HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, October 9, 1974

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

QUESTIONS

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

ABATTOIRS

In reply to Mr. CHAPMAN (October 2).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The South Australian Meat Corporation, which operates and controls the Gepps Cross abattoir, is a statutory body, and is therefore autonomous. Consequently, Government policy is not involved in decisions by the corporation on capital works to be undertaken at the establishment. Undoubtedly, any such projects would be embarked on by the board only after a full investigation and evaluation of their economics. The Minister of Agriculture states that the honourable member's description of the Gepps Cross works is incorrect and completely unwarranted. He advises me that, overall, the charges at Gepps Cross compare favourably to those now applying in similar establishments in other States.

LAND VALUATIONS

In reply to Mr. RUSSACK (August 7).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: In 1970, the Land Tax Act was amended by section 12 (4) to provide rebates of tax for primary-production land. These rebates were originally designed to off-set the high amounts of tax that would have been payable as a result of the quinquennial assessment made under the former provisions of the Land Tax Act, which required the whole of the State to be valued as at July 1, 1970. They were retained notwithstanding that the 1970 assessment, in so far as it related to primary-production land, was discarded and replaced by a new assessment made as of June 30, 1971, because of a fall in the level of rural land values that became evident after the original assessment was made. The Government is looking at the matter of recent values of unimproved land for land tax purposes. However, it is not expected that any action will be possible to amend the tax scale in respect of tax payable during the present financial year.

STUDENT IDENTIFICATION

In reply to Mr. MATHWIN (September 26).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member's suggestion for the provision of an identity card for students of secondary schools is believed to be worthy of further examination, and my officers will therefore proceed to do this. I shall be pleased to keep the honourable member informed of progress that is made.

HIGHBURY PRIMARY SCHOOL

In reply to Mrs. BYRNE (September 24).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: At least one conference and several other contacts have been made with the Tea Tree Gully council concerning this project. Sketch plans have been produced by the Public Buildings Department, and discussion has been carried out between that department and the Education Department. The Highbury Primary School Head has been told that the project has been approved in principle, but that it has not been possible to include it in the list of major capital works for this year or next year. Because of this, further planning is not proceeding at this stage.

LIQUOR GLASSES

In reply to Mr. SLATER (September 18).

In reply to Mr. BECKER (September 24).

The Hon. L. J. KING: The food and drugs regulations provide that a person may request that he be provided with a clean glass for each drink, or when a glass previously used by him is not refilled within his sight he shall be given a clean glass. The regulation dealing with cleansing of glasses and the provision of a clean glass where it is not refilled in the presence of the consumer was gazetted in August, 1961. At that time it was considered to be an improvement on conditions then existing. Representation has been made by various persons for the introduction of a regulation requiring a clean glass for every drink, similar to that existing in the Eastern States. A report is being prepared by the Public Health Department after which the matter will be referred to the Food and Drugs Advisory Committee for consideration.

RADIATION

In reply to Mr. DUNCAN (September 18).

The Hon. L. J. KING: Radiation levels in various foods in South Australia are monitored by the National Radiation Laboratory of the Australian Government whenever there is a possibility of fresh fission products in fall-out from nuclear testing. The results of the monitoring are collated in Melbourne and made available to the Prime Minister. There is an agreement between Commonwealth and State Governments that, in the event of hazardous levels of radiation in food being detected, the State authorities will be notified. There has been no such notification following the recent French nuclear tests. Furthermore, direct inquiries have revealed that radiation levels in foods have been very low.

The Engineering and Water Supply Department monitors radiation levels in rain and drinking water in South Australia. The maximum levels of radiation recorded in rainwater tanks and reservoirs in the 12 months period ending September 25, 1974, were respectively 125 and 24·9 *pico curies* a litre. Radiation sickness is not a notifiable disease in South Australia. It occurs only after exposure to levels of radiation very much greater than those occurring in Australia caused by fall-out from nuclear tests in the Pacific Ocean.

AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

Dr. EASTICK: With the announcement that the Leyland organisation is expected to close, can the Premier say what effect this will have on suppliers of component parts; are any national suppliers, for example, of shock absorbers and safety equipment, likely to be affected in this State; what effect will a down-turn of production of parts have on the cost of components which will be required for the surviving manufacturers; and does the Premier see any danger to the work force in South Australia, particularly at Elizabeth, from the increasing production of General Motors-Holden's engines in Korea, of transmissions in the Philippines, and of components in the recently opened factory in Singapore? The close-down of Leyland will mean that there will be a reduction in the request or requirement for component parts, some of which are common to several makes of motor vehicle and some of which, if not exactly common, have a production line undertaking that allows greater efficiency of production and, therefore, a greater economy in the production of those components, which economy is then shared by various manufacturers. Again, the situation that several component and production sources are developing in South-East Asia for those vehicles

that hitherto have been manufactured totally in Australia causes, I believe, grave concern to anyone who has the motor vehicle industry at heart. On this basis, I ask the series of questions that I have put to the Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Investigations by the working party are proceeding into the effects on the componentary industry and the motor industry generally of changes in the tariff level, and also the possible effects of the recommendations, if they were to be adopted, in the Industries Assistance Commission report. I have not received the report and, consequently, I cannot, off the top of my head, give the Leader details about the matter. However, I expect the report to be completed soon, and I will get a complete reply for him.

ALBERTON OVAL

Mr. OLSON: Will the Minister of Local Government say whether the Government intends to introduce legislation to allow Port Adelaide Football Club to use Alberton Oval during the 1975 football season? As the Minister will recall, recently I introduced to him a deputation from the club regarding the future use of Alberton Oval.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: My officers are currently considering the proposition that has been put forward that legislation be enacted to ensure that league football will continue to be played on Alberton Oval in future years, as it has been played there for much longer than 100 years. Unfortunately, there are problems in the present arrangements. I thought those problems had been solved last year when, with the authority of the Port Adelaide council, the Town Clerk signed a letter agreeing to the terms and conditions that had been arrived at by consultation, subject to certain qualifications. The club acknowledged those qualifications, and I think it could be claimed that an exchange of letters (I think last October or November) finalised the arrangement for the continuation of football there. Unfortunately, it seems from information given to me that the Port Adelaide council has repudiated the undertaking that the Town Clerk gave on its behalf, and the net result of this was discussed at a deputation that the member for Semaphore introduced. Indeed, you, Mr. Speaker, as a member for the area, were also involved. Following this deputation, I had a further discussion in my office with the Town Clerk and the Mayor, and I urged that the Town Clerk, as the responsible chief administrative officer of the Port Adelaide council, should meet a representative of the South Australian National Football League. I was willing to offer the services of the Secretary for Local Government (Mr. Hockridge) as an arbiter to convene these discussions and solve the problems that were apparent then, so as to try to ensure that league football continued to be played on that oval. In my office, the Mayor agreed to this.

Unfortunately, it now appears that the council will repudiate the Mayor. Although I am informed that the council met last Monday, it then deferred consideration of the matter until tomorrow evening, when it will have a further meeting. Notwithstanding that he is on leave, the Town Clerk has said that he will be available for discussions until the coming weekend, when he is going away. I very much regret that apparently much time has been wasted on the matter, with no solution to the problem being found. I gravely fear that the league may be forced into the position of having to programme matches for 1975, leaving Alberton Oval out of consideration. As I believe that all football-loving people would regret such a situation, I only hope that a little common sense will prevail. Regarding the honourable member's question, although it would be difficult for us to introduce legislation on the matter, we are certainly looking at the possibility of doing so, for we strongly believe that the people of South Australia want and deserve to have league football played at Alberton Oval.

PETROLEUM EXPLORATION

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Minister of Development and Mines say what steps, if any, the Government intends to take to increase the level of petroleum exploration in South Australia? In the annual report of the Mines Department, which the Minister tabled in the House yesterday, it was stated that petroleum exploration had dropped by about $11 600 000 last year. It was further stated that this position was caused to some extent by uncertainty in the industry as a result of the Commonwealth Government's policies, which had caused a down-turn in petroleum exploration. As this is a dramatic down-turn, what action does the Government intend to take to restore confidence in the industry? Will it take action itself, or will it make representations to the Commonwealth Minister for Minerals and Energy (Mr. Connor) on behalf of the South Australian people?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I guess that the major step has already been taken with regard to the negotiation for a new exploration agreement with the Cooper Basin partners. This information has previously been given to the House. Honourable members will know that, under the previous agreement, the requirements on the Cooper Basin partners were extremely nominal. Under the new agreement, a much higher level of expenditure will be required of them—$15 000 000 over five years. Regarding the resources that we have, the Cooper Basin partners are our major interest. True, we would like to see a stepping up of activity in the offshore tenements. Over the last couple of weeks, I have had discussions with interested people about continuing activity on those tenements and taking up additional tenements; that is an on-going problem. It is a matter of assuring these people of assistance and our support, and also of negotiation with the Commonwealth Government; this is proceeding. Regarding onshore exploration, the major area of our concern is Cooper Basin and the further proving of resources there, as well as the exploration of additional resources in the adjoining Pedirka and Officer Basins. As I have outlined to the House before, we have been able to secure this agreement from the present partners for a higher level of exploration. We trust that this expression of confidence by those partners, along with the assurances we have given them, will attract other people as well to take up tenements. The only other matter is that any such project could be wrecked if there was a continuation of the sort of meteorological conditions experienced in the centre during the past 12 months.

TEACHER RETIREMENT

Mr. VENNING: Does the Minister of Education believe that, after teachers reach retirement age and continue to teach, the continued service should be considered for long service leave purposes? I have been contacted by a female teacher who has taught continuously for 14 years but is credited with teaching for only nine years because she continued to teach, after reaching 60 years of age, until she was 65 years of age. She has been told that she does not qualify for long service leave and believes that that decision is unjust. As it seems that long service leave provisions for teachers are not in line with those applying in the Public Service, I ask the Minister to consider this type of situation.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If the honourable member will give me details of the case to which he refers, I shall be pleased to look into the matter for him.

WHEAT QUOTAS

Mr. RODDA: Will the Acting Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Agriculture, discuss with his colleague the transfer of wheat quotas for those people who have been displaced by the decision to develop the new town of Monarto? Of the several landholders who have transferred to my district (I understand there is an even more glaring case of a landholder transferring to the District of Mallee) some have been able to purchase land to which a small quota applies but, on new properties purchased in the South-East, people are disadvantaged in their traditional role as wheatgrowers by not being able to take their wheat quotas with them and therefore cannot continue as wheatgrowers. I know that quotas have been lifted this year and that that situation will apply for some time; however, as this problem is hanging over their heads, I believe the matter should be investigated.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will consult with my colleague and bring down a reply as soon as possible.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say how many of the 11 187 known unemployed people in South Australia have applied for retraining? Unemployment is at its highest level for the past 30 years, and this state of affairs has been caused because of the bad management and the tariff policies of the Australian Government—

Mr. Wells: Question!

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's leave is withdrawn. The honourable Minister of Labour and Industry.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I understood that the honourable member was more or less referring to unemployment, but he did mention retraining in his early remarks. I will have to obtain a report on that matter, because I have no information regarding how many people may have applied hitherto. The additional number of registered unemployed in South Australia during September was 336, of whom only five were adult males. The total number of registered unemployed increased to 10 813, or 1·96 per cent of the work force. I point out that the rate of unemployment compares favourably with the national average of 2·4 per cent, and that it was well below the 3·15 per cent in December, 1972, when the Australian Labor Party won Government.

Mr. Mathwin: It's the worst for 30 years.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: So, we are in a much better position than under the Liberal Government in 1972.

Mr. Mathwin: What about retraining?

