 000/) that we had last year, the oil refinery stopped pumping fuel last Saturday. Unless the refinery plant is maintained, problems will develop when the dispute is settled and the plant is brought back into operation. South Australia has not recovered from the last oil dispute, and the State Government should have learnt from that occasion. Again, people in the metropolitan area are held to ransom. I question the wisdom and validity of this clause, because restrictions do not apply in country areas and, if a person living in the metropolitan area obtains petrol from a country area and is then stopped while travelling, say, in King William Street, he has to prove the source of his petrol. Is this really necessary?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member is wrong in saying that the driver must prove the source of his petrol. There is no such provision in this clause. The driver must truthfully answer the questions put to him.

Mr. Becker: If I have a full tank, this is the situation.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Heysen.

Mr McANANEY: As I believe petrol is held in the tanks at Port Stanvac, what action will the Government take to ensure that this petrol is made available to the people of South Australia?

Clause passed.

Clauses 14 to 17 passed.

Clause 18—"Acts, etc., not actionable."

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I make an emphatic protest against this clause. I protested against clause 13, but I did not take it any further, because of arguments that could be put in the circumstances of the crisis. However, I do not believe there is any justification whatever for this clause. As we have had this Bill for only an hour and a half, at the most, I refer to what the clause provides:

No proceedings of any kind shall be instituted or heard in any court in respect of any act or decision of the Minister or any person authorized by him in the exercise or purported exercise of his powers under this Act.

This puts the Minister and the Government absolutely above the law for no reason whatever. We are passing here a Bill to provide for the rationing of petrol and the administration of a rationing system, if that should be required. By clause 17 we have just given enormous powers to the Minister without any complaint, and there are many other powers in the Bill that can be exercised untrammelled.

Why should we not make the Minister accountable for anything he does in excess or in contravention of the powers we have given him in any of the other provisions of the Bill? Although it will not stop him at the time, it will mean that he is accountable when the crisis is over and that he will then have to justify what he has done. That is a brake on administrative discretion. Why is this brake being taken away? How can it possibly help the Government to administer a system of rationing by putting the Minister above the law? As this has not been done in other Acts, why should we do it here? There is no justification whatever for this, because a Minister should be in the same position as any other citizen. As he is given powers under an Act, he must abide by those powers and, if he does not abide by them he should be accountable in the courts of this State in the same way as you, Mr. Speaker, or I. What possible reason could there be for putting him above the law?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member has not paid much attention to his knowledge of the provisions in the law. The honourable member must be aware that unless this clause were in the Bill the whole Act could fall about our ears. The simple way of doing that would be this: anyone disputing the action of the Minister in the exercise of his discretion, or anyone to whom he delegates any power, could bring a case to the court and obtain an interim injunction. That would bring the whole of the administration of the Act into question in an emergency situation and would make administration impossible.

This provision is a necessary feature of emergency legislation. Of course, it is not a feature of normal legislation. Indeed, it should not be, and I would not support its inclusion in normal legislation in any circumstances. However, where there is a limited period, where the action of the Government must be taken administratively and must be made to stick if the public benefit is to be maintained, it cannot be held up by the normal processes of law which could otherwise postpone the administrative acts of the Government while a matter was litigated. The honourable member knows perfectly well that that is the situation and that is the reason for this clause.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am not satisfied with that explanation, which is the explanation the Premier gave last year in similar circumstances. I was not willing to accept it then, and I do not accept it now. It is absolutely absurd to suggest that, because a Minister is accountable and interlocutory proceedings may be taken against him, he should be put above the law altogether. This is what we are doing, and it is to this that the Premier has not adverted. In fact, he ignored the point because there is no answer to it. How often in the administration of an Act is an injunction or an application for an injunction taken out against the Minister? If what the Premier said about this clause was right, it would be right about any legislation under which a Minister has powers of administration. I have not, to my knowledge, supported the insertion of such a provision in any other legislation, and I do not believe such a provision has been inserted. Therefore, why should it happen in this case?

Moreover, as the Premier knows, in an emergency the procedures of the court could be speedy indeed. Applications for interlocutory injunctions can be dealt with in a matter of hours, if necessary, and decided one way or the other after both sides have been heard by a judge in chambers. This can be done in a most informal way. That is not a justification for giving such sweeping powers. If such an action arose (and there would be one chance in 10 000 that it would arise), the law could deal with it speedily without interfering with or interrupting this system of rationing. Even if I am wrong on that, it touches only a tiny proportion of the evil that I believe this clause does. The clause is not precluded to protecting the Minister against such interlocutory proceedings as the Premier has referred to: it protects the Minister against any proceedings at any time in future for anything done under this legislation. The Premier did not even try to justify such a wide power for the purpose he gave as his justification. All I can say is that I do not believe what he has said in justification even for a limited application of such a wide power as is included in this provision.

The Committee divided on the clause:

Ayes (29)—Messrs. Broomhill and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Coumbe, Crimes, Duncan, Dunstan (teller), Eastick, Evans, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, McAnaney, McKee, McRae, Nankivell, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.

Noes (14)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Gunn, Hall, Mathwin, Millhouse (teller), Russack, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Majority of 15 for the Ayes.

Clause thus passed.

Clauses 19 to 23 passed.

Clause 24—"Summary proceedings."

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I move:

After "summarily" to insert "or at the option of the defendant shall be dealt with on indictment".

This amendment will give a person charged with an offence the opportunity, if he wishes, to be dealt with by a judge and jury and not by a magistrate. In view of the offences we are creating, the harsh powers in the legislation and, above all, the penalties of imprisonment, I suggest this is a proper provision to make. I have protested most vigorously against one clause and pointed to the dangers of another. One could also point to dangers in other clauses. One safeguard against the abuse of power is to provide that a person shall not be convicted of an offence unless he be found guilty by a jury, because that brings in the

common sense of people and their sense of fair play, and that is most important. The amendment I have moved does not mean that for every offence there must be a trial it means that, if a defendant asks for a trial, he shall have one before a judge and jury and not be tried summarily. I suggest it is a modest and reasonable amendment, particularly if, as the Premier has said in his second reading explanation, he hopes there will not be any proceedings for offences taken at all. In that case, it will not matter. If proceedings are taken, however, this will safeguard the rights of liberty of the subject, many of which we are taking away by other provisions of the Bill.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not believe that it is necessary for offences under this legislation to be tried on indictment. The offences created by this legislation are not different from many others that are tried summarily, and I believe it would be of advantage to the public that they should be dealt with summarily rather than on indictment.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (8)—Messrs. Arnold, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Hall, McAnaney, Millhouse (teller), and Venning.

