

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, September 18, 1974

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

PETITION: COUNCIL BOUNDARIES

Mr. ALLEN presented a petition signed by 286 persons stating that they were dissatisfied with the first report of the Royal Commission into Local Government Areas, and praying that the House of Assembly would not bring about any change or alteration of boundaries.

Petition received.

PETITIONS: SPEED LIMIT

Mr. Crimes, for Mr. DUNCAN, presented a petition signed by 26 persons, stating that because of conversion to metrics the speed limit of 30 kilometres an hour past school omnibuses and schools was too high and presented an increased threat to the safety of schoolchildren, and praying that the House of Assembly would support legislation to amend the Road Traffic Act to reduce the speed limit to 25 km/h.

Mr. MAX BROWN presented a similar petition signed by 26 persons.

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

Petitions received.

QUESTIONS

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

HIGHWAY MARKING

In reply to Mr. McANANEY (September 10).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The roads to which the honourable member referred are under the care, control, and management of the Commissioner of Highways. The standards adopted for road marking of arterial roads in this State by the Highways Department are based on nationally accepted standards. The Highways Department is now extending the "no overtaking" line system on departmentally maintained roads commensurate with the needs of road safety.

COUNCIL GRANTS

In reply to Mr. COUMBE (August 20).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I refer to the question asked of the Deputy Premier on August 20, 1974, during the debate on the Loan Estimates regarding grants made to local government. No formula for road grants is made available to councils, as the Highways Department fixes the amount of contribution for each and every grant according to the prevailing circumstances. Subject to funds being available for grants for 1974-75, councils will contribute about 12 per cent of the total expenditure. It is not possible to quote exact figures, as all grant funds are not distributed in the original allocation. A reserve is held for emergency needs, and the contributions to this are not known until allocations are made.

MURRAY RIVER FLOODING

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Deputy Premier say whether the Government will make an urgent application to the Commonwealth Government for financial assistance from the \$1 500 000 disaster fund, which was announced in the Commonwealth Budget last evening, for use in the fight

against the rising floodwaters on the Murray River? During the Budget speech last evening, the Commonwealth Treasurer announced that \$1 500 000 had been set aside for use by the States on a \$1 for \$1 basis in times of national disaster. The Deputy Premier is well aware that already disaster is threatening parts of South Australia because of the expected widespread flooding of the Murray River early next month and possibly continuing until February, or March next year. Therefore, I ask the Deputy Premier whether he will make this urgent application to obtain, in relation to the areas likely to be most affected, financial assistance not only for those who will need it but also to assist the flagging South Australian economy.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I think the Leader knows full well that the South Australian Government is willing to do all that is absolutely necessary to mitigate damage from the flood that is approaching South Australia now. Indeed, the criterion laid down by the Commonwealth Government for measures to be taken to prevent damage is that at least \$1 500 000 must be expended by the State concerned before it can apply for funds to assist with measures to prevent a disaster from occurring.

Dr. Eastick: Will you—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I ask the Leader to let me finish and then he can ask another question if he wants to do so. Not only because of the flood that is approaching but also because of floods that occurred earlier this year in the northern part of this State, it is possible that more than \$1 500 000 will be spent. Therefore, any amount spent above that spent in the northern part of the State we will be able to recoup directly from the Commonwealth Government in relation to expenditure regarding the Murray River region. The matter involves expenditure not only in preventing damage but also in regard to damage that occurs as a result of any disaster. I think the Leader would appreciate that, in order to apply to the Commonwealth Government for funds from the disaster fund to which he has referred, it would be first necessary to show the extent of the disaster for which a State was applying for funds, and it is not possible to do that at this stage. I assure the House and the people who will be affected directly by the flood that is approaching us on the Murray River that everything possible will be done. I think that can be shown amply by the fact that already we have told councils that we are willing to spend almost \$60 000. Yesterday I approved further expenditure to protect, I think, the shacks to which the Leader referred last evening, and that will involve more than \$20 000. In addition, this morning I made provision for work to be undertaken at Cadell. Officers of the Engineering and Water Supply Department and the Lands Department are currently canvassing councils on the lower part of the Murray River. I expect a report from them on Friday at the latest, and I assure the leader that by Monday decisions will be made and councils notified to proceed with any work that is considered essential. Irrespective of the amount of money involved, any action that possibly can be taken is being taken, and certainly we will be approaching the Commonwealth Government for assistance if we exceed the expenditure of \$1 500 000, as I have stated.

BAKERS' STRIKE

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say what are the latest developments in the current bakers' strike that is affecting so many householders in the metropolitan area? Was a meeting held this morning

and, if it was, was progress made towards settling the dispute? In any event, are the arrangements made for the emergency supply of bread working satisfactorily?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: This morning, there was a meeting with the union concerned. As I said yesterday, at a meeting the proposals put forward were rejected. This morning the decision was made not to meet again until next Monday, this information being given me by the Secretary soon after the meeting. As Minister, being concerned about bread not being available until next Monday, I contacted the President of the Industrial Court, who is now arranging to call a compulsory conference of both parties. As this was arranged this morning, summonses to the parties will probably go out this afternoon, with the conference being held tomorrow, I imagine. I have received no complaints regarding the supply of bread to hospitals and similar institutions. I understand that Opie Brothers Bakery Proprietary Limited is baking bread to supply these organisations.

NORTHFIELD HOSPITAL

Mr. WELLS: Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Health what the Government intends to do about upgrading the Northfield Hospital? Extensive upgrading of this hospital has been planned. I understand that, although a schedule of work was prepared, the work had to be deferred because of a lack of funds. In view of the contents of the Commonwealth Budget presented last evening, I believe the project at Northfield must be considered urgently. I should appreciate information from the Minister about what his department intends.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will refer the matter to my colleague.

PETRO-CHEMICAL PLANT

Mr. MILLHOUSE: This question would have gone to the Premier had he been here, but I understand he has gone off to Canberra. Therefore, in the Premier's absence I direct my question to his Deputy. Is the Government aware that apparently no provision for funds for the Redcliff project has been made by the Commonwealth Government in its Budget and, if it is, what action, if any, does it intend to take? As I understand the position, the Redcliff project cannot proceed without, amongst other things, financial support from the Commonwealth Government. I expected that there would be some reference in the Commonwealth Budget to a provision during the next 12 months for the beginning of the project, bearing in mind what has been said in this place that the project must begin within the next 12 months or it will be too late. Although I have not yet seen the Budget papers, I am informed by Senator Hall—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What would he know?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —that he could find no reference in the Budget to any allocation of funds—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: It would have to be printed in Braille for him to understand it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister of Transport is very irritable—

The SPEAKER: The honourable Minister is out of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —and the interjections are completely uncalled for.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Senator Hall can find no reference in the Commonwealth Budget to any provision for the Redcliff project. It may be that it is hidden away somewhere. However, if it is not and if there should not be some Commonwealth provision for the project this year, it is a pretty bad omen for the negotiations that have apparently been taking place (and this is what we have been told) and proceeding satisfactorily between the two Governments. Certainly, there is no reference in this morning's *Advertiser* to the Redcliff project, although reference is made to Monarto and to locusts.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham is now commenting, and that is not part of the explanation of his question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, Sir. I have probably given sufficient explanation anyway, and I hope to get from the Deputy Premier an ample reply because this is a matter of great importance. It occurs to me that perhaps this is the very reason why the Premier has flown to Canberra today, so perhaps the Deputy Premier will tell us about that, too.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am sure that nothing would delight the member for Mitcham more than for me to tell him that he or his worthy colleague Senator Hall could find no reference in the Commonwealth Budget to the Redcliff project and that it is therefore doomed to failure, but I am afraid that I must disappoint him. Moreover, I assure the honourable member that the Premier and the Minister of Development and Mines are absent today because they are conferring with Commonwealth Ministers.

Mr. Millhouse: About this?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Not about this matter, but about the indenture Bill to be introduced in this Parliament soon. That Bill will lead to the development of the Redcliff project in this State. Of course, arrangements for the meeting were made more than a week ago; it did not suddenly happen that the Premier discovered that no reference had been made to the Redcliff project in the Budget and then scampered off to Canberra to find out what was wrong. I assure the honourable member that that is not the case. In addition, I assure him that, as far as the Commonwealth Government's financing the infrastructure of the plant to be developed at Red Cliff Point is concerned, that will be forthcoming at the appropriate time; the honourable member need have no fears about that.

LOTTERY AND GAMING REGULATIONS

Mr. PAYNE: Will the Attorney-General, representing the Chief Secretary, ask his colleague to consider amending the regulations under the Lottery and Gaming Act to increase the present limits for sweepstakes and lotteries in the special category? Regulations under the Lottery and Gaming Act, 1971, currently set the gross proceed limits for sweepstakes at \$500. In the case of special lotteries, of which no more than 12 are permitted each year, a limit of \$5 000 applies in terms of the combined value of the prizes permitted. It has been drawn to my attention that promoters of these lotteries, which are conducted for purposes which I believe all members would support, wish to be able to continue to offer, for example, two motor vehicles as prizes. With the current price of motor vehicles, however, the present limit of \$5 000 makes it difficult for promoters to achieve this objective.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will refer the matter to the Chief Secretary.

GAUGE STANDARDISATION

Mr. VENNING: Can the Minister of Transport, in light of the comments made about the Commonwealth Budget regarding the ratification of the agreement to start

work on the standard gauge line between Adelaide and Crystal Brook, say whether State and Commonwealth Government representatives have yet signed the agreement? In a report on the Budget in this morning's newspaper it is stated that about \$3 000 000 will be provided for South Australian railway projects. The report states:

Subject to ratification of agreements between the South Australian and Federal Governments, almost \$3 000 000 has been provided in the Budget for South Australian rail projects.

As I had been led to believe that ratification of the agreement between the two Governments had been agreed to, will the Minister clarify this matter for me?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I sympathise with the honourable member's having to try to determine what he ought to believe: what I have told him in the House or what the press is purporting to tell him. Unfortunately, however, he is getting his wires a little crossed. I have told the House previously that the agreement between the two Governments to standardise the line between Adelaide and Crystal Brook has been signed (that is a statement of fact) by the Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Gough Whitlam) and the South Australian Premier (Hon. Don Dunstan). As I understood the report in the paper, it refers to ratification of that agreement, which means that the agreement must be ratified by legislation passed by the Commonwealth Parliament. I expect that what the Australian Treasurer was saying was to cover himself in the event of the Opposition in the Senate rejecting the legislation, as it has done in respect of other legislation.

ISLINGTON WORKSHOPS

Mr. LANGLEY: Will the Minister of Transport be making representations to the Australian Government regarding the building of modern high-performance bogie waggons, suitable for inter-system use, at the Islington workshops? The Commonwealth Budget brought down last evening provides for the purchase of 500 such waggons this year and 800 next year. As the workshops have done excellent work in turning out rolling stock for many years, this would seem to be an excellent opportunity for the workshops again to show their skills.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am delighted to think that the workshops will execute at least part, if not all, of the contract, and I assure the honourable member that we will certainly be competing by tender, and I hope that we shall be successful.

DENTAL APPRENTICESHIPS

Mr. BOUNDY: Can the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Health, say whether dental technician apprenticeships are to be provided in 1975 and, if they are not, whether they could be provided? It has come to my attention that the provision of such apprenticeships is unlikely. I ask whether they can be provided, with a view to reassuring young people who wish to undertake a career in this field that job opportunities and ample work are available to them. Such training could also act as a means of reducing in due course the long waiting list of indigent people seeking dental treatment.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will refer the question to my colleague.

RADIATION

Mr. DUNCAN: Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Health whether the monitoring of radiation levels is undertaken in South Australia by either the State Government or the Australian Government? If such monitoring is taking place, what have been the levels over the past two months? Also, is radiation-related sickness a noti-

fiable disease in South Australia and, if it is, how many people are presently registered? The French Government recently detonated another nuclear device in the atmosphere in the Pacific area and it is well known that such tests have a dramatic effect on radiation levels in Australia. It is not clear how many more atmospheric tests in the Pacific area the French Government may carry out. This is a serious matter for the people of this State and the nation as a whole, and we should be thoroughly conversant with the radiation levels affecting the atmosphere in this State. I have been advised that further cases of radiation sickness have been registered in Japan as a result of the Chinese nuclear tests. As this situation could well apply to Australia, it is in the interests of members of the public that they be given this information.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will refer the question to my colleague.

BRANDY EXCISE

Mr. ARNOLD: In view of the additional excise of 40c a litre imposed on brandy by the Commonwealth Government and the inability of some wineries even prior to the presentation of the Budget to pay growers the agreed purchase price of fruit for the 1974 vintage, can the Minister of Works, as Deputy Premier, say whether his Government will make representations to the Commonwealth Government for funds to be made available to wineries faced with a liquidity problem. Many growers in my area have been unable to meet their commitments for council rates and/or Lands Department water rates and in some instances they have been served with summonses as a result of their inability to meet these commitments. Also, will the Lands Department accept a procuracy order in lieu of cash for water rates where growers are not paid for their fruit?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall have the matter examined to see what can be done. I do not know whether any good purpose would be served by applying to the Commonwealth Government, but I will examine the ramifications of the question and submit it to Treasury and Lands Department officers to see whether the second part of the request can be granted.

DERNANCOURT SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Education, who is absent from the House on business, to ascertain from the Education Department whether it has plans to erect a primary school in the near future on land held by the department at the corner of Lyons Road and Lower North-East Road, Dernancourt?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be delighted to do that for the honourable member.

PRESS RELEASES

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I was going to ask the Premier this question, but as he is away again I will direct it to the Minister of Works, as Deputy Premier. From which Government source came the press release which was designed deliberately to mislead the public and which indicated that no increased taxes or charges would be included in this year's State Budget? Statements appearing not only in the daily press but also in the rural press, and attributed to the Premier and the Government, were to the effect that no increased taxes or charges would be in this year's Budget, whereas we all know that the Budget contains several heavily increased charges. In the interests of accurate reporting, I should like to know whence came these misleading reports, so that the public of this State is not grossly misled by that sort of activity.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No doubt this release emanated from the Premier himself, as Treasurer. I have read the statement and, speaking from memory, I think it alluded to the fact that, when the Budget was brought in, no measures not already announced by the Treasurer would be introduced. In other words, during the few months leading up to the introduction of the Budget (indeed, during the preparation of the Budget), the Treasurer, before the Premiers' Conference, made announcements to the press and the media generally in this State indicating that taxes would be imposed and indicating what they were. Apart from those that he announced before the introduction of the Budget, any other measures were announced in the Budget speech.

The Hon. L. J. King: Although he warned that others might be necessary.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: He warned at that time that depending on whether the Commonwealth Government, in its Budget, gave what he understood would be additional money to South Australia—

Mr. Venning: He knew then what was coming to this State.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: He indicated that, if those funds were not forthcoming, it would be necessary for him to introduce further tax imposts in this State. The Leader cannot have it both ways. He described the Budget speech as a speech of "ifs" and "buts" and said, "If the Commonwealth Government does this and that," and now he is denying that our Treasurer said that.

Mr. Mathwin: Answer the question!

The SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members know what is required of them by Standing Orders and if they do not observe Standing Orders they will suffer the consequences.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Treasurer announced no new taxation measures other than those that he announced before the Commonwealth Budget was introduced, and therefore the press report is incorrect and misleading. Secondly, as my colleague the Attorney-General has said by interjection, the Treasurer foreshadowed that, if the Commonwealth Government did not give the additional \$10 000 000 or so that he was expecting, he would have to introduce further taxes in this State. That is the position, and he has told the people of South Australia.

TREASURER'S ABSENCE

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Deputy Premier say whether it is expected that the Treasurer will be back in the Chamber this evening? If he will not be back, is it intended to sit after dinner?

Members interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If I may now explain my question, in reply to my earlier question (or to part of it) the Deputy Premier explained that the Treasurer had gone, with another Minister, to Canberra today in connection with the Redcliff indenture, but this, as he said, had not been made public, although it had been planned a week or two ago. I point out that private members' business will be dealt with this afternoon and, if proceedings take the usual course, it will continue until the dinner adjournment. However, I think the first business on the Notice Paper for this evening is the Appropriation Bill, and it would be unusual for the Bill to proceed in the absence from the State of the Treasurer, who is ultimately responsible for what goes on (although I noticed that he was not here last evening, either).

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Nor were you.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I wonder whether the Minister is pleased or sorry about that. Anyway, it would be unusual for the Government to go on with the Appropriation Bill in the absence of the Treasurer, and it would be an affront to the Committee if it did so.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member stated first that I had indicated that the Treasurer left today to go to Canberra, but that is incorrect. If the honourable member had been here last evening, he would have known that the Treasurer went to Sydney last evening. It is most unusual (and it sounds as though this may happen) that the honourable member will be here this evening. We all know that Wednesday evening is a special evening for him. We know that he then uncloaks as a Parliamentarian and frocks himself as a Lieutenant-Colonel in the Citizen Military Forces of this country.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: At \$3 000 a year!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not know how much he is paid for it.

Mr. Goldsworthy: He's paid for both jobs at the same time.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: That is right. If the honourable member cares to forgo that extremely important function that he involves himself in every Wednesday evening and comes back to see us this evening, he may get a surprise: he may be able to see the Treasurer back here, and able to reply to the question that is burning the honourable member up now. I think he will have that opportunity if he comes back.

LIQUOR GLASSES

Mr. SLATER: Will the Attorney-General say whether, when future amendments to the Licensing Act are being considered, consideration is likely to be given to making it mandatory for suppliers of liquor, such as hotels and clubs, to supply a fresh glass with each drink provided? I understand that this position applies in most of the other States and, if it is considered to be in the interests of public health to do so, I ask the Attorney whether this matter can be considered when future amendments are made to the Licensing Act of this State.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will consider the honourable member's suggestion and discuss it with the Minister of Health. As the honourable member has stated, it is the law in most, if not all, other States of Australia. However, there has been much discussion and controversy in South Australia about whether the provision is useful and desirable. The matter certainly is controversial amongst customers, and many people who drink liquor, particularly beer, in hotels have expressed themselves to me as being opposed to having a fresh glass on each occasion. So far as I know, the health authorities in this State have not considered this to be a significant factor in the spread of disease. However, I will take up the matter with my colleague to find out the latest information on the subject, and I assure the honourable member that, if there is any indication that there is danger to the health of the people in the practice that obtains in this State, that practice will be altered.

TICKET SELECTOR

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Transport say how effective has been the new Municipal Tramways Trust ticket selector that is located immediately opposite the General Post Office? The ticket selector has been put there for the convenience of patrons, but I understand that it has been out of order many times and that it usually has over it a bag marked "Out of Order". I have noticed

two technicians, with their heads under a cover, engrossed in trying to solve the problem. I ask the Minister to state, when he is replying to the question how effective the machine has been, what is the cost of the machine and whether any additional machines will be installed in the metropolitan area.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will obtain the information.

STATE TAXATION

Mr. BECKER: Can the Deputy Premier say what new taxes or charges will be imposed to make up the \$6 000 000 that is required to balance the Budget that has been put forward in South Australia? Although we have been told that the State Budget contains no new taxes, before it was introduced certain charges were increased, and stamp duties were increased in the Budget itself. Certain residents in the metropolitan area have had to pay large water and sewerage rates, with a Government announcement relating to the land valuation system. Can the Deputy Premier say whether the Government has looked at any new taxes? Is it considering a higher petrol tax, as is suggested in this afternoon's newspaper (although previously the Treasurer has said that this will not happen)? In what areas can we expect increased charges?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: When the Treasurer returns this afternoon or this evening, no doubt he will confer with Treasury officers. I expect that on Monday he will submit a proposal to Cabinet. I am not able to say (nor do I intend to do so) which area is likely to be looked at in this respect by the Treasurer or his officers. I think that the honourable member will accept that.

Mr. Becker: You must have some idea.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I can have all the ideas I like, but I will not join with the honourable member in speculating about what these areas may be.

The Hon. L. J. King: That would be very mischievous.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes. The honourable member said that high water and sewerage charges had been imposed on some people. As I said before, the Government does not make any money out of providing the service; in fact, it has to take money out of general revenue to keep the service going.

SMITHFIELD HOUSES

Mr. DUNCAN: In the absence of the Minister in charge of housing, will the Deputy Premier have investigated the possibility of the Housing Trust's taking over from the Air Force the many vacant Air Force houses located in the Smithfield Plains area? I understand that at present more than 40 houses that are vacant in the Smithfield Plains area are either owned or held under long lease by the Air Force. This seems to be a grave waste of housing accommodation at a time when there is a chronic shortage of houses. If the Housing Trust could use the houses, this would go some way towards reducing the housing shortage in the Elizabeth area.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to take up the matter with my colleague and obtain a report for the honourable member.

UNDER-AGE DRINKING

Mr. PAYNE: Is the Attorney-General satisfied with the present operation of the amended section of the Licensing Act that deals with under-age drinking on licensed premises? On April 11 last, amendments to section 137 of the Licensing Act were assented to and commenced operating. As I understand the position, the effect of the amendments

was to put the onus on persons drinking on licensed premises, when they were challenged by the licensee, his servant, or a police officer, to produce proof of age. In addition, I understand that the amendments were designed to assist licensees to conduct lawfully their business on licensed premises and also to help in curbing any possibility of under-age drinking. Because of recent comment by the Coroner which was published in the newspaper and which related to the part played by alcohol in the deaths of two people who were well under the age of 18 years, I ask this question in the public interest.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I believe that we are all concerned about the problems that arise from drinking, particularly excessive drinking, by young people in licensed premises and in places other than licensed premises. Of course, in this regard the law can only extend its operation really to licensed premises. I believe that it is the responsibility of all those who are concerned with framing laws relating to the supply of liquor, enforcing those laws, and conducting premises licensed to supply liquor, to do everything in their power to ensure that under-age drinking is eliminated. As I have often said in this place, this is a difficult task. I do not want to appear unsympathetic to those who have the responsibility of policing the law and conducting licensed premises, as I know the difficulties under which they operate. As I have no specific information about the operation of the amendments passed by Parliament, I will obtain information, through the Chief Secretary, from the police on this topic and supply it to the honourable member.

PARLIAMENT HOUSE WORKMEN

Mr. WELLS: Is the Minister of Works willing to express confidence in the workmen engaged in renovating this building? Is he aware of statements made yesterday by the member for Fisher denigrating the workmen engaged by the Public Buildings Department?

Mr. Venning: Absolute rubbish!

Mr. WELLS: As this concerns unionists, it is obviously rubbish as far as the honourable member is concerned. Yesterday, the allegation was made that workmen in this building had to be virtually locked in, as they had to be forced to walk past a foreman's door to prevent their going home from the job early and cheating. Of course, the member for Fisher made this allegation when he was supporting contract work in preference to day labour. The allegations made are not substantiated; indeed, I believe they are entirely erroneous.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting.

Mr. WELLS: I ask the Minister whether he is willing to express confidence in the workmen under his jurisdiction.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am certainly willing to express confidence in the—

Mr. Venning: Ha, ha!

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: It's all right for you to laugh; we know your attitude.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister might laugh in a moment.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am willing and indeed anxious to express confidence in the workmen who are renovating this building. It is all right for the member for Rocky River to sit back and laugh and for the member for Fisher to make the comments he has made in this place, which has previously been described as "Coward's Castle". Had he wanted, the member for Fisher could have come to me to have the matter investigated. If there

was a specific instance, he could have laid any complaint he might have had about the conduct of workmen, and I would have looked at it for him in the proper way. However, the honourable member chose not to do that, but stood up here and tried to reap an advantage (I do not know whether he calls it public benefit or publicity) by taking on people who cannot come here and answer for themselves; but I will answer for them. Let me tell the member for Fisher that, if contractors had been used to renovate this building, the cost would have been very much more than will be the cost by using the Construction Branch of the Public Buildings Department.

Members interjecting:

Dr. Eastick: You wouldn't know.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I know that the Leader is opposed to it, and I have been told that the project manager has often had to leave men idle because of requests by members in this place, particularly when committees are meeting and the House is meeting, and many other things have happened during which time men have been told to cease work, and they have obeyed these instructions. If a contractor were here, I would hate to have to meet the bill. I admit that the type of work being done here requires this sort of action.

Mr. Venning: What about the front fence?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: If workmen were left in this building and it was vacated, they would be able to get on with the job and do it as speedily as and better than contractors would do it in many cases.

Mr. Venning: What about the fence?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member may refer to the fence, and I will give him some replies.

Mr. Venning: Why don't you look at it?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have looked at it, too. One of the most maligned departments in the Government service seems to be the Public Buildings Department. People never seem to realise that it is engaged in one of the most difficult industries, and any building contractor would agree how difficult this industry is. I was alarmed, as was the Director, Public Buildings Department, to see a report in the *Advertiser* following the tabling in this House of the Auditor-General's Report which referred to mismanagement in the Public Buildings Department and to an amount of \$78 000. That was a most unfair statement, because nowhere in the Auditor-General's Report (and the Auditor-General referred to the Public Buildings Department and to other departments regarding inefficiency in accounting matters) did he use the word "mismanagement". In fact, the \$78 000 referred to was actually spent after Cabinet approval. It was Commonwealth money that we had to spend before a certain date: it was spent on an urgent project at Hillcrest about which there had been a political furore. It served its purposes, and the certificates that the Auditor-General claimed were not obtained were, in fact, obtained. Having spoken with the Auditor-General about this matter, as well as with the Director, Public Buildings Department, I know he is concerned, as I and the Director are concerned, that this sort of thing has been reported in the way it has been reported. I hope that the *Advertiser* will see fit to put the matter straight. There has been no mismanagement or mis-spending of funds in the Public Buildings Department that the Auditor-General or anyone else can put the finger on, and that includes the member for Davenport who has a sneer on his face.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will say more about that later, because that action speaks for itself, and no-one need speak about the action of the member for Davenport as to the payment of his rates.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I welcome the chance given me by the member for Florey to challenge the member for Fisher to come to me with specific instances if he wishes, and I will check them.