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

RUNDLE STREET MALL

Dr. TONKIN: When does the Premier expect that the Commonwealth Government will notify his Government that the conversion of Rundle Street into a pedestrian mall may proceed? It has been advocated for years that Rundle Street become a pedestrian mall. The proposal was announced originally at the time of the last election, although I recall that, when it was announced, it related to environmental studies and studies into carbon monoxide pollution. As approval has now been obtained from the Rundle Street traders and the Adelaide City Council, everything is ready to go: all we are waiting for, I understand, is $1 500 000, one-third of which is to come from the Commonwealth Government. As the Commonwealth Government sees fit not to give us the moneys we need for our own purposes, and as we now depend on its approval for this project to proceed, can the Premier say when the Commonwealth Government is likely to give permission to proceed with this local issue?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not expect the Commonwealth Government to say any such thing to the State Government.

Dr. Tonkin: Why doesn't it go ahead, then?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member is trying to be clever, as usual. He knows perfectly well that no question of permission to proceed with the mall has been raised by either the State Government or the City Council, as far as the Commonwealth is concerned. There is no question of permission or otherwise.

Dr. Tonkin: What about—

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member has made a deliberate implication in his statement that we must apply to the Commonwealth Government for permission to proceed with the mall, and he knows that that is untrue.

Mr. Mathwin: Rubbish! Why the heck don't you get on with it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member will keep quiet for a moment I will reply to the question: namely, when will the Commonwealth Government give permission? The reply is that it will not give permission, because permission is not required.

Mr. Venning: Would you—

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

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member's question were honestly, sincerely and properly, "When will the Commonwealth Government reply to an application for finance toward the mall?" the reply would be "I hope soon."

Mr. Goldsworthy: You've been living in hopes for a long time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member does not want us to get any Commonwealth Government money—

Mr. Gunn: You can't get out of it like that.

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

Mr. Goldsworthy: You can't get blood out of a stone.

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

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If Opposition members continue with the kind of childish interjection they have been making, they cannot expect a serious reply to the question. It is the policy of the Government to proceed with the mall in Rundle Street. The policy was announced in the last election speech and it was not connected with carbon monoxide studies, because they were published after the announcement about the mall. If the honourable member did his homework he would know that. It is an announced policy of the Government but, as in other matters, the Government has been trying to obtain the major consensus in relation to its policy before implementation. We have been working hard at this with the City of Adelaide Development Committee and with the Adelaide City Council.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: And very sucessfully, too.

The SPEAKER: Order! Standing Orders apply to the Minister.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government intends to proceed with its policy. Naturally enough, we are determined to do the best job possible by the State in relation to the financing of that policy.

Dr. Tonkin: Will it proceed without Commonwealth aid?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member must know how silly that question is.

Dr. Tonkin: I want to know.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Does the honourable member expect me to get up here and say that I will finance this whether or not I get Commonwealth help, and then expect the Commonwealth Government to help? The honourable member knows perfectly well that all he is doing is trying to play politics, and nothing else.

DISTRICT BOUNDARIES

Mr. KENEALLY: Can the Attorney-General say whether there is to be a redistribution of House of Assembly districts before the next election? My question is prompted by an advertisement in the *Advertiser* of Saturday, October 5, wherein a political Party in South Australia calls for nominations for House of Assembly seats which include the District of Sturt. As there is no House of Assembly district of Sturt at present, I wonder whether a political Party has inside information of Government intentions and whether we are to have a redistribution that will include such a district.

The Hon. L. J. KING: No. I saw the advertisement and I wondered where the House of Assembly district of Sturt might be. I thought for a moment it might have had some relationship to the district which I have the honour to represent, but on closer examination I could see no suggestion that the District of Coles had ever been called Sturt and, indeed, there is no proposal for it to be called Sturt. There are no plans for redistribution.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT

Mr. BLACKER: Can the Minister of Transport state the terms of reference and conditions set down by the Road Traffic Board for the granting of exemption of primary producers' vehicles from the provisions of the gross vehicle weight and gross combination weight classes of the Road Traffic Act? The provisions of the Road Traffic Act concerned with gross vehicle weight and gross combination weight become operative on January 1, 1975, and primary producers are wondering what will be the requirements of the Road Traffic Board.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am not aware of any terms and conditions laid down, other than those written into the legislation, which call on the Road Traffic Board to grant exemptions where, in its opinion, an exemption should be granted. I know that the board is considering the matter currently in an attempt to get a reasonable approach to this question. I think the people concerned will need much understanding of the total problem to appreciate what will happen. I think I made the point during the debate on the legislation that what might apply in one area would not necessarily apply in another. In the honourable member's district of Port Lincoln, I think the Road Traffic Board would be loath to grant permission for a grossly over-weight vehicle coming down the extremely steep hill from Cummins. Of course, that situation would not have the same application at Port Giles, in the district of the member for Goyder, where the land is fairly flat. However, no terms of reference have been laid down: it is merely a matter of administration by the Road Traffic Board. I do not doubt that the board will administer it as efficiently as it has administered other areas that have been entrusted to it.

SUPERMARKET STAFF

Mr. WELLS: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry investigate allegations that certain supermarkets are making female staff redundant? I have been told that certain supermarkets are retrenching female staff because they are now required to pay to the female staff the full adult male rate. I have been told that, as restrictions are placed on the weight that females in any industry are permitted to lift, supermarkets consider that, because the full adult male rate must be paid, they will dispense with the services of some female assistants and replace them with male assistants who will be required to do much heavier work.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I will have the matter examined to find out what can be done for the honourable member.

RIVER FLOODING

Mr. BOUNDY: Will the Minister of Education, as Acting Minister of Works, make a full and public statement regarding the causes of the flash flooding that occurred in the Virginia and Two Wells area last Friday and Saturday, and will he say how many floodgates on the South Para reservoir were opened, when they were opened, and for how long they were open? Also, will the Minister consider further deferring interest payments by growers in that area who have been affected by both the hail damage last year and the recent flooding? It seems that residents and growers in Virginia are still not convinced by the reasons that have been given for the flooding that occurred last Friday and Saturday. They want an inquiry into the matter and they want a full explanation of the facts surrounding it printed in the various local newspapers. Extreme hardship is involved for some people who have been affected by both hail and flood, and I have received representations from constituents who consider that there is a valid case for assistance in these circumstances.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will take up the matter of deferment of interest payments with the Minister of Lands, seeking his views on it. Regarding the flooding and its causes, I thought a full report had been given on this matter yesterday. The position is clear that a flood occurred because of the flooding of the North Para River, and that was entirely outside the control of the Government or the Engineering and Water Supply Department. I will take up the honourable member's suggestion and find out whether a full statement on the matter can be printed in local newspapers to achieve further clarification. However, the presumption by local growers that the way the South Para reservoir was managed had anything to do with the flood in any significant respect is incorrect. I have detailed information on the opening of the gates at the South Para reservoir, when they were opened, and how much water flowed through, and I shall be pleased to give that information to the honourable member. However, I point out that the maximum flow out of the South Para reservoir was 2 300 cusecs, and the maximum flow down the North Para River reached an estimated 8 700 cusecs. I understand (although a full study of the hydrographic records will be necessary before we can show this) that any peak in the flow of the South Para into the Gawler River occurred after the main peak of the North Para River had already passed into the Gawler River. I point out again what I said yesterday: namely, that the capacity of the Gawler River is such that it can take a

flow of about 3 000 cusecs, and obviously the flood that came down the North Para River produced in the Virginia and Two Wells area a flood that was inevitable.

NORTHUMBERLAND INSURANCE COMPANY

Mr. BECKER: In the temporary absence of the Treasurer, will the Minister of Education say what action the Government can take to assist members of the public insured with Northumberland Insurance Company Limited who have claims outstanding and who now are forced to reinsure? I understand that, as the company has gone into liquidation, outstanding claims will not be settled in full for some time, if ever. I have received complaints from constituents that crash repair companies will not release repaired motor vehicles until the accounts are paid in full by the owner of the vehicle or by this insurance company and that, as a result, many pensioners and people on fixed incomes will suffer extreme hardship. I understand that one case involves the owner of a motor vehicle worth $4 000. Repairs to that vehicle after an accident cost $1 000, and the repair company has told him that he must either arrange a personal loan or lose his motor vehicle. I also understand that about 80 per cent of taxi-cab owners had insured with this company. Their premiums are considerably higher than the premiums paid by private motorists, and those taxi-cab owners must reinsure with another company. One rate of insurance offered is $390 for the first $1 000 and $520 for $2 000. The State Government Insurance Commission recently has increased its premiums by over 30 per cent, and the commission's premiums are $300 to $400 higher for taxi owners. That seems extremely high to me. The whole point that I am making is that much hardship is being caused to people insured with the Northumberland company who had accidents before the failure of the company and who must arrange finance to get their vehicles back. Further, pressure is being placed on taxi-cab owners and vehicle repair companies.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will refer the matter to the Treasurer to make sure that the position as I understand it is correct. The only coverage of any kind that can be provided in this sort of case arises through the nominal defendant scheme, but that applies only to third party personal injury. Nothing could be done by way of assistance regarding comprehensive insurance cover. Obviously, the Government regrets the situation that has developed. We would wish that all insurance companies were on a sound basis, and the events regarding the Northumberland company could not give anyone in the community a feeling of security. Whether it is possible to get tighter controls regarding insurance remains to be seen. As I understand it, no arrangement is possible or could be considered practicable to provide the coverage from Government sources that was previously provided on comprehensive policies by the Northumberland Insurance Company.

HOUSING TRUST

Mr. EVANS: Can the Minister of Development and Mines, as Minister in charge of housing, give the causes for the low rate of house production and the poor financial record of the South Australian Housing Trust for the year 1973-74? Today, the Minister has said that the Government is considering setting up an authority to co-ordinate activity and seek co-operation in the building industry. No such proposal has had to be considered in the past, as the housing position in this State has been good; until two or three years ago, the trust has had a good record in constructing houses. For 1973-74, the number of houses constructed fell by 279 at a time when the overall building rate was at its highest level. During the period, the trust purchased 422 houses that were already constructed, giving it an increase in houses available to applicants during the year of about 140. Applications for rental accommodation had increased by about 700 from the previous year to 10 126, while the number of people housed had decreased from 4 504 in the previous year to 4 018. Therefore, the number of applicants has increased, while fewer houses are available. At the same time, sales applications increased to 5 587, whereas the number of people able to obtain houses did not increase greatly. The increase in the number of applications for sale housing was 2 000 for the one year. The trust cannot meet its commitments. For the year 1973-74, the trust showed a loss of $1 800 000 in the rental field. Recently, the Minister said that the Government did not believe in socking people with high rent increases. However, it is common knowledge that some people who live in rental houses earn more than $20 000, and maybe some earn even more than $30 000 a year. Will the Minister say that at least those people in the very high income groups over $15 000 a year will be asked to pay more rent? I do not suggest that people should pay unfair rents, but there has been a loss of $1 800 000 at a time when the trust's finances are in a serious position.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is making a statement rather than explaining his question.

Mr. EVANS: According to the report, in the broad-acre situation the waiting time for the first house to be completed on a site is 180 weeks, or about four years. As this is a serious situation, can the Minister say what are the real causes of the problem?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The honourable member has really asked two questions; I think I should answer only one, namely, the original question that he rephrased at the end. The subsidiary question has been canvassed extensively in this place by the honourable member and, on behalf of the Government, I have dealt with the matter as recently, I think, as a fortnight ago. Regarding the performance of the trust as revealed by the annual report, I want to say two things. By his reference to 180 weeks being the whole of the flow-sheet period, the honourable member has assisted me in this respect. First, when one looks at how many people actually have their keys transferred to them, one must look partly at the situation at the beginning of this very lengthy process. Therefore, much of the problem with regard to the relatively slow production of houses generally must be seen in the light not necessarily of what was happening in the last 12 months but of what was happening four years ago when decisions were being made to commence some of these estates. However, that is water under the bridge. What I want to say about the present situation and the situation that has obtained over the last couple of years is that several imaginative and innovative estates are on the drawing board, some of them having got beyond that stage. The honourable member will have noticed from the annual report to which he has referred that the number of construction starts is now running at a significantly higher level than has occurred for the last 12 months; we will see the benefit of that at the end of this construction period.