Noes (34)—Messrs. Allen, Becker, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Coumbe, Crimes, Duncan, Dunstan (teller), Eastick, Evans, Groth, Gunn, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, McKee, McRae, Nankivell, Olson, Payne, Russack, Simmons, Slater, Tonkin, Virgo, Wardle, Wells, and Wright.

Majority of 26 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Remaining clauses (25 and 26), schedule and title passed.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I want to say something briefly on the third reading of the Bill. I regret the need to introduce it: I blame the Government for that need. I do not like some of the provisions in the Bill: those which we have debated briefly and those which we have not (there are many of them). I hope fervently that the measure will not be proclaimed, that there will be no need to proclaim it, that it will lapse at the end of November, and that a measure of this kind will not be introduced in this House in future with such haste, if at all.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Later:

Bill returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

PETITIONS: CASINO

Mr. PAYNE presented a petition signed by 33 persons who expressed concern at the probable harmful impact of a casino on the community at large and prayed that the House of Assembly would not permit a casino to be established in South Australia.

Mr. MILLHOUSE presented a similar petition signed by 161 persons.

Dr. TONKIN presented a similar petition signed by 83 persons.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill, for the Hon. D. H. McKEE, presented a similar petition signed by 31 persons.

Mr. WRIGHT presented a similar petition signed by eight persons.

Petitions received.

QUESTIONS**GAS**

Mr. HALL: In the absence of the Minister of Development and Mines, can the Deputy Premier say what is the price of liquid petroleum gas on the overseas market: in other words, the financial return from the sale of L.P.G. overseas? I take it that, as a result of the intensive negotiations that have been proceeding, this information may be available.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I cannot give the information now, but I will inquire and tell the honourable member.

NULLARBOR PARK

Mr. GUNN: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say whether his department plans to acquire Nullarbor station for a national park, and whether the department has any similar plans regarding surrounding lands in that area, some of which are Crown lands and others held by adjoining landholders? I have been contacted by the owner of Nullarbor station, who is concerned because, when he made preliminary inquiries about the renewal of his pastoral lease, he was told that the Government intended to acquire his land for a national park eventually, but that that would not occur until 1985, when the lease expired. My constituent is concerned about protecting his investments for his sake and for the sake of his family. If the Minister cannot give me the information now, will he get it and give it to the House later?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: It is intended to provide a national park near the head of the Great Australian Bight, and the boundaries of that proposal are still being considered by the National Parks and Wildlife Service, in the Environment and Conservation Department. I will inquire about the present stage of the proposal and let the honourable member know as soon as possible so that he can tell his constituent.

NATIONAL HEALTH SCHEME

Mr. HALL (Goyder): I move:

That in view of the provocative statements made by Mr. Hayden, the Commonwealth Minister for Social Security, and the apparent determination of the Commonwealth Labor Government to proceed with fundamental and authoritarian alterations to our medical and health services, the Government of South Australia should request the Prime Minister to re-evaluate his plans and arrange a working conference with State Ministers, members of the medical profession, and representatives of private hospital managements before proceeding.

I move this motion not so much because of an ideological difference with the Labor Party about what ought to be done regarding our health service and the impact of Commonwealth Government action on the State function in providing health and hospital services, but really because of the lack of information given by the Minister about the effect of the proposal on State services. Several months ago I, as an observer, attended a conference in the South-East and, with many other people, I listened to an explanation by Dr. Deeble of the Commonwealth Government's attitude to the changes in our national health and medical services.

The one great point arising from that talk was that the Commonwealth Government did not know what many of its basic actions would be and what would be the results of those actions: the picture was one of much confusion. Because of that, hospital administrators who

attended the meeting did not get any real information and they had many other doubts about the future. South Australia has developed hospitalization based on much private involvement, and this is threatened by Government legislation. Dr. Deeble was one of the two architects of the national health plan, the other being Dr. Scotton. Both are economists, and I understand that they obtained their doctorates because of their work in planning the scheme. It seems that the medical profession was hardly consulted in the framing of the scheme.

One thing that came out of the meeting was that private hospitals would experience much difficulty in future. I say that because, from the information given by Dr. Deeble, it seems that many people will not be covered for the charges involved in private hospitalization, and that hospitals will therefore have difficulty in providing the service that they are providing now. It seems that the Government is considering altering its plan, and this is reported in today's *News*.

One fact that alarms many people is the claim made by the Commonwealth Minister for Social Security (Mr. Hayden) that the scheme will cost less than the present scheme costs users. This claim is difficult to substantiate: information from the medical profession proves that it is wrong and that the Commonwealth Minister is overstating his case in regard to what the public will pay. The 1.35 per cent levy proposed by the Commonwealth Government will severely hit many families who now pay one contribution but who will be forced to pay two contributions because the husband and wife will be earning. One can accept that most families will pay much more for medical and health services than they pay now.

In Australia today there are about 3 000 000 male and about 1 600 000 female salary earners, and one realizes how much greater the impact will be by creating a levy on each individual salary. The other factor is that, inevitably, there must be a greater load on existing medical services because of lack of connection between any payment by the user of the service and those who provide the service. Anyone who has studied human nature knows that something that ostensibly is free creates a greater demand. Whilst the scheme will not be free and charges will be made by a levy on income, that is a painless levy because it is not separate and the user will feel no pain each time he uses the scheme. I predict confidently that the 1.35 per cent levy will be incorporated in the general taxation rate after several years. That aspect does not concern this House, but what should concern it is the over-use of medical services in our community as a result of action taken outside the State. After conferring with several members of the medical profession, I believe that, because many of them will be placed in a situation which controls them more directly and which controls their collection of fees, they will work reduced hours.

I have been told this by people in the medical profession whom I trust and who I believe are telling the truth. With fewer hours being worked by the profession and with a greater demand on their services, it is obvious that a situation will develop similar to the situation at Elizabeth and other places in South Australia in which the overloading lends to produce a break-down of services. The State Government will face a real problem in Government hospitals as a result of this suggested scheme. I understand that those who obtain free treatment at Queen Elizabeth Hospital face a waiting list of four years for urgent surgery. If that is the waiting lime now, what will it be when the scheme is free for the whole community? Obviously, the waiting list will be much longer. There

will be a low standard of service and a long, sometimes dangerous, wait for people who need treatment. I included other factors in an article I wrote for the *News* some time ago.