Mr. Venning: You wouldn't know where to start!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: That is the attitude of the honourable member. What he would do if he had the chance would be to follow the workmen around with a big whip.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am pleased to have had the chance to ask the *Advertiser* to correct the report or the manner in which it reported the Auditor-General's statement about the Public Buildings Department, because this statement has had an effect on the morale of my department, since it was an unjustified and untrue statement.

INCOME TAX

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I move the motion standing in my name. This motion is fundamental to the future of the federal system in this country.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is moving a motion, and that motion must be submitted to the House for its consideration.

Mr. GUNN: If you want me to read the motion, Mr. Speaker, I move:

That because of the serious financial position of South Australia and the other States of the Commonwealth this House request that the Commonwealth Government enter into an agreement with the States to return to the States a fixed percentage of the Commonwealth income tax revenue, the proportion to be determined in agreement with the States and, in addition, there should be equalisation grants to the States with smaller populations.

The purpose of this motion is to protect the federal system that is fundamental to democracy in this country. It is obvious from reports in this morning's *Advertiser* that this State and other States will be forced to levy highly inflationary taxation measures, which are detrimental to growth, initiative, and enterprise. Only one method can be used to overcome this unfortunate set of circumstances, and that is by the Commonwealth Government facing up to its responsibilities, recognising that ours is a federal system, putting aside its centralist philosophies and its aims to destroy the federal system, and giving the States a set proportion of income tax revenue. In that way, State Treasurers would be able to budget and would not be forced to impose the vicious types of taxation that the Treasurer has already foreshadowed. This sort of situation has been considered for many years and has been the subject of debate at the Constitution Convention. I believe that, if the convention is allowed to function as it should (and as it was intended to), we may reach a sensible compromise that will allow the taxpayers of South Australia to receive part of their tax payments from the Commonwealth.

The Commonwealth Government does not have the sole right over taxpayers' funds. Apparently, that Government believes it is the Almighty and can decide how taxpayers' funds should be disbursed so that the States become the agent for the Commonwealth Government. That situation cannot be tolerated in any democratic system. The federal system to which I have paid most attention is that operating in West Germany, a country that has twice experienced strong centralist Governments. That country has now decided on a federal system that allocates income tax revenue to the States and local government in set proportions, so that each arm of government can discharge properly its constitutional role of carrying out programmes in the interests of the taxpayers. With the present situation in Australia, the Commonwealth Government is receiving thousands of millions of dollars each year from income tax returns, but the States, being virtually forced into bankruptcy, are to impose capital taxation, which is a most unfair and unjust tax. We of the Liberal Party recognise this matter. In fact, it is stated Liberal Party policy and will be put into effect after the next Commonwealth election, when we shall deal with this matter.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: How are you going to do that?

Mr. GUNN: The Minister may not be greatly concerned about the situation, but I will tell him clearly what we shall do. In the manifesto presented before the last Commonwealth election (and it is more relevant today than it was then) it was stated:

The Liberal and Country Parties believe that the States must be provided with adequate and assured sources of revenue with which to discharge their proper responsibilities and that the States should receive a guaranteed proportion of Commonwealth personal income tax revenues. The proportion shall be determined by arrangement with the States.

It goes on:

The Liberal and Country Parties will continue to grant moneys to the States for the achievement of specific national purposes.

Finally, on that topic, it is stated that we shall maintain the Grants Commission. That is a clear commitment to the system of giving the States access to income tax revenue, unlike the situation we have today where the present Commonwealth Government tries to allocate funds to the States by way of section 96 grants, and ties the States to the Commonwealth, making them agents of the Commonwealth Government. The Victorian Deputy Premier (Mr. Thompson) was correct when, during the recent Australian Constitution Convention held in New South Wales, he discussed this matter and quoted a statement made by Sir Robert Menzies at the 1953 Premiers' Conference. That statement is even more applicable today than when Sir Robert originally made it. Sir Robert said:

A State that is not the master of its own revenue, which has to go along every year and say "Please", will, in due course, at some moment of exasperation on the part of somebody . . .

I will not read further, but the import of what he said is relevant. We all know that members of the Labor Party, such as the member for Stuart, try to belittle anyone who does not agree with the type of policy their Party wishes to inflict on the Australian people. My motion is designed to protect the democratic system in this country, because the federal system guarantees democracy and prevents the type of take-over we have seen in other parts of the world. The member for Stuart ought to recognise that point. Moreover, he should take the time

to read what the South Australian Premier said at the recent Constitution Convention when he ridiculed what Mr. Thompson said.

However, after the abortive Premiers' Conference, when he was short-sheeted by his colleague the Prime Minister, the Premier said that it was time the States received a fair share of Commonwealth income tax funds. Before that, he was willing to be like a small puppy at the convention and lick the heels of the Prime Minister. The Premier was not willing, in the interests of the people of this State, to stand up to the Prime Minister. The member for Mitcham has said, "You cannot be a good South Australian and be a member of the Labor Party." The member for Stuart has clearly demonstrated that he is not a good South Australian, because what he has said entirely supports the action his Prime Minister has taken to destroy the States. The member for Spence also supports that policy. It must be remembered that we are all Australians, but that we are South Australians, too.

Mr. Crimes: Secondly!

Mr. GUNN: I do not believe there are any second-class citizens in Australia, but the Labor Party believes it, because the Commonwealth Government, by its actions, wants to make the States second-class members of the Federation. We of the Liberal Party believe in democracy and, therefore, are true liberal democrats. We are not Socialists, who want to control and destroy people. In the statement to which I was referring, Sir Robert Menzies clearly explained that any State or Government that was not the master of its own financial resources could not properly discharge its functions for the people it was supposed to represent.

Our own Treasurer, in the course of introducing the recent Budget, clearly indicated the inconsistencies in the present financial relationship between the State and Commonwealth Governments. Throughout the Budget he highlighted inefficiencies and the financial dependence of the States on the Commonwealth, pointing out literally that the States had to go along cap in hand to the Commonwealth at Premiers' Conferences to make various submissions just to discharge their proper constitutional functions. That is not the proper way for a Government to perform, and it ill behoves the Commonwealth Government, which for a short time will comprise members of the Labor Party, to continue this situation. If it wants to assist the people it claims to represent, the Commonwealth Government should immediately enter into negotiations with all States to ensure that all Governments in Australia have proper access to the finances they need and to which they are entitled. The situation we face currently is that the States have to think up more and more types of unpleasant forms of taxation, and I believe we already have too many forms of taxation in this country. There is really only one fair form of taxation, and that is income tax. Other indirect forms of taxation are wrong; in fact, many of them should be abolished. If it is necessary to pay higher personal income tax, I do not believe the majority of citizens would complain. I believe I have said ample on this matter at present to indicate—

The Hon. L. J. King: I agree that you've said ample. In fact, you've said more than ample.

Mr. GUNN: I hope that my colleagues will support the motion and that members opposite will support it, too. Moreover, I sincerely hope that the motion, if carried, will be transmitted to the Commonwealth Government so that it can see how South Australia feels about the current Commonwealth-State financial relationship and how it is having a detrimental effect on the people of this State.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): I have pleasure in seconding the motion, because it raises the point that the Australian States are in a dire financial situation: there can be no dispute whatever about the present crisis. Our own Premier has spoken out about the matter and has forcibly described the crisis that this State faces. We could see from the recent State Budget that State taxes were being increased drastically to cover the ever-diminishing financial resources of the States to discharge their responsibilities. The question that remains unanswered is: how do we resolve the present financial crisis? I believe that the passing of the motion is the only rational and logical means of resolving it. It is a move I have supported several times. In fact, on Sunday, September 29, a new book called *Looking at the Liberals* will be released. As a contributor to the book, which is about the Commonwealth Liberal Party of Australia (published by Cheshire, of Melbourne), I put forward a proposal in it that a certain percentage—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What has this to do with the motion, or is this a commercial break?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: If the Minister will only listen for a moment, he will find out. I put forward a proposal in the book that a percentage of income tax should be returned by the Commonwealth Government to the States. It is therefore with great pleasure that I second the motion. As a Federation, Australia is in a unique position: the Commonwealth Government raises about 77.1 per cent of all public revenue; the State Governments raise only 12.9 per cent; and local government raises 9 per cent. The public revenue raised by the Commonwealth Government is significantly higher than that raised in any comparable federation in the world. In Germany, the Federal Government raises only 49 per cent of the total revenue; in Canada, 51.5 per cent; and in the United States of America, 62.9 per cent.

For a workable federation, it is imperative that governmental responsibility be matched with the power to raise revenue. The State Governments have tremendous responsibilities, particularly in education, health, hospitals, and urban development, in which spheres expenditure is increasing at a far greater rate than that of the population increase. It is these spheres to which the community is starting to pay much attention. Although the States have these important areas of responsibility, most of the power to raise revenue to finance them lies with the Commonwealth Government, which is reluctant to hand over the necessary finance to the States to match these responsibilities. Even the Commonwealth Liberal Government, when in office, was somewhat reluctant to do this, but the present Commonwealth Labor Party Government is even more reluctant: it is trying to hang the individual States by pulling on the purse strings. This reluctance by the Commonwealth Government is seen by the fact that, during the past nine years, its increase in revenue from income tax has been over 100 per cent, although the increase in the State's share of these revenues has been only about 70 per cent.

I understand that the latest Commonwealth Budget predicts that personal income tax will increase by about \$3 000 000 000, whereas the original sum to be collected was only about \$5 500 000 000. So, we can see the tremendous rate of increase in personal income tax as a result of inflation but, unfortunately, the States will not receive the benefits of this increase. As a result of all this, expenditure by the States in the basic areas of education, health services, hospitals, and urban development has not kept pace with expenditure in other areas of the

economy. The States have fallen further and further into debt, relying more and more on Loan grants from the Commonwealth. Again, we can see this from the announcement made yesterday that the State Government is now \$18 500 000 in deficit in the first two months of the current financial year.

Obviously, this critical situation must be resolved. There are two courses of action: first, the Commonwealth Government can be given greater responsibility to match its revenue-raising power. The other alternative is to ensure that the States receive adequate financial return to carry out the responsibilities allocated to them under the Commonwealth Constitution. Mr. Whitlam and the A.L.P. have chosen the former of these alternatives, namely, a policy of centralism. For the latter plan to work, that is, for the States to receive the finance to carry out the responsibilities they have, the allocation of such finances cannot be on the restricted and inhibitory basis of the past. Such revenue needs to be allocated as a proportion of the total income tax collected by the Commonwealth Government, with additional provisions to encompass the growth of the individual States and the disabilities suffered by the smaller States.

After all, that is exactly what the motion is about. The Commonwealth Government should allocate a certain percentage of personal income tax to the States, and the States should allocate this money according to the responsibilities they have and as they see fit. This would necessitate redistribution grants, but these grants should not be on the same basis as that of the Canadian equalisation grants. If the Canadian method were adopted, Victoria would prosper and other States, particularly South Australia, would suffer. I believe it is feasible to work out a basis for the allocation of equalisation grants so that South Australia, Western Australia, and Tasmania can maintain a growth rate equal to that for the three larger States of New South Wales, Victoria, and Queensland. So, what is really needed is an entirely new co-operative federalism, one in which the whole area of finance administration, and legislation is reviewed. However, before we can reach this Utopia of co-operative federalism in Australia, the first step we must take is to resolve the way in which finances are allocated.

The ludicrousness of the present situation may be seen from the present accounts of the Engineering and Water Supply Department. In 1973-74, the department raised, in water and sewerage rates, just over \$44 000 000, of which \$22 000 000 was returned to the Commonwealth as interest on Loan grants: one-half of the revenue raised had to be returned to the Commonwealth to pay off interest rates. This shows the plight the States are in. What is happening is that the Commonwealth Government is using personal income tax it has raised to finance its own works, on an interest-free basis. It is the States which, under the Commonwealth Constitution, must go to the Commonwealth to raise Loan grants, if necessary, within Australia or overseas. Naturally, the States must pay interest rates on those Loan grants. It was for this reason that the Prime Minister, in an article in the *Australian Quarterly* in 1971, said, in effect, that the Commonwealth Government could carry out works at less than half the cost at which the States could carry them out.

The only reason why the Commonwealth can do that is that it pays no interest on the finance it raises. Compared on an actual work-cost basis, the States could probably carry out such work at a lower cost than could the Commonwealth, because the States generally have a lower wage structure in their Public Services than has

the Commonwealth. So, more than one-half the cost of any of our capital works goes to pay interest rates. I therefore have great pleasure in moving the motion.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You're only seconding it! Are you still trying to grab the headlines?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I wish the Minister would, instead of making stupid, childish comments, appreciate the critical situation the States are now in. One would have thought the Minister had no concern for the great deficit that the South Australian Railways Department faces because (on his own statements) of the high interest rates it has to pay. One would think he would at least support this motion. We have heard from the Deputy Premier that the Premier is in Canberra today trying to sort out the State's finances.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I didn't say anything about that.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I believe when he gets back this evening—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I didn't say that.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: We know the Premier is concerned, and he has made a statement in the *News* this afternoon that taxes may have to be imposed. The only reason for doing that—

Mr. Wright: Have you read the *News* yet?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I have read the headline.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You read just headlines and never the substance of the article.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: That is because I do not sit in the House, as the Minister does, with his feet up reading a newspaper. State taxes will have to be increased, because the present system of Commonwealth-State financial arrangement is entirely unsatisfactory. This motion represents what I believe is the only workable solution, and I have great pleasure in seconding it.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I move:

That this House condemn the Government for its abject failure so far to give any lead in the present grave situation of industrial unrest and disruption and call on it immediately to urge all members of the community to observe the processes of law and in particular to use the machinery of industrial arbitration and conciliation and to observe decisions made thereby.

I put this motion on the Notice Paper some weeks ago when the situation in South Australia was extremely grave. We had a situation of industrial unrest, when strikes were continuing unrebuked by the Government, even though they were causing much disruption to the community and particularly our economy. I am glad to say that while we are still labouring under the burden of strikes, the bakers' strike being the latest, the situation is somewhat better than it was. Soon after I put the motion on the Notice Paper the Premier, no doubt prodded into it, in part at least, by the notice I had given, came out belatedly and criticised the Transport Workers Union for its part in the demarcation dispute at the Port Adelaide wharves. For once I was glad to hear him speak as he did; it is a pity it does not happen more often, and it was a great pity it had not happened earlier because the strike collapsed not long afterwards.

However, I believe that the motion still has a great deal of substance in it and, in support of it, I want to say something about what has happened since in the T.W.U. Having already canvassed this matter in the grievance debate before the Budget last week, I intend not to go over that again

but to carry on from the point that had been reached at that time. Last evening (this is another example of the lawless way in which unions are carrying on at present, and I invite members opposite to take up what I am saying and to support me in it) there was a meeting of the management committee of the South Australian branch of the T.W.U.

Members interjecting:

Mr. Wright: I suppose you had a spy at the meeting.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Here they are all coming in like the tide; they are anticipating me. I did not have a spy there; nor, as Mr. Nyland suggested to me on television last week, did I have one at the branch meeting, but we have had newspaper reports, both this morning and this afternoon, of what went on at that meeting. We knew, of course, what was to occur at that meeting, because part of the notes which were handed to me and which were made by the man who attended the branch meeting earlier dealt with this point. Perhaps I should just remind members what was said about this at the general branch meeting, as follows:

The Secretary said that the two members who were the original picket breakers should be expelled but if the executive did it they could be issued with a civil writ, but if the meeting directed them to do it nobody would know who was there and as a result those who were there could not be found and they (the executive) did not want to know who was there either.

That is what Mr. Nyland said at the branch meeting, and he has been as good as his word, because it is reported in today's *Advertiser* that the branch committee purported to expel those two men (Messrs. Trinne and Flynn) at a meeting held last evening following the general meeting. It is stated in the *Advertiser* and again in the *News* this afternoon that neither man had received any notification whatever either of the move against them at the general meeting or (except what was reported in the press after I had spoken in this place) of what was to happen to them last evening. I have had a look today at the rules of the T.W.U., and I will refer to them in a moment. Not only is what has happened contrary to natural justice, as it is called (every man who is up for expulsion from any organisation is entitled as a matter of natural justice to be given an opportunity to be heard in his own defence): the specific rules of the T.W.U. have been ignored.

Mr. Wright: What is their misconduct?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Adelaide asks what is their misconduct: apparently, although this has never been reduced to writing to my knowledge, it is that they were the first two men to drive across the picket lines, virtually at the invitation of the Premier. Rule 58 of the Transport Workers Union of Australia applies to this case, and I will read the relevant parts of it (I will read the lot if anyone thinks I am just picking and choosing) as follows:

Penalties:

(a) Any member who is charged, in writing, by any other member that he—

(i) fails to abide by or observe any of the rules of the union;

(ii) failed to observe any lawful resolution of the union of which he has had previous written notice;

(iii) induced or assisted any member who is legally entitled to remain a member, to tender his resignation as a member of the union;

may be summoned to a special meeting of the federal council, federal committee of management or his branch committee of management to explain his conduct.

First of all, the charge by implication must be in writing, because it says, "Any member who is charged in writing", and I know of no evidence that a charge in writing has been made against either of these men.

Mr. Wright: Have you checked that out?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, I have not checked that out, but I am concluding it from the implication in the comments both men have made. I may be wrong but I believe I am right: there has been no charge in writing. I am confident from reports and from what I have been told independently that these men received no notification and were not given any opportunity to attend the meeting last evening or the general meeting last week to defend themselves. It is crystal clear that they must be given that opportunity, because the words used are "may be summoned to a special meeting . . . to explain". They have not been given any opportunity to explain.

Mr. Wells: The operative word is "may", though, isn't it?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, I agree with that, but I assert that in those circumstances they must be given an opportunity to attend, even though the word is permissive, not mandatory. Rule 58 (b) states:

Any member who, being summoned to attend under sub-clause (a) hereof at any meeting of the federal council, federal committee of management, or his branch committee of management—

(i) Fails to attend the meeting to which he was summoned and does not after being called on for an explanation of such failure satisfy the members of the body to which he was summoned that he has a reasonable excuse for such failure; or

(ii) If, after due inquiry, the meeting is satisfied that the charge is made out, fails to give an explanation of his conduct . . .

By that part of the rule, he must be given the opportunity to explain. The rule continues:

—which is satisfactory to a majority of the members of the body present at such special meeting shall be liable to be fined any sum not exceeding \$20; or may be suspended or dismissed from any office or position held by him; or may be expelled from the union; as may be decided by a majority of the members of the body present at the meeting to which such member was summoned.

Rule 58 (c) states:

For the purpose of the foregoing a meeting of the branch committee of management of the branch concerned shall be deemed to be a meeting of the branch.

Then there are provisions for appeal, but it is perfectly obvious that, in several ways (although we may not be able to be precise about how many ways), those rules already have been breached by the T.W.U. in the purported expulsion of these two men. They were not given notice, they were not able to go to the meeting, and they were not given any opportunity to make an explanation. That, again, is an example of the lawlessness that is going on in that union and, as I said last week, I suspect that is only an example of what is going on in other unions, but not in all unions.

Mr. Wright: That's unfair.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am not saying more than that I suspect, but we have had other examples of malpractice. However, I do not want to go into that matter now, having read the rules of the T.W.U. and knowing what has happened so far in this unhappy matter. Will the union's action, having purported to expel those members (and I believe such expulsion is invalid), foment industrial trouble if other union members are working with these men? Will the union put a black ban on those for whom these men work? If the union does that, what action will the remainder of the trade union movement, as well as the Minister and his Government, take?

Mr. Gunn: We should be told today.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I hope that the answers to those questions are self-evident and that the T.W.U. will be condemned by this House, the Trades and Labor Council, and the Government. As the member for Eyre has stated by interjection, we should be told today what action the Government will take. The Minister of Labour and Industry is in the House and he will have the opportunity soon to speak out without equivocation on where his Government stands.

I point out to the Minister and to every other member that in this situation there is potential for renewed industrial trouble in the transport industry in this State, and we should nip that in the bud now if we can. That is why I have taken the opportunity, in speaking on a motion that I prepared for other purposes a few weeks ago, to raise the matter this afternoon so that it can be dealt with. I do not resile from the generality of the motion, and I consider that the motion is amply justified in any case. However, the urgency of it now lies with the T.W.U. dispute and the actions at the general meeting last week and at the branch committee meeting last evening.

Mr. BOUNDY (Goyder): In seconding the motion, I am pleased to support my colleague, who has covered the subject in his usual expert way. It is necessary for me to mention only a few minor points. My colleague has pointed out the problems that face the State when anarchy replaces responsible union leadership. I, too, deplore the difficulties that we, as citizens of this State, experience. Union members should be concerned about the risk of losing many benefits gained by their organisations over the years.

In the present industrial and economic situation, the credibility of some unions and some union leadership is at stake. The rank-and-file members now must take the opportunity to be more active in the affairs of management of their union, in the interests of safeguarding its credibility, their own future, and the future of us all. This Government has a duty to encourage such responsible behaviour by unions.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE (Minister of Labour and Industry): I do not intend to delay the House at any length in replying to the member for Mitcham. Because of the nonsense that the honourable member has gone on with this afternoon and recently, I doubt that many members are interested in what he has said. I think we could include in that comment most of the citizens of this State and of Australia. I listened with interest to the honourable member when he talked about the conduct of union meetings. It was obvious to me and, I thought, to all other members that he really had no knowledge of the matters that he was trying to talk about. In fact, he was speaking from the depths of his ignorance. The member for Eyre interjected and wanted to know where the Government stood in taking action on the matters that the member for Mitcham has raised.

I have already pointed out that the member for Mitcham has raised no matters of concern to this House, to the Government, or to me. The Government will not institute any inquiry into the conduct of these unions. Furthermore, the Government will not take the advice of the member for Mitcham, because those who have done so in the past have lived to regret doing it. I understand that some of his clients are in gaol, and some have been banished from the State and told not to return (and the honourable member probably knows whom I am talking about). On Wednesday, September 11, the member for Mitcham, in his motion, asked this House to express its congratulations to the Commonwealth member for Hindmarsh—

Mr. Millhouse: You're on the wrong one.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The honourable member has on the Notice Paper so many motions expressing his dissatisfaction with unions that I find it hard to know with which one we are dealing. At this stage, I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

CHILD CARE

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I move:

That this House deplore the appalling decision of the Commonwealth Government not to honour the commitment that it made before the recent Commonwealth election to a programme of child care and, in the interests of children of pre-school age in South Australia, request the Government to make urgent representations to the Commonwealth Government to reverse that decision.

Again, I put this motion on the Notice Paper some weeks ago following what was called the Commonwealth mini Budget when the Commonwealth Government announced that it intended to renege on the undertakings it had given during the Commonwealth election campaign. However, this motion has now become timely again because of the Commonwealth Budget last evening when we had confirmed the fact that the Commonwealth Government was letting down the people of Australia and not living up to the specific promises given at the time of the Commonwealth election. The member for Mitchell may snigger at that; perhaps he is laughing in embarrassment at his Commonwealth colleagues.

Mr. Payne: You can tell the difference between my snigger and my laugh; one is louder than the other.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will remind members of what the Prime Minister said about child care in the Labor Party policy speech.

Mr. Payne: You talk about our policy; you haven't got one of your own.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will tell the honourable member what is the Liberal Movement policy on this matter.

Mr. Payne: When did you run it off?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Paragraph 1 of the L.M. policy on education—

Mr. Payne: You're getting on the Labor bandwagon.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Crimes): Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Is he not impossible, Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker? He has asked me to give our policy, saying first that we did not have a policy. Now, when I try to read it, all he can do is make inane remarks. Let me read the paragraph relating to education.

Mr. Payne: Is it published yet?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The policy was freely available from the L.M. stand at the Royal Show, where we distributed hundreds of copies. Our policy has been available for some months. Paragraph 1 of our education policy is as follows:

Pre-school: every primary school should have a pre-school attached to it, financed from a central State agency, to prevent the inequality of locally financed kindergartens in less affluent areas.

If the honourable member thinks that that is not a coherent and sensible policy, he should say so. That is where the L.M. stands on this matter. However, I do not speak for the so-called Liberal members in this place; what their policy is I do not know. In April, during the Commonwealth election campaign, the Commonwealth Leader of the Labor Party said (and it is high-flown prose):

The advice of the qualified and the concerned men and women now being made available through our commissions and inquiries enables the Government to implement its broad vision of the nature and purpose of education in a modern society. We want not only to provide wider opportunities for education for a lifetime, we want to provide opportunities for a lifetime of education. Such opportunities must be made available if Australians are to be able to lead full and happy lives rewarding to themselves and to the community. In a society undergoing such rapid change as ours, the plain fact is that a majority of people will change their occupations more than once in their lives. Redundancy is no longer the lot of manually skilled workers alone. Few occupations are going to be left untouched by the technological revolution.