As the honourable member has admitted, the time of construction is only a small component of the total production period, which is now very lengthy. Some of what is involved is under the control of the Government. I know that this matter has exercised the attention of some of my colleagues from time to time, and we are doing all we can to streamline the process. Nevertheless,

some of it is totally beyond our control. Some of what happens simply relates to the difficulty any developmental project has these days in getting off the ground, because of the operations of certain vested or local interests, however well founded they may be, and the sort of pressures they place on statutory authorities to ensure that all factors are properly considered before a final decision is made. Indeed, some of this relates to local government and the fact that some councils meet only monthly, so, even if one can get a proposition through one's local council at one meeting, it may well be a matter of six weeks before this happens. As likely as not, such a decision will be deferred if a council raises an objection to any aspect of the proposal while it is before the council. These are other factors that unfortunately are beyond our control. I am sure that any move by this Government to centralise these approval processes would be severely castigated by the honourable member and his colleagues as being a further centralisation of power and a derogation of the powers of local government.

Secondly, the honourable member raised the matter of co-operation with the building industry. In my statement, I said nothing about co-operation with the building industry. I believe the Government now receives a high level of co-operation from private builders; I look forward to a continued and fruitful association between the Government and industry. My statement rather related to the possibility of having some system of monitoring resources so that the maximum resources could be directed to the area of cottage building, which I think should now have the highest priority over roads, bridges, high-rise buildings, and any other form of construction. That is what my statement was all about; I was not talking about trying to get additional co-operation from the building industry, as I believe we now have co-operation. The other point I should make is that over the past 12 months the private building industry has had much difficulty in constructing houses in the sort of time span with which it has been familiar. The honourable member must have received approaches from constituents about this matter. I have received them, I know my colleagues have had them, and I am sure he has had them. People are saying that they have signed a contract 15 or 16 months ago and that only the foundations are down.

Mr. Evans: The overall building rate is down.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: All I am saying is that the public building sector (the trust) is not immune from the sorts of problem encountered by the private sector regarding supplies of skilled labour and materials. I suspect that for one reason or another (and I have said this before in the House) possibly private industry is in a slightly better position than the trust to get its corner of whatever building supplies may be around.

When one speaks of the activities in respect of public cottage building in South Australia and also of private building, in a sense one is speaking about the same thing, because the trust builds on contract and relies on the health of the private building industry as to the extent it can perform. I am aware of the problems of the private building industry and I suspect that, increasingly, there will be builders who will be relying on contracts from the trust to keep going. It is our responsibility to ensure that there is sufficient finance to make sure that these contracts are available, and that is, in part, the business of the coming conference of Commonwealth and State Ministers to be held in Canberra on Friday.

CANDIDATE SELECTOR

Mr. GUNN: Can the member for Mitchell say whether he has taken on a new position? As well as being the Australian Labor Party member for Mitchell, is he also the Country Party candidate selector?

The SPEAKER: Order! I rule this question out of order. It does not concern the affairs of this House or the affairs of this State.

ABATTOIR CHARGES

Mr. CHAPMAN: Will the Acting Minister of Works, obtain from the Minister of Agriculture a list of slaughtering charges applying at Gepps Cross abattoir and also those applying in similar establishments in other States? My question is supplementary to one I asked the Minister of Agriculture on October 2. In his reply the Minister said he had been informed that the overall slaughtering charges at Gepps Cross abattoir compared favourably with those now applying in similar establishments in other States. Obviously, the Minister of Agriculture has access to details of slaughtering charges that I cannot obtain. I asked my question last week as a result of details recently published about slaughtering charges at Gepps Cross and the suggestion is that there is a different set of charges available to the Minister.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will ask my colleague to supply the information asked for by the honourable member, and no doubt in supplying that information the Minister of Agriculture will make sure that the charges are compared on a proper comparable basis, because that is not always the case.

LIAISON OFFICER

Mr. ARNOLD: Can the Premier say whether the necessary approach has been made to the Public Service Board to appoint a Greek-speaking liaison officer to reside in the Riverland? This suggestion was made at a meeting at Berri of Greek growers, and at that meeting the Premier said that it would be necessary for the Government to establish a liaison office (probably in Berri) staffed by an officer who could speak fluent Greek for the purpose of helping the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs and other Government departments in various matters, particularly in fixing grape prices each year. As the present season is now progressing and it is urgent that the fixing of grape prices be considered soon, I ask the Premier whether the necessary approach has been made to the Public Service Board.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. The approach to the board was made promptly. I sent a minute to the board and asked that, since the creation of the position and calling of applications under the Public Service Act would take some time, a special and emergency appointment under special provisions of the Act be made as soon as possible. I will follow up this matter.

WARREN RESERVOIR

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I think my question should be asked of the Premier, because of its great importance, but it may be that the Acting Minister of Works should take it. What precautions, if any, are being taken to protect the town of Gawler and the surrounding areas in case of trouble following the reduction of the height of the Warren reservoir spillway? It has been announced today that a 12 m section of the spillway of this reservoir is to be reduced by about 1 m, and I see that this is reported in the *News* this afternoon. Although the report in the newspaper is responsibly written and plays down the aspects of safety, it is

obvious, if one reads between the lines, a degree of danger is involved in the present situation and in the action being taken. In the report one sentence, which I understand is from a press release by the Minister this afternoon, states:

Over-topping increased the hydraulic load on the dam structure, reducing the factor of safety below that acceptable by present-day design standards.

Being interpreted, that means to me that the dam wall is unsafe. The procedure of reducing the spillway is being hurried on instead of waiting until the summer; as it is being done in the next day or so when water is still flowing over the spillway (at least a few centimetres), it must involve, despite the denial by Mr. Lewis, some possible danger. As I understand the situation, if the spillway collapsed it would cause an intolerable strain on South Para, and that could cause a catastrophe with grave danger to the town of Gawler. I understand that this situation was feared last Friday, and that was the reason for the presence of police officers in that town and surrounding districts. It is to seek an assurance from the Minister that precautions are to be taken that I ask this question.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is a pity that the honourable member, in asking the question, was not willing to be as responsible as the press. There is no significant risk whatsoever—

Mr. Millhouse: No significant risk!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Millhouse: That's a qualification!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: On the basis of a responsible press report the member for Mitcham has tried this afternoon to raise what I consider to be an irresponsible and alarmist point of view. He should at least allow a reply to his question to be given. First, there is no significant risk whatsoever in the procedure of lowering the spillway. The spillway area is about 2·7 m high at the side of the dam and is based on rock. The proposal is simply to remove, over a 12 m section, almost 1 m of that spillway, and the total quantity of water to flow from the Warren reservoir into the South Para River as a result of that action will be about 1 000 M*l*. That expected flow will reduce the size of the Warren reservoir by 1 000 M*l*.

Mr. Millhouse: That is about one-sixth—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is one-sixth of the size of the Warren reservoir, and will raise the level in the South Para by 23 cm because the flow will occur over four or five days. We could, if necessary, reduce the volume of water in the South Para reservoir over four or five days by significantly more than 23 cm. The honourable member will appreciate that the action taken in this matter involves no cause for alarm.

Mr. Millhouse: It won't weaken the—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The engineers have assured me that the matter is being supervised by officers of the Mines Department and that there is no risk of that taking place. Even if something like that did occur, the volume of water that would flow from the Warren reservoir into the South Para would be significantly less than the volume of water that flowed into the South Para last Thursday and Friday, when about 6 000 M*l* flowed into that reservoir and was stored in addition to the volume that was released. The volume that flowed into the South Para reservoir during a couple of days last week exceeded the total storage capacity of the Warren reservoir. If the member for Mitcham would care to examine a picture of the Warren reservoir he would see the spillway at the side and, even if all that section of the spillway were removed, a considerable storage capacity would remain because the depth of storage in the central part of the Warren reservoir is about 30 m and the spillway is only about 3 m high and is constructed on rock. So, any suggestion that the honourable member made in his question that the operation that is being undertaken today and tomorrow by the Engineering and Water Supply Department involves any danger to the people of Gawler should be rejected out of hand. I hope that the media, in reporting the honourable member's question today, will be as responsible as was the *News* today in reporting the statements made by Mr. Lewis and me. In the history of the Warren reservoir the water has topped the dam wall itself only once, and that was back in 1917. As a normal safety precaution, a check was made last year by the Engineering and Water Supply Department of old dam structures. It seems that additional pressure has built up at the Warren reservoir because of what the engineers call "uplift" from hydraulic pressure coming from beneath the wall, and it is now considered that action must be taken to minimise any possible over-topping of the dam. By lowering the spillway by almost 1 m, which is to be done this summer over the entire 43 m of spillway, the spillway overflow to be allowed could be increased to 7 000 cusecs, which is equal to the peak of the 1917 flood.

Mr. Dean Brown: You can sit down now.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I realise that the member for Davenport may not be interested but, because of the irresponsible behaviour of the member for Mitcham, I believe a full reply is necessary, whether the member for Davenport or anyone else likes it or not. By taking the action we are taking, we will ensure that the likelihood of the dam wall at the Warren reservoir being over-topped is virtually eliminated. There is no significant danger at all with respect to the action taken.

Mr. Millhouse: You keep putting that qualification "significantly" on to it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I repeat that the action taken by Engineering and Water Supply Department officers today and tomorrow will not involve any danger.

At 3.5 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

SALISBURY EAST HIGH SCHOOL

The SPEAKER laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on Salisbury East High School (Additional Building).

Ordered that report be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE: HON. J. D. CORCORAN

Mr. LANGLEY moved:

That two months leave of absence be granted to the honourable member for Millicent (Hon. J. D. Corcoran) on account of ill health.

Motion carried.

PYAP IRRIGATION TRUST ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Mr. NANKIVELL (Mallee) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Pyap Irrigation Trusts Acts, 1923 and 1926. Read a first time.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It may help members if I briefly outline some of the history of the Pyap Irrigation Trust. In 1921, the Pyap Proprietary Company was registered in Victoria to carry on the business of fruitgrowing and packing at Pyap. The company presumably got into financial difficulties during 1921 and mortgaged Crown Lease P/L 8669 to the Bank of Victoria Limited. In August, 1921, it subdivided the subject land into 15 blocks and offered them for sale by public auction. Of the blocks sold, nine were sold at the sale and the others were sold privately by private treaty but under the same terms and conditions of sale.

Because it seemed that the company would have to go into liquidation in order to protect the settlers and to enable them to carry on the irrigation of their blocks, it was decided to vest the whole of the irrigation plant, channels, implements, and equipment in a trust consisting of the settlers. By doing this the vendor was released from its undertaking to regulate and distribute water to the settlers and, in so doing, the long-term interests of the settlers were protected. By setting up such a trust the settlers believed they were protected in perpetuity.

The original private Bill introduced to establish this trust was presented to Parliament on September 4, 1923, was drafted along similar lines to that of the Renmark Irrigation Trust Act, and was designed to enable the trust to be formed to take over the regulation and distribution of the water supply. In 1926 a further Act enabled the trust to borrow money on long term against the rate income of the trust. The trust continued to operate for 50 years, but changing circumstances, such as the change in ownership of properties and perhaps, in particular, the metering of water pumped from the Murray River, caused dissension to creep in. This dissension was principally brought about by the poor condition of the distribution channels, most of which were earthen and unlined. This meant that the volume of water delivered against a fixed pumping allocation into the channels was reduced greatly because of seepage losses by the time the water reached members of the trust on the ends of those channels.