I am pleased that the Australian Medical Association is conducting an excellent campaign and that the community is now becoming aware of the real danger that exists to our medical and health services as a result of the doctrinaire approach of the Commonwealth Government. This is the first step towards nationalizing the health scheme in Australia in which all medical practitioners will be paid and employed by the Government. The situation reflects no credit on either of the main political Parties. The A.M.A. approached the previous McMahon Government (or even the Prime Minister before him) with proposals to improve the present voluntary scheme, but it did not receive any acknowledgment of these proposals. The situation was aggravated because the previous Liberal and Country Party coalition Government in Canberra ignored (apparently deliberately) the A.M.A. proposals to improve the scheme in the way we would now like to see it improved. Before the recent Commonwealth election members of the medical profession were protesting in this State at the possibility of a national health scheme, and I compliment them on their action.

However, I have been appalled at the tactics of some Liberal politicians in the Commonwealth sphere who supported them with blue and white signs and made political capital out of the situation. Since the present Commonwealth scheme has been proposed, there have been no protests from Liberal politicians, except in recent weeks. After the Labor Party's proposals, almost no Liberal politicians in Australia protested as they had protested during the Commonwealth election of last December. I have not suggested in my motion that the State Government should oppose the Commonwealth scheme: that would not be a sensible move, because, as this is a Labor Government, it would support the general direction of the Commonwealth Government. However, I have asked that the Government should request the Prime Minister to have his Government re-evaluate its plans before it automatically agrees to the Commonwealth proposal, which may have such a far-reaching effect in reducing medical and health services in South Australia.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): This matter has been discussed previously in this House during another debate, and I think that the matters covered in that debate have been covered briefly by the mover of this motion. No doubt the present proposed nationalized health scheme deliberately ignores the fact that there is already a national health scheme operating in this country. The member for Goyder referred to patients at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital waiting for four years for urgent surgery. I believe the honourable member was wrong and meant non-urgent surgery.

Mr. Hall: I meant very necessary surgery, but I stand corrected.

Dr. TONKIN: That is what I have referred to previously in questions as elective surgery, about which I have been given the brush-off by the Minister. The honourable member slated also that few State or Commonwealth Liberal politicians had made any protest about a nationalized health scheme. I question that statement, because the Liberal Party now has a firm policy on improving the present health scheme, and it arrived at its policy after having discussed the matter fully with the Australian Medical Association and many other health authorities, including the health funds. It came up with its proposals

after having considered the matter fully and thoroughly. It was said that no action had been taken: perhaps no action was apparent in the media, because the degree of coverage in the news media is not always a correct indication of the activity going on.

Many thousands of names have been obtained on petitions organized by Liberal politicians; indeed, I believe that the number of names and the number of petitions have significantly persuaded the Government to back down on some of its proposals. These petitions and the strongest possible representations by members of the medical profession and of other organizations vitally concerned with the health of Australians have had great effect. Much work has been done. The Liberal Party has proposed that low-income earners should have their premiums to insurance organizations subsidized or paid fully for them. I believe the present scheme can be improved tremendously in this way. The motives of the member for Goyder are good and I congratulate him on moving this motion, although I believe it does not go far enough. I believe one of the terms he has used does not cover exactly what the honourable member had in mind. The motion states that the Prime Minister "should re-evaluate his plans and arrange a working conference with State Ministers, members of the medical profession and representatives of private hospital managements before proceeding". I do not want to see the nationalized health proposals dreamt up for their thesis by Drs. Scotton and Deeble (then Messrs. Scotton and Deeble) proceeded with. We must get the wording of the motion correct, and I will take the appropriate action later, I hope, to improve the motion.

The fact that a 1.35 per cent levy on taxable income is to be used to finance the proposed national health scheme is to be used to finance the proposed national health scheme is a bit of a laugh, because this figure seems to have been plucked out of the air. The fact that the Commonwealth Minister for Social Security (Mr. Hayden) has raised a great furore about doctors' fees and has tried to obscure the true issue by referring to high increases sought by the A.M.A., only to find that the independent tribunal established has virtually justified the claims made, has shown that the A.M.A. acted in a most responsible way in arriving at its claims. I refer to the effects on private hospitals and private health practice to which the member for Goyder has referred, and I agree with him: the health of the nation will suffer because of the restriction that will be placed on the freedom of the individual to choose his form of health care.

Members opposite may say that there will be no restriction on the freedom of choice, but financial pressures are being applied by the very terms of the nationalization proposals. Financial sanctions are being proposed to prevent people from exercising their freedom of choice, and those financial sanctions are such that it will not be possible for many people to afford to choose private health care (private medical attention and private hospital care). This is the Labor Party's defence: that it has preserved freedom of choice; that it is possible for the patient to choose. It may not be possible for a patient to afford to choose, and I believe that this has been deliberately done.

Mr. Hall: Also the registration of specialists!

Dr. TONKIN: That has existed for some time, and I think that, under the terms of the National Health Act and the medical benefits provisions, it has had to come. There, is no doubt that, under the proposed national health scheme, surgeons and specialists of any form will be forced to 'do their work in public hospitals because under the original suggestions, patients would not have been able to afford to choose to go to see them. For this reason, the number

of beds in private hospitals would be seriously reduced and we would see the 60 per cent of private hospital beds in this State seriously reduced and perhaps even ultimately wiped out. The honourable member referred to the report in today's *News* of a statement attributed to the Minister for Social Security that he refused to give an assurance to Mr. Chipp that the Government would not resort to alternative plans if the Senate rejected its present scheme. This is a low and miserable trick that is being played: it amounts virtually to blackmail, but it is a story that we have heard in this House many times before. The *News* report states:

Mr. Hayden said he had seen an alternative proposal to the Government's scheme which would enable the Federal Government to enter into bilateral agreements with any of the States to provide them with finance for public hospitals . . . The improvement in services offered by public hospitals would be great, Mr. Hayden said. I seriously doubt this. Once again, the Commonwealth Minister for Social Security has demonstrated his complete and absolute lack of grasp of the fundamental problem involved in the provision of health services in this country; that is, that all the money in the world provided to public hospitals or any other hospitals and all the new hospitals in the world, as well as clinics that may be established, will not provide more doctors.

The member for Goyder referred to this and to the situation at Elizabeth, where doctors are working long hours, which is beyond their endurance, with the result that their work is suffering. When those doctors can no longer carry on and an after-hours service is sought at the Lyell McEwin Hospital, we are told that patients cannot be seen at that hospital. The story is that they cannot be seen there because more patients are seeking attention there, as doctors in the community are not making after-hours calls. This is not the case at all: the sheer logistics of the problem are that there is no doctor on duty at the Lyell McEwin Hospital after hours (at least there has not been), simply because no doctors could be found to join the staff of that hospital. This state of affairs is taking place all over the country. I am not trying to play politics; I am trying to tell honourable members what the situation is. There are not enough doctors to go around.