That was the introductory paragraph. Even at the risk of being told that I am quoting the honourable gentleman out of context, I will leave the next few paragraphs and read the last paragraph, which is of special relevance here, as follows:

Child-care services will be subsidised with parents contributing to the cost according to their means, the main thrust of the programme in the first years being to assist disadvantaged children.

I invite members opposite, especially the member for Mitchell, to listen to the next sentence.

Mr. Payne: I'm listening.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is as follows:

It is estimated that the cost of this programme in the first year—

and we are now in the first year—

—(a programme of vision and imagination based on a compassionate understanding of the needs of the child, the parent and the community) will be \$130 000 000.

Yet, in the Commonwealth Budget announced last evening, the sum provided is \$75 000 000. If members opposite think that that is honouring an undertaking given by the Prime Minister in his policy speech, I should like to hear them say so. In that speech, the Prime Minister allowed himself to be specific, stating the sum of \$130 000 000. However, a few months later, the Commonwealth Treasurer has included in the Budget only \$75 000 000, not much more than half of what had been estimated as the cost in the first year. Of itself, that justifies a rebuke. I framed this motion after hearing the comment of the Minister of Education in this House when cuts were first announced at the time of the Commonwealth mini Budget. On that occasion, the Minister described the decision of the Commonwealth Government as appalling. I use that word advisedly in this motion.

It was appalling from every point of view: not only did it let people down after the specific promise had been given but also it puts into disarray all plans and aspirations we have for children of this age, and it has been characterised by our own Minister, who is a Labor Party man, as an appalling decision, and it is being carried on in the Budget we heard last evening. What did Mr. Crean, the Treasurer, say in the Commonwealth House on July 23? I use his remarks to confirm an outlook of the Government, and I am not relying on newspaper reports. Mr. Crean stated:

Secondly, in the policy speech last April reference was made to our plans to embark on a major pre-school and child-care programme at a cost then estimated at \$130 000 000 in this financial year. This initiative reflected the high priority that we have consistently attached to the meeting of needs in this area—needs, I might say, which had been neglected almost entirely before.

They may give it a high priority, but they are not willing to match their deeds to their words. The statement continued:

The Social Welfare Commission's report on the matter will be tabled in due course, and we would expect a good deal of public discussion thereafter.

There will be public discussion if I have anything to do with it. Mr. Crean's statement continued:

Questions of resources, including staff, for such a programme, have also been arising. Given these delays, as well as the now extreme need to restrain the further growth of Government spending, the Government has reluctantly decided to postpone until 1975-76 the commencement of the full-scale programme. We will, of course, fully honour the commitments that we have already entered into under the interim pre-school and child-care schemes, and which alone could call for an outlay of about \$34 000 000 in this financial year. Investigations currently in train may lead to the provision of further funds during the year.

Certainly, there has not been any full honouring of the undertaking, which was given by the Prime Minister in Parliament this year and on which the people of Australia were entitled to act. It is for those reasons that I commend the motion to the House, because I believe the decision of the Commonwealth Government is, to use the words of the Minister of Education, an appalling decision. I cannot see how any member in this place, because the decision has been so characterised from the Government benches, could possibly fail to support the motion. It is an appalling decision, and is letting down the people of this country and those who have been lauded rightly by the Prime Minister in his speech, that is, the children of this community. In moving the motion, I hope that it will have unanimous support.

The Hon. L. J. KING secured the adjournment of the debate.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Mr. GUNN (Eyre) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Planning and Development Act, 1966-1973. Read a first time.

Mr. GUNN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its purpose is to bring about a better liaison between the State Planning Authority and primary producers in this State. It has been evident for some time that the State Planning Authority has not been fully conversant with the views and wishes of primary producers in this State. This Bill sets out to give the United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia Incorporated and the Stockowners Association of South Australia the chance to submit names to the Minister, so that one person representing these organisations shall be a member of the authority. I believe that, if this Bill is passed, it will benefit not only primary producers but also the State Planning Authority and planning in general in this State. I commend the Bill to the House, because I believe it is significant and in the best interests of primary producers.

The Hon. L. J. KING secured the adjournment of the debate.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Constitution Act, 1934, as amended. Read a first time.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This is a short Bill, the substance of which has been debated before in this House. It is available to members, who will receive a copy of it in a moment. The object of the Bill—

The Hon. L. J. King: I think we all know what the object is.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —is, I am happy to say, substantially, although not word for word, in line with the policy of the Liberal Movement: it provides that in future it is

not necessary, or an obligation, for Ministers of the Crown to be members of the Legislative Council.

The Hon. L. J. King: That is going to the very roots of the political history of South Australia.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, and I am confident I shall have the Attorney-General's support, and that of all his colleagues, in this.

The Hon. L. J. King: I shall be interested to hear you recount the historical background of this matter.

Mr. Gunn: You—

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not think it is necessary to cause the members of the Liberal Party as much pain as that. I will satisfy the member for Eyre, as far as his challenge is concerned, in due course. The present subsection (2) of section 65 of the Constitution Act is in these terms:

The Ministers of the Crown shall respectively bear such titles and fill such Ministerial offices as the Governor from time to time appoints, and not more than eight of the Ministers shall at one time be members of the House of Assembly.

That means that, if we are to have a full complement of 11 Ministers, which is now provided by subsection (1) of section 65 of the Act, three of them at least must come from the Legislative Council. More than three can come from the Legislative Council, but three must, because no more than eight can come from the House of Assembly. The proportion of Ministers from the Council has been steadily dropping with each increase in the number of Ministers (I doubt whether all of them have been justified), as the number that must come from the Council has remained at three. I think at one time, as the Act was printed in 1961, there were eight Ministers, of whom no more than five could be members of the House of Assembly. So a far higher proportion in those days came from the Council than now must.

However, we do not believe it is necessary for any Ministers to come from that Chamber. We believe (and this has been made clear on many occasions) that the Council is a second Chamber which is a House of Review, and, if it is to carry out that function fully effectively and not simply be a House of privilege and obstruction, there is no requirement for any of its members to be Ministers of the Crown; nor is there a requirement for any Bills to be initiated in that Chamber. I remind the member for Kavel, who is about to jump in, that in Tasmania—

Mr. Goldsworthy: Does your Party Leader in the Upper House go along with this?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, he does, and I am confident that he will pilot this Bill right through the Legislative Council when it gets there, but whether or not that is a vain hope remains to be seen. It will be interesting to see whether there has been any change in the outlook of members of the Liberal Party in the Upper House. We are always being told that the Liberal Party has changed: it has changed its name, it has changed its administration, the General Secretary now has silver wallpaper, and so on, so it will be interesting to see whether the Liberal Party has changed on this matter, whether there is any change of outlook or substance in what it does. But let me say that we believe that this is a desirable move, that the Legislative Council should be a House of Review, and that it can then carry out its functions as a House of Review if it does not have, as members of it, Ministers. I remind honourable members (I was going to do this when the member for Kavel interjected a little while ago) that this is already in operation in Tasmania: there are no Ministers in the Legislative Council there.

There is a Government representative in the Upper House, and he handles Government Bills which he himself supports but, if he does not happen to support a certain Bill (I am talking now of when a non-Labor Government is in office), the Government has to look for someone else to handle the Bill for it. That system works, and it would work here and allow the Upper House to fulfil its proper role as a House of Review.

However, as in all things, I have been pretty moderate in my amendment and have simply provided that Ministers need not, not "must not", come from the Upper House. It would be possible, in theory, under this Bill for half or all the Ministers to come from the Legislative Council. All it does is say that there need not be any Ministers from the Legislative Council. In case I am challenged by the member for Mitchell on my Party's policy, let me read it out to him.

Mr. Payne: Is this the September, 1974, policy?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No; I am glad the member for Torrens is here, because he participated in the making of this policy, and so did several other members including the member for Glenelg, who is reading his newspaper. They were part of the Liberal Movement when this policy was first enunciated. It has been confirmed since, but they were in the Liberal Movement when it was first formed. It is not a new policy. This is what it states:

So that the Legislative Council may be a true House of Review:

(1) Section 65 of the Constitution Act should be amended to provide that there be not more than 10 Ministers, of whom not less than seven be members of the House of Assembly.

Mr. Keneally: Did Murray Hill agree to that?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. That shows that the policy is of some age, because the number of Ministers set down there is 10. Whereas we had a policy with 10 as the number (there are, in fact, now 11 under the Constitution), the policy provides that not less than seven should be members of the House of Assembly, so I am really going as far as that policy would oblige me to go.

Mr. Simmons: You should add another one to the total number.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That may be so. However, I am not couching the Bill in these terms but am leaving it wide in the hope that I am offering a compromise to members of the Liberal Party, both to those who originally supported this policy as members of the Liberal Movement and to those who did not, to test the change of heart which they are so fond of asserting they have undergone and of which I see no evidence. However, that is all by the way. The foundation of this Bill is that we believe that the Legislative Council should be a House of Review and should not necessarily have Ministers in it at all and that it could perform its function properly without Ministers. If this Bill goes through, it will mean that future Governments (and, indeed, this Government) will have unfettered discretion as to how many members of the Ministry come from one House or the other, which is a desirable situation. So, with some confidence on this occasion, I commend the Bill to the House.

The Hon. L. J. KING secured the adjournment of the debate.

INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 21. Page 613.)

Mr. WRIGHT (Adelaide): Naturally, I oppose the Bill. I have been trying to convince myself ever since the Bill was introduced by the member for Glenelg why he should be the member from the opposite side who would introduce such legislation.

Mr. Duncan: He's the only one stupid enough to do it.

Mr. WRIGHT: On many occasions, he was the one member opposite who told the House that he had had at least some affiliation to the trade union movement. If that is so, I believe that he is showing his complete ignorance of the workings of a union and of how it can work effectively. First, I oppose the Bill in principle, because the real effect of this attack on the trade union movement is to take power out of the hands of unions, and place it in the hands of the court. I consider that is the essence of what the member for Glenelg is trying to do.

Of course, he did not say in his speech, or at any other time in the House, whether he intended taking the same power out of the hands of companies and placing it in the hands of the court. In fact, not one member opposite has said that. It must always be the principle that the trade union movement has the power to run its own affairs: it cannot function in any other way.

During my Address in Reply speech in July I mentioned the Donovan report. I do not intend to reiterate the points I made at that time except to say that it is the only well-known report available to the public. At every level, the Donovan report provides many valid reasons why it is impossible practically to run ballots by the industrial court or, for that matter, to suggest that the result would be any different. I believe that is the most important factor, because I have no doubt that the member for Glenelg and the member for Alexandra had in their minds (and unfortunately it is in the minds of the public not only in South Australia but in the whole of Australia) that the result would be somewhat different from that taken at an open ballot where a show of hands or a division was used.

Mr. Mathwin: That's right.

Mr. WRIGHT: It is not right. In fact, it has been proved completely incorrect. The Donovan report points out that in Canada, the United States of America and the United Kingdom there are many instances where the result has been the reverse. No proof exists on any examination that could be conducted that the result would be any different or that members of an organisation would be less militant because it was a secret ballot than would apply if it were merely a show of hands. The complete reverse is the case, because there has been a reversal of ballots taken in these circumstances, and members of the organisations concerned have proved to be much more militant.

Mr. Mathwin: The Donovan report refers to Canada and the United States, but not the United Kingdom.

Mr. WRIGHT: That is not the important matter: the important point about this Bill is that it has been designed to take the power out of the hands of the trade union movement and to place it in the hands of the industrial court, thus disadvantaging the trade union movement in the activities it can pursue, and placing employers at a definite advantage over employees.

Mr. Payne: That's the aim of this Bill.

Mr. WRIGHT: Yes; the member for Glenelg is trying to stop the trade union movement from functioning properly. He is trying to place it at a disadvantage and to give more power and make more tactics available to

employer organisations. I do not believe that the member for Glenelg can deny that that is his sole object in this matter.

Mr. Mathwin: I most certainly deny it categorically.

Mr. WRIGHT: Well, the honourable member has not influenced me in any way. In fact, I read his second reading speech twice, and it is as clear as crystal that he is trying to give employers more powers of manipulation and less manoeuvrability to the trade union movement so that it can be placed at a disadvantage. I make no apology to the member for Glenelg for that statement, because I do not believe he is in the least interested in giving the trade union movement what he says is a fair go, but he is giving employers a fair go.

Mr. Mathwin: I want to give the ordinary member a fair go.

Mr. WRIGHT: I have checked the rules of various union organisations in this State and, almost invariably, there is, within those rules, a method by which members can demand a secret ballot. My own organisation's rules provide that five members can ask for a secret ballot to be conducted.

Mr. Becker: Is that all?

Mr. WRIGHT: Yes. At any mass meeting, irrespective of the size, any member can get up and demand a secret ballot. I have no objection to that procedure. I am not defending the non-right or right to conduct secret ballots, but I am defending the opposition to this Bill, because the member for Glenelg is trying to take control away from trade unions. If a trade union organisation or a member of that organisation wishes to have a secret ballot, it can be demanded.

Dr. Eastick: How can you take it away from them when the only voters would be trade unionists anyway?

Mr. WRIGHT: It is already in the hands of the trade union officials and the trade unions themselves to decide on the method of taking a ballot.

Mr. Coumbe: All of them?

Mr. WRIGHT: I did not say all of them. It would certainly apply in most cases. If the rank and file members wish to have a secret ballot on any matter, that is all right with me; there is nothing wrong with that. I can give numerous examples of this occurring in my own organisation and in other organisations that have come in for criticism in this House. Trade unionists themselves have to agree to conduct a secret ballot and undertake the task of implementing it. A blanket situation cannot apply.

Consider my own organisation, the Australian Workers Union, during a shearers' dispute where the court intervenes. Let us assume for the moment that this Bill passes (I hope it will not, and I believe it never will) and the court has power over trade unions to conduct their affairs. If there was a dispute involving shed hands, shearers, wool pressers, station hands, cooks and anyone else (all itinerant workers living all over Australia), the secret ballot papers would have to be posted to everyone in the organisation (remember that my organisation is a national organisation with between 17 000 and 20 000 members), and I could not see for the life of me how long that process would take.

Mr. Olson: It would take at least six weeks.

Mr. WRIGHT: Is that the sort of situation the member for Glenelg is trying to introduce? Does he want disputes prolonged, or does he want disputes settled as soon as possible?

Mr. Olson: He would want them to be prolonged.

Mr. WRIGHT: The ballot papers would never reach everyone, because some members could be away shearing or on holiday. All sorts of problems could arise to prevent their receiving the ballot papers. People might be travelling from shed to shed and the letter containing the secret ballot paper might not reach all of them. We could find ourselves in a situation where only about 5 per cent to 8 per cent of the members would vote in the ballot. That is the very thing the member for Glenelg says he is trying to prevent. I oppose the Bill not only in principle but also in relation to its impracticability: it cannot and will not work.

Let us now look at the dispute that involved the 6 000 members of the Transport Workers Union who were on strike three or four weeks ago and a meeting was held at the St. Clair Youth Centre. How long do members think it would take to police that sort of a crowd at a meeting, hand out the secret ballot forms to those present, and have them counted? The result would have to be ascertained, which would take some days. All these delays can affect the possibility of further offers being made by employers, which is an important point. Although in a dispute one could almost be at crisis point, ballot papers would have to be posted out and it would be some days before they could be returned, and the employers could make a new offer. Unions such as the Waterside Workers Federation, the Amalgamated Metal Workers Union and the Seamen's Union, have power to call their members together in, say, only 1½ hours and obtain a decision on the spot. Is that not a more practical way of resolving a dispute or, indeed, deciding whether a dispute should exist?

The attitude expressed by many Opposition members about standover tactics at union meetings is so much hogwash that I will discount it. I have never seen anyone stood over at a union meeting or refused the right to speak by a chairman. Nor have I seen anyone who has been qualified to attend refused the right to attend a meeting. The talk about stand-over tactics is so much rubbish that it should be disregarded.

Mr. Mathwin: I am not saying all of them: I am saying some.

Mr. WRIGHT: If a man wants to go to a meeting but has not got the courage of his convictions to stand up and tell the rest of his workmates what he thinks, he is not worth his salt.

Dr. Eastick: Would he think he had a case if he knew he would be thumped?

Mr. WRIGHT: How does anyone know that he will be thumped until that actually happens? This exposes the Leader's attitude. He is no better than the worst of his colleagues in relation to the trade union movement. His statement is ridiculous.

Dr. Eastick: Would you say that no-one had ever been thumped?

Mr. WRIGHT: The Leader has cited only one example in the past 15 years in South Australia of someone's being thumped. On that occasion, the V.B.U. was involved. This occurred because the union's rank and file members thought that their leaders had not been sufficiently militant. The Opposition always shifts the blame on to the union leaders. However, I say unequivocally that most disputes emanate from the shop floor: the militancy starts at home. It is the job of the trade union to determine the passage for a dispute and try to get things in their correct perspective. No-one wants to go on strike, as too

much injustice and loss of pay is involved. All members in this Chamber realise that the power of the employer to withhold the bread is much stronger than the power of the employee to hold out for certain things. He cannot do that for long: he is forced back to work by sheer poverty, not because of any erroneous act by an industrial court. I refer now to the second reading explanation of the Bill given by the member for Glenelg on August 14, part of which is as follows:

Mr. Clyde Cameron, who has had plenty to say on this matter and has made no secret of the fact that he fully supports secret ballots, is referred to in an article in a newspaper of October 5, as follows:

Mr. Cameron, M.H.R., the Labor Party's chief spokesman on industrial relations, sounded a clear warning about "push button political strikes," the sort that can get under way without the rank and file having a say or even knowing what the strike is all about. Mr. Cameron expressed concern for the unfortunate union member who might lose pay in such strikes.

It seems that we have the full support of the previous Deputy Leader of the Labor Party (Mr. Barnard), the full support of the present Minister for Labor and Immigration (Mr. Cameron), and the full support of members of the general public.

Mr. Wells: And the member for Florey objects!

Mr. Wright: Why not read further? What's your authority? I say you are telling lies, and you should quote your authority about Cameron.

The member for Glenelg refused to cite his authority, although he said he would table it. He may have done so; I do not know. However, I took the trouble to check it out. In the *Advertiser* of Tuesday, October 19, 1971, Mr. Cameron was reported by the member for Glenelg as having said he supported secret ballots. This is peculiar, because at that time the member for Mitcham also made a speech in this House regarding secret ballots, in which he said Mr. Cameron had also said on the Australian Broadcasting Commission radio programme *A.M.* that the Labor Party and he supported secret ballots. On October 25, 1971, I wrote to Mr. Cameron. He replied (and I will have to read this letter to clear up the matter) as follows:

I am in receipt of a *Hansard* report of a speech made by Mr. Robin Millhouse, M.H.A., in the South Australian House of Assembly last week. It disturbs me to read that a gentleman of his standing within the Adelaide Establishment could so grossly distort the sense of my statements to the A.L.P. Federal Conference at Launceston without first ascertaining the facts. It is unlike Mr. Millhouse to attempt to score a cheap political point by the misrepresentation of what a political opponent has said, and I will be surprised if he is not greatly distressed when he learns of the injustice he has done me in telling the South Australian Parliament that I advocated compulsory strike ballots when addressing the last A.L.P. Federal Conference.

Mr. Millhouse refers to part of a transcript of an A.B.C. *A.M.* programme, which he says was broadcast on June 24, and in which reference was made to a certain recommendation of the Labor Party's Policy Committee for Industrial Relations. The committee comprised some of the most powerful men in the trade union movement. They are: Mr. John Ducker (Assistant Secretary of the N.S.W. Labor Council and N.S.W. State President of the A.L.P.), Mr. John Egerton (President of the Queensland Trades and Labor Council and Queensland State President of the A.L.P.), Mr. Ray Gieizelt (Federal Secretary of the Miscellaneous Workers' Union), Mr. Bob Hawke (President of the A.C.T.U. and Federal Vice-President of the A.L.P.), and Mr. Barney Williams (Federal Secretary of the Australian Council of Salaried and Professional Associations and Secretary of the Bank Officers' Association). I was the Chairman of that committee.

By unanimous decision, the committee recommended to the conference that the A.L.P. platform should make provision to permit the Industrial Registrar to exempt a union from the existing law governing the petitioning of "controlled ballots" for the election of union officials.

They are the facts, and that is the policy of the Australian Labor Party. That letter can be tabled for any honourable member to read, if he so desires. There is no doubt in

the world that the member for Glenelg either tried to mislead this House or lied to it, because neither the article nor—

Mr. Becker: It's a bit strong to say he lied.

Mr. WRIGHT: I do not think it is strong enough, because what he said was not contained in the report to which he referred, and it is not in the letter that was written to me in 1971 as a result of my checking what the member for Mitcham had said. I honestly believe the member for Glenelg tried deliberately to mislead this House. He should apologise to the House, and he certainly owes Mr. Cameron an apology. Unless he apologises, I do not think he is worthy of staying in the House.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You must be kidding!

Mr. WRIGHT: I am not. If the member for Kavel were to tell lies in the House, he ought not to be able to stay here.

Mr. Goldsworthy: About whom were you talking in your previous reference?

Mr. WRIGHT: I was talking about the member for Glenelg. As I think I have now cleared up those situations, I want to deal with one point, namely, that a horse can be led to water but it cannot be made to drink; that is an old and true saying. I will now cite the example of a strike in the Queensland sugar industry in 1964. The facts were that 1 000 members were summoned by the Queensland court, under a court-controlled ballot system, which that State has had for many years. Queensland has always been loath to use the system, because of the strong objections of the trade union movement. I do not know of any other such case in Queensland's industrial history before or since 1964. I am not saying that there has been no other; there may well have been but, to my knowledge, there was only this one case in which 1 000 men were ordered by the court to vote at a secret ballot. The unionists affected by the order attended at the voting place, but only nine registered a formal vote. Of those nine, eight were in favour of the strike, and only one was against it. The other 991 strikers simply lodged blank ballot-papers. I think I have proved a strong case against the Bill.

I have only one further matter I want to prove, and this is closer to home and happened in the Miscellaneous Workers Union. We all know that that union's Secretary has been much maligned in the House from time to time. He has been called a great militant, and he has been blamed for causing many of the strikes and much of the disruption in industry, and for stopping people from getting bread and milk. I have defended him on previous occasions, and I do not want to have to do so again today. I want merely to establish that his organisation (which is one of those organisations that come under much fire from the Opposition from time to time) has provisions in its rules for secret ballots, provided that its members require it. About three weeks ago a dispute occurred in a cannery. A strike was in progress, and union officials attended to report to the meeting.

Dr. Eastick: Isn't that where there's been a massive loss of jobs?

Mr. WRIGHT: The union officials went to the meeting to report on the progress they were making on the log of claims. When they arrived at the meeting there was a great clamour from a few people to hold a secret ballot. Mr. Cavanagh said, "That's all right. There's nothing wrong with that. It's quite in order. If a certain number require a secret ballot, I welcome it." So, the secret ballot was conducted on the spot and, lo and behold (I mention this for the benefit of the member for Glenelg), the motion

moved at the meeting, not to accept the employers' latest offer, was reinforced by the vote of about 20 per cent more than previously.

Mr. Mathwin: But I have no objection to that.

Mr. WRIGHT: If the member for Glenelg has no objections, I want him to get up and say so.

Mr. Mathwin: If they voted to go on strike, that's fair enough. I am thinking about the ordinary unionist.

Mr. WRIGHT: I have made my position clear. If unionists on the job want a secret ballot, they are entitled to have it. However, the member for Glenelg wants his Opposition colleagues' support to the matter taken out of union hands and placed in the hands of the Industrial Court. So far as I, my Party, and the trade union movement are concerned, that is just not on.

Mr. McAnaney: What about the Australian people?

Mr. WRIGHT: Trade unionists are Australians, too. If the member for Heysen attempts to interfere in the affairs of those organisations, I warn him that it will be over bloodshed, so he should lay off the trade unions.

Mr. JENNINGS (Ross Smith): I congratulate the member for Glenelg on his intentions. The fact that his Bill would not achieve his objects, or even go any way towards achieving them, is why I am opposing it. He rather prides himself on his industrial prowess and on his association with the painters' union, or whatever it was, in his home country.

Mr. Mathwin: Painters and decorators.

Mr. JENNINGS: Many members will recall that he has told us many times of the nation-wide grief occasioned by his migrating to Australia from Great Britain. Now I can understand why, because what he was unable to understand was that his fellow unionists wanted to ensure that he did not miss the ship. They went down to see that he had a one-way ticket to Australia. Surely there is no dispute between the member for Glenelg and Government members over the election of union officers. Many examples, analogies and comparisons given by the member for Glenelg in his second reading explanation were completely useless to his argument; in fact, they had nothing to do with it. He referred to Caucus elections—as though he would know anything about them, anyway! I am willing (and I might be castigated by my colleagues—)

Mr. Mathwin: Might be what?