As a result, some people preferred to take a water allotment from the trust's licence and to install their own pumps, rather than take a supply from the trust's system. However, when they sought to do this, they discovered that the Act would not permit them to withdraw from the trust and act independently, and this is the reason behind the introduction of the amending Bill. These people, who were dissatisfied with the distribution of water under the trust's distribution system, decided that they wanted to cease being members of the trust, and to operate independently, but they were prevented from doing so by the Act.

Yesterday, I again visited Pyap, where I met the Chairman of the trust, who reaffirmed that it was still the unanimous wish of all members of the trust that I should proceed to have their private Act amended in the form agreed to at a meeting held on Friday, June 29, 1973, to discuss the question. Following that meeting, I received a letter from the Secretary of the trust setting out the form that the amendments should take and asking me to have them properly drafted. The form of the amendments they wish to be made to the Act is as follows:

(1) That the trust shall consist of ratepayers only and not lessees of all land within the area.

(2) That ratepayers shall be defined as those persons whether owners, lessees or occupiers of land within the area to which water is supplied by the trust's system.

(3) That only ratepayers, as above defined, shall be assessed for rates by the trust, and the trust shall not be obliged to supply water to any owner, lessee or occupier of any land within the area if the owner, lessee or occupier shall have ceased to be a member of the trust or if at any time the trust has ceased to supply the land with water for a continuous period of one year.

(4) That a ratepayer shall cease to be a member of the trust if he shall give to the trust six calendar months notice of his intention to supply his land with water by means other than the trust's system, provided that if a ratepayer shall fail to give six months notice as aforesaid he shall be regarded as a ratepayer and liable to payment of rates for a period of six months after the receipt by the trust of a notice of intention to use another supply or of having done so.

I am grateful to Mr. Hackett-Jones (Parliamentary Counsel) for helping me with the drafting of the Bill: in fact, it would be fair to say that he drafted the Bill. A copy of the draft amendments has been sent to the Minister of Lands for his information and comment. The Minister obviously had the proposals fully investigated because, on January 29, 1974, he wrote to the trust drawing attention to what appeared to be restrictive provisions in the proposed amendments and asking for the comments and assurance of the trust that it did not wish to amend the Bill any further. In due course, the members of the trust held another meeting, and I am told that they agreed unanimously not to change the form of the Bill but to proceed with the draft legislation without any changes.

It is the approved draft that I am now presenting to the House in the form of a Bill. The intention of the Bill is to permit any member who wishes to cease to be a member of the trust to have the right to do so by giving in writing to the trust six calendar months notice of his intention to supply his land with water by means other than the trust's system. Clause 1 simply consolidates two previous Acts. Clause 2 provides for such land to be exempted from rating—that is, land occupied by people who have opted out of the trust. Clause 3, the major amendment, provides for a new definition of membership of the trust by repealing clause 7 of the principal Act and replacing it with the new sections contained in clause 3. Clauses 4 and 5 are consequential amendments.

As this is a private Bill, it will need to be referred to a Select Committee of members of this Chamber and, because of the urgency to have the Bill passed before private members' time terminates on October 30, I ask for the co-operation of all members in permitting the speedy passage of the Bill so that the Select Committee can be set up without delay. I thank the Minister for his co-operation in promising that the Bill will be passed speedily.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Acting Minister of Works): I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time and referred to a Select Committee consisting of Messrs. Arnold, Crimes, Groth, Hudson, and Nankivell; the committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to adjourn from place to place; the committee to report on October 23.

INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, 1972, as amended. Read a first time.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is hardly necessary to emphasise the influence in the community of trade unions and the trade union movement

generally: that is obvious and my statement cannot be challenged by anyone. The corollary of that, I suggest, is that the community is entitled to know that the affairs of trades unions are being properly conducted. It is hard to think of any other kind of organisation in the community, certainly none that is so powerful and influential as trade unions, over which the community exercises so little supervision, if not some form of control. Almost every other form of organisation which is influential in the community and which can affect our lives is subject to some kind of supervision, if not control.

It is inevitable that, if trade unions are to continue to play such a big part in our lives, for good or ill (and I leave that entirely on one side: I am not here to argue that question now), the community must demand some right of supervision over their internal activities to ensure that everything is being done as it should be done.

That is precisely what has happened to other influential organisations in the community. This Bill aims to take that process one small step and it is not the first time that step has been taken in this Parliament and in other Parliaments. Senator Steele Hall, when he was the member for Goyder during the life of this Parliament, attempted to introduce legislation which would have provided for the scrutiny of the accounts of trade unions, and that was a move I supported and still support. The member for Glenelg has on the Notice Paper a Bill with the object of providing for secret ballots in connection with strikes. Those are just two examples of attempts that have been made or are being made in this field, and I believe in the long run it is inevitable that there should be some such supervision and control. It is not only inevitable: it is most desirable. What is the real problem we face with trade unions and the movement?

Mr. Chapman: Their irresponsible leaders.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Alexandra has given me a reply to the question and I would not argue with the way he has put it, but let me put it another way and at greater length. There is so much apathy amongst the rank-and-file members of trade unions that the affairs of most unions, if not all, are controlled by a little power group consisting of the officers and particularly the paid officers of the unions. I will give three different examples of this. First, during the last few weeks I have had some contact with Mr. Nyland, the Secretary of the Transport Workers Union. I do not want to go over the whole story again but I refer to this union first because to me Mr. Nyland epitomises the trade union secretary, and he is the secretary with whom I have had the most recent contact. Members have witnessed one television conversation that I had with Mr. Nyland. The ordinary monthly meeting of the T.W.U. was held, I think, last week.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Did your pimp get in there again?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will answer that question in this way: 39 members, or apparent members, of the union were present. When Mr. Nyland was asked about the low number present he said, "That is because none of Millhouse's spies are here tonight." That is the sort of mentality he has. Mr. Nyland wields, as we all know to our cost, much power in this community, and that is the sort of thing he says. Let me now turn to an example that comes from the Australian Government Workers Association, and it is not something on which I am putting a gloss. I have before me a paper which was distributed some months ago by the shop stewards' committee at the Strathmont centre. Headed, "Open letter to all staff", it states:

When you walked into the Woodville Town Hall in May, were you prepared for the bulldozing tactics employed by your union to persuade you to accept the interim offer and subsequently the work value case? Possibly you were not prepared for the fiasco you witnessed and you certainly were not prepared for the drawn-out work value case which has been dragging on since you accepted it on May 12. Many of you seem to think that this delay has been caused by the Industrial Commission; however, your claims now being considered were originally presented on January 24 of this year, and surely you can see that a delay of this length cannot be attributed to the Industrial Commission. The fact is, your union thrust upon you a work value case which they said would last only seven days; that was four months ago! It is about time we put some pressure on the union; it is about time we rose from our apathy and forced the union into action. We have received your petitions demanding immediate action; give us your support now. (Signed) Strathmont Centre Shop Stewards Committee.

Mr. McRae: Not one personal signature!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, but I believe it is a genuine document and that it has the sympathy of many members of that union at the Strathmont centre. The third example of apathy concerns the Amalgamated Metal Workers Union.

Mr. Max Brown: A very fine union!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I say nothing about the union but let me say something about the numbers who bothered to vote in the elections for the union. I have a table setting out the numbers who voted on Saturday, September 21, in the election for a full-time organiser, and if this does not show apathy I do not know what does.

Mr. Max Brown: That was a secret ballot.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It may have been a secret ballot, but let me now say how many people voted.

Mr. Max Brown: What is your Bill going to do about that?

Mr. Chapman: You must be frightened about the answer.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The statement is in the form of a table, which is as follows:

Branch voting	No. on roll	Votes Total	Votes Formal	Votes Informal
Adelaide	2 646	10	10	—
Port Pirie	333	59	59	—
Mannum	332	2	2	—
Port Lincoln	71	6	5	1
Mount Gambier	2 063	5	2	3
Port Augusta	497	2	2	—
Millicent	116	7	7	—
North-East	1 918	22	20	2
Western districts	2 603	12	12	—
Peterborough	54	4	4	—
Christies Beach	611	3	3	—
Southern branch	2 271	9	9	—
Para districts	2 446	22	22	—
Total votes:	15 961	163	157	6

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: It looks just like a local government election, doesn't it?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is the sort of election with which the Minister of Local Government is all too familiar, because he is a former trade union officer.

Members interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have given that as the third example of the apathy that pervades the trade union movement. The three examples that I have given are from the Transport Workers Union, the Australian Government Workers Association, and the Amalgamated Metal Workers Union. They are different unions, but all the examples show the same shocking apathy on the part of members of unions.

Mr. McRae: Will you table the document you have read?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, I will.

Mr. McRae: Right away?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will table it any time members want it: I will table it now. There is nothing secret about it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot table it at this stage.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I was willing to do that, anyway. I will table the document, not give it to the member for Playford personally. I am willing to put the document into the custody of the House.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You want to cook it up before you hand it over.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, I am willing to put that document into the custody of the House.

The SPEAKER: Order! Let me point out to the honourable member for Mitcham that he cannot table the document that he has quoted. Secondly, it is not permissible for any document to be left in the custody of the House, so it is no good making idle threats about what will be done. If the honourable member wants to give information to another honourable member, he can do it as one honourable member to another.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I thought that saying that I would put the document into the custody of the House was another way of saying that I would table it. If I cannot do that, I cannot do it. I have read out the whole document—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Hand it to the member for Playford!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —except one line.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Except one line! Hand it to the member for Playford!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will read it out. They did not vote at Whyalla. Their own representative was elected, and the number on the roll was 1 421.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: How can the member for Playford check it? He can't take your word for anything.

Mr. MILLHOUSE. I seem to have drawn some comment from the Minister.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You're cheating, that's why. You're doing your usual cheat.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know what the Minister means by that.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I said that you usually cheated, and you're doing it now.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have stated that, if it were possible, I would table the document but, if the Speaker rules that I cannot do that, I will keep it. The heading on the table is:

Amalgamated Metal Workers Union, election for full-time organiser, held Saturday, September 21, 1974.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: If you haven't anything to hide, hand it to the member for Playford.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will not hand it over.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You must be hiding something.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Whyalla nodded his agreement when I stated the number of members in his home town. The figures will be set out in *Hansard*.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Without authenticity, and that's the secret.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Members of unions often are urged to go to meetings and take part, but they do not take any part in their unions' affairs. I am referring to the bulk of them.

Mr. Olson: That proves that they're satisfied.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It does not. Probably, there are many reasons why they do not go, but I will be charitable to the member for Semaphore and say that perhaps in some cases they are satisfied. However, I suggest that one other reason is that they do not know what to do when they get to a meeting.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Do you think that members of unions are all dills?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, that is the last thing that I think. Most people do not know much about the procedure at meetings, what they can move, when they can speak, and how a vote should be taken. Few people, except those in our occupation, have a detailed knowledge of procedure at meetings. I have heard the most shocking stories about how trade union secretaries and other officers have blustered and bluffed their way through meetings, merely because people at the meeting have not known their rights. Recently I heard that at a union meeting, which was well attended because the matter of strike action was to come up, the Commonwealth Secretary of the union told those present that they had only two choices about what they decided. Other action could have been taken but no-one at the meeting had sufficient confidence in his knowledge about what to do to challenge that officer. I have also heard of meetings at which a vote has been taken so badly that, as soon as those present put up their hands to vote one way, the presiding officer has stated, "It is carried," without inviting those who wanted to vote the other way to show their hands. The problem is that few trade unionists know how to conduct meetings properly, and there is a colossal advantage for the full-time officers of unions. They have the knowledge and authority and they can bluff their way through.