The Minister of Education will know that, because of the selection of medical students on an academic basis for entry into the faculty, we have encouraged people who can pass exams but who are not necessarily suited to going into the community and becoming good general practitioners. They tend to remain in the academic atmosphere, staying in university departments or going to hospitals. They do not go into the community, where they are desperately needed. I do not know the solution to this problem. Perhaps there should be a new form of selection of medical students. I hope that at Flinders University the social medicine proposed by Professor Fraenkel will solve the problem. The fact is that a nationalized health scheme, as proposed by Mr. Hayden, will not solve any of these problems.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Would you explain what you mean by "nationalized"?

Dr. TONKIN: I use the word to refer to Government control of health services in a total and dictatorial way, because that is exactly what will happen in this country as a result of the steps proposed by the Commonwealth Minister for Social Security. Mr. Hayden is flirting now with proposals to enter into bilateral agreements with the States to provide them with finance for public hospitals, such a scheme to be introduced under section 96 of the Commonwealth Constitution. Mr. Chipp describes such a

proposal as surreptitious. Under section 96, we come to the old phrase of special grants, which once again raises its ugly head. I will not develop that theme further, as I think all members know what I am talking about. The fact is that a centralist Government is willing to give to the States money with strings attached. The money will need to be used for specific purposes. Undoubtedly, this will further the Commonwealth Government's ends, as has been the case with other legislation. In its proposals for a nationalized health scheme, it will put special strings on finance and want control of how it is spent, just as it has done in the case of housing, education, land and so on. I cannot in any way countenance this roundabout method of taking over the health care of the country.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You aren't interested in improving health care, that's the trouble.

Dr. TONKIN: If the Minister can contain himself, he will hear what I propose. The point I make is that changing the system and doing all these things to our health service will not provide a better health service than we have now. The present health service can and should be improved, and that is as far as we need go. We should also be planning new medical schools and training more doctors. As I have said before, even with the Flinders Medical Centre taking students next year, it will be 1982 before the first graduates go into the community. To tidy up and improve the motion, while still expressing the intention of the member for Goyder, I move:

To strike out all words after "Prime Minister" and insert "to arrange a working conference with State Ministers, members of the nursing and medical professions, representatives of hospital funds, representatives of private hospitals, and other interested parties with a view to improving the present health scheme by covering all low-income earners while still preserving the advantages of the present scheme in maintaining the highest standards of health care".

I do this for two reasons. One minor matter involved is that hospital funds, as mutual organizations, have every right to be considered by any committee or conference organized to look at the present health scheme. The most important matter is that the present health scheme, with improvements, would be most satisfactory. There is no point in changing the whole system just for the sake of changing it. We do not want the new scheme to proceed.

The SPEAKER: Is the amendment seconded?

Mr. MATHWIN: Yes.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education) moved:

That this debate be now adjourned.

Mr. MATHWIN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I understand that some time ago the Whip submitted my name as a speaker on this motion, and I expected to speak on it.

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot uphold the point of order, because at all times the debate is in the hands of the House. At any time, any honourable member can move for the adjournment of the debate, provided that he does not interfere with an honourable member who is speaking in a debate.

Motion carried; debate adjourned.

ISLINGTON LAND

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Millhouse:

That this House is of opinion that the price being asked by the Government for the old Islington sewage farm land is scandalously high, especially in view of the oft-expressed Government intention to keep prices down and calls on it forthwith substantially to reduce the price sought.

(Continued from October 17. Page 1293.)

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): I oppose the motion, and I do so partly on behalf of (he member for Ross Smith, who had prepared material in relation to the matter that he had intended to put before the House. The first general point that needs to be made is that the Government, in selling land, should proceed on a reasonable basis. In certain circumstances, there may be cases for special arrangements, where the industrial development being fostered is of special significance to the State. If there is no special significance to the State in the form of industrial development, it does not seem to me that the private industry that buys land from the Government should gain some special advantage that would not be available to a private industry buying land from some private landowner.

In other words, the same general conditions should apply, whoever is purchasing the land, unless there is something special about the development that establishes a community interest and the need for special encouragement. Apparently the member for Mitcham believes that it is immoral for the Government to sell land at a reasonable price. Rather than do that, he believes that the Government should sell land at below its market value and indiscriminately pass on a capital gain to the people who buy that land and use it. That, basically, is the argument of the member for Mitcham, not capital gain.

Mr. Millhouse: Can't you do better than that?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Unfortunately, the member for Mitcham has a most remarkable view of the world, because he thinks that one acre (.4 ha) of land is much the same as any other acre of land and that it does not matter what kinds of service or facility are provided on that land. He thinks that one block of land is the same as any other block of land; therefore, there should be no distinction in price. The honourable member would know, if he spent any time in legal practice, that blocks of land even of similar size in a certain neighbourhood are not identical.

Mr. Millhouse: You must be pretty light on with arguments to put that one forward.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It would seem to me that the honourable member, having interjected so early in my remarks, did not want to listen to anything I wanted to say on the matter. He is just concerned to interject, and then tries to use the interjection as a justification for the case he has put up. The honourable member's basic position is that he believes that capital gain should be indiscriminately passed over by the Government to individual owners of land, that the Government does not have any right to serve the public funds, and that it is not apparently acting in the interests of the community as a whole. After all, the sale of Crown land is an accrual to the revenue of the State. To the extent that reasonable prices are not obtained for Crown land that is sold, revenue must be obtained from other sources, such as from general taxation. It is clear that there will be circumstances in which industrial development should be subsidized by the Government, but it must be clearly established that this will be in the community interest and that the form of industrial development required cannot be achieved in any other way.

For the Government to do otherwise would simply be saying to taxpayers, "We are dreadfully sorry but you, as a group, will have to pay the costs of providing land indiscriminately to private owners for industrial purposes." The Regency Park industrial estate comprises 33 sites with a total area of 84 acres (34 ha). These are fully serviced industrial sites, and the area is zoned for light

and general industry. The estate is conveniently situated within 6 km of the General Post Office, Adelaide, and is in the heart of an intensive industrial area. The estate is accessible by three main roads: South Road, Regency Road and Grand Junction Road. So, the estate is fully serviced, zoned properly, and has the necessary road access. The estate is 5 km from Port Adelaide dock facilities and close to the Islington railway yard. Land adjoining the estate has been set aside for the proposed Islington highway.