Mr. JENNINGS: Castigated, but I am not afraid of being castigated; it does not mean what the honourable member probably thinks it means. We, in Caucus, have a secret ballot for the election of union officers, but for no other purpose. In all other decisions regarding our attitude to legislation, and so on, after a free discussion with only minimum restrictions, a vote is taken on the voices or by a show of hands. We walk out perfectly good friends, whether we have won or lost. I admit that I frequently lose, and I think that every Government member has been in the minority many times in Caucus. However, we do not think any less of our colleagues as a consequence. Most trade unions of which I am aware have a secret or democratic vote for the election of officers. Although I am not a trade unionist in the accepted sense of that term, it may astonish members opposite to find out that I am the returning officer for a South Australian trade union. Before I was appointed returning officer, that union was for many years bedevilled by all sorts of strife, and no-one trusted the union ballots that were held. The union executive said, "We have to get a returning officer who is like Caesar's wife—above suspicion." To

whom could they possibly go? They came to a member called John Joseph Jennings, who was certainly above suspicion, although he might not resemble Caesar's wife in other respects. So, I took the job and regarded it as a challenge.

I conducted the ballots in accordance with conditions that would make any court-controlled ballot look like a Liberal and Country League gerrymander. Every candidate had the right to have scrutineers watching at every stage of the ballot. We went to almost ridiculous lengths to ensure fairness. There was much suspicion at the first ballot. I remember that one scrutineer wanted me to lock the key in the ballot box, but I persuaded the lady that the only way I could do that was to lock my arm in, too. She then relented. Now, after many years of fair ballots that are seen to be fair, the faction fights in the union have completely disappeared, and I guarantee that, if a general election was held now, I would not have any scrutineers following me around.

Mr. Mathwin: To which union are you referring?

Mr. JENNINGS: It is one that is not affiliated to the Labor Party, as a matter of fact. There is a case for a secret ballot in connection with the election of officers. Every union that I know about has a secret ballot or a court-controlled ballot for the election of officers. However, in regard to industrial matters, the cumbersome nature of a secret ballot would completely take away the element of surprise. Who would get the vote in secret? Would every union member get it, including those who were not at the meeting on a specific occasion as a result of sickness or for some other legitimate reason? Or, would only those attending the meeting get the vote in secret? The expense could be prohibitive.

Mr. Mathwin: It could be determined by the court.

Mr. JENNINGS: Evidently, everything is to be determined by the court. The member for Glenelg said that many rank-and-file union members attending a meeting might be inarticulate; that may be so, although I have never seen evidence of it. I believe that union members would certainly not be frightened to vote in any way in which they wanted to vote; to say otherwise is to cast a horrible reflection on the moral character of Australian unionists, who are red-blooded men and women who vote in any way in which they want to vote. They are not pusillanimous poltroons who would just follow someone who told them that they had to vote in a certain way.

It has been claimed that union leaders, usually paid secretaries, lead their members into strike action. Every Government member would support me in saying that that is very far from the truth. I can recall many occasions when rank-and-file members have taken matters into their own hands and disregarded the advice of their leader. Earlier, a member on this side recounted a situation of that kind; that is when it is pretty hard to get union members back to work.

I shall recount a situation involving the former member for Adelaide, the late Sam Lawn, who was a renowned union secretary in his day. He was very fond of telling a story that I shall relate. During the Second World War he was the secretary of a union that had many female workers. He arranged, through national security regulations, with the Minister for Aircraft Production (the late Arthur Drakeford) to get a higher percentage of the basic wage for his female members. To do this he had to establish a dispute. So, he arranged with Mr. Drakeford to get the girls out on strike and to get them to attend the Tivoli. Mr. Lawn was to get up and read a telegram and say, "It is all over, girls. We have got what we wanted. Now, go

back to work." The girls turned up, and Mr. Lawn said, "We have won our fight. Here is the telegram from the Minister." Mr. Lawn read Mr. Drakeford's telegram, and he said, "Now, you can go straight back to work and get on with the job." Not on your life! They were out on strike, and they were going to stay out on strike. Sam Lawn argued with them for as long as he could contain his patience, and he then tore up his papers, threw them at the girls, and said something that I cannot repeat in this House.

The story had a sequel when he entered Parliament. (I can mention this now, because the waitress concerned has long since left Parliament House.) Mr. Lawn was met by a former Clerk of the House and, after being shown around the House, he was, as usual, taken into the bar for a cup of tea. Members will know how Sam Lawn loved his cup of tea! The Clerk introduced him to this waitress, and she said, "Oh! I know Mr. Lawn. I was at that meeting, Mr. Lawn, at the Tivoli that night." So, someone had not forgotten him.

This Bill is impractical to the extent of being nonsensical. The best that I can say for it is that probably the member for Glenelg acted in what he thought was the best interest, but he is so short of understanding or imagination that he believes that it is a panacea for all our industrial shortcomings. If it was that, we on this side would have introduced it years ago.

Mr. DUNCAN (Elizabeth): In rising to speak in this debate, I feel as if I am cast in a historical role, because this Bill and the debate surrounding it represents a continuing attempt by Liberals and the Liberal Party to attack and to destroy the trade union movement. Indeed, it is part of a long history of such moves being made by right-wing forces in Australia over many years. The Bill is destructive and deceptive; it obviously seeks to destroy the efficacy of the trade union movement as well as to deceive the South Australian public. Moreover, that deception is cast in the intention of this Bill to make the South Australian public believe that no secret ballots are conducted in the trade union movement. Of course, that is completely incorrect and it is a complete lie. That view is based on a woolly-headed approach to the situation. Trade unions in South Australia have for many years (and from my knowledge they have since their inception always elected union officials by secret ballots) conducted their affairs in the same way as members are elected to this House—by the secret ballot.

Which members opposite suggest that the motions, resolutions and proceedings of this House should be determined by secret ballot? None, yet that is the system that members opposite suggest should be enforced on the trade union movement. No member opposite suggests that the business of this House should be conducted in that way. Clearly, this Bill is completely deceptive because it seeks to deceive the South Australian public into thinking that the trade union movement does not elect officials and does not determine its office holders by secret ballot. That is the purpose of this Bill and, for those reasons, I say it is a destructive and deceptive Bill.

I refer particularly to the contents of the Bill, because my two colleagues have dealt most satisfactorily with its general principles. Subsection (2) of new section 152a refers to what shall be contained in an order of the court. Of course, the sponsor of the Bill has been careful to avoid all the pitfalls himself by casting all the problems inherent in this legislation on to the courts, which will be left to hold the baby and to solve all the problems. Subsection (2) (b) provides that an order—

shall specify the person or body that shall conduct the secret ballot . . .

Are we to have the electoral office besieged with applications for it to conduct ballots? Will that office become completely bogged down with this one new task? Alternatively, will the unions be cast in the role of an electoral office to conduct a ballot?

Mr. Chapman: Would you like to amend the Bill so that it directs the men to hold a secret ballot?

Mr. DUNCAN: No, I would not. That would be completely contrary to what I am saying. The Bill is completely inoperative as it stands and the principle of secret ballots in strike situations is also completely inoperative because such a provision would remove the efficacy of the unions if it were thrust on them.

Mr. Wells: The industrial groups introduced that.

Mr. DUNCAN: Yes, that is the sort of group the member for Alexandra represents. The Miscellaneous Workers Union comprises over 100 different groups and, in many industrial circumstances, a secret ballot may be required to fulfil the functions of the union. Because that union is most efficient and well run, most of the awards covered by it are reviewed at least once a year, but the result of this Bill would be that that union would be unable to operate industrial disputes every week. The member for Glenelg is trying to foist on this union, which looks after the interests of its members, a situation where the membership would be inundated and swamped by secret ballots, which would completely destroy the efficacy of the union and which would make it impossible for it to operate in those circumstances. That is the aim of the Bill. If this Bill were passed, the trade union movement in South Australia would be rendered completely ineffective and inoperative. Of course, that is what Opposition members in general and the member for Glenelg in particular want to see. Subsection (2) (c) of new section 152a provides that the court order—

shall specify the person or body that shall bear the cost and expense of the conduct of the secret ballot.

Again, we see a situation being created whereby the union would have the cost of such a ballot foisted on it. I can easily imagine the situation that would apply under this provision: the employer would apply for a secret ballot and the court would grant that application, with the union having to bear the cost of the ballot. That situation, which is completely untenable, is aimed solely at destroying the trade union movement by wrecking its financial viability. That is the intention in a nut shell. Subsection (3) (c) of the new section provides that a court order shall not be made except on the application of—

an association or body whether corporate or unincorporate that satisfies the court that it is, or would be likely to be, directly affected by a strike referred to in subsection (1) of this section.

So, such a body would have the right to apply to the court to hold a secret ballot. That means that any organisation in the community that was slightly inconvenienced by a strike could apply to a court. Indeed, the courts would be forever hearing such applications because there are enough people in the community who do not appreciate the great role played by the trade union movement in the community and who would be wanting to bash the unions constantly. From what I have seen emanating from members opposite, I should not be surprised to see several Opposition members in the courts applying for orders.

I now refer to further specific difficulties created by this Bill. In the half hour available to me, I may not have time to deal with them all, but there is one difficulty with which I must deal. This Bill is painted by the member

for Glenelg as a cure-all for all the problems involved in the current spate of strikes experienced by the community. Of course, the Bill completely overlooks the fact that many, if not most, of the awards governing the industrial conduct of employees in South Australia are Commonwealth awards, and this Bill would have no application at all in this context. The member for Whyalla nods in agreement with me, as he knows only too well that most of the people in his district work under Commonwealth awards and this Bill would therefore have no relevance there.

Mr. Max Brown: What about the F.I.A?

Mr. DUNCAN: The F.I.A. has two awards (one State and one Commonwealth award) and the union would simply have to claim that a dispute was a Commonwealth dispute to defeat the intention of this legislation as easily as that. I refer to the problems that could arise in the courts because, as soon as a case goes to court on an application such as this demanding a secret ballot, the parties involved immediately come under the jurisdiction of the court and are put into what often becomes a legal quagmire.

Mr. Wells: And the legal sharks make a fortune.

Mr. DUNCAN: As the member for Florey has said, sharks and many other people are involved. Once an action is before the court, people can get into a quagmire with injunctions and applications. An action could move from the Industrial Court to the Supreme Court. Let us not forget the sort of time capsule that people are involved in when they are dealing with an industrial situation. Such a situation is fluid and the people involved have not got time to run between the Industrial Court and the Supreme Court getting injunctions that could be sought on the basis of many factors. I could go on for hours explaining what sorts of fact could be used to get injunctions, and I know that the whole procedure of secret ballots could not work, because of the practical difficulties involved. I refer to new section 152b regarding another practical difficulty. The new section provides:

A person shall not—

- (a) refuse or fail to comply with a direction, applicable to him, in an order under subsection (1) of section 152a of this Act;

Such an order would be an order for a secret ballot. The position of a union in a wildcat strike situation would become completely untenable, because "person" referred to in that new section refers not only to a natural person but to a corporate person and to a union, which constitutes a legal person. Therefore, a union could be liable under a court order, even though the union had given none of its authority to the strike and even though it was not directly involved in the strike at all.

What would be the position of a union that found itself in that situation? A fine of \$200 is provided for, and this provision is a complete abrogation of the fundamental principle of the law that a person should not be liable in a situation for which he is not responsible. In this case, the union could be held liable and fined \$200, although it had had no say in the matter and had not been involved. That seems to be a fundamental problem about this Bill and clearly one that the member for Glenelg did not notice when he drafted the measure.

Mr. Olson: There's no penalty there for lockouts.

Mr. DUNCAN: There is absolutely no provision for that. I want to refer now to the situation that developed in the United Kingdom. I think this matter has particular reference to the member for Glenelg, because he would be well versed in the sorry situation that has developed in the U.K. arising out of attempts by the Conservatives to bash the unions there by introducing the Industrial Relations Act.

Mr. Mathwin: It was the best Bill that was ever brought forward.

Mr. DUNCAN: We will hear about that. I intend, for the benefit of members who are interjecting, to quote from the *London Times*. I realise that that newspaper may well be more appropriate for quotation in another place. However, as it contains a good report on this matter, I intend to quote from it on this occasion. The relevance of the quotation is that it shows the situation that developed when the first secret ballot was held under the secret ballot provisions of the Industrial Relations Act. The report clearly shows that if union members are coerced into having a secret ballot, those coercing them will get nothing but blood on their hands as a result, because union members will not be coerced into having matters determined and decisions made by bodies outside the trade union movement. This has been proved over and over again in the history of the trade union movement. A report in the *London Times* of Thursday, June 1, 1972, states:

Rail unions' ballot shows five to one vote in favour of renewed industrial action. Railwaymen yesterday voted more than five to one in favour of further industrial action in the first compulsory ballot ordered under the Industrial Relations Act . . . Mr. Macmillan, Secretary for Employment, expressed his disappointment at the ballot result and said there was a clear possibility of a state of emergency being declared . . . The first compulsory ballot ordered under the Industrial Relations Act has produced a resounding vote by railwaymen in favour of further industrial action.

Mr. Mathwin: It won't be compulsory under this Bill.

Mr. DUNCAN: I will come to that matter. Of course it will be, and that is a deliberate falsehood. The report in the *London Times* continues:

Union leaders, who fought the imposition of the ballot in the National Industrial Relations Court and the Court of Appeal, were jubilant last night when they were told by the Commission on Industrial Relations . . . nearly 84 per cent voted "Yes".

Mr. Wells: I wonder whether the Tories supported the strike after that ballot.

Mr. DUNCAN: They did not. They talked about introducing emergency powers and even further and more regressive measures against the trade unions. That was their reaction, and that would fit in perfectly with the sort of woolly-headed narrow thinking behind this Bill. That is the sort of philosophy behind it. The attitude implicit in the Bill is that, if unions go on strike, we ban strikes. Members opposite think that they can reduce the number of strikes by introducing compulsory ballots, but that will not be the case.

I want to deal now with the interjection by the member for Glenelg that this Bill does not introduce compulsory ballots. He is using the thin end of the wedge, because this legislation has no aim other than to provide that courts may order compulsory ballots, on the application of any person who would be likely to be affected by a strike or may be affected by one. Obviously, the member for Glenelg intends that compulsory ballots will be foisted on unions so that the unions cannot operate.

I have referred to the difficulties that there would be in trying to enforce secret ballots in strike situations, and I refer to a report in the *London Times* of Thursday, May 25, 1972. In a front page story, the newspaper deals with the progress made in the ballot in the railway industry, and the report, headed "Court gives extension after rail ballots delay", states:

The National Industrial Relations Court has granted a 24-hour extension in the railwaymen's pay ballot because of a less than perfect distribution of the voting papers. The closing date for the receipt of votes by the Commission on Industrial Relations will be midnight on Saturday.

That report indicates clearly the sorts of problem that we would have. We would have a situation that was very fluid.

Mr. Chapman: Don't you think we have a problem now?

Mr. DUNCAN: If we have a problem, we will solve it by conciliation rather than by bashing one side of the industrial fence and leaving the other side alone. However, the latter method is the attitude that members opposite take. We know only too well that the member for Alexandra wants to send children back down the mines. That is the sort of attitude he takes.

Members interjecting:

Mr. DUNCAN: I have referred to that wellknown and renowned journal, the *London Times*, and that newspaper's report on the strike ballot in the U.K. The point I want to make from the report is that there was an example of this type of legislation. It was the first ballot held under the Industrial Relations Act in the U.K. and there was constant confusion because the court could not conduct a ballot in the short time required. That is because, as I have said, these situations are fluid: they change from day to day. Employers may decide that they have been holding out for too long and for too much, as is usually the case, and may decide to increase their offer. The money spent on court applications and secret ballots is then lost and wasted. However, because the unions had possibly accepted an offer from the employers, they would find themselves in the position of having to pay the costs of the court applications and the conduct of the ballot.

The member for Alexandra has asked whether we have a problem at the moment. If we have, solutions are available. This Government is looking at those solutions, which are being applied in the Industrial Court in South Australia and in the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission. For the honourable member's benefit, I suggest a couple of solutions that could go a long way towards calming industrial relations in this country. First, I suggest that we must greatly improve the morale of members of the work force. The sort of degrading task employers expect human beings to undertake in the 1970's is absolutely appalling. To me, it is no wonder many people working in industrial occupations are disillusioned and unhappy, and that their morale is extremely low. That aspect could be looked at to improve the morale of the work force.

My second suggestion for the improvement of industrial relations is to provide a better distribution of income. A start was made in that direction by the Commonwealth Government last evening, although I cannot go into that matter in this debate.

Mr. Millhouse: You thought that was a good Budget, did you?

Mr. DUNCAN: I thought it was an excellent Budget.

Mr. Gunn: You are one of very few in the community who thought so.

Mr. DUNCAN: That has not been my experience.

Mr. Millhouse: Even your own Government does not seem too happy about it.

Mr. DUNCAN: I am not permitted to refer to that any further in this debate.

Members interjecting:

Mr. DUNCAN: I will not let Opposition members waste my time. I want to refer now to the motive behind the introduction of this Bill. Even if the member who introduced it was honest and sincere in doing so, the opening

words of his second reading explanation clearly gave a clue to who was behind the evil intention in this legislation. He commenced his explanation by saying:

I thank my colleagues for the help they have given me in enabling me to introduce this Bill today.

There is no doubt that the intention comes from some of the backwoods members opposite, who have no knowledge of trade unions or industrial processes. The member for Glenelg continued:

However, with the assistance of my colleagues I am now able to introduce the Bill. In introducing the Bill, I have the full support of the Liberal Party . . .

That shows the position quite clearly.

Mr. Mathwin: They allowed me to go first with the Bill; that's all.

Mr. DUNCAN: In my view, this Bill has been introduced in this House with the intention of deceiving the public and destroying the trade union movement. It is wrong in principle and in concept, and it is a Bill that should be thrown out with the utmost expediency.

Dr. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

PRICES JUSTIFICATION TRIBUNAL

Adjourned debate on motion of Dr. Eastick:

That, in the opinion of this House, the inadequacy of the machinery established under the Prices Act is becoming manifestly apparent and this House resolve that it be replaced by a Prices Justification Tribunal.

(Continued from September 11. Page 873.)

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I do not want to cover again the ground I traversed last week in introducing this motion. At that time, I dealt mainly with the ineffectiveness of the application of the Prices Act in South Australia, pointing out that it was apparent from a reply to a Question on Notice on July 31 that the Government had engaged in political manipulation for Party purposes; the manner in which announcements of price increases were held back pending the election on May 18 last was quite apparent. There have been other similar instances.

Another aspect of this issue has been clearly stated by my Commonwealth colleagues in pointing out that we seek to retain the Prices Justification Tribunal as part of our policy of wage and price restraint. They have said that the long-term role of the tribunal will be reviewed in the light of changing economic circumstances and our co-ordinated programme of economic management; in other words, they have been happy to accept that there has been a change in attitude with regard to the benefit arising from the operation of the Prices Justification Tribunal, as it relates to the overall economic situation and to prices generally. I accept the premise they promoted before May 18. Because we are looking at economic management in the Commonwealth and State spheres, we must accept that a system of prices justification enables a concerted approach and attack on the inflation so rampant in the community. Inflation in Australia is brought about by the cost-push process rather than by excessive demand. No matter what one's politics, that is accepted, even by the divided Commonwealth Labor Government that had held for a long time that it was excessive demand inflation, everyone else being satisfied that it was a cost-push inflation.

The cost pushes have come mainly from increased wages, from increased charges in the public sector and, to a lesser extent, from increases in the cost of imported goods and materials. It is contended that profit margins tend to increase in periods of rapidly rising prices. There is no argument about that: it is certainly the basis of Labor

philosophy, as it has been stated on so many occasions. Figures show that the share of the gross national product received by Australian companies has fallen markedly, while the share of G.N.P. going to wages and salaries has increased correspondingly. Figures available clearly indicate this fact. The inflation growth in the public sector cannot be ignored, and the tribunal that I recommend should be established is needed to implement an attack on inflation that is broad and multi-pronged, unlike the present system whereby specified goods only come within the jurisdiction of the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs. To be successful, an attack on inflation must be all-embracing and not merely a measure that nibbles at the edges.

Mr. Keneally: Are you sure the words you're using relate to inflation?

Dr. EASTICK: The honourable member may introduce other words in his contribution, but I make the point that, with the powers he has under the Prices Act, the Commissioner only nibbles at the edges of the whole problem. To control inflation there must be a concerted attack by Commonwealth and State Governments. The States have indicated to the Commonwealth their willingness to co-operate, subject to knowing what the Commonwealth Government wishes to do and that a time limit will be imposed. The Commonwealth Prices Justification Tribunal has completed its first year of operation and, in an interview published in the *Australian* of June 20, 1974, the Chairman (Mr. Justice Williams) claimed the tribunal had reduced inflation in its first year of operation and was reducing the order of price increases. Since August of this year the tribunal has had power to inquire into all prices charged by companies, irrespective of turnover. This was an aspect on which there had been major divisions between the two political philosophies when the original Bill was introduced into the Commonwealth Parliament. All reports of the tribunal are made direct to the public, thus overcoming the situation existing in this State of the report of a responsible officer being held up by a Minister or by Cabinet and being made public only when the Minister or Cabinet thinks that the time is more opportune. Because the report is made public, there can be no interference or delay in implementing the decision. Under the present South Australian system, although the Commissioner is able to control the price of certain goods and services that are gazetted, he is unable to control a situation of galloping inflation. Commonwealth *Hansard* at page 1966 on May 29, 1973, contains the report of a debate in the Senate, as follows:

If in actual fact a number of minor price increases were proposed—and these have escalated certainly in the past few months—the tribunal should be able to indicate by not replying to a notification within a certain period that the company has the right to increase those prices. Indeed, that action has been taken, with prices automatically being increased when the tribunal did not respond. The report continues:

I ask the Senate to note that in the case of one company in the retailing field in Melbourne some 3 600 applications a day would need to be made to this tribunal in respect of increases in the cost of items which are supposed to be specified in this Bill. It would be a sheer impossibility for the tribunal ever to work in such circumstances. That example indicates the position faced by one large store in Melbourne. The volume of business and the variety of goods in other stores should be noted. For example, the average large retailing firm handles about 200 000 items.

My point is that, in considering this motion, we have to face the reality of decisions that will have to be made. We have to be clear in fixing the guidelines to be followed,

so that we will not bog down with a multitude of products, such as 200 000 individual items for one store. The guidelines must allow flexibility within certain limits, suggesting a responsible and realistic attitude to a matter such as this. I seek the Government's acceptance of this principle and the Minister's response by his introducing a Bill that will give this State the chance to make a worthwhile and progressive advance in controlling the price of goods and services and, at the same time, recognise that the determination of those prices should never be the subject of political manipulation.

Mr. DEAN BROWN secured the adjournment of the debate.

PETROL SUBSIDY

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Millhouse:

That this House, especially in the interests of those living in remote areas of the State, request the Government as a matter of urgency to make strong representations to the Commonwealth Government to reinstate the schemes formulated under the Commonwealth State Grant (Petroleum Products) Act, 1965-1973 and call on all South Australian Senators to support the motion to this effect to be moved in the Senate by Senator Steele Hall.

(Continued from September 11. Page 875.)

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

That this debate be further adjourned.

Mr. Millhouse: No; you've had plenty of time.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (21)—Messrs. Broomhill and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Crimes, Duncan, Groth, Harrison, Jennings, Keneally, King (teller), Langley, McKee, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.

Noes (15)—Messrs. Arnold, Becker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Millhouse (teller), Rodda, Russack, and Venning.

Majority of 6 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried; debate adjourned.

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Becker:

That, in the opinion of this House, the periodical payments made to participating clubs pursuant to paragraph (e) of subsection (1) of section 31p of the Lottery and Gaming Act, 1936, as amended, be made at quarterly intervals in lieu of annually as heretofore.

(Continued from September 11. Page 876.)

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): I oppose the motion. The Committee of Inquiry into the Racing Industry discusses the matter of quarterly distribution of Totalizator Agency Board profits in two paragraphs on page 275 of its report, and concludes that the best course would be for the T.A.B. to discuss the position from time to time with the clubs. Beyond that, the committee makes no recommendation.

From the clubs' point of view, the adoption of a policy of quarterly distribution would be of doubtful benefit. The immediate problem would be that in 1974-75 the clubs would receive about \$1 800 000 from the board's 1973-74 profits and perhaps \$1 500 000 (three quarterly payments) from its 1974-75 profits, making a total of \$3 300 000. Unless this was all used to boost stake money or to improve facilities in 1974-75, the profits of the clubs would be boosted dramatically and their income tax liability would rise accordingly. Much of the benefit would therefore be felt by the taxation office rather than the clubs. If the clubs did manage to adjust their stake money to absorb all the extra funds, they would then be faced with a much lower distribution of

funds from the board in 1975-76 (four quarterly payments only) and the necessity to reduce stake money below the 1974-75 level. Any impetus given the industry by improved stake money in 1974-75 would immediately be lost.

The other factor to be considered is the relative interest burdens of the T.A.B. and the clubs. If the T.A.B. was obliged to make quarterly distributions, it would be forced further into overdraft and the sums available for distribution in subsequent quarters would be reduced by the extra interest cost. The clubs, on the other hand, would be able either to reduce their own overdraft interest costs or to earn interest by investing the extra funds. They would only benefit overall if they could reduce their own interest costs (or raise their interest earnings) by more than the extra charge to the T.A.B. On balance, it is suggested that the two factors would roughly offset each other. It is therefore difficult to see any long-term benefit accruing to the clubs from quarterly distribution of T.A.B. profits. Rather, they stand to lose a proportion of these profits to the taxation office.