I now make an offer on behalf of the Liberal Movement and on my own behalf. I hope this is a constructive offer, although members may not think so. However, it is meant to be constructive, and I make it in all sincerity. My offer is that I will advise (as I have done already on occasion) any union member or members about meeting procedures, particularly about procedures under the rules of their own union. If union members want advice, I shall be only too happy to give them this information. If there is a sufficient response to this offer, I shall see that courses on meeting procedure are organised which people can attend and at which they can learn about these matters, so that they will know when they go to their union meeting what are their rights and obligations. There will be no charge for this, and there is certainly no obligation on the Liberal Movement to do it. I make that offer as a public service; I cannot for the life of me see why members opposite should resent it.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: We're already doing it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister is annoyed, but there is nothing wrong with that offer, which I make in good faith. I am determined to see, if I possibly can, that unionists know their rights, for I believe that if they know them there is far more chance of their taking an active part in union meetings. That should be our objective. I cannot see why any member opposite should resent this or be afraid of it. This Bill is a small step in the direction of giving ordinary union members a more effective say in what goes on.

Mr. Max Brown: How do you link up your remarks with this Bill?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am satisfied that I have done that to the best of my ability. The Bill inserts in the principal Act new section 135a, providing that the rules set out in the second schedule shall, once the Bill is passed, be regarded as incorporated in the rules of all registered associations. As I see that for once the member for Whyalla is interested in what is going on, I will read out the second schedule (the operative part of the Bill), as follows:

Where at any duly constituted meeting—

and I emphasise that it is a union meeting that has otherwise been properly called—

any question is to be decided by the votes of all or some of the members of the registered association, it shall be competent for any member, entitled to vote on that question, to request that a secret ballot be held on that question and upon such a request being made consideration of the question shall be deferred until such a secret ballot has been conducted at that meeting in accordance with the Rules made under section 175 of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, 1972-1974, and until such a secret ballot has been conducted the members of the registered association shall not be otherwise competent to decide the question.

Mr. Max Brown: It would never work.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: For the life of me, I cannot see why not. If we were at a meeting at which a vote was about to be taken, and one of us said that he wanted it taken by secret ballot, a secret ballot would have to be held there and then. All this means is that the presiding officer or secretary must be willing to take a vote secretly at the meeting. This gets over the question of sending out notices, and so on. I have heard only too often about the intimidation of people who wished to vote at a meeting in a certain way. Members on both sides must acknowledge that there is never any difficulty at a meeting in having a secret ballot there and then on any question that arises; it takes only about five minutes to arrange.

Mr. Olson: You'll give a vote to financial as well as unfinancial members.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Mr. Nyland does not worry about that in his union.

Mr. Wells: How would you conduct a ballot of 6 000 members at St. Clair?

Mr. Venning: Easily.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I think the member for Rocky River is being a little optimistic, but it would not be impossible. A meeting of 6 000 at St. Clair would obviously be on a matter of great importance. If a matter is so important, that is all the more reason to conduct a ballot. It would not be impossible, and I know the member for Florey is fair-minded enough to acknowledge that. The ballot could be conducted there and then, if it were desired. It might take an hour or more to organise and conduct, but the effort would be well worth while, because we would then know that the result was genuine.

If the Bill is passed, it will be incumbent on unions to make rules for carrying out these ballots at their meetings. I am willing to accept (there is nothing else I can do) that these rules will be honestly interpreted and carried out. This is a small matter. All that is involved is the writing of this provision into the rules of all unions covered by the legislation. Although this is only the beginning, I believe it is a worthwhile beginning of a process that is inevitable and desirable. I cannot believe that there are any insuperable barriers to prevent this from being carried out. Therefore, I hope that, despite the partisanship that has been so evident during my speech, the Bill will be considered on its merits by members on both sides and passed.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUCCESSION DUTIES

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I move:

That, in the opinion of this House, the value of a policy of life assurance irrevocably assigned to the Treasurer of the State for the purposes of the payment of succession duty on the estate of the assignee should, to the extent that the value does not exceed the amount of that succession duty, not be regarded as part of that estate for succession duty purposes.

This matter is near and dear to my heart. Action is needed, and has been needed for a long time, not only in relation to State succession duties but also in relation to Commonwealth estate duties, which should be abolished. If my motion is carried and acted on by the Government, it will allow people to protect their dependants properly in the event of an untimely death in a family. The proposal I suggest is simple and will not reduce the return to the Treasury from succession duties. I will say more about this in a moment. It will allow people to take out an insurance policy with insurers of their choice and assign it to the Treasurer. It would not be difficult to estimate the amount of succession duties, although there might be a problem in doing this accurately, but a person could cover a substantial part of the succession duties that may be levied. This action would give people living in rural communities and those owning small businesses a chance to have their families continue on the property or with the business. Members must realise the unfortunate position of many dependants particularly when inflation is so rife as it is at present, because it is difficult to obtain the necessary money to pay succession duties.

In many cases it would be impossible to meet this commitment, and many people have been forced to sell part of a business or property and thus prevent the property from continuing to be a viable unit. If one examines the report of the Senate Standing Committee on Finance and Government Operations, tabled in December, 1973, particularly the reference therein to death duties, one must come to the conclusion that some effort must be made to tackle the problem. If my motion is carried, many benefits will accrue to people who at present are affected by this unjust form of taxation. Page 37 of the report states:

Rural land is not readily divisible for sale to meet death duty liabilities. If the payment of these taxes induces the fragmentation of viable holdings into uneconomic holdings, this would tend to work in the opposite direction to the farm build-up objectives of the Rural Reconstruction Scheme and the Marginal Dairy Farm Scheme.

The report, after giving other examples, makes a pertinent point at page 38, as follows:

The valuations of rural land for probate purposes are quite unrealistic, bearing no relationship to available market prices.

If my motion is carried, this situation will be alleviated because a person could take out a substantial insurance policy that would allow for any inflationary trend. I sincerely hope that the House will consider this matter favourably, and pass my motion.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): I support the motion. Members would be well aware of many questions asked for a long time on this matter indicating that the rural

community is concerned with the problems of succession duties and the way they can be handled fairly. A person who lives for three score years and 10 can do something about it, but, in respect of the person who dies prematurely, his wife and family will have difficulties, and much of the property may have to be sold to pay succession duties. The purpose of this motion is to try, to a degree, to solve some of these problems. I can recall that my father had an insurance policy. He married late in life and, in order to protect his wife and young family, he took out an insurance policy with a fairly high premium. An insurance salesman suggested that he should have the policy assigned as a probate policy, but that did not mean that the policy was exempt from the estate. In those days, it formed part of the estate.

Mr. Keneally: He was conned.

Mr. VENNING: Perhaps, but the passing of this motion would mean that any benefits of the policy would be paid to the Treasurer to offset succession duties and would not form part of the estate. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

BRAKING EQUIPMENT

Notice of Motion, Other Business, No. 7: Mr. McRae to move:

That the regulations under the Road Traffic Act, 1961-1974, in respect of braking equipment, made on June 27, 1974, and laid on the table of this House on July 23, 1974, be disallowed.

Mr. McRAE (Playford): I should indicate as a matter of courtesy to the House that I will move in the way I do because the minutes of the Subordinate Legislation Committee that were tabled yesterday and the accompanying report indicate the satisfaction of the committee in respect of the final state of the regulations. Therefore, I move:

That this Order of the Day be read and discharged.

Order of the Day read and discharged.

UNION MILITANCY

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Millhouse:

That this House express its congratulations 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—

which the Minister of Labour and Industry had moved to amend by leaving out all words after "(Hon. C. R. Cameron, M.H.R.)" and inserting the following words:

Australian Minister for Labor and Immigration for the courageous, competent and realistic manner in which he is performing the onerous duties of his portfolios.

(Continued from September 18. Page 1028.)

Mr. WELLS (Florey): I support the amendment to the motion. It distresses me to see measures such as those involved in the motion, because I believe they constitute a poisonous attack on the trade union movement and its officers. It is an effort to drive a wedge between the political and the industrial wings of this Party, and to put members in a position where they must either support a senior Commonwealth member of Parliament or deny the veracity of his remarks. It should be clearly understood that the trade union movement and the Australian Labor Party are one; they consist of a political wing and an industrial wing and, as such, operate in concert.

We have heard much about the misdeeds of trade union leaders and have been told that the A.L.P. Government, whether State or Commonwealth, is a prisoner of the trade union movement. Because there is such a close liaison between the industrial and political wings of the Party it causes great heartburn to the Party's opponents.

Mr. Evans: And financial hardship to the people of Australia.

Mr. WELLS: Opponents see in this unity a solidarity that they cannot break and they therefore try to divide the two wings by moving motions such as this. Labor Governments are not prisoners of the trade union movement but are partners to it, and the trade union movement stands solidly behind any elected Labor Government in this country, causing great concern to opponents of the Party. How often do we hear criticisms levelled at one organisation or the other? How often do we hear people saying that Australian unions run the country? It is all just so much rubbish. We do not hear from the Opposition benches any criticism of their wing—the rural wing.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Perhaps they clipped it a bit!

Mr. WELLS: We do not hear the rural wing being criticised when it makes demands on this Government or the Commonwealth Government and the demands are supported by the Opposition. Perhaps we never hear criticism of that wing because it is invisible. It distressed me to hear trade union leaders being criticised, particularly Jack Nyland. I would stand in defence of Nyland at any time. I did not agree with his actions during a recent industrial dispute; perhaps I am biased to some degree in respect of that dispute but I honestly believe he was wrong.

Dr. Eastick: Was he wrong about stopping ladies from carrying on their work?

Mr. WELLS: I admire him for carrying out the dictates of the members of his union; after all, that is what he is there for. He received instructions from his members and carried out their wishes. No trade union officer is worth his salt if he does not do that. Barry Cavanagh was also criticised, but he is a dynamic trade union leader and has improved tremendously the conditions of the various organisations that come under the jurisdiction of the Miscellaneous Workers Union since he took a senior administrative position. The member for Mitcham saw fit to link Barry Cavanagh's name with that of his father (a prominent and capable Senator, and a Minister of the Crown).

Mr. Millhouse: It was an irresistible link.

Mr. Coumbe: Isn't Barry Cavanagh a friend of the member for Playford?

Mr. WELLS: If Barry Cavanagh ultimately turns out to be as capable a trade union officer and politician as his father, Jim Cavanagh, the Labor Party in South Australia will be well served.

Mr. McAnaney: Didn't Cavanagh put the tyre people out of work?

Mr. WELLS: We can discuss that subject at another time. Australia is fortunate in having at its helm, and holding the Labor and Immigration portfolio, a man of the calibre of Clyde Cameron.

Mr. Millhouse: I thought you were going to say Dave McKee.

Mr. WELLS: He, too, is a good Minister. Both Ministers have handled all sorts of problem in a way that reflects credit on their ability. Clyde Cameron does not hesitate to express his own viewpoint, something he did recently, but that was not necessarily the viewpoint of all members of the Party. Mr. Egerton did the same. Clyde

Cameron is an efficient Minister, the best in the category he represents (in fact, the best the country has had for many decades), and for that I admire him. He can see that Australia is in a perilous plight because of the actions and policies handed down in Liberal Budgets back to 1970, and is straightening out the situation. He is a man of wide vision and should be acclaimed as a capable and dedicated Minister of the Crown.

Mr. Millhouse: Or Prime Minister?

Mr. WELLS: I suppose one could look at the front bench in the Commonwealth Government and say that any of the men on the front bench has the necessary calibre to become Prime Minister. All of them have the inherent ability to lead the country to success.

Mr. Dean Brown: Has Gough Whitlam been stabbed in the back?