The surrounding districts comprise medium-density residential areas interspersed with diversified industrial development, and the locality is well served both by bus and rail public transport. The Government intends that the land will be sold under agreement for sale and purchase over a term of five years on 20 per cent deposit, with the balance of principal and interest payable by 10 equal half-yearly payments. The interest rate applicable will be the Treasury rate effective as at the date of agreement. All these factors and the suitable terms stated must be taken into account if any comparison is to be made with other land in that vicinity or in any other vicinity. The purchaser of industrial land in this area will be required to develop the land for its proposed use within three years from the date of purchase in accordance with plans and specifications to be approved by the Minister of Lands, who will require that all buildings be set back at least 30ft. (9.14m) from any road boundary and that the front walls of all buildings on the South Road frontage be of solid construction.

Mr. Millhouse: What's this garbage got to do with the motion?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am dreadfully sorry for the honourable member. He has been up and down like a yo-yo this afternoon. Apparently he does not want to listen; he puts his own argument, interjects on everyone else, and then puts his own argument again in reply. The honourable member is not interested in the basis on which the land is available, its characteristics and the conditions that apply, all of which are relevant to the price that is being charged. If the honourable member cannot see that, I am dreadfully sorry for him. We know him, through the conventions of the House, as a learned member, but it is a pity that his learning does not extend to the basic economics of the determination of a price for land.

Mr. Millhouse: You're casting around for something to say.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am not. I always thought the honourable member was an incredible fellow, but he is becoming even more incredible than in the days of yore, when he was the "double Deputy" in the House. When he was not justifying a comparison with the Vicar of Bray (you remember the old line, Mr. Speaker, that "no matter what king shall reign, I'll still be the Vicar of Bray"). In comparison with the vicar, the honourable member at that stage of his political career was the bishop. However, despite the incredibility of the honourable member during his "double Deputy" days, today he is even more incredible. Apparently he wants to say that, no matter under what conditions the land is made available, how it is serviced, what the road locations or the zoning conditions are, or what terms of finance are made available for the purchase of the land, these things are entirely irrelevant and the price being asked is scandalously high. The honourable member may want to say that outside to certain people whom he may want to duce for one reason or another, but I am sure that intelligent members of the House will recognize his argument for the garbage it is.

Mr. Millhouse: At least you're using my word.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: What?

Mr. Millhouse: I used "garbage" a few moments ago.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I think it is automatically the term to use when I consider arguments advanced by the honourable member. As I have said, the conditions laid down will require that buildings must be set back at least 30ft. from any road boundary and that the front walls of all buildings on South Road must be of solid construction. Those sorts of condition could be factors that it could be argued would justify lower rather than higher prices for the land. I am merely making sure that honourable members interested know the full facts. The intentions and ability of the prospective purchasers to develop the site on desirable lines will be taken into account when the applications are considered.

The whole of the Government's purpose in relation to this area is to ensure that the development of the project takes place in such a way that the project will be a high-class light and general industrial area, with all essential services. The land has been priced and is now available for purchase. I have a schedule of the prices proposed but, as the schedule is rather long, I ask leave to have it incorporated in *Hansard* without my leading it.

Leave granted.

REGENCY PARK INDUSTRIAL ESTATE
Price List

Section	Area			Zoning	Purchase money \$
	A.	R.	P.		
954	1	3	28	General industry	58 000
955	1	1	12	General industry	40 000
956	1	2	19	Light industry	53 000
957	10	0	0	Light and general industry	300 000
958	2	2	16	Light industry	84 000
959	2	3	10	General industry	84 000
960	3	2	5	General industry	106 000
961	1	1	32	General industry	44 000
962	1	2	8	General industry	46 000
963	1	2	1	General industry	46 000
964	1	2	38	General industry	52 000
965	1	3	3	General industry	52 000
966	3	0	20	General industry	94 000
967	2	3	1	General industry	83 000
968	2	2	27	General industry	80 000
969	1	2	26	Light industry	54 000
970	1	2	19	Light industry	52 000
971	1	1	15	Light industry	44 000
972	1	1	20	Light industry	44 000
974	3	3	26	General industry	117 000
975	3	1	32	General industry	103 000
976	3	1	2	General industry	98 000
977	2	2	21	General industry	78 000
978	2	2	23	General industry	79 000
979	2	2	18	General industry	78 000
980	2	2	18	General industry	78 000
981	2	2	17	General industry	78 000
982	1	3	23	General industry	57 000
983	2	0	24	General industry	64 000
984	2	1	39	Light industry	82 000
985	2	2	13	Light industry	82 000
986	3	1	12	Light industry	106 000

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: In fixing the prices, the Land Board had regard to the market value of industrial land in metropolitan Adelaide, bearing in mind the superior services provided at Regency Park. These superior services are as follows:

1. Heavy-duty industrial roads throughout the subdivision with easy access to established highways.
2. Industrial-type sewage and water connections to each section.

Mr. Mathwin: That's all in the brochure.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It will be in *Hansard* now. It shows what a ridiculous argument the member for Mitcham has put. The list of services continues:

3. Underground storm-water drainage connected to each section.

4. Availability of natural gas and three-phase electricity to each section.

5. The situation of the subdivision in proximity to the centre of Adelaide, the rail services available, established intense industrial development, and the adjoining proposed Islington highway.

I am sure that the member for Mitcham would agree with the correctness of the statement that, in the circumstances, the Land Board has determined reasonable prices of the land. He is trying to suggest that the board has behaved in a scandalous way and that, although it has been a conservative valuation authority in all its previous arrangements, it has suddenly become an authority that is exploiting industry on behalf of the Government.

Mr. Millhouse: Can you find any comparable land nearby that is more expensive?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: There is none nearby. Does the honourable member think that the land will be sold at these prices? If the land is for legitimate industrial purposes, is the price too high?

Mr. Millhouse: I believe it is too high.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Why does the honourable member believe that? He has no basis for saying it.

Mr. Millhouse: Last week I gave you details of comparable sales.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: They were not comparable.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member is an agent in this House for outside interests, and those interests hope to make a profit at the expense of the general taxpayer. That is what is involved in the motion.

Mr. Millhouse: You make an accusation and won't listen to the reply.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member has not stated comparable prices. He has moved this motion not in the interests of the community but presumably in the interests of people who have an interest in this land and would like to get it for less. In other words, the Government, acting on behalf of the taxpayers, would get less revenue because of a gain by some industry. The honourable member has not produced any evidence that the land that he alleges to be comparable is comparable in terms of the services provided. If the land is over-priced, presumably it will not sell. I do not believe that will be the case but, if it is, the Government, to promote the industrial area, would have to reduce the price. If the land does sell and if there are more applications for it than there is land available, will the member for Mitcham still say that the land is priced at a scandalously high level?