From the Government's point of view, it is immaterial how the profits are distributed, except to the extent that a prosperous racing industry augments State revenue. This matter is not of concern to the State Government: it is really a matter to be dealt with by the clubs in consultation with the T.A.B., as recommended by the inquiry committee. The State Government will certainly participate in any discussions that are desired in this respect. The Government wants to do what is in the best interest of the clubs and the racing industry generally. As at present advised, the change suggested by the motion would operate to the detriment and not to the advantage of clubs. I understand that this is the current attitude of the clubs, anyway. The Government is, and will remain, open to any recommendations that may be made to it for a change in the system. However, at present apparently all who are directly concerned with this matter agree that it would not be in the best interests of the racing industry for a change to be made.

Mr. RODDA secured the adjournment of the debate.

UNION MILITANCY

Adjourned debate on motion by Mr. Millhouse:

That this House express its congratulation to the Commonwealth member for Hindmarsh (Hon. C. R. Cameron, M.H.R.), Commonwealth Minister for Labor and Immigration, in condemning some trade union officials for their militancy, regret that the State Government has not done likewise, and call on it, as a matter of urgency, to follow Mr. Cameron's lead.

(Continued from September 11. Page 877.)

The Hon. D. H. McKEE (Minister of Labour and Industry): I said, when speaking on another motion earlier this afternoon, that I did not intend unduly to delay the House; but this is an entirely different motion. I do not often find myself agreeing with the member for Mitcham. Although I do not agree fully with him in this matter, I find myself agreeing with the part of the motion that states:

That this House express its congratulation to the Commonwealth member for Hindmarsh (Hon. C. R. Cameron, M.H.R.) . . .

In the remainder of his motion, the member for Mitcham makes some exaggerated statements with which I cannot agree.

Mr. Millhouse: I only quoted Mr. Cameron.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: As I wish to amend the motion, I move:

To strike out all words after "congratulation to the" and insert "Australian Minister for Labor and Immigration for the courageous, competent and realistic manner in which he is performing the onerous duties of his portfolio".

The motion will now read as follows:

That this House express its congratulation to the Australian Minister for Labor and Immigration for the courageous, competent and realistic manner in which he is performing the onerous duties of his portfolio.

Mr. Dean Brown: You said "erroneous".

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: No, I said "onerous". I am sure that the House will support the amended motion.

Mr. CUMBE (Torrens): I listened with interest to the Minister's remarks. He made one of the most humorous speeches I have ever heard in the House (it was completely off the cuff), but to ask the House to support the amended motion is simply asking too much: it is a complete joke. I was not surprised that the Minister tried to get out of the problem by moving his amendment, but it is ludicrous for him to ask the House to support it. The amendment, apart for negating the original motion, is one which no honourable member in his true senses could support.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: It commends the Minister by congratulating him.

Mr. CUMBE: The original motion refers to statements made by Mr. Clyde Cameron, in his capacity as Minister for Labor and Immigration in the Commonwealth House of Representatives, and it presumably refers (although I do not have the mover's confidence in this matter) to other statements made by prominent members of the trade union movement, one of whom was Mr. Egerton, of Queensland. Mr. Egerton has made significant statements; in fact, I quoted one of his recent statements in my Address in Reply speech. Mr. Egerton referred to a certain union whose activities were having a disruptive effect on the Australian industrial sphere. Since then, Mr. Egerton has made forthright statements in this regard that have had the imprimatur of Mr. Cameron and, above all, of Mr. Hawke, who upheld some of them.

I think it is about time that some of the things Mr. Egerton was moved to pour forth at a recent press conference in Queensland were said. As I believe that these things had to be said, I compliment Mr. Egerton on his approach on that occasion. I believe that this is the purport behind the original motion. By his amendment the Minister is saying, in effect, that the State Government does not follow Mr. Cameron's lead in this matter. In other words, the Minister has no confidence in his Commonwealth colleague in this regard.

As I understand it, Mr. Cameron urged restraint on and criticised the militancy in certain unions as a result of irresponsible actions they had taken. This, combined with what Mr. Egerton had said, led to the motion being moved. Although I do not agree with many of Mr. Cameron's statements (and I have suffered at length at some of the meetings I have attended and at which he has spoken, as he is not noted for his brevity), I believe that on the occasion to which the motion refers he was on the ball. The motion calls for our State Minister at least to have the courage and foresight to make a similar kind of statement, but he has not done that. By amending the original motion, the Minister is asking the House not to support his Commonwealth colleague's statement. I do not support the amended motion and I do not believe that any honourable member with any sense would support it. I support the motion.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): In supporting the motion, I oppose the Minister's amendment. The Minister, in his usual fashion, has tried to get away from the matter under

discussion. He never gave any reason for moving his foolish amendment. This is the sort of thing I would expect from the Minister perhaps at a Sunday school picnic; I do not expect it in this House. All responsible members and the community at large are concerned at the actions of a minority of trade union officials who have tried to hold the people of the State and the country to ransom. The motion calls on the Government to show some courage. The first time this Government showed courage by standing up to certain groups, the matter was dealt with in the interests of the people of the State. That action of the Government had the full support of Opposition members. Why does the Minister not take a similar course of action now, in the best interests of the people, instead of trying to whitewash the whole matter? I support the motion.

Mr. LANGLEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

WRONGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Third reading.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham) moved:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): I support the motion. The point that needs to be made on the third reading of this Bill is that it points up the necessity of establishing in this State some machinery for reviewing regularly the provisions of Statutes that involve sums of money.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I do not want to stop the Attorney-General making an announcement that he hopes will steal a headline, but I point out that the third reading debate must be related to the Bill as it emerged from Committee. The Attorney-General is going on to something that has nothing to do with the Bill at all.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order.

The Hon. L. J. KING: May I be heard on it?

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Mitcham has raised a point of order, on which I must rule for or against. At this stage I uphold the point of order because, under Standing Orders, at the third reading stage the Bill as it came out of Committee is the only matter that can be debated; no other matter can be discussed at the third reading stage. In this Bill, the main content is the raising of the amount involved from \$1 000 to \$3 000.

The Hon. L. J. KING: That, indeed, was the matter to which I wished to address myself. The fact that it has been necessary in this Bill to make this substantial increase indicates that we must keep an eye on this legislation and on other legislation to ensure that there are periodic reviews of the amounts that are paid, in this case to the widow and children of a deceased person. In future we must not get into the situation in which we certainly were, in which the amounts included in the legislation were depreciated by changes in money values, with consequent injustice to people who instituted claims under this legislation. We are adjusting it now, but in the past 10 years people received sums that were less than those which they ought to have received, because of our failure to make adjustments. This points up the necessity for a regular review of this amount and other amounts.

Bill read a third time and passed.

[Sitting suspended from 5.58 to 7.30 p.m.]

STATE BANK REPORT

The SPEAKER laid on the table the annual report of the State Bank for the year ended June 30, 1974, together with profit and loss account and balance sheets.

Ordered that report be printed.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it had divided the Local Government Act Amendment Bill into two Bills, namely, the Local Government Act Amendment Bill (No. 1) and the Local Government Act Amendment Bill (No. 2); and that the Local Government Act Amendment Bill (No. 1), comprising clauses 1 to 6 and clauses 8 to 38 and schedule had been agreed to without amendment; and that it returned the Local Government Act Amendment Bill (No. 2) with amendments.

EVIDENCE (AFFIDAVITS) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Evidence (Affidavits) Act, 1928-1968. Read a first time.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

By an amendment in 1968 to the principal Act, the Evidence (Affidavits) Act, 1928, as amended, it was provided that affidavits for use in any court could be sworn before "proclaimed bank managers" within the meaning of the Oaths Act, 1936, as amended. This Bill provides that such affidavits may in addition be sworn before "proclaimed postmasters" and "proclaimed police officers" within the meaning of the Oaths Act. Such an extension, it is suggested, is in the public interest, in that the widening of the classes of person before whom affidavits may be sworn will ensure that affidavits may be executed more conveniently.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends the long title of the principal Act to reflect the change proposed. Clause 3 amends section 2a of the principal Act by enlarging the classes of person before whom affidavits may be sworn.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY secured the adjournment of the debate.

JUDGES' PENSIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Judges' Pensions Act, 1971-1972. Read a first time.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

In essence, this Bill provides for appropriate amendments to the principal Act, the Judges' Pensions Act, 1971, as amended, to incorporate into the scheme for judges' pensions some, at least, of the provisions of the scheme of superannuation for public servants and others approved by this House in the enactment of the Superannuation Act of this year. In addition, some other changes have been made following consultation with Their Honours the judges.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3, which amends section 4 of the principal Act, being the section that provides the definitions necessary for its purposes, inserts a definition of "eligible child" and "notional pension", which in terms follows similar definitions in the Superannuation Act. Clause 4 makes a drafting amendment to section 5 of the principal Act to bring the reference to a repealed Superannuation Act up to date. Clause 5 will enable a judge to retire on pension at age 60 if he has the necessary qualifying service. This accords with the retiring age of 60 years recognised in the Superannuation Act, 1974.

Clause 6 repeals and re-enacts section 8 of the principal Act, with the effect that the widow or widower of a deceased judge will be entitled to pension and the rate of that pension will be 66⅔ per cent of the notional pension of the deceased judge in lieu of 65 per cent of that pension. Clause 7 amends section 9 of the principal Act and makes substantially the same amendment, in relation to deceased former judges, as has been indicated in the

explanation of clause 6. Clause 8 amends section 10 of the principal Act and is consequential on the proposed enactment of new section 10a, as to which see clause 9.

Clause 9 provides, in terms similar to the provisions of the Superannuation Act, 1974, at sections 85 to 90, for the payment of child benefit in the case of the death of a judge or former judge. Clause 10 makes certain consequential amendments to section 12 of the principal Act to enable pensioners, who derive their pensions from this section, that is, pensioners whose rights to pension vested before the enactment of the principal Act, to be covered by the provisions relating to automatic adjustment of pensions. Clause 11 repeals section 14a of the principal Act and provides for a system of "automatic" adjustment of pensions related to movements in the cost of living. In terms, this provision clearly follows the corresponding provision in the Superannuation Act, 1974.

Mr. COUMBE secured the adjournment of the debate.

APPROPRIATION BILL

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Deputy Premier) moved:
That further consideration of the Bill in Committee be now resumed.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I have something I want to say arising out of last night's Commonwealth Budget.

The SPEAKER: Order! I seek information from the honourable Leader of the Opposition as to whether the member for Mitcham is the member deputed by him to be the main speaker for the Opposition in this debate.

Mr. Millhouse: Surely you know the answer.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. EASTICK: No.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I thought that question would not have needed to be asked.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Just checking up!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The matter I wish to raise (and I am surprised that no member on this side, or, indeed, on the other side, has yet indicated he wants to speak on this matter or a similar matter) concerns an action of the Commonwealth Government in the Budget, which was introduced last night and which will have a most adverse effect on one section, if not on the whole, of the South Australian community. I refer to the announcement of a further increase of 40c a litre in the excise duty on brandy, which is the only alcoholic beverage on which excise has been increased. The increase will have a most adverse effect on producers, particularly producers of grapes for that drink. Having prefaced my remarks, I want to quote from a letter.

Mr. Slater: You're not going to quote the Liberal Movement policy, are you?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, but I will quote something nearer to the honourable member.

Mr. Slater: Who is the author?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The author is the Premier, and the letter is dated October 19, 1972. The honourable gentleman sent the letter to many producers of wine grapes in this State, soliciting funds for his Party just before the Commonwealth election of that time. The letter is particularly appropriate in regard to the increase in the excise on brandy. Let me get on with the letter, and we will see how hypocritical the Labor Party can be.

Mr. Wright: Surely you can be more original than that.

Members interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is typical of the attitude of members opposite. They do not really care if people in this State are disadvantaged by the actions of their Commonwealth Government. This afternoon the member for Elizabeth said that the Commonwealth Budget was good and that he was satisfied with it. Honourable members opposite obviously know what is in the letter, and do not want to hear it, but I do want to read it out. It is signed "Don Dunstan, Q.C., M.P., Chairman, A.L.P. Federal Election Finance Committee".

The Hon. D. H. McKee: What's wrong with that?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Nothing, but there is plenty wrong in what the Commonwealth Government has done. The letter states:

Clearly it is unnecessary for me to describe to you the many problems and injustices facing the wine industry as a result of the wine excise. The industry together with the wine grape industry has already presented many well documented submissions on the hardships facing winemakers and grapegrowers. Earlier this year as a result of intense pressure from the industry, the Federal Liberal Government reduced the tax by half to 25c a gallon. It is too early to tell whether the market for wine has recovered, as the decision was a poorly kept secret and the recovery of sales after the reduction of the tax was largely due to the fact that stocks had been allowed to run down in anticipation. But the excise itself is only part of the problem. The other part is the enormous increase in costs of administration which the collection of the tax has imposed on wineries. These additional costs remain the same whether the tax is 50c or 25c per gallon. The future of the wine industry has become an issue at the forthcoming Federal elections. The Australian Labor Party believes, and its Federal Executive has stated, that the only solution that will guarantee continued prosperity for the wine industry and the many thousands of growers who supply it is complete abolition of the excise and its non-replacement by a sales tax or any other imposition.

The Australian Labor Party had that belief in October, 1972.

The letter continues:

I seek your financial support—

The Hon. D. H. McKee: This is a serial. You've read this out a dozen times.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, I have not seen it before this evening.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Who imposed the 50c in the first place?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Honourable members opposite do not like this, but let them wait until I finish. There is more to come. The letter continues:

I seek your financial support for the A.L.P. campaign for the elections. You have already spent many hundreds of thousands of dollars on the wine tax and on collecting the information required by the Customs and Excise Department. The election of a Federal Labor Government will save you these costs in the future. You may be sceptical about the intentions of an A.L.P. Government regarding the excise. Accordingly, the attached form provides the opportunity for you to:

(a) forward a donation forthwith or

(b) pledge a donation to be paid only after the Federal Leader of the Australian Labor Party, Mr. Gough Whitlam, has given an unequivocal assurance during the campaign that a Government led by him will abolish the excise and not replace it with a sales tax or any other imposition.

There are several ways in which donations can be made. If you would like to discuss your donation with me, you can make the necessary arrangements through Mr. David Combe, whose telephone number is 51 8744. Donations and pledges should be sent to me at the above address.

The letter concludes "Yours sincerely", but I do not know how sincere he was or how sincere he is now about this. Then there followed the little form for the victims of this confidence trick to fill in. The address given on the form is as follows:

Hon. D. A. Dunstan, Q.C., M.P., Chairman, A.L.P. Federal Election Finance Committee, 11 South Terrace, Adelaide, 5000.

That was the letter that the Leader of the Party opposite sent out in his capacity as Chairman of the A.L.P. Election Finance Committee, pledging the abolition of the excise on wine. What has been done since then by the Commonwealth Labor Government on whose behalf he was soliciting funds in October, 1972?

If the Premier knew then what would happen, what was stated in that letter was a deliberate lie. Unless he denies in this place, on his return from Canberra or wherever he has been, that he knew at the time what the Commonwealth Government would do and states that he condemns it for what it has done, I will regard the letter as a lie and I will regard the Premier and his supporters as complete and utter hypocrites.

What has happened since then? I am sure that I speak now on behalf of every member on this side, particularly the member for Chaffey, whose constituents will be affected greatly by this latest impost. Clearances on brandy since August, 1973, have decreased by 24 per cent and for the six months to June this year they have decreased by 25·8 per cent. Those producers who have spoken to me today and have asked for help (and, incidentally, they gave me the letter, which had been sent to them) have told me that those reductions in clearances are a fairly accurate indication of reductions in sales. In August, 1973, in the Budget 12 months ago, an additional 40c a litre alcohol was added to the excise on brandy, and we were told then that there would be progressive increases in the excise on brandy until it was the same as that on other spirits. It was not set out in the Budget of 1973 that, in addition to the 40 cents to be put on then, the whole of the wine industry, including the brandy industry, would be slugged by the so-called mini Budget in July of this year.

At that time there was an addition of \$2·55 to the excise, and now there is a further increase of 40c, so that there has been an increase in the excise since August, 1973, from \$3·08 to \$8·55, which is what it is at present. That will mean conceivably a drop of 50 per cent in sales in a full year once the impact of these imposts is felt, and that could lead to a reduction in grapes needed for brandy production of about 20 000 tonnes, representing a loss to grapegrowers in Australia of about \$1 500 000; 80 per cent of that loss would be borne in South Australia, most of it in the River areas. That is what the Commonwealth Government has done and, if no other member is willing to protest about this, I am. I make the strongest possible protest now. I am reminded that, four years ago, soon after the A.L.P. Government came into office in this State, and on the night corresponding to this one in that year, the Premier in this House moved, without notice, a motion in these terms:

That this House calls on the members of the Commonwealth Parliament representing South Australia to take action in the Commonwealth Parliament to protect employment and development in South Australia from the impost on the sale of wines—

and he mentioned a number of other things, but I refer only to the impost on the sale of wines—

which are proposed in the Commonwealth Budget and which will adversely affect South Australia far more than any other State.

What is this Government going to do tonight about what has gone on and the added impost we have seen today put on by the Commonwealth Treasurer? There has been no change in the excise on beer since 1965, but the excise on

brandy has nearly trebled in 13 months. In the past five years, Australian brandy sales have increased by only 36 per cent, whereas sales of what have been described to me as imported spirits of doubtful origin, mainly cheap French so-called brandy, have increased by 178 per cent. I quote the comments of one producer, as follows:

The Labor Party, whilst in Opposition, promised the industry every assistance, but in office has appeared to go out of its way to try and bring a local industry, offering decentralised employment, to its knees whilst doing nothing to restrict cheap imports.

This was written without the letter I quoted to begin with in mind. I am told that the Government's action is likely to bring severe hardship and possible ruin to sections of a basic primary industry, and it makes a mockery of the earlier promises of the Labor Party, showing its members in their true light, and showing their hypocrisy.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Are you the author of that letter?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am not, but I adopt it as my own and I am happy to do so, because I believe that to be the position. I hope members of the Liberal Party in front of me will support me on this. Let me give figures of production costs of brandy, as given to me. The cost of brandy ex still is \$2·50 a proof gallon. To bring it to maturation in two or three years costs another \$1·07, bringing the cost to \$3·57. By the time it has been bottled and all costs have been paid by the producer, the costs, to one producer anyway, are up to \$9·39 for a dozen 26-oz. bottles, which equals two gallons. They sell the product for \$10·91, which gives a profit on two gallons of \$1·52.

On top of that, the distributor's margin is \$5·92, bringing the total cost as it leaves the distributor to \$16·83. The duty on that is \$30·42, making the wholesale price \$47·25, on top of which sales tax of \$7·09 is added. That tax, of course, is compounding the tax because most of it is on the excise already included in the price. That brings the figure to \$54·34. The retailer's margin is \$14·06 and the retail price for two gallons, or one dozen 26-oz. bottles, is \$68·40 or 5·70 a bottle. That is what is happening already, and it is no wonder producers of brandy and producers of grapes are complaining about it. Even if the Labor Party had never given one promise on that they would have had something to complain about, and they complained loudly when the Commonwealth Liberal Government did something about it. Then, of course, they were aided and abetted and backed up by the Labor Party. Extraordinary!

Let us see what the grapegrower gets out of it, because I have the figures to show that. The Government charges are \$1 103 a tonne, and, on the 1974 grape prices, taking the four most commonly used varieties, the grower got an average return of \$72·78, out of which he provided all capital, working expenses to produce, and the picking wages, which averaged \$11·20 a tonne. The producer of grapes, therefore, gets almost nothing out of it when compared to what the Government gets.

Mr. Langley: How many grapegrowers have you got in your district?

Mr. Venning: That is not the point.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Unley asks how many grapegrowers I have in my district and the member for Rocky River says, quite rightly, that that is not the point. I represent in this House a Party that is interested in the problems of the whole State. We aim to represent everyone and I am here to speak on behalf of anyone who is suffering an injustice. I intend to do that, whether the member for Unley likes me to or not. Let me now dissect the figures. The new price of brandy in South Australia is likely to be \$5·64 a bottle, out of which the

producer, the bottler, and the distributor between them will share \$2.52. The Commonwealth Government will receive \$3.12 a bottle. I believe it is a scandalous situation, because we are greatly harming a section of primary industry in this State that deserves help and not harm and, to add insult to injury, these people were promised help by the Labor Party before that Party obtained office in Canberra. Dunstan, as Chairman of the A.L.P. Federal Finance Committee, wrote that letter promising it, and asking for donations in return.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You can't afford a pair of socks, so you are wearing military socks.

Members interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I know that Government members, particularly the Minister of Transport, do not like what I am saying because there is no answer to it. I quoted his Leader's words in a letter that he had written. I know the Minister does not enjoy having him as his Leader. Now we see what the Commonwealth Government has done: it has trebled excise on brandy in 13 months. I protest about this, and invite one of the vociferous Government members to support me. I do not think I have had so many Government interjections in any other speech I have made in the past few days as I am receiving now. I suggest that in this debate, before getting on to the Budget lines, one of these members, either the Deputy Premier who is sitting in the armchair listening, the Minister of Local Government, or a backbencher should get up and either justify what the Commonwealth Government has done or say what he is willing to do to help the brandy producers and grapegrowers of this State in the light of the impost levied by this Commonwealth Budget. Also, I invite members of the Liberal Party to do the same thing. The member for Chaffey and others should support me in my protest. I do not say for one moment that this is the only thing that is wrong with the Budget. Despite what the member for Elizabeth said this afternoon, I believe there are other aspects that make it thoroughly bad. However, this matter is so important that I have singled it out at my first opportunity for an attack, and I ask members on both sides to state where they stand on this matter, and what they are going to do about it.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Kavel.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: A couple of Fascists together now.

The SPEAKER: Order! Before the honourable member speaks in this debate, I seek information from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition whether the honourable member is the member deputed to speak on behalf of the Opposition.

Mr. COUMBE: Yes, he is, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): The member for Mitcham no doubt believes that the tirade that he has just delivered has had some impression on the Opposition, but what the honourable member is doing is supporting a matter raised earlier this afternoon by the member for Chaffey. If the member for Mitcham had been present, he would have realised that he was out of time in seeking kudos by his rather forceful speech, because the member for Chaffey has been pursuing this matter not only today but also for some months and years. I remind the member for Mitcham that we agree with everything he has said, but it has all been said before and much of it was said earlier this afternoon during Question Time, when the member for Chaffey properly called on the Government to make funds available to offset the effect of this added impost, which was initially announced during last year's Budget speech.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Initially announced by the former Liberal Government: come on!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The fact is that the member for Chaffey called on the Government to make funds available to offset the extremely adverse and disastrous effects on the wine industry resulting from this savage impost. The honourable member sought these funds, as wineries (as pointed out by him) are not able to meet the contract prices for which they have agreements with growers to pay for grapes, because of added commitments being forced on them by an act of the Commonwealth Government. The member for Mitcham should not seek cheap publicity by claiming that he has been the first to raise this matter in the House, because it was raised this afternoon by the member for Chaffey and, if the member for Mitcham had been more assiduous in attending the House, he might know something about what is going on.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Right again!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The tenor of what the member for Mitcham has said this evening was raised in a motion moved by the member for Chaffey some time ago. I am doing two things at present: first, getting the time scale of the member for Mitcham in its proper perspective, because he is following the lead of the official Opposition in this place. On October 17, 1973, the member for Chaffey moved a motion concerning brandy excise in the following terms:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Commonwealth Government should act immediately to remove the additional excise imposed on the sales of Australian brandy by the recent Commonwealth Budget.

The honourable member then elaborated further the terms of his motion and, in my opinion, he did it with much more authority and first-hand knowledge of this industry than has the maid of all work from Mitcham. I would not be surprised (as often happens) if this is an exercise in which the member for Mitcham is involved in initiating action for a fund-raising effort that his minor Party would seek in the River district. Perhaps we should get the record straight.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Are you saying he is only politicking?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Of course he is, as he usually is. The member for Mitcham has not only missed the bus but he also missed it by 12 months. I shall refer to a few facts posed by the member for Chaffey when he introduced his motion.

Mr. Millhouse: Not one of you was game to get up and speak this evening. I got the first call and none of you blokes wanted to, although you had the chance.

Members interjecting:

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Who is making this speech?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I had intended to say something in this grievance debate but, because the member for Mitcham seems to be seeking cheap kudos, I think we had better put the record straight.

Mr. Millhouse: This will go down well with producers.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The member for Chaffey raised this matter this afternoon, but in support of his motion last year he said:

This motion enables every member to support the removal of the additional impost that has been placed on the sale of Australian brandy, and I trust that it will be unanimously supported by all members. As a result of the last Commonwealth Budget, we have seen a dramatic increase of about 80 per cent in the total duty collected on sales of brandy. The level of Commonwealth duty prior to the Budget was \$320 a ton, plus \$120 a ton sales tax, making a total of \$440 a ton on grapes used in making brandy. On each ton of wine grapes used for the purpose of brandy manufacture the grower receives about \$60 or \$65.

That follows closely the sort of argument that has been advanced as new material by the member for Mitcham tonight. The Premier admitted publicly that the Prime Minister's actions had made him a liar, and said (as all members knew) that it was a source of acute embarrassment to him. The Premier amended the motion, so ably moved by the member for Chaffey, by striking out all the words after "House" and inserting the following:

the elimination of the differential on brandy excise and the removal, without an adequate period for adjustment, of the provision for arbitrary valuation of wine stock is harmful to the wine industry and should not be proceeded with.