Mr. WELLS: I would expect such a remark from the member for Davenport. He referred to knives and said that the Prime Minister should watch his back. There is no fear of that, but I suggest that the honourable member's own Leader had better watch his back because the member for Davenport might sharpen the knife. However, we are now concerned with attacks on the trade union movement. Such attacks are made without foundation and I believe that ill intent is directed not only toward the trade union movement but also toward my Party. The trade union movement will in no circumstances deviate from its loyalty to the A.L.P. As in all democratic movements, the trade union movement has a voice that it uses, and it makes any statement it thinks should be made. More credit to the movement, and we, as politicians within the movement who owe allegiance to it, listen to its voice in the same way as it listens to our voice. The only purpose of the motion is to denigrate the trade union movement in this country, but the movement has made Australia the great country it is and always will be.

Mr. McRAE (Playford): I support the amendment and necessarily oppose the motion. I have listened to the comments made by the member for Florey and agree with the substance of what he has said. I have also analysed the speech made by the member for Mitcham on September 11 and, for a motion of such apparent magnitude, little has been said to support it.

Mr. Millhouse: It was all to the point.

Mr. McRAE: I do not know about that. First, the honourable member said that one of the great weaknesses of a Labor Government, whether State or Commonwealth, was that it was always the prisoner of the trade union movement, but that is not so. Taking the State situation, members will vividly recall that the Premier was condemned for criticising trade union officials and members of the Australian Building and Construction Workers Federation on the steps of this very House about two years ago. He did not look like a prisoner to me, and this incident received wide television and press coverage.

Mr. Payne: The Minister of Labour and Industry was there, too.

Mr. McRAE: Yes, and he did not look like a prisoner to me. It is well known that at various stages during the demarcation dispute involving steel on the Port Adelaide wharves, the Premier publicly criticised the behaviour of officials of the Transport Workers Union, and this criticism was reported by the press. If the member for Mitcham is trying to demonstrate by his motion that there is no capacity on the part of the State Government to criticise the actions of trade union leaders or the trade unions when such actions are considered to be against the public interest, the evidence is just not there.

What the motion also does not acknowledge is the matter raised by the member for Florey. Over the last 10 weeks, for a reason which I shall give but which was not given by the member for Mitcham, a series of strike situations has occurred, and there have been some bitter situations. However, what the motion does not acknowledge is that the Minister of Labour and Industry has played an active role in intervening in these disputes, either between unions or between unions and employers, and in bringing them to a successful conclusion.

Similarly, the Commonwealth Minister for Labor and Immigration has done much the same. First, he has criticised the actions of certain trade union officials he considered to be irresponsible. Secondly, he has intervened either directly or by means of his officers in several industrial disputes and has been successful in bringing them to a close. The member for Mitcham quoted figures from the Australian Guarantee Corporation Limited newsletter of July 31, 1974, under the heading "Strikes and Absenteeism Soaring to a Record". Although I accept the figures, why is it a record number of working days has been lost as a result of strikes during the past six months? There is a simple answer: because of the absolute, appalling, blind greed of employers in the 1950's and 1960's, adjustments were not made in those periods at regular enough intervals to prevent a head-on collision. Throughout that period, apparently there was a capacity on the part of industry generally, by agreement or by helping the process of conciliation and arbitration, to have made greater wage payments than in fact were made.

In many cases the courts did not decide the matter, because they were positively and actively misled by the employers. I will take a cross section of the period to which I have referred. The year 1954 was fairly significant: it was the year of the Mooney formula in the metal trades area, and that formula was adopted by other sectors of industry as well, as many members will recall. That adjustment related back to a wage formula set in 1937. So, I can excuse, but only partly, the lack of generosity of the learned judge. I excuse his apparent lack of generosity and his meanness in the 1954 decision by saying that the period between 1937 and 1954 was beset by economic difficulties. The years 1937 to 1939 saw us in the last cycle of the great depression; 1937 to 1945 saw us in the war-time era; 1945 to 1949 saw us in the period of post-war reconstruction; 1949 to 1954 saw us in the Korean war period generally, and it was a period of tremendous inflation.

That takes me to 1954. I am willing to absolve the arbitrators up to 1954, but I will not absolve the arbitrators or employers for the period between 1954 and 1967. That 13-year period was critical in Australia's history. From the beginning of 1954 until the early part of that 13-year cycle, it was true to say that employers had just climbed out of what had been a difficult period; perhaps the same could be said of employees, too. However, by 1960, only six years later, the industrial resurgence was so colossal that we were hit with the next cycle of a forced imposed credit squeeze that resulted from demand inflation. History has demonstrated that that six-year period was one of colossal resurgency but the adjustments to wages in the period between 1954 and 1960 were minimal and totally inconsistent with the profit margins of employers and the productivity of the country at that time. I will ignore the effects of the credit squeeze from 1960 to 1962. The years between 1963 and 1967 covered a period of resurgence and an acknowledged era of productivity and profitability for large employing groups.

What wage offers were made by employer groups in those two eras of resurgency, productivity, and profitability? Such people were obstructive; they were wrong; and they were mean to a point of stupidity because it was obvious that as inflation went on, unless proper and constructive efforts were made, a build-up would occur that would lead to catastrophic events. Any unbiased observer, be he political or economical or an actual participant in the era, would agree in broad terms with my analysis of that period. The peak era of wage movements started in 1967, because of the work value case in respect of the Metal Trades Award. It was only that case which unfortunately in the long term cut out the relativities that existed between classes of skilled and unskilled employees. Because of that new evaluation made by the Arbitration Commission and taken up by State Industrial Commissions, a new era of expansive wage levels started.

However, the era went haywire because, after two periods of resurgency which had not been reflected in employees rates to any reasonable degree at all, suddenly employees and trade unions generally were aware of the fact that by taking advantage of the new formula they could gain consistent and large increases, and this they did. However, we are still talking about a period of resurgency, productivity and profitability between 1967 and 1971. During that period the majority of employers blindly and stupidly did not make a proper, sensible or moral adjustment of employees' wages to cater for the long-term problem. It was inevitable that the years 1972 to 1974 would see a head-on confrontation in certain areas. It is scandalous to think that before 1972 the low-wage earner in a large industrial concern was being paid little more than the living wage, which was a notional $37 a week, if that.

When I first entered Parliament, the wage for the average unskilled worker was $42 a week, a completely inexcusable rate in the light of previous productivity and profitability and, of course, that group of people, including the A.G.W.A. members to whom the member for Mitcham has referred, demanded wage justice. Indeed, they were prepared to go on strike for it, and I do not blame them for going on strike. If I had been in their position I would certainly have gone on strike and, if I was one of their leaders, I would have certainly called for a strike unless I could solve the problem by other means. As they had been denied justice for that length of time it became incumbent on union leaders and on the rank and file to do something about it.

There was an unrealistic attitude by employer groups generally, and the member for Torrens, a former Minister of Labour and Industry and a much experienced man in this field, will recall that the policy of the National Employers Federation towards demands for increased wages was a simple "No, no, no". Mr. Robinson (now Mr. Justice Robinson of the Commonwealth Arbitration Commission) must have begged them for seven years to make a constructive offer; it was not until 1967 that we saw some progress, but too little too late and that is why we have had this series of catastrophic strikes.

I do not support strikes as a first resort: I support strikes as a last resort and, as far as I am aware, most union officials accept the policy of strikes as a last resort, not as a first resort. In many cases they are forced to strike as a matter of expediency. The person who stands to be hurt most by the strike is the employee who strikes and that has led in turn to things worse than strikes, such as guerilla tactics. I want to make clear that, when Mr. Cameron was talking about the bloody-minded attitude of certain union officials, he had in mind certain specific instances that were occurring at that time: he was not talking about the whole community. He would be aware, as I am, and as are reasonable members opposite, of the tremendous problems which have been caused by the generation of judges before the present judges and which are now catching up with us and with which we have had to grapple. Certainly, when he saw some unionists using the strike weapon as a weapon of the first resort or as a weapon to unfairly batter certain employers, he accused them of being bloody-minded (and so would I have) and he stuck to his guns. I believe he has every right to say what he did and, if in the process he misjudged any official, it was for that official to take it up with him and ask whether he was included in the bloody-minded class of union officials.

From all these things the member for Mitcham deduces, for some reason which defies my sense of logic, that the Commonwealth Minister is to be applauded for condemning certain trade union officials for what they did, but the State Government is to be condemned. I do not know why he said that. He has not said that the State Government should have stepped in and done X, Y or Z, and he ignores instances where the State Government has stepped in and taken a stand. He proceeded from that by some peculiar method of logic to attack the Government, but I do not think he intended to be logical. I support the member for Florey when he says this is not meant to be a logical motion and that this debate is not meant to be logical. The motion is intended to be an illogical blast against the State Government and an attempt to embarrass it. It is a dismal flop, however. The Bill, introduced by the member for Mitcham earlier today, is a disgrace but hardly more disgraceful than this motion.

Mr. Millhouse: My Bill is a good one.

Mr. McRAE: It is a disgraceful Bill, as I will prove when I speak on it later.

Mr. Millhouse: I've had you dancing about, anyway.

Mr. McRAE: Possibly, but only because of justifiable anger. The speech which was made by the member for Mitcham on September 11 and which I have read from this afternoon was just as disgraceful as his speech today and in no way supported his motion. If ever a Minister was justified in moving an amendment, it was in this case. Obviously, the Australian Minister for Labor and Immigration is competent and realistic in what he does.

Mr. Millhouse: In what he says, too.

Mr. McRAE: Yes. It would be foolish for the member for Mitcham to imagine that the State Government or our Minister of Labour and Industry could not be characterised by the same qualities. It is absolutely disgraceful for a political Party that is seeking recognition to give a set of figures relating to strikes without explaining why the strikes have occurred. The honourable member did not even ask whether the strikes were justified; surely he would not say that all of them were unjustified. I think I have credited the member for Mitcham far too much by referring to what he said, but I thought it necessary to introduce logic into the debate.

Mr. Millhouse: You've failed dismally.

Mr. McRAE: I have not failed, and I have pleasure in supporting the amendment. I must comment on the interjection by the member for Torrens or one of his colleagues that I was frightened to comment on something that the member for Mitcham had said about Mr. Cavanagh. Apparently the member who interjected thought that, because Mr. Cavanagh had contested preselection

and other things against me, I would not grasp the nettle. However, I should hate anyone to think that I would not reply to that, whether to do so was permissible or not.

Mr. Coumbe: He could become a Conciliation Commissioner.

Mr. McRAE: I do not know about that. He probably has the ability to become a Commissioner. The member for Torrens knows that some people who are militant in their industrial days become the best Commissioners and others who are generous in their industrial days become the meanest Commissioners. Mr. Cavanagh and I do not see eye to eye by any means; in fact, we disagree on almost every conceivable topic.

Mr. Coumbe: Aren't you left enough?

Mr. McRAE: No, and I consider him to be too left, but that does not mean to say that I accept what the member for Mitcham has said. The member for Florey summarised the matter admirably, and Mr. Cavanagh can be congratulated on the work that he has done for his union. In other respects, I do not congratulate him, and I do not think he would congratulate me. He has done a remarkable job, considering that members of his union comprise people such as cleaners, and his members are a hard group to organise. He has looked after them.

Mr Mathwin: He put up a good fight for the glove factory, didn't he?

Mr. McRAE: I thought he was beaten in that fight, but we are not discussing his boxing record. Notwithstanding any personal disagreements (which, by the way, show the democratic nature of our Party), the man who is supposed to be all-powerful did not beat me. I beat him, and I am still around.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I do not support the amendment. The member for Playford and the member for Florey evaded an opportunity to say which trade unions they considered had gone overboard. The motion refers not to all trade union officials but only to some. Even if Government members were not willing to support the motion, they could have stated what actions by militant leaders were wrong and they could have supported statements made by Mr. Cameron.