Mr. Millhouse: Will you tell me how many applications there are?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Will the honourable member tell me how many private sellers of land are willing to sell land to industry at below its normal market price? Is that the normal behaviour of private sellers? The honourable member knows that it is not. If this land sells at a higher price than land that the honourable member regards as being comparable, there must be reasons for that, and the reasons can relate only to the services to the land or the finance made available in relation to its purchase. If the honourable member, having ignored all those facts, still wants to say that the price is too high, he will be saying that the Government, rather than obtaining the revenue on behalf of the taxpayer that could be obtained at the market price, should pass that money on indiscriminately to people who apply for the land. If that is how the honourable member would conduct the business of the State, it is no wonder he is where he is now.

Mr. Millhouse: How many applications are there?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: That will come out in due course.

Mr. Millhouse: When?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: When all the applications have come in and are being considered. The honourable member can inquire about the matter then. I suppose he would argue that, when the Government bought land on behalf of the community as a whole, it should pay more than the market price and that, when it sold land, it should sell at less than the market price. That is the kind of approach the honourable member would make, and he wants to say that in some way, the Land Board is not a proper authority to value land or that it has made some incredible mistake in this matter. My experience of the board is that, if it makes a mistake, it is always on the side of conservative valuations.

Mr. Millhouse: Are you saying that this valuation is conservative?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am saying that it may well be conservative, yes.

Mr. Millhouse: That shows the absurdity of the whole argument you are putting.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member—

Mr. Millhouse: I know you're using someone else's notes, and that makes it difficult.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member has been in this House for a long time. My experience has been that, the worse the argument he puts up and the more he is acting on behalf of some vested interest, the more he shouts and expostulates.

Mr. Millhouse: For whom do you think I am acting this time?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I do not know. I should be pleased if the honourable member told us, but he is not acting on behalf of the community. The only people in whom he is interested, apparently, are prospective purchasers of this land, and he wants to see them get an unearned capital gain at the expense of the taxpayer. There are other examples of industrial land sales and I ask leave to incorporate a schedule of them in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

SCHEDULE OF INDUSTRIAL LAND SALES

Sale	Date	Vendor	Purchaser	Sec.	Hundred	C/T	Area (acres)	Price \$	Per Acre \$
1	4/9/70	Dimet Corrosiar	Transpec	484	Port Adelaide	3623/7	2.06	40 000	19 417
2	30/12/71	N.Z.L. Holdings	Sands & McDougall	1 000	Port Adelaide	2362/59	5.79	57 937	10 000
3	9/4/73	W. Haughton & Co.	Roche Brothers	954	Port Adelaide	3809/51	9.00	76 000	8 444
4	2/4/73	Galvanising Holdings	K.Q.I.L. (Trading) etc.	Lots 50-59	Town Wingfield				
5	1/5/73	Hines Metals	Sims Consol	220	Hundred Port Adelaide	401/204	4.75	111 500	23 474
6	9/2/72	T. V. Westwood	Slater Walker Fin.	96	Adelaide	2271/161	3.22	80 000	24 845
7	23/9/71	P.G.H. Pty. Ltd.	Minister of Lands	46	Adelaide	2385/147	0.84	30 000	35 714
8	16/11/72	Commissioner of Highways	S.A. Housing Trust	95	Adelaide	3237/142	2.06	63 500	30 825
9	2/9/72	Allen Realty	Wood, Mason, Cold Storage Pty. Ltd.	95	Adelaide	3946/141	2.77	85 000	30 700
10	22/12/69	G. Satari	Cottees Foods	96	Adelaide	2732/154	2.85	72 000	25 263
11	18/7/72	Colton Palmer Preston	Permanent Trustee	389	Yatala	282/71	2.00	150 000	75 000
12	7/9/70	—	Fricker Bros.	398	Yatala	3726/154	4.44	90 000	20 270
13	17/11/69	Cargo M. T. C.	O. S. Nilsen & Co.	398	Yatala	3006/145	3.42	58 000	16 960
14	3/2/71	Est. A. M. Bennett	Abel Lemon & Co.	161	Yatala	1538/160	1.50	42 000	28 000
15	19/12/69	L. S. R. Emerton	Wytkin Invest.	153	Yatala	847/138	2.00	50 000	25 000
16	27/1/72	Wytkin Invest.	Copper & Assoc. Mineral Exploration	153	Yatala	847/138	2.00	59 000	29 500
17	18/4/72	E. D. B. Keele	AHA-Greigy Aust. Ltd.	412	Yatala	3679/112	1.08	33 000	30 556
18	27/4/72	Croydon Timber & Joinery	Simpson Pope	395	Yatala	2845/83	4.50	123 000	27 333
19	26/1/70	Wattyl (S.A.) P/L	Sunbeam Corp.	153	Adelaide	3709/80	1.44	47 000	32 639
20	30/9/70	C.T. West Torrens	S.A. Plywoods	153	Adelaide	3729/85	4.00	120 000	30 000
21	24/9/70	C.T. West Torrens	Aust. Conf. Assoc.	153	Adelaide	3729/86	5.41	162 187	30 000
22	4/12/72	S.A. Housing Trust	Esso Aust. Ltd.	154	Adelaide	3772/29	2.39	86 000	36 037
23	15/12/70	Wilkinson & Co.	J. & E. Fabian	42	Adelaide	3248/95	2.18	55 000	25 215
24	15/12/70	J. & E. Fabian	Rapid Metal Dev. Pty. Ltd.	42	Adelaide	3747/199	1.02	28 500	27 941
25	18/6/73	Preston Holdings	Accident Insurance	195	Port Adelaide	1976/21	4.22	46 500	11 090
*26	1972	West Lakes	Various				1.00	—	19 000
							1.20	—	21 000
							1.20	—	17 300
							2.00	—	16 000
							2.90	—	16 000
	1973	West Lakes	Various				7.50	140 000	18 666

* (Sales reported by transfers not registered.)

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: In respect of the schedule, the examples, which cover a wide area, cover recent land sales at Cavan, Dry Creek, Wingfield, Dudley Park, Ferryden Park, Torrensville, West Lakes, and Plympton North. The prices for vacant industrial land vary from \$8 000 an acre (.4 ha) for unserviced land at Wingfield (which is a noxious trade area), to \$35 000 an acre for partly serviced land at North Plympton. If we consider the above aspects, the average price for the general industrial area was fixed at \$30 000 an acre. The prices fixed for each section are tempered by the terms of sale where 20 per cent deposit is required with the balance being paid over five years. Regarding recent press articles, the sales quoted were for industrial land, which is not as conveniently located and which does not enjoy the same facilities and standards of service as provided for the land at Regency Park. It is further pointed out that the price of \$40 000 an acre, quoted for the land at Regency Park, is incorrect. The range is from \$29 000 to \$32 800 an acre, depending on the location. Apparently the member for Mitcham did not want to take any account of these recent land sales. I do not know what he would say about the price of \$35 000 an acre for partly serviced land at Plympton.