There is no argument that this matter is of grave concern to the official Opposition.

Mr. Millhouse: Why didn't you say something about it first, then?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: If the honourable member would only open his ears, he would know that I have already said four times that the matter has been raised by the member for Chaffey. He raised it in a most searching question earlier today, and last year he moved the motion to which I have already referred, but those efforts have already been lost to the headline hunter.

I refer also to the proposal in the Commonwealth Budget to reduce from \$400 to \$150 the allowable tax deduction for education expenses for schoolchildren. This is a most savage blow aimed at a minority of people in the community who choose an independent school education for their children. One well remembers the earlier savage attack by the Commonwealth Government when it saw fit not to implement the recommendation of the Karmel committee that aid to some schools should be phased out. The Commonwealth Government sought to knock that out immediately and not to follow the schedule recommended by the committee.

Unfortunately, no-one has been able to discover the terms of reference of the Karmel committee, whose recommendations conflicted directly with those made by the Cook committee set up by this Government. If members examine the recommendations of the latter committee regarding the disbursement of aid to independent schools in this State, they will see clearly acknowledged the fact that all independent schools are in financial difficulties. This Government and its big brother in Canberra intend, for political purposes, to squeeze the wealthy schools. Having recommended grants for all independent schools in this State, the Cook committee acknowledges that all independent schools are in trouble. Yet we get this sort of garbage churned out from Canberra to the effect that the Commonwealth Government is not hurting the wealthy parents of children attending private schools! No member of the Karmel committee or anyone else realises the efforts that some parents will make to send their children to the school of their choice.

Mr. Evans: And they aren't rich people.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: They certainly are not, and the schools are not wealthy. Although some schools may be well endowed, the Cook committee points out that all these schools have large capital debts that are hard to service.

Mr. Wright: Not all of them.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The member for Adelaide ought to do his homework. His statement illustrates the sort of hatred that results from an inferiority complex that some members of the Labor Party seem to have. A fact of life is that the Premier saw fit to send his children to independent schools. Why do Government

members not ask him what he thinks about this matter? As a parent, I have had experience with Government and independent schools. I know of the efforts made by many of the parents of children attending the so-called wealthy independent schools.

Mr. Crimes: They are wealthy parents, not wealthy schools.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The point I am making, if the member for Spence would listen, is that I know a cross-section of the parents of children attending such schools and many of them would not receive anything like the income that the member for Spence receives.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: However, these parents are willing to make a financial sacrifice and to go without—

Mr. Crimes: If they are willing to do it, O.K.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: —and they are saving the Government money. Indeed, the Auditor-General's Report shows that the cost of educating a child at a Government secondary school in this State, excluding debt charges, was \$587 a year in 1973. Therefore, the parents to whom I have referred and who make sacrifices for their children's education are saving the taxpayers that sum, although they still pay their taxes to the Government.

Mr. Crimes: That's their choice.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: In the past Government members have advocated no aid for independent schools, be they Catholic or non-Catholic schools, because that is the Government's policy. I remember Mr. Clyde Cameron saying at one of the Labor Party's meetings at Broken Hill, "We as a party will not subsidise the Catholic Church." Those were his words.

Mr. Wright: What's your authority for saying that?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I will find the reference, because he said it.

Mr. Wright: I say you're a liar.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The member for Adelaide can call me a liar.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: However, I will ask for a retraction if I can find the statement to which I have referred. It was a report on the Broken Hill meeting, which report I saw a year or two ago in the Parliamentary Library. The Commonwealth Government's intention to reduce from \$400 to \$150 the allowable tax deduction for education expenses for schoolchildren will do exactly what the great democracy in Canberra says it does not want to do. The Commonwealth Government will make these schools even more exclusive and more and more of the so-called middle class (I do not believe in what the Labor Party calls "the middle class", but that is the term it uses) will find it almost impossible to send their children to the school of their choice. They will no longer be able to send their younger children to the school their elder children have attended. The children of parents forced by the savage reduction in the allowable education expenses to send their children to a State school will cost the taxpayer money. Moreover, it will do exactly what the crowd in Canberra says it is trying to do. The Commonwealth Government does not believe in exclusive schools, but this savage reduction will make them even more exclusive. Everyone is well aware of the effects inflation is having on education, which is a labour-intensive industry, if I could use that term.

In any large independent school many highly-qualified people are employed, and it is incumbent now on secondary schools particularly, also on primary schools, that they pay the same salaries as those paid in Government schools.

We know too well the impact salary increases are having on Government schools. I believe the time is coming when some of the independent schools in grave difficulty (which they are in now) will be forced to amalgamate: some may even be forced to close. I believe that this is one of the most savage and discriminatory actions any Government could take. The Labor Party is not interested in minorities, especially the rural minority. I have even heard Government members say that the mob lives in the city, so what the heck! The Commonwealth Government is interested only in political expediency, not in fairness or democracy. That is made only too apparent in the savage attack the Commonwealth Government has unleashed on some of our independent schools. In conclusion, may I say that I hope the member for Mitcham will get his time scale correct; he has been following the member for Chaffey not only today but for some months. I have also raised another matter of vital significance to an important minority in this State.

Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I am grateful for the belated support I have received from the member for Mitcham on the important matter I raised in the House earlier today: namely, the additional impost on brandy.

Mr. Payne: You're following him, though.

Mr. ARNOLD: If the honourable member had been in the House just after 2 p.m. today, he would recall the request I made to the Government to appeal to the Commonwealth Government to make funds available to wineries and distilleries that have been affected not only by the most recent impost placed on brandy once again in the Budget brought down last evening, but also by the impost placed on it in the Budget brought down in August, 1973. Being a brandy-grape producer, I know full well the effects on the growers and brandy producers of this State of the recent additional impost on brandy. The member for Mitcham referred to the letter the Premier wrote seeking financial assistance for his Party. This letter has been quoted many times, and Government members are well aware of it.

The important point I stressed earlier today was that South Australian growers and brandy-grape producers could not meet their financial commitments. In fact, some of them are receiving summonses for not meeting their financial commitments, simply because, as a result of the excise tax, inflation, and the credit squeeze, the winemakers cannot meet the financial commitments they have entered into with the growers, especially as regards the 1974 crop.

If the member for Mitcham had been in the House earlier today he would recall that I called on the State Government to ask the Commonwealth Government for immediate funds to enable wineries to meet the commitments they had entered into with the growers, so as to overcome their financial difficulties. I also suggested to the Deputy Premier that the Lands Department should consider accepting procurement orders from growers to cover their water rates. Because of their financial position they cannot pay their water rates, and interest is being charged on the outstanding sums. The effects not only of the recent impost but also of the earlier imposts made by the Commonwealth Government have made the Berri winery, for example, reassess its position as the major Australian brandy-producing winery and distillery and to decide whether it is in the company's interests to go back to full-scale brandy production. This is the effect of the brandy imposts.

Government members will recall the disastrous fire which occurred at the winery last year and which destroyed the vast stocks of brandy held at the winery. There is no

point in the winery's producing the product if there is no outlet for it. One should study the clearances of Australian brandy for each month since August, 1973, compared to clearances for the same month in the previous year in order to see what is the percentage fall. The table is as follows:

BRANDY CLEARANCES

	Percentage fall over past 12 months
September, 1973	15.36
October, 1973	25.78
November, 1973	35.21
December, 1973	3.27
January, 1974	39.94
February, 1974	14.76
March, 1974	7.92
April, 1974	13.92
May, 1974	33.22
	(estimated)

In that nine-month period there was not even one instance of an increase; this has been the result of the excise, which is crippling not only the brandy producers but also the grapegrowers. The industry would be one of the most viable industries in the country if it was left to its own devices and not destroyed by the continuing increase in brandy excise.

Mr. BOUNDY (Goyder): I support the remarks of the member for Mitcham. I am sure that all members would agree that this evening we have witnessed a spirited debate. The member for Mitcham, having been described as a military man, has been under fire from both flanks this evening, but he has acquitted himself very well. He raised a matter of great concern to primary producers, including the member for Chaffey and his constituents, for whom I have much sympathy. I represent a barleygrowing district, from which vast sums are collected, through excise, for the support of the Government. Excise on the barleygrowing industry does not have the same detrimental effect as it has on the brandy industry, and our sympathies are with the brandy producers, on whom the Government is levying these savage charges.

In the short time I have been a member of this House, I have heard no reference to any effective use being made of the effluent from the Bolivar Sewage Treatment Works. Part of my maiden speech referred to the need for using the effluent. I have witnessed the introduction of the Loan Estimates and the Appropriation Bill, and last night we heard about the Commonwealth Budget. Being a novice, I may have missed something, but I have not heard any reference to a provision being made for reticulating the effluent water to market gardeners at Virginia. Further, I have not heard any announcement that large sums are to be spent on research, and I doubt whether such expenditure is necessary. The Virginia market garden area is an important part of the vegetable-producing areas of the State. I am told by producers there that \$10 000 000 worth of vegetables is produced annually. New water licences are not being issued, and quotas have been imposed on water usage. The producers are gravely concerned that there is no room for expansion or incentive. They have no opportunity to provide for their sons to follow them in the industry.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: What about Chowilla dam?

Mr. BOUNDY: I point out that 136 400 kL goes into St. Vincent Gulf daily. My informants tell me that the Bolivar treatment works has been modelled on a scheme at Santee in California, but I am not sure about that. Effluent water from the Californian scheme is being used for domestic purposes and in swimming pools. The only essential difference between the Bolivar treatment works

and the Californian works is that the latter has the extra facility of a final gravel filter. As I live on a very stony farm, I shall be only too happy to provide the gravel to put that facility at Bolivar. Because we are wasting 136 400 k/ a day by allowing it to flow into the sea, perhaps further research is needed into the feasibility of using this water. However, I believe that at present very little more needs to be done before the effluent water can be used as an adjunct to the water supplies that the Virginia market gardeners are using for vegetable growing. In fact, the Munno Para District Council has for several years had plots established to try out this effluent on vegetables, and the experiments have been very successful.

There has been success in growing french beans, which have always been the indicator of water salinity for gardening purposes. These plots have produced tomatoes and french beans for human consumption, and my informant tells me that they are unsurpassed for quality. The trial plots established at Munno Para are almost in the heart of the salt pans at Dry Creek. If there was a risk associated with the salinity of the Bolivar water, surely nothing would grow in the plots, much less french beans. The plots have now been discontinued because they have achieved their purpose. According to the Virginia growers, they have proved their point. All this merely serves to show that it has taken much time to decide whether this water is suitable for market-gardening purposes.

I now refer to the August 1, 1961, *Hansard* report of the Address in Reply speech by Mr. (now Senator) Hall the then member for Gouger, when he quoted the report of the Public Works Committee on the establishment (13 years ago) of the Bolivar Sewage Treatment Works, as follows:

The committee is of the opinion that every effort should be made to find some economic way of making use of the effluent. At the same time it recognises that the quality of the effluent may limit its usefulness for irrigation, and that a soil survey of any area available for irrigation would be necessary to determine the likely effect of continued application of the effluent.

Surely 13 years is sufficient time to prove the point.

Mr. Evans: What did he say in 1969 when he was responsible for this matter himself?

Mr. BOUNDY: I have not got that far.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: You looked at the 1969 volume, but it did not suit you.

Mr. BOUNDY: That is a ploy that all members of this House have used. I believe I have amply shown the need for more research to be undertaken and that funds should be provided for that research. Alternatively, if the Government and the Minister of Works can prove that 136 400 k/ a day cannot be used, let them come out and say so, because my constituents in the Virginia area would then know that they had no future.

I refer now to the decision made by the Industries Assistance Commission that Australian farmers have no case for the retention of the superphosphate bounty. Many speakers in this House have referred to the need to retain this bounty for the benefit of agriculture generally, but the terms of reference of the commission will not allow it to consider anything that has not yet happened. I am reminded of the words of Dr. Dawson, when he was a member of the State Agriculture Department almost 20 years ago. He said that farmers should use the soil as a bank to store up superphosphate against the need that will arise in future years. Farmers have done this: they have built up a bank of residual fertiliser in their soil.

All members are aware that South Australia is largely a phosphate-deficient State. If we build up a bank of phosphate in the soil, and then measures are introduced to

reduce the application of superphosphate to our soils, that bank is depleted and we become bankrupt. Is this Government merely to wait for this to happen before it offers any assistance to primary producers who use superphosphate? The Government should be championing our cause each and every day with its Commonwealth colleagues.

Mr. Keneally: I heard that 80 per cent of primary producers use less than \$300 worth of superphosphate a year. How will that bankrupt them?

Mr. BOUNDY: That is not the point at issue. Farmers will not go bankrupt tomorrow. No-one is suggesting that, but our application to the commission fails because we cannot prove that we are going to become bankrupt tomorrow. Farmers are talking about the long-term bankruptcy of primary industry.

Mr. Langley: When you purchase a property, don't you know whether it is viable or not?

Mr. BOUNDY: The honourable member may know something about electricity, but he knows nothing about primary industry. The point at issue is that the depletion of our phosphate resources is a long-term matter. It is not going to happen tomorrow. Certainly, one can buy a viable farm today but, if overall costs are such that farmers have to cut down on the application of superphosphate, our production will eventually be reduced. Phosphate is vital to the long-term prosperity of this State. I repeat that the Government should champion our cause in the Commonwealth sphere to see that the superphosphate bounty is retained, if not wholly, then at least partially, as a means of ensuring that the fertility and productivity of our cereal lands is maintained. I point out that we are coupling a steep increase in the price of superphosphate with the loss of the bounty that has previously applied, and those two factors are not easy to counteract.

Mr. Chapman: We have fewer overseas markets as a direct result of action by the Government's Commonwealth colleagues.

Mr. BOUNDY: True, it is a combination of these factors working to our detriment. The retention of the superphosphate bounty is one measure the Government can take to help primary industry. Moreover, I have always believed that the superphosphate bounty was not so much a subsidy to the farmer as a subsidy to the consumer because, in respect of the wheat industry, the subsidy held down the price of wheat thereby reducing the cost of the end product to the consumer.

In referring to land tax valuations, I pay a tribute to the member for Gouger for his address yesterday on this matter. The honourable member covered this matter well. I raised this matter with the Premier yesterday during Question Time. The Premier's reply states:

Proper provisions are made to ensure that the Valuer-General's assessment can be appealed against. If the honourable member gives me the details of the assessments that he says are out of line with current values, I will undertake to have them examined.

I suggest that the Premier did not understand, or chose not to understand, the point at issue. The whole problem about this matter is that the overall assessment, not the individual assessments, is what concerns us. Appeals can be only against inequities between properties and comparisons between a person's property and his neighbour's property. The whole assessment is too high, and I ask why it has been levied so savagely. This Government stands condemned on all the points I have raised.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

(Continued from September 17. Page 999.)

Schedule.

Labour and Industry, \$2 267 000.

Mr. COUMBE: The Manpower Development Branch of the department has been formed to promote improved training and development for the South Australian work force and to provide associated advisory services and research. A report issued by the Minister's department in 1973, which was a report on the survey of training needs in industry and commerce in South Australia in 1972, deals with the training of the work force, including specialists, not only in regard to safety but also considering the needs of industry, commerce and Government in this State. I should like information about how the scheme is working, how many specialists have received training, how many skilled workers are taking part in the course or being invited to take part in it, and whether any unskilled workers are taking part in it. It is important that the unskilled worker receive training so that he can take part in a suitable industry.

I refer also to the Worker Participation Branch of the Minister's department which was formed some time ago. Unfortunately, there has been what I believe has been some unfounded criticism of the work being done by this branch, particularly by its leader. This criticism has come from the leaders of some trade unions and I regret this attack on the branch and the objects established for it as a result of the report. I consider that the branch is doing a worthwhile job in improving worker-employer relations in this State, and I ask the Minister whether he can give information about it and say what is happening in relation to the Industrial Training Council.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE (Minister of Labour and Industry): The Industrial Training Council was established by my department after extensive survey of and research into the requirements of industry and commerce. I think that that survey continued for about eight or 12 months, and the need for in-training in industry came out of the survey. Industries, having considered the requirements, were keen to take part in what the Government was doing to assist them in every way to increase productivity by increasing the knowledge that those employed in the industries had.

We established the council, comprising people in industry and the trade union movement who were most interested in this matter. The council is headed by David Pank, as Chairman. The non-Government members are P. L. Cotton, T. B. Prescott, J. L. Scott, and R. M. Tremethick. The \$1 100 is provided for fees paid to members of the council. I think the honourable member knows that members of the council are responsible people and are keen to ensure that industry and business can get the right type of people and the right training for people so that their operations can be conducted in a businesslike way. We are in the throes of establishing this committee as a statutory body so that it will have authority to give instructions and be able to assist business and commerce to the fullest possible extent to increase productivity and to further the training of employees.

The Manpower Development Branch is under the control of Mr. Max Johnson (Assistant Secretary for Labour and Industry). This line relates also to six additional positions, including four transcription typists and two trainee court reporters, to cope with increased activities. The branch is in the early stages of development and is working in liaison with the Australian Department of Labour to avoid overlapping with the Commonwealth. It ties up with a scheme announced by the Commonwealth Government known as the N.E.A.T. scheme. I understand a pilot scheme will be set up in South Australia, shortly. It will apply only to people receiving social

service benefits, who will be given top priority for retraining. We have had some problems with the Trades and Labor Council, because we cannot interfere with apprenticeship training. We have received great co-operation throughout the building industry. A bricklayers class has been going on for some time, and about 200 bricklayers have been trained in the past 18 months or two years. They are not fully qualified, but they do a course for 18 weeks and, at the end of that time, they are given status equivalent to that of a three-year apprentice. They are readily accepted in the industry because of the intensive training course they have undergone. With the assistance of the Commonwealth Government, they are paid a sum equivalent to the basic rate while they are training, and in some areas we also pay a subsidy to the employer. This is a great incentive for employers to accept these people to that they have a chance to re-establish themselves. Because of technological changes, people become redundant from time to time and must be retrained. It is a most useful project.

Mr. COUMBE: While I thank the Minister for the information he has given, I hope he is not encouraging people to go on to social services so that they can be retrained cheaply. I am aware of the benefits of the retraining scheme and the crash courses undertaken in some trades, especially in the building industry, but it is important that we retain the apprenticeship system. We must not break down the advantages to be gained by the serving of a full indenture, although certain credits can be granted. I hope the final recognition of the person undergoing the crash course does not deter apprentices from entering those trades or detract from the rights enjoyed by tradesmen on completion of apprenticeships. I wholeheartedly support the concept of worker participation, and I regret the attacks made, as reported in the press, by what I believe to be irresponsible people, directed particularly at the officer in charge of the section. Can the Minister say how effectively this committee is working and how the concept of worker participation is developing?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: Mr. Prowse, the head of this project, has recently visited countries participating in this scheme. He returned this week and is now preparing a report on his trip. He visited Switzerland, various parts of the United Kingdom, and other places where worker participation is operating. I understand his visit was well received and that people he interviewed overseas were most interested in what was being done in South Australia. I know the member for Torrens asked this question because of adverse criticism levelled at the worker participation unit at the recent Australian Labor Party Convention, and he did not agree with that criticism: The people who criticised the unit probably were criticising the personnel more than the concept. Recently, I handed to the Treasurer a report on the activities of the unit; it has been well received in Government departments, hospitals, and private industries. Committees are being set up, but nothing will happen overnight. Probably, it will take some time to get the right climate within the trade union movement for full acceptance of the concept: some members of the movement think there should be worker control. We want to create a quality of life so that people enjoy their work. We want to take away the monotony associated with repetitive work. We are getting co-operation, committees are being set up, and views are being exchanged. I will receive a full report shortly, and I shall be pleased to let the honourable member see it so that he may ascertain what we are doing.

Mr. EVANS: I believe in the training of apprentices, but there must be an incentive for a person to go through the full apprenticeship, particularly as a person who does the crash course can receive almost as much as a tradesman who has done his apprenticeship and who has probably had a better education. Without this incentive, this system will be killed and we will have more shoddy tradesmen, particularly in the building industry. We are to allocate money to the Apprenticeship Commission but, if we are not careful, the commission will not exist.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: This year there has been a record intake of apprentices, and the Australian Government has greatly assisted by increasing incentives to employers to take on apprentices. Our training programme will not interfere with the commission.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I am interested in the shearing industry which is desperately short of tradesmen. Can the Minister say whether his department intends to assist—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! We are discussing the line "Apprenticeship Commission—Members' fees".

Mr. CHAPMAN: As money is being appropriated, one would expect to know what these members will be doing. Can the Minister say whether the commission will consider introducing a training scheme for shearing apprentices and, if it will, what sort of training is contemplated?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: People have never been apprenticed in the shearing industry but, having been approached by the industry to consider introducing training, I raised this matter at a Ministers' conference a few months ago. However, I could not get agreement from the other Ministers about introducing such a scheme. If we operated such a scheme in South Australia, what would stop the trained shearers from travelling to other places?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! We seem to be getting away from this line.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Acting Chairman. This matter interests me, and Parliament is to appropriate money to employ members to act on this commission. I want to know what they will do.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Is the honourable member referring to the work they will do for which they will be paid?

Mr. CHAPMAN: Yes. Will members of this commission consider introducing a shearer-training programme?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The Government does not intend to set up a shearing school in South Australia. The allocation comprises the fees payable to members of the committee: Messrs. C. W. Branson, S. J. Gifford, R. M. Glastonbury, and J. E. Shannon, as non-Government members, who are paid \$500 a year each, and Mr. H. H. Macklin-Shaw, the Government member, who receives \$400 a year.

Mr. COUMBE: I refer to the line relating to fees for members of the Industrial Training Council. What recommendations does the council make regarding the age of persons admitted to the crash course for bricklayers?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: Ages are considered, and I think persons over 30 years of age are not admitted. Many are returned servicemen from Vietnam, in their middle and late twenties.

Mr. VENNING: I refer to the line "Executive, Project and Research Officers—Worker Participation". What portion of this allocation comprises the salary of Mr. Prowse, who is in charge of the worker participation section?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I have not got that information with me, but I will obtain it for the honourable member.

Mr. RODDA: The allocation for the worker participation section has increased by about \$28 000 over last year's actual payments. Does this mean that its activities are to be expanded?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I assure the honourable member that this money will be spent wisely.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Did the Minister say that, following consultation with other State Ministers, a training programme for members of the shearing industry in this State could not be implemented?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: This matter was discussed at great length, and in some States it was found to be unnecessary as sufficient people were already going into the industry. There is an obligation on pastoralists to attract people to the industry and, if they maintain good living conditions for their shearers, they will attract the right type of person. I do not think anyone in this State has been unable to get his sheep shorn, so there is not a shortage of shearers here. Indeed, if a training school was established, we could well have a surplus of shearers, which would not be good for the industry. I know that the member for Alexandra, like the member for Rocky River, would like this State to have a glut of shearers, so that prices could be cut.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Will the Minister say what sections of the Public Service are using the services of the worker participation group?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: This group, which comes under the aegis of my department, has been in close contact with most Government departments and various industries.

Mr. Dean Brown: Which Government departments are accepting its help?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: Although in the short time it has been in existence the worker participation group has not contacted all departments, it has assisted the Hospitals Department, the Engineering and Water Supply Department, the abattoirs, and many private industries. I have recently received an extensive report from the head of the department, which was also submitted to the Treasurer. However, as I cannot remember its complete contents, I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

Mr. Coumbe: Has any opposition been received from Government departments?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: No, we have done well.

Mr. CHAPMAN: What is the Minister's basis for saying that there could be sufficient shearers in South Australia, and that he did not intend to enter into a training programme because he believed that, as a result of the programme, a glut of shearers could ensue?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member is ranging far too widely. He must stick to the lines as set down.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I am concerned about the sum in these lines proposed to be spent on training council members. For apprentice supervisors and clerical staff, \$132 950 is allocated. Surely it is reasonable that we question what those staff members will do. The Minister began to answer me by saying that he did not believe—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! Does the honourable member want to know the nature of the duties of the personnel for which this sum is allocated?

Mr. CHAPMAN: Yes, Mr. Acting Chairman.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: They are members of the Apprenticeship Commission, whose job is to administer the training of young people. This is a big job, because we have had the largest intake of apprentices this year in the

history of the State. We have improved the whole conditions with regard to apprentice training. We have had all day-time training, and have brought country youths down to the city, housing them in Government buildings. The increased Australian Government subsidy has given an incentive to the employers to take on additional apprentices, exceeding all past intakes.

Mr. MATHWIN: For manpower development officers \$61 400 (or about \$38 000 more than was spent last year) has been allocated. Will this service be expanded to cater for the retraining of redundant workers? Will a quota be placed on the number of people to be trained in each different trade? How will development officers retrain a redundant worker, aged between 50 years and 55 years, who has worked all his life in the clothing industry (an industry now facing problems), to be a building tradesman? Surely such a worker should be able to express his opinion on which industry he wishes to enter.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I doubt whether I would be permitted to reply to the honourable member's extensive questions. The allocation provides for a full year's salary for the present staff of the Manpower Development Branch, whereas last year's allocation provided for only part of the year.