The motion does not condemn the whole trade union movement or all the leaders, nor do the statements by Mr. Cameron and Mr. Egerton. The member for Florey has said that the political wing and the trade union wing of the Australian Labor Party are close and that there are no problems. Let any member tell the people that there are no problems in Australia at present, or let him ask the people whether they believe that, at least in part, trouble has been caused by conflicts between the two groups and the pressures that trade unions can bring to bear on the Commonwealth and State Government!

The member for Playford has said that some wages for unskilled workers were extremely low and that they had a right to go on strike. I do not know about strikes, but I admit that the wages were extremely low. However, we now have the ridiculous situation of many unskilled workers receiving more than tradesmen who serve an apprenticeship for four or five years. We did not hear about the strike by members of the Storemen and Packers Union. Were those persons receiving $40 a week? They were receiving $8 000 or more a year, and they held the State to ransom because they considered they were underpaid. There is no doubt that the present Government did nothing to stop that strike. It never set out to use the great power of communication that the member for Florey says exists between the political and trade union wings of the Labor Party. No beneficial result was achieved for the people of South Australia. That strike was allowed to continue; had it gone on for a few more days, the whole State would have ground to a halt through militant trade union action that I do not believe was justified. A salary of $8 000 a year is not so low that storemen and packers can claim to be underpaid; that salary is more than is received, on average, by schoolteachers, nurses, and others.

I know that it is argued that the industry can afford to pay the extra money. However, ultimately, the industry does not pay it: society pays it. Low-income earners on about $100 a week who have to pay an increased price for commodities are affected; those who earn $8 000 to $20 000 do not suffer. Yet members opposite, who by their silence have supported the strike to which I have referred, claim to represent people on low incomes. That is not so; they have let those people fall by the wayside. The reason why Mr. Cameron said what he said was that he was conscious of what was happening to Australia. Mr. Jack Mundey has said that he does not mind if the total Australian economy collapses; that is his objective. He is smiling at the fate of Cambridge Credit, the Mainline company, and other companies. Because of his philosophy and ambitions, he and those who support him are laughing all the way to the ballot box. Some people in the A.L.P. support Mr. Mundey, as do a number of trade union leaders in this country. That is not denied by Mr. Cameron or Mr. Egerton.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Mr. Cameron has never made a statement like that in his life. It's a damn lie for you to make the claim that Mr. Cameron said there were Communists in the Labor Party.

Mr. EVANS: I never said—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Mr. Cameron has never admitted there is a Communist in the Labor Party, and if you say that you're an outright liar—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: —and you know it. It's the filth you engage in in the sewer. You're a typical sewer Liberal.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I suggest to the honourable Minister that he is a little out of order. The honourable member for Fisher.

Mr. EVANS: So that the Minister may know what I have said, I point out that I have not—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I'll look at *Hansard*.

Mr. EVANS: —used the word "Communist" since I have started speaking this afternoon.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You couldn't lie straight in bed.

Mr. EVANS: I referred to Mr. Mundey, but I did not refer to any—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You read *Hansard* tomorrow; you don't know what you're saying.

Mr. EVANS: I know what I said. I said that Mr. Cameron had never denied certain things: that is the way I put it.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What has Mr. Cameron never denied?

Mr. EVANS: A.L.P. members have never come out and spoken against the militant group for actions taken at Port Stanvac refinery. Mr. Mundey would be happy if the oil companies went broke, along with Cambridge Credit, Mainline, and other companies affected at present. Mr. Mundey will be happy when the total Australian economy collapses, because that is part of his philosophy. They were the terms I was using but the Minister chose to interject. If I had wished, I could have asked the Minister to retract his statements.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You wouldn't have got me to.

Mr. EVANS: I thought it was wiser—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask honourable members on both sides of the House to contain themselves. The honourable member for Fisher is making a speech. I think he should be able to continue his remarks, containing them so that they do not engender the heat that we have just seen engendered.

Mr. EVANS: I have preferred to leave standing the Minister's words as a record of the type of reaction that can be expected from him when remarks are a little close to the bone of his own thoughts and philosophies.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I like them to stand so that people will know the sort of individual you are and how deep you can get into the sewer.

Mr. EVANS: Mr. Cameron has shown that, on some occasions, he can divorce himself from persons such as Jack Mundey and others .

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: It's part of the smear.

Mr. EVANS: However, as we can see this afternoon, no member opposite is willing to divorce himself from that person.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You go outside and say these things publicly, instead of hiding in coward's castle with your allegations. You haven't got the courage to do that. I'd like to see you have the guts to make these statements at South Terrace.

Dr. TONKIN: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I understood that the member for Fisher had the floor, and not the Minister of Transport.

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

Dr. Tonkin: I challenge the Minister to make a speech in this debate.

The SPEAKER: Order! There will be no challenges. If any challenges are made, I will join in.

Mr. EVANS: Mr. Cameron said that the bloody-mindedness of some trade union members concerned him, and he spoke out against them. One member opposite said recently in this debate that the work of people in the trade union movement had made this country.

Mr. Wells: That's true. It's not the farmer and woolly-nose: it's the worker.

Mr. EVANS: In part, that statement is true; there is no denying that. The collective effort of Australians in the past has made this country, whether by woolly-nosed farmers or militant trade unionists. In the past, the militancy of trade unionists was not nearly as extreme as it is today. We should give credit to those who went before us because they worked for the country. If we all had the same hatred for the cockies as the member for Florey has exhibited this afternoon, we would not mind if the cockies were forced off the land. The Labor Party does not mind if cockies are crushed overnight; in fact, Commonwealth Labor members have set out to crush them. The member for Florey knows that a person selling beef today is lucky to receive more than 6·8c a kg for a beast that weighs more than 226 kg dressed. However, by the time the beef reaches the counter for purchase by consumers its price is 40·8c a kg. Strikes at the abattoir because of militancy are part of the reason for this increase that has to be paid by the housewife.

Mr. Wells: Rubbish! How many stoppages have there been at the abattoir in the last 12 months?

Mr. EVANS: We would want no more than we have had in the previous two years: that is enough to last the community for at least 20 years. The member for Playford, in his references to the periods of industrial development in this country, overlooked the fact that, between 1960 and 1970, over-award payments were introduced. They had a significant effect, and industries that had financial backing offered these payments but many workers on lower incomes were placed in a difficult position. I am sure that the member for Playford deliberately did not refer to that aspect. The recent steel strike on the wharf at Port Adelaide caused considerable increases in costs and further delays in receiving materials. The Waterside Workers Union and the Transport Workers Union could not decide who was to handle the steel.

Mr. Wells: That wasn't a strike, it was a demarcation dispute. Don't you know the difference?

Mr. EVANS: The problem that existed certainly created a difficult situation. The Minister of Development and Mines, who is the Minister responsible for housing, said that the delay period of 180 weeks to complete a house had been caused four years ago. However, the Housing Trust report indicates that 12 months ago the delay from broad acres to the completed house was 132 weeks, but that delay period seems to have increased to 180 weeks—not four years ago, but within the past 12 months.

Mr. Wells: Did the wharfies and transport workers cause that?

Mr. EVANS: They contributed to the problem, because the steel delayed at Port Adelaide was required by the building industry. Let the honourable member deny that statement.

Mr. Wells: Don't talk rubbish.

Mr. EVANS: The member for Playford said that the Premier had smoothed over problems with the builders labourers union. The building industry in this State has been cut to ribbons by industrial strife both within and outside the State, and many delays have been caused in deliveries of material by industrial strife in other States. Now, rank-and-file members of the trade union movement are sick and tired of their militant leaders, because their way of life has been affected. Many young people cannot rent or buy a house and, in part, the trade union movement is to blame.

Mr. Payne: What about land speculators?

Mr. EVANS: Another factor in this problem of house shortages is the poor administration in Government departments and the slow development of land for house construction. Even the Housing Trust has problems in this regard. The amendment to this motion is ludicrous. Members opposite should have the courage of the Commonwealth member for Hindmarsh (Clyde Cameron) who condemned militant action by some trade unions, which have set out to break the economy of this country. The political philosophy of militant groups, as well as of people like Mr. Mundey, is the cause of rejoicing in their ranks at the failure of companies like the Mainline group of companies and Cambridge Credit Corporation Limited. Mr. Clyde Cameron had the courage to say that he did not appreciate what was happening, but not one Government member here has supported his action. I support the motion and would never support the amendment.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I think it appropriate that we should finish the debate today. It is starting to generate too much heat, to my surprise, and I think I can reply quickly to what has been said against the motion. I appreciate the support I have had from members on this side, but I do not necessarily adopt everything they have said in supporting the motion.

Mr. Wells: They are fighting on the front bench.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am not interested in the struggle in that Party. The Minister who led the opposition to my motion said absolutely nothing about it, but moved the amendment and left it at that. I shall not refer to every point in the speech of the member for Florey: he is one member I respect greatly, although I find myself differing from him nearly all the time. Today, I am sure that he let his loyalty to his Party overcome his good judgment and common sense. It was only out of loyalty that the member for Florey could say this afternoon what he did in opposition to the motion. We had from the member for Playford the same lecture on trade union affairs that we often get in this House: its content did not vary much and had little relevance to the motion. My object in moving the motion was certainly to show that Clyde Cameron has the courage of what I believe are his convictions and also to show that the South Australian Government does not have the same courage to condemn what obviously should be condemned in the way in which Mr. Cameron condemned it. I believe from what has been said and from the way members opposite have seen fit to move an amendment, which is close to a direct negative, to get out of their embarrassment simply confirms my point. It shows conclusively that there is embarrassment.

I do not expect to win the vote on my motion—I seldom do. However, I sometimes win. What is important to me, though, is to win the debate and to hear what other members say and do in reacting to a motion put forward by me or a speech made by me. I am content with the reaction I have had to my motion: it has shown conclusively to me that members opposite are in the most appalling dilemma. They know perfectly well that what Clyde Cameron and Mr. Egerton said is correct. However, members opposite do not have the courage to say so publicly in this House, and as a result we get the absurd amendment so they may avoid embarrassment. I am not willing to allow them to avoid it indefinitely; I oppose the amendment and support the motion as I originally moved it. We shall see how the vote goes.

The House divided on the amendment:

Ayes (23)—Messrs. Broomhill, Max Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Crimes, Duncan, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Keneally, King, Langley, McKee (teller), McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.

Noes (20)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse (teller), Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, and Venning.

Majority of 3 for the Ayes.

Amendment thus carried.

The House divided on the motion as amended:

Ayes (23)—Messrs. Broomhill, Max Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Crimes, Duncan, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Keneally, King, Langley, McKee (teller), McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.

Noes (20)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse (teller), Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, and Venning.

Majority of 3 for the Ayes.

Motion as amended thus carried.

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT (DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 25. Page 1139.)

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): In speaking to the Bill, I suppose I would be expecting too much if I was to require of the member who introduced it (the member for Elizabeth) a clear intention now that it has been introduced with the full accord of the Labor Party. I see several anomalies in the Bill and certainly some embarrassment to some of the Government capitalists: those in receipt of large sums of extra remuneration, whether from renting houses or shacks or from what other means they have, or from their professions, lectures, etc.

It does not seem that the member for Elizabeth is going to indicate clearly that he has his colleagues' full support. I indicate to him that I do not support the Bill, although I have no personal fear of its consequences. However, I believe that the Bill is completely against the best interests of my family and relatives. It is not merely a matter of my having decided to enter politics and, having succeeded at an election, requiring the persons close to, or even removed from, me to make known their financial interests.