Mr. Millhouse: I think I actually quoted that.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If that is so, I cannot see the basis for the honourable member's objections.

Mr. Millhouse: You did not listen to what I said.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I did listen to what the honourable member said but, unfortunately, it was mostly hot air with little argument of any substance at all. It is significant that the honourable member found out about this whole matter only as a result of a letter he allegedly received from someone whose interests he claims to be representing. He complains about what he calls an attractive blurb that was prepared by the Government for the sale of this land. Apparently, the Government is not supposed to do this.

Mr. Millhouse: Why do you say this?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member complained about the blurb being produced—

Mr. Millhouse: I didn't complain at all about that.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am glad that the honourable member is at last clear on this, because he did not make that point clearly. He said he would refer to some of the special conditions to which the sale of land would be subjected, and he gave the following example:

The purchaser shall use the land for such purpose as is determined at the time of the allotment or as the Minister may from time to time approve and for no other purpose.

That is not an onerous condition: it applies to building blocks in many areas, including some in the honourable member's own district (if there are still any building blocks available there). However, at the time of the allotment of land there is an agreement about the use of the land, and the purchaser has to agree that the land will be used for a certain purpose and that can be varied only with the Minister's approval. The honourable member then referred to another condition, as follows:

The agreement shall be liable to forfeiture if any of the instalments reserved by the agreement shall be unpaid and in arrears for more than six months after the day whereon the same is made payable by the agreement . . .

I cannot imagine any possibility of even a Liberal Government imposing such conditions. A private developer would love to do it, but that would be private enterprise. The

honourable member continued by saying that the Government did not have to pay for the Islington land in the first place. That is unadulterated rubbish, apart from the fact that it ignores the fact that the cost of the land is the opportunity cost, and the relation to any historical cost is not a valid basis for determining the price of the land.

By providing sewerage at a great loss for many years, so far as this land was concerned, the Government on behalf of the community paid over and over again for the land. The Government had to provide an alternative farther north, at Bolivar, for the sewerage services of the State, and considerable expense was incurred to upgrade the Islington land before it could be sold at all. Apparently, however, all that is irrelevant to the member for Mitcham, who apparently believes that it should just be handed over to the land sharks. I suppose that, when it is handed over to them, they will be so grateful that they will make a contribution to the Liberal Movement, which must be worried about the L.C.L.'s competing with it for the Myer fund. Several things said by the honourable member were so intemperate as not to be worthy of reply.

The basis of the reply to what the member for Mitcham has said is that the land is priced reasonably by the Land Board, which consists of competent officers who do a thorough and conscientious job and who are concerned all the time to protect the community interests in whatever transactions they engage in. I speak with some feeling on this matter.

Mr. Dean Brown: Are you trying to justify speculation?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member makes statements that are as incredible as those made by the member for Mitcham. The Government is not speculating in any respect, as the honourable member knows. The member for Davenport has developed a tactic of irresponsibility in this House which has fostered initially by the member for Goyder and which has now been taken over by the member for Mitcham. The sooner we see the end to this type of irresponsibility in statements made by members such as the member for Davenport the better off we will be, and the sooner the standard of debate will return to a reasonable level. Surely the honourable member does not suggest that the Land Board would act in any way which was irresponsible or which was not in the interests of the community as a whole. My experience, as Minister of Education, of the Land Board (and I am sure the member for Mitcham, as Attorney-General, also had this experience) is that it always opts on the conservative side. When, as Minister, I have wished to purchase land and the price has looked like being more than the Land Board has regarded as reasonable, the board has brought great pressure to bear to make sure that the community is effectively protected.

Mr. Millhouse: It's on the other side of the deal now.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is looking after the community interest, but that does not matter to the honourable member, as it is the last consideration he has. I have explained the conditions that attach to this land, which is fully serviced. I have said that there are examples of prices in other locations where the land is not as well serviced as this land and yet is selling at a higher price. It is absolutely ridiculous for the member for Mitcham to suggest that the price being asked is scandalously high. That is not so. Such a statement is a reflection on the honesty not only of the Government but also of officers of the Government who, as the honourable member knows, have under Statute an obligation to carry out (as they do carry out) their work honestly and without scandal. Under the privilege of Parliament, the honourable member can make his accusations and laugh.

Mr. Millhouse: I'm laughing at you.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: He may do that, too, but he does little credit to the people he represents or to the State, and he does even less credit to the Party of which he is alleged to be a member—temporarily, no doubt. He could well have explained who should gain the benefit of land being sold by the Government at less than the market price. Should it go to his political friends? Will the Leader of the Opposition say who should get the capital gain that would be involved if the land was sold at less than the market price? The honourable member has not said this. Apparently the community interest is not to be considered. To suit the honourable member, we should sell the land for the lowest possible price. In order to gain extra revenue to cover the consequent loss, I suppose we should increase taxes that affect the general community. That is the kind of policy put forward by the member for Mitcham in what has now become recognizable as a display of some basic inner irresponsibility in his nature. I am appalled by what the honourable member has said, and I ask the House to reject his motion. I seek the support of as many Opposition members as possible who are willing to make a reasonable and honest assessment of the matter.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): In moving his motion, the member for Mitcham said that, as the Government got the land for nothing, it should sell it at a reduced price. I think such a statement is hogwash, because we realize that the land has a value. If the Government sells it to one industry, as the Minister of Education has said, that company can capitalize on the benefit offered to it by the Government. The Government has set out to control the price of urban land, and Opposition members object to that proposal. We did not accept an attempt to control an area less than one-fifth of a hectare. Now the member for Mitcham is saying that the Government should reduce the price of industrial land that it owns.

When the former Liberal and Country League Government of which I was proud to be a member was dealing with this matter, the Public Works Committee considered an area of about 1 200 acres (486 ha). I said that the land should all be left as recreation park, but the Government (and the member for Mitcham was a member of the Cabinet) decided to make 300 acres (121 ha) available for recreation purposes, and land was also made available for a school. Engineering and Water Supply Department facilities, and an Electricity Trust substation. The balance was to be reserved for industrial purposes.