Mr. COUMBE: I understand that the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Board recommends to the Minister (and eventually to Parliament) regulations to be made under the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act. As I understand it, Parliament has seen only the regulations mainly in connection with the building industry. Certain other fields have yet to be considered. It is now about two years since the Act was passed, following the report of a Select Committee that sat for about a year. What progress has been made, in preparing regulations for consideration by Parliament, by these members, for whom \$1 300 is provided? I remind the Minister that one matter that had to be referred for regulation was the matter of noise abatement.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The board first considered the building industry. I think it has just about completed that work, and it is now taking evidence in the rural sector.

Mr. Coumbe: What section of it?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The rural industry generally. I notice that the member for Rocky River has pricked up his ears.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! As the question was asked by the honourable member for Torrens, I suggest to the honourable Minister that he reply to that precise question.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The member for Torrens knows that a decision has not yet been made regarding the decibel count.

Mr. Coumbe: Yes it has.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: There has been a recommendation, but that has not been considered by the State and Commonwealth Governments. The noise in industry aspect, under the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act, will be introduced by regulation. In the building industry all the regulations associated with this matter are almost complete. We are now moving into rural industry, and then into industry, commerce and other areas.

Mr. Coumbe: It's taken a long time.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: Yes, we are moving slowly. Regulations covering this area must be correct; we cannot afford to make mistakes. The board is doing a good job, and I think that we will have regulations covering safety, health and welfare for all people employed in industry throughout the State within the next year.

Mr. BECKER: I am concerned about the 25 per cent increase in the allocation for the Labour and Industry Department, in view of the Treasurer's statement that further tax increases will have to be imposed in South Australia. I hope the allocation will enable the department to carry out its important work. What consideration has been given to retraining white-collar workers, particularly in view of the trend towards computerisation?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: Anyone who requires retraining, irrespective of whether he is a white-collar worker or a blue-collar worker, will be considered.

Mr. MATHWIN: People are being retrenched as a result of the Commonwealth Government's economic policies, such as people in the clothing and shoe industries. Will such people be retrained by the manpower development officers?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: Yes, if they require it.

Mr. MATHWIN: I can see a reference to overseas visits of officers, but I cannot see any reference to an overseas visit by the Minister.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I could not hear the honourable member clearly.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The honourable member is asking a question about overseas visits of officers, and he wants to know whether the term "officers" includes the Minister.

Mr. MATHWIN: That was my intention. The Minister should have gone overseas when the Treasurer went on his jaunt to Scandinavia and other areas.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member has agreed that the way in which I phrased his question was correct. I suggest that it now be referred to the Minister.

Line passed.

Minister of Labour and Industry, Miscellaneous, \$22 000; Minister of Agriculture, \$80 000—passed.

Agriculture Department, \$5 889 000.

Mr. RODDA: Can the Minister of Works say what is covered by the allocation for salaries, wages and related payments in connection with research centres?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): The only information I have with me at present is a list of names of people. The allocation referred to covers the salaries of those people.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The Callaghan report recommended that the Agriculture Department be restructured. The Government has more or less said that it will eventually adopt the recommendations in the report. When will the recommendations be adopted, and will they affect the salary allocations in this line?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: They will not affect the salary allocations, because the reorganisation will not take place at this stage.

Mr. Dean Brown: When will it take place?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not know.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Vine Improvement Society at Nuriootpa has co-operated with the Agriculture Department in establishing a useful vine improvement programme there. Earlier, the Government acquired some land there. I played a part in liaising between the society and the Minister in this connection. There is concern as to the effect of the recommendations in the Callaghan report on the work of the Nuriootpa Research Centre. Can the Minister give further details of the future of the centre? There is a need for the injection of a considerable sum into the research centre if it is to extend its research and developmental work, which has until now been undertaken so well by district grapegrowers and Agriculture Department officers.

I understand that certain experiments have been undertaken by Dr. Les Rendshaw of the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation on the predacious mite, an insect that is of significance to the fruitgrowing industry. The Agriculture Department has expressed interest in undertaking research to obtain biological control of this insect. Will the Minister find out whether any definite developments are foreseen, and whether the department intends to go into this field, which is an area of great concern to fruitgrowers?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The only information I have is in respect of specific items, but I shall be happy to obtain a report from the department on the matters referred to by the honourable member outside those items.

Mr. VENNING: As a large sum has not been allocated to the rural youth organisation, can the Minister say exactly what is the position with regard to that organisation, which is under the control of the Agriculture Department?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have no information on the activities of rural youth, although I understand a payment is made to the State committee of the organisation. As the honourable member seeks information about the organisation's activities, I shall be happy to obtain a report for him.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Will the Minister obtain information about the number of staff presently employed on rural youth activities and indicate, at the same time, whether the allocation to the organisation includes funds for the filling of various staff vacancies that have existed for some time? Temporary appointment was made about two years ago as senior adviser for rural youth, yet that appointment has never been confirmed. The position has not been re-advertised or filled by an appointment from either inside or outside the Public Service. Moreover, I understand there are two or three rural youth advisory positions currently vacant, that have been vacant for some time. It is time we learnt the facts of this.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will get information for the honourable member on this matter.

Mr. EVANS: I refer to the line dealing with control and destruction of proclaimed weeds, including subsidies to councils. Has the Minister a breakdown of the amount set aside as the expected subsidy to councils, and has he a comparison with the sum expended last year? Is additional effort to be made this year to control and eradicate African daisy? Having led a deputation of Hills residents concerned about the millepede pest to the Minister of Agriculture, I know that the Minister was not sure under whose jurisdiction the attempt to control that pest should fall. As the Minister of Agriculture knows of the concern of these residents, will the Minister of Works ascertain whether work on this problem can be undertaken this year, perhaps by providing grants to individuals to carry out research work or other work such as that carried out by Mr. Baker at the Waite Agricultural Research Institute?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will get information for the honourable member on these matters.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I should appreciate information about the contribution towards special projects of the Australian Agricultural Council. We recognise the work that the council does throughout Australia, and the amount of \$37 100 provided. Is it based on the number of head of stock in the State, or by what means? How much money is in the campaign fund, having regard to money coming from the other States? I

would appreciate information on projects that have been researched and on the benefit that they will be to South Australia.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The purposes for which the \$37 100 is provided are as follows:

<i>Project</i>	<i>Provision for 1974-75 \$</i>
Australian Journal of Experimental Agriculture	4 175
Fruit commodity (disinfestation)	7 633
Light brown apple moth	1 481
Codling moth	591
Legume inoculant quality	3 519
Locust patrol service	2 535
I.S.T.A. fees	477
Plant quarantine publicity	1 864
Tractor testing	4 500
Virus-tested fruits	5 180
Agricultural Bureau contribution	3 020
Symposium on ruminant physiology	Nil
20th International horticultural conference (Sydney)	700
Handbook of Australian wheat varieties	1 425

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister say how the amount of \$709 597 spent last year on fruit fly eradication was made up, how the expenses were incurred, what was the number of permanent staff, what temporary assistance was needed, and what compensation was paid?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Provision is made this year for normal border roadblocks and for lure and inspection activity in the metropolitan area. There were nine outbreaks of fruit fly in 1973-74, but no provision has been made for any outbreaks in 1974-75. I will check the matter, but it seems that the \$392 300 is being provided for roadblocks and for lure and inspection activity in the metropolitan area. These roadblocks are permanent. The other item, eradication, is dealt with by Act of Parliament and, doubtless, an amount was paid last financial year and there has been a flow over to this year. It seems from the figures that there is constant surveillance regarding this pest.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I ask whether the department sees any end in sight to the fruit fly eradication programme. I am not advocating that the programme should cease, but it is referred to as the fruit fly eradication programme and it has been continuing since I was a youth. Does the department believe that the time will come when fruit fly will be eradicated? Because of the time for which the operations have continued, it seems that there will be a continuing programme of control.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will ask the Minister of Agriculture about the matter.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Can the Minister say why the provision for the tuberculosis testing programme for this year is twice the sum provided last year? It seemed from a reply given by the Minister of Agriculture on September 10 that the testing programme in South Australia virtually was under control. The Minister implied that in his explanation as it related to Kangaroo Island. I had the impression that Kangaroo Island was one of the last regions in the State proclaimed to be tested, and the Minister explained that that area was almost completed. Despite the department's massive programme, the amount provided has been doubled. Further, does the department intend to widen its activities to include brucellosis testing?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The amount provided for the testing of cattle for tuberculosis is the Government's direct contribution to the cost of the brucellosis and tuberculosis eradication campaign in this State, which is

financed mainly by the Australian Government. The increased provision is in keeping with stepping up the programme, together with the replacement of \$25 000 previously drawn from the Cattle Compensation Fund.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I understand the purpose of the fruit fly programme is to eradicate fruit fly. Over the past 10 years, the State has been free of fruit fly for most years, and the officers of the department are to be complimented on the job they do. I compliment my former colleagues within the department on their excellent work. Can the Minister say whether an inquiry will be held within the next 12 months on organisation of the staffing of the fruit fly eradication programme? Last year, when eight or nine major outbreaks occurred in the metropolitan area, certain deficiencies in the organisation of the day-labour force were revealed.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: It was under contract.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I appreciate that, but there were certain deficiencies in the organisation; I think that is commonly accepted by the people who were trying to eradicate fruit fly. I understand that in one area several men were found throwing fruit at one another.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Oh dear!

Mr. DEAN BROWN: It is "Oh dear!", if it happens to be infected fruit that is being thrown around the countryside; obviously, then it would become an effective spreading campaign rather than an eradication programme. Is there any planning for some sort of supervision of the present arrangements, and how many members of the permanent staff are involved in the eradication programme?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not know the number of staff involved in the programme, but I will pass on to the honourable member's ex-colleagues in the department his advice on how to run the scheme, telling them that if they need any assistance at any time they should ring and ask him how to conduct the programme. He indicated that there needed to be a tightening up in control. I believe I should indicate to the department, especially to the officers running this programme, that if they need assistance or information the member for Davenport will tell them exactly how to go about it.

Mr. RODDA: What efforts are being made to prevent the introduction of foot and mouth disease or blue tongue, both of which are serious livestock diseases?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to obtain the information for the honourable member and bring down a report.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: My former colleagues in the department fully appreciate my views.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! Debate must be confined to the line under discussion.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I am referring to the line relating to the fruit fly eradication programme. My former colleagues appreciate my efforts in this House, and recent efforts by the Minister of Works and other Ministers to discredit me in the eyes of those people have been useless.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! It is a matter of speaking to a certain line. The honourable member should be seated when the Chairman is addressing the Committee.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I raised with the Treasurer last week the matter of accounting procedures. I understand the Commonwealth Government, in its various allocations of grants for the purchase of livestock, allows the agricultural research centres to have running accounts; revenue from the sale of stock goes back into the account and can be used for further purchases. The South Australian Government, in its accounting procedures, purchases stock

under this line, but the proceeds from the sale of stock go to general revenue. Therefore, it is impossible for the department to find adequate finance to purchase the required stock. Will the Minister investigate the use of a different accounting procedure, with a running account such as I have outlined?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am pleased to see the member for Davenport trying to square off with his ex-colleagues. He described the lack of competence of the people who worked on fruit fly control, saying that there was a lack of supervision and that they were not properly organised. I shall give officers of the department the advice I suggested earlier. On the matter of accounting procedures, I advise the honourable member to look at the procedures used in other Government departments, to see how these matters are handled. Apparently, he thinks the people he has mentioned should be treated as a special case and be allowed to do what major departments are not permitted to do. Other Government departments operate on the same system as that used by this department, and I cannot understand why these people should be considered particularly. However, I will refer the question to my colleague and ask him whether it has any merit.

Line passed.

Produce, \$1 461 000—passed.

Minister of Agriculture and Minister of Forests, Miscellaneous, \$470 000.

Mr. VENNING: Can the Minister say how the \$205 000 for reimbursement to district councils and other expenses in connection with noxious insects is to be allocated?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: This is a provision for the cost of insecticides and equipment to assist councils in controlling potential grasshopper and locust hatchings and plague grasshopper control programmes in infested areas. Additional provision is made for expected large-scale hatchings of plague locusts, particularly in northern pastoral areas. Councils will be supplied with insecticides free of charge where large infestations occur.

Mr. RODDA: The investigation of South-East stock saleyards has created much interest in my district. Can the Minister say what progress has been made in this matter?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I understand that the committee is about to report to the Minister, who will take the recommendations to Cabinet. The Government's decision will be far-reaching, because I believe that it will not be restricted only to the South-East, but will cover other parts of the State. I hope that it will result in adequate stockyard facilities being available at South-Eastern and other centres, and the most desirable course would be for them to be financed by councils. I understand that the investigation committee has considered the location, siting, design, and cost of stockyards, and that a decision will be made in regard to these matters.

Mr. GUNN: Why does this State spend a smaller percentage of its total funds on the Agriculture Department than is spent by any other State?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member must refer to a specific line, so his question is out of order.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Why is the total Miscellaneous figure of \$470 000 such a small percentage of the total Budget?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I am sorry, but the Minister cannot reply to such a question, because we are dealing with specific lines.

Mr. RUSSACK: In a recent reply the Treasurer said that subsidies paid to country show societies in 1973-74 totalled \$22 154 and that payments by way of grants for the same period amounted to \$4 800. These figures total the amount of \$26 954 that was actually paid last year to country agricultural and horticultural and field trial societies. Can the Minister say to whom the \$4 800 was made available and for what purpose?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I told the honourable member the other evening that I would obtain this information for him.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I refer to the line "Noxious Insects—Reimbursement to District Councils", for which \$205 000 has been allocated compared to actual payments of \$4 554 in 1973-74. I understand that a plague could occur within the next month and that the Minister has applied to the Army for the use of helicopters, light aircraft and vehicles to help deal with it. Will the Minister say how much money has already been spent on insecticides? I understand that difficulty is being experienced in obtaining sufficient insecticides and, indeed, that they cannot be obtained from England?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I suppose that, if the insecticides could not be obtained, the money could not be spent. Perhaps I should get my departmental officers to telephone the honourable member to see if they can obtain the information from him!

Line passed.

Environment and Conservation, \$3 374 000.

Mr. MATHWIN: I refer to the allocation of \$80 372 for the Executive Engineer and other staff of the Coast Protection Board. As the actual payment for 1973-74 was only \$39 455, I take it that the board's staff is to be increased?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister of Environment and Conservation): It is intended to provide an additional engineer and two engineering assistants to assist with the board's work. However, this does not comprise the board's total requirements, and other appointments will be made.

Mr. VENNING: I refer to the allocation of \$1 500 for the fees for members of the Coast Protection Board. Will the Minister give me details of this allocation?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: A wide range of people who are not public servants but who have expertise in engineering, foreshore matters, and so on, serve on this board and are paid a fixed fee for doing so. This allocation embraces the payment of such fees.

Mr. BECKER: I refer to the allocation of \$150 000 as a transfer to the Coast Protection Fund. To date, the fund has received about \$600 000, \$405 000 of which has been spent on foreshore protection and \$119 000 on repairs, and that expenditure has been appreciated in my district. I have received a report that sand is being dredged at North Haven and used as filling in the North Haven development project instead of to replenish the supply of sand on our beaches. I understand that Brighton beach is not in a good condition and that in parts of Henley Beach and at West Beach and Glenelg North the condition of the sand has deteriorated. It has also been reported that a lifesaving club may have to hold its annual carnival not at Henley Beach but at West Beach if the sand supply does not build up in the next few months. Will the Minister say whether the \$150 000 allocation will be used to cart sand from North Haven in a continuing programme of replenishing the sand on our beaches, or whether the sea is to be dredged where there are known resources of sand? Also, what plans does the board have regarding the restoration and protection of our beaches?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: This allocation is simply a transfer to the Coast Protection Fund and is not the total expenditure on coastal protection work; the total expenditure exceeds \$500 000. Sand is constantly being transferred to the beaches from near North Haven. I will have to ascertain from the board whether it is confident that a sufficient build-up of sand on our beaches will occur in the spring and early summer, and whether the board intends to cater for the type of problem to which the honourable member has referred.

Mr. EVANS: I refer to the line "Environmental, Administrative, Accounting, Supply, Clerical and General Staff", the allocation of \$296 812 for which is about \$120 000 more than the actual payments made last year. Expenditure on the line "Director of National Parks and Wildlife, Scientific, Administrative, Technical, Clerical and General Staff" shows an increase from \$571 342 spent to only \$677 207, or a percentage increase less than the increase in the general administration expenditure of the department. We have lacked sufficient rangers in the National Parks and Wildlife Service to look after our natural environment and the national parks. It is important that we increase the number of rangers to protect these areas, otherwise it will be a waste of time setting them aside if they are not protected. This further emphasises that the National Parks and Wildlife Service is a forgotten item in the allocation of money: it is not even keeping up with the inflationary trend as regards salaries. On improvements and general expenses incurred in normal operation and maintenance of national parks, \$307 496 was allocated last year, whereas \$319 496 was spent.

We are close to the budgetary figure, and one can see that we did not even keep up with the inflationary trend during the year. This year, only \$271 850 has been allocated. This is an area in which we should be taking a keener interest and at least keeping up with inflationary trends. However, this year's allocation shows that we are not keeping up with inflationary trends. I believe that the National Parks and Wildlife Service is most important. I draw a comparison between the arts and films, for which we doubled the allocation, whereas in this area we are not even keeping up with inflationary trends. Can the Minister explain his Government's lack of interest in this field?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I am grateful for the honourable member's support for the line the Government has taken. However, I point out that he is wrong when he says we have reduced our expenditure on improvements and general expenses incurred in normal operation and maintenance. About \$100 000 was spent last year on building maintenance and charges, whereas this year the work will be done by the Public Buildings Department. Accordingly, the sum must be increased by at least \$100 000 for expenditure we will incur under this line in the Public Buildings Department this year. If the honourable member applies his own mathematics he will see that we have provided for a substantial increase.

Regarding the staff of the National Parks and Wildlife Service, this year we will be providing additional staff, including one senior projects officer, to be involved in work associated with the development and management of our existing and future parks; one superintendent field operations officer; two scientific officers; and one senior ranger, all of whom will be included in this line. While it is true that that might not be the same kind of growth we will be having in the Environment and Conservation Department itself, we will be having a senior environmental officer and six environmental officers in that section. This year we have had to increase substantially

that section of our Environmental Division not only because of additional work but because we have been building up to our full strength. I point out that the Environmental Section is reasonably new compared to the more established National Parks and Wildlife Service.

Mr. VENNING: What are the activities of the Land Price Control Division? We have allocated \$44 855 this year, which is more than a 100 per cent increase on the \$20 696 spent last year.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: This substantial increase results from legislation that has only just been introduced. Last year's expenditure of \$20 696 was for only half the year's operations, whereas this year we must allow for a full year's operations.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I refer to the line covering contributions to environmental studies, for which \$1 500 has been allocated. Can the Minister say on what environmental studies the \$1 360 was spent last year? Obviously, \$1 500 would be a drop in the bucket in respect of studies to be undertaken on the Redcliff project. Has the department undertaken any study of note in connection with the Redcliff project? Another line shows a considerable grant to the Coast Protection Board, which involves itself in sand dune studies, etc. I see no line that caters for the important scientific activity in connection with the Redcliff project. I point out that the public must be reassured that the Spencer Gulf waters will not be affected and that the whole future of the prawn industry will not be jeopardised.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The general matters the honourable member has raised are not dealt with under these lines. The line to which he has referred is simply a standing requirement we normally meet in the Environment and Conservation Department. About \$600 was paid to an exploration group for the work it performed, and the rest of the sum is made up of a grant to the Adelaide University for an environmental study.

I draw the attention of the honourable member to the line dealing with environmental study consultant's fees, for which \$18 250 has been allocated; this deals marginally with the Redcliff activities. Some of the studies proposed this year with regard to the Redcliff oceanographic study include sea grasses and mangrove studies, but they are only fringe studies associated with the Redcliff project. I will provide the honourable member with a copy of a reply which I gave in another place two or three weeks ago and which listed the total studies now being undertaken by the Fisheries Department, the university, the Environment and Conservation Department, and others. The consortium has agreed to pay for those studies. So, the cost of the study lies where it ought to lie—in the hands of the consortium. I will provide the honourable member with a full list of all the studies currently being undertaken.

Mr. VENNING moved:

That progress be reported.

Motion negatived.

Mr. MATHWIN: The Minister will be aware that a recommendation has been made to the seaside councils committee that the coast should be policed, in some cases by a ranger in a boat. Will there be an inspector of this type, and is there any provision for the purchase of a boat? Further, is there provision for an overseas tour by the Minister or his officers, particularly to study coast protection? It is imperative for the Minister to go on such a study tour, because he would then receive first-hand information.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: No firm decision has been made in relation to policing the coast and in relation to the need for patrol vessels. These matters will be dealt

with as the year progresses. When decisions are made, any necessary approval will be sought for them. At this stage it is not intended that there should be special provision for overseas trips for the Executive Engineer and other members of the staff of the Coast Protection Board. The item to which the honourable member has referred relates to a proposed trip by an environment officer to examine environmental impact statement procedures. The Deputy Director of the State Planning Authority, who is overseas, will be conducting studies in this field. There are issues affecting the environment that I should examine overseas, and I hope that time can be made available as early as possible for me to do that, but no provision is made in this line for that purpose.

Mr. EVANS: Can the Minister say how many people were employed in the general section of his department and in the National Parks and Wildlife Section at the beginning of 1973-74 and at the end of 1973-74? Further, can the Minister say what is the expected increase in staff and what are the salary ranges?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I shall be pleased to provide that information.

Mr. BECKER: I refer to the provision of \$300 000 for a transfer to the Planning and Development Fund. Can the Minister say what role the State Planning Authority plays in the acquisition of historic buildings?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The provision relates to the purchase of open-space recreation areas: it does not relate to any activities in connection with historic buildings. That matter is currently under consideration, and the Government is considering the introduction of legislation in that connection.

Mr. MATHWIN: I refer to the provision for the purchase of motor vehicles for use by the State Planning Office. Last year actual payments in this connection amounted to \$5 691. The Minister previously said that motor vehicles were purchased cheaply because sales tax was not involved. Can the Minister give details of the purchase of motor vehicles, for which \$16 000 is provided?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I do not know how many vehicles are involved, but there is a procedure of which most members would be aware. Variations occur from year to year, depending on the age and mileage of the vehicles that have been used. I do not have the details at present, but probably an additional two vehicles are provided for.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: As the Minister promised the member for Kavel a list of all environmental studies undertaken in respect of the Redcliff project, I would appreciate a copy too. Regarding environmental studies and consultant fees, will the Minister make available a complete list showing all studies being carried out, what those studies are, the purpose of the studies, who is doing the work, and how much is being paid for each study?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I shall be happy to get that information.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I commend the work of the department on the Waterfall Gully restaurant. It now looks much better than it did 18 months ago. This is a tribute to John Downey, the proprietor, as well as to the department. However, there are certain deficiencies, and I do not believe the restaurant will be really good until these are overcome. Has an allocation been made for expenditure on chairs and tables for the restaurant? The existing furniture is totally inadequate.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The chairs and tables at the Waterfall Gully restaurant have been criticised from several quarters. I am aware that they do not fit in with

the general surrounds, and the matter is being considered by the departmental officer responsible for such matters. Doubtless, if funds are available, favourable consideration will be given to this matter.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I welcome the Minister of Development and Mines back to the House and I wonder where the Treasurer is at the moment, as his return to the Chamber was earlier promised by the Minister of Works, in his capacity as Deputy Premier.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: He is doing something that you should be doing—something useful.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MATHWIN: Regarding the Coast Protection Board and the purchase of plant and equipment for the board for \$2 500, what does this item entail?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: It is contemplated that a small boat with a trailer shall be purchased during this year for minor surveys.

Line passed.

Botanic Garden, \$617 000.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I take this opportunity to commend the Director of the Botanic Garden and members of his staff for their excellent work. I specifically refer to the estimated expenditure of \$15 000 on water and sewer rates. I am shocked that, although the allocation last year was only \$10 000, actual expenditure was over \$14 000. On what basis is the Botanic Garden charged for water, and does that amount include payment for excess water?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The charge is determined on the same basis normally applying to such projects. The substantial increase in the sum allocated results from the activity of the department in making new provisions for botanic parks at both Mount Lofty and Wittunga. These two new developing areas naturally require additional maintenance and additional water services.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I refer to the expenditure of \$473 060 on staff. The Minister said it was hoped to open Wittunga during the next 12 months and the Mount Lofty annex in about two years time. The allocation for salaries and wages shows only a small increase over the sum actually spent last year. The board is having great difficulty in engaging sufficient qualified staff to meet its commitments in opening both these new botanic gardens. These magnificent areas should be opened to the public as soon as possible, but the Government should realise the difficulty involved and, if possible, make available additional funds for the provision of extra staff and facilities as soon as possible at these places.

Line passed.

Fisheries, \$527 000.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): The Committee should know whether the amount actually paid for the item "Director of Fisheries Research" in 1973-74, namely, \$16 210, contained provision for higher duties performed, and also when it is likely that the position of Director of Fisheries will be filled. The Minister has given information, in reply to questions, that applications have been invited for this position several times by advertisement in other States and overseas.

I have had discussions with fishermen over a large area of the State, including the Deputy Premier's district, at Port Lincoln, and at other places. Mr. Olsen's name had to be submitted to Executive Council because the Government did not have a Director of Fisheries who could sign documents related to that position. That came about when Mr. Olsen was appointed Director of Fisheries Research. The

fishing industry respects Mr. Olsen. Many people in the industry will say that they hate the sight of him, but then they will say that he has helped the industry more than anyone else has helped it. They say that, whilst they have not always appreciated the way in which he has gone about his work, they want him.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: They want him and they don't want him!

Dr. EASTICK: They recognise that the devil they know often is better than the devil they do not know. I do not want to be disparaging of Mr. Olsen in any way, and I know that people in the industry, from the Far-West coast to the South-East, recognise what he has done for the industry and would like him to be Director of Fisheries. I should like information about the Government's intentions. The Government may be able to find a Director of Fisheries Research, whereas it has been unable to find a Director of Fisheries.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I think the position has been blackballed.

Dr. EASTICK: Some activities, not by the present Minister and not necessarily by any previous Minister (and there were several of them), may have created a situation that was well recognised around Australia, if not around the world. This important industry returns to the State more than \$15 000 000 a year, and the committee should have a clear and concise statement from the Minister about this vital issue.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I agree with the Leader's comments. I think I made clear during the past week the seriousness of the present position, with the non-appointment of a Director of Fisheries. This is causing the Government and me, as Minister, much concern. Developments that I cannot reveal at this stage have taken place since I replied to a question that I think the Leader asked during the past week. I expect to be able, within the next couple of weeks, to make an announcement that will clarify the position regarding the position of Director of Fisheries. Regarding the other part of the Leader's question, the Acting Director of Fisheries has received an allowance for higher duties during the period that he has been acting in this capacity.

Mr. RODDA: I refer to the provision for a transfer to the Fisheries Research and Development Fund. What is contemplated about research in the fishing industry? Production in that industry is worth more than \$14 500 000 to the State each year, and this amount could be increased with adequate research. People in the industry right around the coast have said that there should be what they term nomadic research points, and I think the Minister referred to this matter in a recent statement that specific research would be done in the South-East. Can the Minister tell the Committee what he has in mind for his department for this year in this regard?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I have the information with me but it is lengthy and almost every section of the fishing industry is covered either in a limited way or to a larger extent, and it would save time if I undertook to send the honourable member a list of the areas where we intend to do research.

Line passed.

Minister of Environment and Conservation, Miscellaneous, \$90 000.

Mr. CUMBE: About a year ago we established the City of Adelaide Development Committee, and the committee's term will expire in 1975. The operations of the committee extend into the North Adelaide part of my district, and those operations have had much influence on

development, particularly high-rise development and some public institutions in that area. While \$43 000 was provided last year, \$23 570 was spent, of which about \$21 500 represented salaries. This year, \$50 900 is to be provided. Can the Minister say why there is to be such a large increase? Are the activities of the committee to be greatly extended?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I understand the reason for the difference is that these lines broadly cover the amounts for consultants' studies undertaken during the past year. Some are to be undertaken during the forthcoming year, and no doubt it is a question of when the fees must be paid. During the year the consultants' fees were in relation to the implementation of the planning study by the Urban Systems Corporation, which was partly financed by the Adelaide City Council. We are also providing this year for the employment of consultants who will be required to provide advice in connection with appeals against decisions made by the committee. If that information is not correct, I will get more accurate information for the honourable member.

Mr. GUNN: In relation to the activities of the advisory committees on the prawn fishing industry and the rock lobster industry, will people who wish to have permits, or the conditions attaching to permits, varied be able to state their case before the committee?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The matter has been considered. The views of the Rock Lobster Advisory Committee, which met today, have been sought, but to date it would appear that the committee is not anxious for this development to take place. I shall keep the honourable member informed when decisions are made.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Why is \$8 000 provided for the tree planting support programme, when only \$883 was spent last year?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The full amount was not spent last year only because sufficient trees were not available for the programmes we wished to undertake. As a result of that experience, we have made early approaches to the nursery conducted by the Woods and Forests Department and other places for the number of trees required.

Mr. EVANS: What part do the people of South Australia play in contributing to the funds of the Australian Environmental Council, and what action will be taken by that council within this State? Was a greater allocation sought by the Keep South Australia Beautiful organisation, and why has that grant not been increased at a time when we should be concentrating on litter control? The trifling sum to be provided, which is less than any other State Government provides, does not even keep pace with the inflationary trend. The grant for the Nature Conservation Society of South Australia is the same as that given last year. Was an application received from the society for a greater allocation; why has the amount been kept so low? Did the South Australian Fly Fishers Association ask for a higher allocation, and why was it kept at the same figure as last year when the association is carrying out an active programme in stocking trout streams? Can the Minister obtain from his department information as to what trees were ordered last year, at what stage they were ordered, and from whom? It is hopeless to expect any nursery to provide \$5 000 worth of trees at short notice. The Woods and Forests Department nursery within the Belair Recreation Park has the capacity to produce all the trees the department requires if forward orders are placed. Where do the Government's priorities lie?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I am confident that, had we had firm guidelines and policies from our tree planting promotions committee at the beginning of last

year, we would have been able to order the trees in advance, because we would have known how we were going to use the tree planting allocation at that time. It has been difficult to establish to which organisations we should supply trees and ensure that they will be properly cared for. The tree-planting committee, which has been established, could not provide guidelines at the start of last year and still has not provided them, but hopes to do so before the end of this year. I will obtain information for the honourable member concerning his questions about requests made by organisations for funds. Generally, after inquiries, if no major alterations have occurred in the organisation's general activities, we provide the same amount that had been provided in previous years, and allocate other moneys to areas of higher priority.

Line passed.

Marine and Harbors, \$6 552 000—passed.

Minister of Marine, Miscellaneous, \$5 000.

Mr. COUMBE: For port sites, investigations, etc., \$5 000 has been allocated compared to actual payments last year of \$26 029. Can the Minister explain this difference?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Marine): I will obtain a report for the honourable member, because I am not sure of the details.

Line passed.

Transport, \$3 772 000.

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Minister give details of the \$2 714 actually paid last year for the overseas visit of the wife of the Minister?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport): It is payment for details stated in the line.

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Minister give information about the \$11 210 allocated for the purchase of motor vehicles for the Administration and Planning Division?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Vehicles were scheduled to be purchased last year but, as they were not purchased, provision has been made for the purchase this year.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The sum of \$100 000 has been allocated as a contribution towards transport research projects. Apparently, this amount is in addition to the \$600 000 provided for this purpose in the Loan Estimates. The Minister has previously referred to the development of an induction motor. Can he say what was the result of the expenditure on that project, whether money will be spent on it this year, and on what other research projects this allocation will be spent?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

Mr. BECKER: I refer to the allocation of \$342 968 for the Government Motor Garage. In June, 1974, the garage had 25 vehicles, 17 of which were allotted to Ministers and other members of Parliament. The fleet travelled a total of about 350 000 kilometres during the year, an average of 34 000 km a vehicle, which seems to be high. Will the Minister say who uses the other eight vehicles and whether consideration has been given to making Government cars available to ordinary members of Parliament who must attend certain special functions? Members who represent Ministers are provided with a car.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the honourable member ever has the distinction of representing a Minister at a function, I am sure he will be given the same treatment as any other member. If he would like me to give details of the distance travelled by each member provided with a Government vehicle, I should be pleased to do so. However, I warn him that the information may embarrass him, as the Leader of the Opposition's vehicle travels a great

distance, as does that of his counterpart in another place. If the honourable member wants that information published, it will not worry me.

Dr. Eastick: I have nothing to hide.

Mr. BECKER: The Minister has missed the point. The Government Motor Garage has 25 vehicles, 17 of which are allotted to Ministers and members of Parliament. I should like to know who uses the other eight vehicles.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: There must obviously be cars to pick up bits and pieces. Also, cars are used by the Public Works Standing Committee.

Mr. BECKER: Has consideration been given to ordinary members of Parliament using Government cars on special occasions?

Line passed.

Highways, \$11 883 000; Railways, \$70 530 000; Minister of Transport and Minister of Local Government, Miscellaneous, \$2 061 000; Community Welfare, \$14 111 000—passed.

Minister of Community Welfare, Miscellaneous, \$4 111 000.

Dr. EASTICK: I refer to the allocation of \$20 000 for research grants, which is exactly double the amount voted for 1973-74 and slightly more than double the actual payment of \$8 518 for that year. Will the Minister say how it is intended to spend this allocation, and what research was undertaken in 1973-74?

The Hon. L. J. KING (Minister of Community Welfare): This provision is for research carried out by the consultative councils in various areas. These councils are charged with the responsibility of conducting surveys in order to ascertain the welfare needs of certain areas and to make recommendations thereon. For that purpose, they need to have funds. The increased allocation this year is simply a reflection of the increased number and degree of activities of these consultative councils.

Mr. MATHWIN: I refer to the allocation of \$399 800 for sundry grants as recommended by the Community Welfare Grants Committee. Last year, the Boy Scouts Association received \$2 500, Daughters of Charity \$1 000, Elizabeth Counselling Centre \$5 600, Girl Guides Association \$2 500, Inter-Church Trade and Industry Mission \$3 000, International Social Service \$500, and the Marriage Guidance Council of South Australia \$21 600. Are those allocations still the same this year, or have they been increased?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Can't you read it?

Mr. MATHWIN: I cannot, because only the total allocation of \$399 800 is shown. It is surprising that this year the Government has decided not to detail the allocations to all these organisations but to lump the lot together, thereby making it as difficult as possible for members to see what is happening. If the allocations have been increased, I should like to know. The allocation to the Boy Scouts Association, the Girl Guides Association and the Daughters of Charity have remained static for many years. I ask the Attorney-General to consider that, when next year's Estimates are prepared, this section be given in the form in which it is usually given, to preclude me from asking this type of question.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The answer to the last part of the question is "No", because the system has been changed. The allocations were set out in detail in previous years because specific grants were made, by Cabinet decision, direct to the various organisations. The practice has now been adopted of having all applications for community grants handled by the Community Grants Advisory Committee, which considers the overall needs of the community and the funds available, and allocates them according to

need. The general directions which the committee has is that, of the sum of \$399 800, \$55 000 is for children's institutions for capital subsidies, \$104 800 covers the grants previously itemised, and \$240 000 is for subsidies and grants to community and youth facilities to be recommended by the committee. I am unable to say whether any of the organisations to which the honourable member has referred will receive increased grants in the current year. They are entitled to apply to the committee for special funds over and above the sum they have been accustomed to receiving and the committee will study the case made out, the overall needs and priorities, and recommend to me as Minister accordingly.

Mr. EVANS: Can the Attorney-General say in what areas the contribution of \$200 000 towards administration and maintenance of Aboriginal housing will be used? We allocated \$214 900 to the Aboriginal Lands Trust last year, whereas only \$51 700 was spent; this year, we are allocating \$30 000. Has the Commonwealth Government taken over some of this responsibility?

The Hon. L. J. KING: Regarding the \$200 000 allocation, I was somewhat surprised to find this on my lines in the Community Welfare Department, but the Treasury always knows best. An agreement exists with the Commonwealth Government, with regard to Commonwealth-funded houses for Aborigines, that 40 per cent of the rental collected is applied to maintenance and 60 per cent is applied towards funding the construction of additional houses. Under current conditions it is estimated that the 40 per cent will fall \$200 000 short of the actual maintenance cost of those houses. Therefore, the sum of \$200 000 will be made up out of general funds towards the maintenance of these houses. The housing arrangements themselves have been taken over by the Housing Trust. The difference between the 40 per cent we are allowed to recoup under the agreement from rents and what the trust must pay out is regarded by Treasury as a debit against the line for the Minister of Community Welfare; hence, \$200 000 appears on this line.

The reason for the marked reduction in the sum allocated to the Aboriginal Lands Trust is that prior to last year the trust was engaged in actual operations in a substantial way, principally at Point Pearce. A substantial sum of State money went into the development of the Point Pearce project. The farming and other operations at Point Pearce were conducted by the trust, which has gradually divested itself, as a matter of policy, of its operating functions and has entered into agreements with the local communities, in the various reserves the land of which it owns, for the Aborigines to carry on the actual operations as a local operation, the trust confining itself to the ownership of the land and to acting as trustee owner of the land for the benefit of the Aboriginal people as a whole. The trust's only need for funds now is for administrative expenses, which are estimated at \$30 000 this year.

Mr. EVANS: How many houses would be involved in the contribution towards administration and maintenance of housing, for which \$200 000 has been allocated? Do we have to find an extra \$200 000 (over the 40 per cent) because the houses are not looked after perhaps as they would be in normal tenancy circumstances, and is the trust experiencing a greater incidence of damage than originally expected? Will the Minister obtain that information for me?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will obtain the information regarding the number of houses. True, the maintenance costs on houses of this type are much higher than those on

normal rental houses, because Commonwealth-funded houses are designed to be let to Aborigines who do not qualify for the ordinary trust rental houses because they do not measure up to the standard tenancy requirements. With these Commonwealth-funded houses we are trying to cater for the Aboriginal family in a transition stage that has not yet reached the standard required by the trust for the normal tenant as regards experience and ability to care for houses, and so on. Consequently, a welfare component is contained in the expenditure on these houses, which deteriorate more quickly than do other houses.

Mr. RUSSACK: Can the Attorney-General say whether any consideration has been given to homes for the aged? I am Chairman of a board of homes for the aged that has seven self-contained units. The occupants of most of the seven units would hold medical entitlement cards. Has any consideration been given to assistance by way of reductions in land tax and rates for such people or for the organisations that house them?

[Midnight]

The Hon. L. J. KING: I assume that in the case to which the honourable member referred the ownership of the property and the liability for taxes rest with the organisation, not with the individual pensioner. In that case it does not fall under the scheme at all. Under the scheme, a pensioner holding a medical entitlement card pays less in rates and taxes than do other people, but it does not apply to an organisation.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I was not satisfied with the Minister's reply to the question asked by the member for Glenelg about sundry grants as recommended by the Community Welfare Grants Committee. The honourable member asked for more details of the grants to the organisations, and the Minister replied that, because these grants were now being decided, the details could not be provided in the Budget papers. I would think that decisions on the grants would have been made prior to fixing the provision at \$399 800. The same sort of argument applies to grants for the performing arts. Is the Minister saying that this sort of detail will not be available in the Budget papers in future? If that is the case, something is amiss.

The Hon. L. J. KING: Of course the detail will not appear in the Budget papers in future, for the reason I gave earlier. The new system is that the funds are voted to be paid out on the recommendation of the Community Welfare Grants Committee, which will make its decisions during this year. Because the decisions have not yet been made, the list of grants cannot be put in the Budget papers. Applications will be considered as they come in, and recommendations will be made from time to time during the year by the committee. It would be possible to provide in the Budget papers details of the grants made in the previous financial year, but it is impossible to anticipate what the amounts will be in the current financial year. The committee will look at the overall needs of the community. So, it is inherent in the system that we cannot see at the beginning of a financial year the detailed amounts that will be provided during that year.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: That is not the position as I understand it. Grants made to the performing arts—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! We are dealing with community welfare grants.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It is in the same general area. How can the Minister fix the figure of \$399 800 if he does not know where it will go? It is perfectly obvious that some of the organisations that have been listed in the past

will receive either the same grants or increased grants; or they may receive no grants, but that is highly unlikely. The Minister is saying that the grants to the organisations cannot be determined in advance; that is incredible.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The needs in the community are so great that the figure provided is the maximum figure that the Government can make available in the area, and it falls far short of the funds that we would like to have to meet the needs of organisations that do excellent welfare work.

Dr. Eastick: What about the squeeze on Mr. and Mrs. Average?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I think Mr. and Mrs. Average are a good deal more generous in their outlook than is the Leader. They do not mind paying taxes to meet welfare needs. I make no apology whatever for hard revenue decisions taken by the Government to meet the situation of needy people and to provide to organisations the funds that they so badly need. If the Leader of the Opposition takes the view that Mr. and Mrs. Average should not be asked to provide the funds for that purpose, let him say so publicly. He should not make snide interjections about squeezing Mr. and Mrs. Average for welfare purposes.

Dr. EASTICK: It seems that the Minister has misinterpreted the question and the comment made from this side.

The Hon. L. J. King: What did it mean if it did not mean what I thought it meant?

Dr. EASTICK: I took it that the Minister was talking about the extraction of funds from the public for the whole of the Government's programme. He has tried to imply that the statement I made related only to a reduction in funds in the area of need.

The Hon. L. J. King: I was talking about this sum of money.

Dr. EASTICK: If the Minister had been here last Thursday, he would have heard me say that \$32 000 is to be spent on a junket to open part of the festival centre complex.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Acting Chairman.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: There is no need for the honourable Minister to take a point of order. I rule the Leader out of order.

Dr. EASTICK: It becomes a matter of distribution of priorities. I am asked to indicate how, as a responsible Leader of a Party, I would apportion funds for needy persons. I would apportion them by making certain that the areas in which I directed the total funds available were going to provide the greatest benefit to the people who needed it. I do not believe it necessary to wine and dine people at several openings.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Minister give the information he was going to give me about the advisory committee?

The Hon. L. J. KING: Although I have provided this information to the member for Glenelg, I will repeat it for the member for Kavel. The general directions to the Community Grants Advisory Committee are as follows: children's institutions, capital subsidy, \$55 000; grants to organisations, \$104 800; and subsidies and grants to community and youth facilities (at the same level as 1973-74), \$240 000; total \$399 800.

Line passed.

Tourism, Recreation and Sport, \$1 371 000.

Mr. EVANS: Concerning the operating expenses, minor equipment and sundries at Ayers House, can the Minister of Tourism say whether any of the operating expenses incurred by the State relate directly to the part of the

premises run by private enterprise? Will the Minister bring down a report on the rental received by the department from that building for the financial year ended 1973-74?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister of Tourism): This line relates to the operating expenses of Ayers House, including rates, taxes and other expenses, and involves the National Trust and other users of the property. As I do not have the other information the honourable member seeks, I will see whether it is available and provide it for him.

Mr. MATHWIN: The amount allocated for subsidies towards swimming pools is only \$6 941. The swimming pool to be constructed at Marion will require a much greater subsidy than this sum, and I understand another swimming pool is to be constructed adjacent to the State centre of the Surf Life Saving Association. Both those projects require an allocation greater than the sum provided here. How is this allocation to be spent? Schools have been encouraged by the Minister of Education and his department to construct one large pool available for use by students and the community generally, rather than provide a small pool for each school. As I did not see a line dealing with this in the Education Department estimates, are these projects to be dealt with in this way?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Before the Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department was established, subsidies for swimming pools were made through the Education Department. The item under this department is required for final payments on projects approved under the Education Department during the year. Provision is here made for final payments during 1974-75 of \$5 636 to the Naracoorte District Council for a swimming-lake project, and \$1 305 to the Le Hunte District Council for the Minnipa pool. The subsidies formerly provided by the Education Department will now be provided through this department. The amount of subsidy will be increased to \$120 000 with the objective of constructing full-size swimming pools in as many council areas as possible for school and community use, thereby avoiding the proliferation of many smaller pools. Several projects have been approved. The Marion project is not shown here, because such proposals are undertaken on a three-way basis, with the local council, the State Government, and the Commonwealth Government each paying one-third. The Marion project involves more than just a swimming pool, as it includes a gymnasium, table tennis facilities and club-rooms.

Mr. EVANS: In regard to advertising the State, will the Minister obtain for me the number of films produced for this purpose, the cost to the Tourist Bureau of advertising the films, the cost to any other department, and the cost of the films to the Film Corporation where films were let out under contract by the Film Corporation? Regarding the amount of \$2 000 provided to the National Trust for maintenance, I ask the Minister whether the trust asked for a larger amount and, if it did, how much was requested.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I cannot give the details regarding the provision for advertising the State. This comes under the Treasurer's portfolio, and the honourable member may care to ask him about the general activities of the Film Corporation. Regarding the Tourist Bureau, we have produced many publications, and these have been updated. As they become available, they can be placed in the Parliamentary Library. In addition, four excellent films were made. I will obtain for the honourable

member the cost of the films, two of which were sold commercially and shown as feature films throughout Australia. I am referring to films dealing with the Barossa Valley and Kangaroo Island. The films attracted large Australian audiences, and our costs have been reduced in this way. We hope that the films can be sold overseas. The cost of maintenance work for the National Trust has been offset largely because of arrangements regarding the national estate and the new principle that the Australian Government has of providing assistance in this regard.

Dr. EASTICK: I realise that details of last year's expenditure of about \$99 000 as subsidies towards the development of tourist resorts cannot be given this evening, but I would appreciate receiving that information from the Minister. I also ask whether the \$132 195 provided this year involves forward commitment, or whether it is an allocation to be made in whole or in part after the passage of this Bill. I expect that in several departments forward planning allows organisations to proceed on the basis that they will receive the money. Further, it would be of value to know the breadth of the definition of "tourist resorts" in relation to this item. Many people who apply for funds for tourist activities are confused at present.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I will give the Leader a list of the projects that we have approved. We have a continuing programme of projects submitted by councils for assistance. As soon as the allocation to the department was made clear, we immediately considered that programme in relation to priorities for expenditure this year. I have approved expenditure on projects this year, and in some cases we have told the councils concerned. The major expenditure in this field will be directed generally towards upgrading and providing caravan parks.

Mr. EVANS: I ask the Minister to give me information about the price at which the films to which he has referred were sold, and also about whether there is any recurring income in the way of royalty and whether the Film Corporation or the department will retain any copyrights. I also ask whether any grants for recreation and sport will be made this year.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The films that have been let for commercial viewing are still the property of the Tourist Bureau and can be shown, but conditions are associated with them while they are being shown commercially. I will get the information that the honourable member has asked for about costs. The expenditure on general recreation activities to which I referred earlier is subject to the amounts announced last evening in the Commonwealth Budget. When the Commonwealth Government indicates what the State's share will be, we will be able to determine expenditure in this field. Expenditure will depend on the State's allocation, and I do not think this will be known for a month or two.

Mr. BECKER: Is the salary paid to the Director of the South Australian Government Tourist Bureau commensurate with salaries paid to directors in other States? Is the Director satisfied with the share of the tourist trade being obtained by the bureau? The Savings Bank of South Australia has established a travel department and has appointed Thomas Cook and Sons as its agent. Why is the South Australian Tourist Bureau not appointed as agent for the State Bank? Why are we not getting a larger percentage of bookings through the Sydney and Melbourne branches of the bureau? Will the Minister consider the two State banks acting as agents for the bureau?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I am not competent to answer the question on wage relativity, but the salary range of the Director is the same as the range applying

to the Director of the National Parks and Wildlife Service, the Director of Fisheries, and other similar categories. At the same time, it should be appreciated that the Director of the South Australian Government Tourist Bureau is under the jurisdiction of the Director of the Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department. It is the province of the Public Service Board to fix the salaries. We have been pleasantly surprised by the additional business that has resulted since the bureau moved to the new building. At times, we have been embarrassed by the upsurge in activity. Accordingly, additional staff is to be provided. The activities of the Melbourne and Sydney offices have increased. Apart from the actual volume of business, the promotion of South Australia is of tremendous benefit.

Mr. MATHWIN: A sum of \$132 195 is to be provided as a subsidy towards the development of tourist resorts. Can the Minister say what is involved in this expenditure?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: It is mainly concerned with caravan parks.

Line passed.

Minister of Tourism and Minister of Recreation and Sport, Miscellaneous, \$124 000.

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister give details of what is involved in the line relating to the Surf Life Saving Association of South Australia?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: This involves a grant direct to the State centre that was previously paid under the line for the Minister of Education. It has been increased from \$11 000 last year to \$14 000 this year. The possible establishment of a new centre in the West Lakes area is an issue associated with a proposal at present being considered. It is still in the early stages and has been discussed with the department in relation to a grant as a joint Commonwealth, State, and local community project. I do not think it would require finance in the forthcoming year; probably it would be formally proposed this year and funded next year.

Line passed.

Hospitals, \$90 345 000.

Mr. CUMBE: Can the Attorney-General give further information on the allocation of \$570 000 for domiciliary care staff?

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): This amount provides \$468 000 for existing staff and \$102 000 for development, but I cannot give the honourable member details of the number of staff.

Mr. CUMBE: Can the Attorney-General give a time table of how the Flinders Medical Centre will engage professional staff, and when some sections of the hospital will be functioning? Also, for what purpose will Ru Rua Nursing Home be used in future?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I cannot give the honourable member details of the time table for Flinders Medical Centre, and I have no information about the use to which Ru Rua Nursing Home is to be put, but I will obtain these details for the honourable member.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Can the Attorney-General indicate staff changes at Glenside Hospital expected during this financial year?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will obtain this information for the honourable member.

Mr. RUSSACK: How will the \$40 000 for the purchase of machinery and equipment at the Wallaroo Hospital be spent?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will obtain particulars for the honourable member.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Has the increased allocation to the Port Adelaide Venereal Disease Clinic been caused by the increase in the incidence of this disease?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will obtain that information for the honourable member.

Line passed.

Public Health, \$4 297 000—passed.

Chemistry, \$554 000.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Is it intended to phase out the Chemistry Department, and is there any likelihood of its operations decreasing during the present financial year?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will refer the matter to my colleague.

Line passed.

Minister of Health, Miscellaneous, \$16 075 000—passed.

Schedule passed.

Clauses 1 to 8 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 12.54 a.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, September 19, at 2 p.m.