Since the present Parliament has been in session, public money has been made available to provide sewerage and other facilities in the Islington area. During the Loan Estimates debate, we were told the land would be used for industrial purposes. We on this side have opposed price control, and surely that must apply also in respect of Government land. In 1968-69, the L.C.L. Government started to develop land at Gillman for industrial purposes and the Cabinet knew that it would ask for the full market price. Similar action is being taken in regard to the old sewage farm.

If the Land Board valuation cannot be obtained, the Government will be left with the land. However, I think the Government will get the price. Industrialists have experts to advise them as distinct from the man in the street, who may be taken in by a sharpshooter. If the industrialists do not know about the markets available, they are foolish to enter into a contract. I consider that the member for Mitcham moved his motion on the spur of the moment without deep thought and without thinking about

his previous attitude on price control and other such matters.

If it happened that the member for Mitcham was in a Cabinet, he would have to back the Land Board and his Minister so as to get the Land Board valuation for land. If an industry bought the Islington land at a low price, we would be subsidizing it and I suggest that we should deal with the matter through the front door, not the back door. I do not support the motion because if I did there would be double standards in my thinking.

Dr. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with an amendment.

LAND COMMISSION BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it had disagreed to the House of Assembly's amendment to its amendment No. 13; and that it insisted on its amendments Nos. 1, 3 to 10, and 14, and its suggested amendment To which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I move:

That the House of Assembly insist on its disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments Nos. 1, 3 to 10, and 14, and the suggested amendment.

The Council has insisted on its amendments, and for the reasons stated yesterday this Chamber should insist on its disagreement.

Mr. COUMBE: It is regrettable that the Government is so adamant, because some of these matters, in our opinion, were reasonable.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): Can the Minister explain why the Government is so persistent in its attitude, when Queensland, Victoria, New South Wales, and Tasmania have stated publicly that they will not, in any circumstances, support a Land Commission Bill? Similar legislation was introduced in the Western Australian Parliament in May this year, but no further debate has ensued. Apparently, the general decision follows a Ministerial discussion in Victoria on Monday, because the Governments of the Eastern States (including the Tasmanian Labor Government) realize that Commonwealth money can be used under existing legislation for the development of growth centres such as Albury-Wodonga and Bathurst-Orange.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Leader has been present during most of the discussions on this measure, and the Premier has clearly stated the Government's intentions in regard to this Bill.

Dr. Eastick: That was on the premise that it would be Commonwealth wide.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: We do not have to do what other States do. This Government is convinced that the way to handle the situation is by setting up a commission. The Premier has explained the Government's reason for objecting to these amendments, and I need not repeat them.

Dr. EASTICK: At the Ministerial conference the Commonwealth Minister (Mr. Uren) agreed to the communique released after the meeting and said that the Commonwealth Government was not persisting in its demand that the Prime Minister have an influence on the commission.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Was he talking about the commission or about the demands made by the Prime Minister?

Dr. EASTICK: He was referring to the original intention that this Bill, along with the others, be passed on the directive from Canberra. He said there was no need to persist in the attitude previously expressed from Canberra that this legislation was required to be introduced in each State. Mr. Uren said there was no longer the need to lie the States to the provisions that were originally intended by the Commonwealth Government. It seems that four States have clearly stated that they will not proceed with similar legislation. Why does the Government not withdraw the Bill even at this late stage, because it is of no value and no advantage to the State?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: That is a ridiculous statement. The Government believes that the legislation is of use to the State and that it will fulfil its function. Regarding the statement attributed to Mr. Uren concerning representation on the commission which the Prime Minister laid down as a condition to money being made available by the Commonwealth Government for the purchase of broad acres, I know nothing of that statement. Certainly, nothing official has been handed to the Premier, to my knowledge, to substantiate the point made by the Leader. I will not comment on any statement conveyed to the House in that way. Although I am not saying that the Leader is not trustworthy, I will certainly not comment on a statement made in this way and read from a newspaper or a similar publication.

This is a reasonable provision. If the Commonwealth Government is to make funds available to the State, it should at least have the right to representation on the commission to oversee the way the money is spent. There is nothing, unreasonable about that. I do not want to comment on the points made by the Leader. Certainly, I will not accede to the ridiculous request that we withdraw the Bill at this stage merely because it is alleged that it will not be of any use. I will not comment on reported statements of the Australian Government Minister (Mr. Uren) until an official communication has been received by the Premier, but I am sure that this will not occur.

Dr. EASTICK: I point out that yesterday afternoon, publicly, in a building in the State of South Australia (in Adelaide, to wit) the Hon. A. F. Kneebone—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You are referring to another [debate].

Dr. EASTICK: A statement was clearly made and reported—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I cannot allow the honourable member to refer to another debate.

Motion carried.

A message was sent to the Legislative Council requesting a conference, at which the House of Assembly would be represented by Messrs. Dean Brown, Duncan, Dunstan, Eastick, and Hopgood.

Later:

A message was received from the Legislative Council agreeing to a conference to be held in the Legislative Council committee room at 7.30 p.m.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN moved:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the conference to be held during the adjournment of the House and that the managers report the result thereof forthwith at the next sitting of the House.

Motion carried.

SAVINGS BANK OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

POSTAL CHARGES

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Blacker:

That, in view of the sharp increases of postal charges proposed in the Commonwealth Budget, this House request the Government to intervene with the Prime Minister requesting him not to proceed with those increases which will adversely affect newspapers and periodicals, especially as they affect country newspapers serving country people.

(Continued from October 3. Page 1035.)

Mr. OLSON (Semaphore): Previously, I had been, referring to the proposition of the member for Flinders about increased postal charges and I had established that, because the productivity of postal workers had increased in the past 20 years, it was obvious that that could not be used as a reason for increased costs. I suggested that the losses of the Post Office could be attributed to the concessions, such as hand-outs and reduced telephone charges, that had been granted to big business and multi-national corporations. This situation had been made abundantly clear by the loss sustained on bulk postage.

The new Postmaster-General (Hon. Lionel Bowen) has indicated that poor administration may have been responsible for the loss of \$23 000 000 this financial year. It was clearly established that another politically coloured Administration had indicated it would increase postal charges. Indeed, if the previous Liberal Government had remained in office it intended to increase these charges by 20 per cent to 25 per cent in 1974. With multi-national corporations in a dominant position as suppliers and installers of capital-intensive technology in post offices, there is an increasing tendency to depend on foreign-owned and controlled corporations that do not necessarily act in the interests of the Australian community. Perhaps an illustration of this could be made by referring to the pink pages of the telephone directory. In this respect I refer to the Parliamentary Committee on Publication of Telephone Directories. I now seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.59 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, October 25, at 2 p.m.