I believe also that the Bill is in complete conflict with another Bill currently before the House, and it is on that basis that I find it difficult to understand why the member for Elizabeth has been permitted even to put his Bill on the Notice Paper by his colleagues who believe in the right of privacy of the individual, even though they do not believe in the right of privacy of members of Parliament. I would expect them to believe in the right of relatives or those in any way associated with members of Parliament to be kept out of the web of the Bill's requirements. On the one hand, we are asked to consider a Government Bill that is allegedly designed to strengthen the right of privacy, whereas, on the other hand, the Bill now before us is aimed at destroying that same right.

I believe it is disgraceful to have the Bill now before us at the same time as the other Bill is before us if, in fact, any Government member wants to be other than hypocritical in his total approach. I am not referring simply to the revelation by a member of Parliament of the source of his or her income additional to the Parliamentary salary. If the Bill were to be forced through Parliament, it would mean that I would be required to divulge that my source of income was from a Parliamentary salary and that I had a source of income of over $500 by virtue of being a director of a company, a position I have held since 1962. Also, by virtue of having a financial interest in that company, I have a source of income by way of dividend from the company that is over the $500 specified. But what my wife, children, parents, brother, his wife and their children have to do—

Mr. Keneally: You're being ridiculous.

Mr. Duncan: Your wife is included, but neither your brother nor any child under 18 years of age is included.

Dr. EASTICK: I am interested in the interjection.

Mr. Duncan: Surely you know the contents of the Bill.

Mr. Keneally: You can learn from the interjections or you should read the Bill again.

Mr. Venning: He has a choice, has he?

Dr. EASTICK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder how many members you have given the call, because about seven or eight contributions are being made at the one time, but I am thankful to members for educating me in these matters.

Opposition members, recognising the way in which they work, fully appreciate that, although the Bill goes only so far now, it is not beyond the Government's method of approach to take it even further. That is the fear I have.

Mr. Payne: A Parliament can always add to any of its legislation. Can't you go on? You can do better than that.

Dr. EASTICK: We might even find that the member for Mitchell has an additional income of over $500.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask honourable members to tone down their interjections a little.

Dr. EASTICK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will refer no more to telex messages. However, I point out that the ways in which members receive remuneration can be wide and varied. This matter has been considered at length in other places. I refer, for instance, to the Report from the Select Committee on Members' Interest (Declaration), which on December 4, 1969, was ordered by the House of Commons to be printed. The report states that much consideration was given to the influence to which members of Parliament might be subjected as a result of offers of assistance if they were willing to, say, stand up in Parliament and peddle (if I can use that term) the wares or philosophy of a certain organisation. Although it would not be right or proper for me to read that document at length, I refer to paragraph 114 on page 33 of the report, as follows:

Your committee have recommended that the House should adopt two resolutions which together would comprise a code of conduct for members. These resolutions are:

(i) That in any debate or proceeding of the House or its committees or transactions or communications which a member may have with other members or with Ministers or servants of the Crown, he shall disclose any relevant pecuniary interest or benefit of whatever nature, whether direct or indirect, that he may have had, may have or may be expecting to have (paragraph 103).

(ii) That it is contrary to the usage and derogatory to the dignity of this House that a member should bring forward by speech or question, or advocate in this House or among his fellow members any Bill, motion, matter or cause for a fee, payment, retainer or reward, direct or indirect, which he has received, is receiving or expects to receive (paragraph 110).

Paragraph 115 states:

Your committee have considered whether it is necessary in addition to set out in detail, by amplifying these resolutions, what a member's obligations are on occasions when his personal financial interests are involved. They conclude that it would be unwise to do so. It would be difficult to cater for every imaginable circumstance, and an attempt to do so might confuse rather than clarify the purpose of the code. The two resolutions define that purpose clearly and comprehensively. One emphasises the duty of declaring in all relevant circumstances a pecuniary interest or benefit, including hospitality on visits abroad; the other deals with the mischief of advocating particular measures or causes in return for payments and rewards. Together they should prove a reliable guide in all but the most exceptional circumstances. If the code of conduct comprising these resolutions is approved by the House, your committee recommend that a copy should be sent by the Clerk of the House to every member, and subsequently to every new member. If a member has any doubt about what he should do, it is open to him to take advice from the Whips or the Clerk of the House, or the Speaker.

Indeed, under the heading "A historical note on declaration by members of pecuniary interests" in appendix 25 of the report, 3½ pages of information is provided by the Clerk of the House of Commons to the Select Committee. I now return briefly to the Bill because, unless I am mistaken, some Government members opposite have suggested that it would not apply to children over 18 years of age.

Mr. Keneally: Adults.

Dr. EASTICK: I refer members to *Hansard* of September 25 (page 1139) where, in his second reading explanation of the Bill, the member for Elizabeth said:

In other words, there is no requirement to name the actual clients. "Members of the family" includes the lawful spouse of a member, but does not include common-law wives or husbands; it also includes children over 18 years of age.

Mr. Mathwin: So how about that!

Dr. EASTICK: That is the official *Hansard* record, which has been circulated for some time and which has been reviewed. Despite this, Government members want to tell me about the "intendment" of the Bill, as outlined in the second reading explanation. The Bill is intended to apply to children over 18 years of age.

Mr. Coumbe: It's the member's own statement.

Dr. EASTICK: That is so, and this is the point to which I now return. I thank Government members for retracting—

Mr. Keneally: No. The Bill is the important document, and you know it!

Dr. EASTICK: That was not the basis of the information given across the floor only a few minutes ago. However, I have said I believe that this is an unwarranted invasion of privacy. This type of information is confidential and is, by law (at least until now), required to be given only to the Taxation Department, and that is how it should remain. The integrity of members of this Parliament is such that they would clearly indicate their position if called on to do so. The member for Stuart shakes his head. That suggests to me that he suspects that other members of this House have allowed an outside influence to determine their attitude to matters before the House. On behalf of my colleagues, I completely deny that they have at any stage been associated with such a situation. It was interesting to note that the member for Elizabeth, when introducing the Bill, acknowledged that he could see the value in members not divorcing themselves completely from a profession or trade, or some other interest that they had previously had.

Mr. Nankivell: Anyone who depended on being a member of Parliament would need his bumps read.

Dr. EASTICK: That statement of the member for Elizabeth is of some help, particularly coming from a person involved in extra-Parliamentary activities, and I do not deny him that right. I have told a number of his colleagues, including the member for Playford, my idea about a person involved in Parliamentary representation (a position so uncertain as to its term) who has not got a clear opportunity to go back to where he started so that there is security for his wife and family. Such a person is a fool if he does not try to keep his hand in, in connection with his profession, or to maintain an interest, so that he can arrange for employment if he is deposed from this place or another place in either the State field or the Commonwealth field.

Mr. Duncan: Yes, but what is the point? This Bill doesn't prohibit that.

Dr. EASTICK: I do not suggest it does. I am just pointing out in connection with any inference that might be drawn from the introduction of this subject (and this is the effect it has had in some outside areas) that I do not deny a member the opportunity of having this extra involvement. I accept the integrity of members; I believe they would indicate their position if they were called on to cast a vote if it was in any way going to

influence a matter in which they were involved. It is obvious that the member for Elizabeth is trying to achieve some degree of political advantage by attempting to imply that it is immoral for a member of Parliament to retain any interest in an activity in which he was involved before his election, notwithstanding his claim that he believes they should have this opportunity. Saying that this Bill will go a long way towards improving confidence in Parliamentarians does not get anywhere near understanding the reasons why the community may have a distrust of Parliament and Parliamentarians. This is not a cause for general disenchantment with politicians and, in many respects, with the Parliamentary system.

Mr. Crimes: You criticised the press for its attacks.

Dr. EASTICK: I will criticise anyone for an unwarranted attack on the Parliamentary system, on my colleagues, or on me personally. There needs to be sincerity of purpose in this matter, not a political, gimmicky approach, as adopted by the member for Elizabeth. Confidence in Parliament and Parliamentarians is developed by members who do their job properly. I fail to see that asking a member to say whether he has additional income from part-time employment will promote confidence in that person. It will not do so, and it is a sham to say that it will. If a member does not do his job properly, eventually the people will show their distrust through the ballot box. I could name individuals who have left this House for that very reason. Whilst I, as an individual, have nothing to fear, I would not wish this Bill upon any member of my family, whether it was intended to include those of my children who were more than 18 years of age, whether it was really intended to include those of my children of less than 18 years of age, or whether it was intended to include my wife. This Bill should be removed from the Notice Paper as quickly as possible.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I support the second reading of the Bill because I agree with the principle it embodies. That is not to say that I support, at this stage anyway, the way the Bill has been drawn. There are a few peculiarities about which I want to speak briefly. On balance, there is a better case for disclosure than for refusal of disclosure. When I was in England last February it was a live topic there; I think the House of Commons had just agreed to some provision such as this. I spoke to Sir Robin Vanderfeldt about the matter. I did not meet any members of Parliament, as it was election time and, once an election is called, members of Parliament are not allowed to go into the Houses of Parliament at all. I discussed the matter with Sir Robin and he canvassed for me the arguments pro and con. If there is to be any possible suspicion, and I agree that there has been none in connection with South Australian members—

Mr. Chapman: How much money did you make in England?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I was appearing before the Privy Council. If the member for Alexandra wishes to be so unmannerly and to try to embarrass me—

Mr. Chapman: How much were you paid?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The brief fee was about $1 000 for the fortnight I was away.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You got a week off from Parliament to go there.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, I got back on the day Parliament began.

Mr. Chapman: This is an opportunity for a member to disclose the facts.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. If members are interested, I am willing to disclose my whole income, including what I get from the Army. In fact, I checked up at Keswick today to make sure that, if I was challenged, I would be able to give an answer.

Mr. Chapman: Tell us how much you get from the Army!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In 1972-73, my total emolument from the Army was $2 113·70.

Mr. McAnaney: Less tax!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It was free of tax. In 1973-74, my income from the Army was $2 306·63.

Mr. McAnaney: That's worth $5 000.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I wish it were, but my income is not at that level.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What about the free socks and boots that you wear here?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not wear them here.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You've got them on now.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: These are civilian boots that I bought at Miller Andersons. They are the most expensive boots that I have ever bought: they cost about $25.

The SPEAKER: Can the honourable member relate this matter to the Bill?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am being genuine. Even though I am getting silly interjections, because they are about matters of personal finance, I feel obliged to give the best answer I can. The socks are not Army socks. They are a civilian copy: I find Army socks the most comfortable, and I ask my wife to buy for me socks that are as similar to the Army type as possible.

The Hon G. T. Virgo: Do you wear Army briefs, or civilian briefs?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not wear Army briefs; they are not issued now, anyway. They were issued to persons in National Service in the 1950's. As I was not a National Serviceman, I dipped out on this personal issue. I am willing to disclose my income at any time when anyone is interested in it. I have replied to the member for Alexandra, and I should tell him that, in addition to being paid the fee on brief for appearing before the Privy Council, I was paid expenses; otherwise, I could not have gone. That was a proper understanding, as it is in every other matter.

Members of Parliament must stand up to this disclosure if we are, like Caesar's wife, to be above reproach; if there is any question about our situation and finances, we should be willing to answer the question. I have done my best to answer the questions that have been put to me and I am willing to go on doing that, if necessary. I make no secret of the fact (and the member for Heysen reminds me of his frequently when he is annoyed with me and cannot think of anything else to say) that I am in practice as a barrister. I find that necessary from a financial point of view and also intellectually. It is necessary for those reasons, as well as for security. The member for Mallee has stated that a member of Parliament has an insecure job. I have been here for a long time, and for several years I depended on my Parliamentary income, having no other significant source of income. I do not consider that that circumstance makes for a good member of Parliament, because in that case one depends absolutely on the job and one's judgment must be affected by that. If one is to do the job properly, one should have a measure of detachment, which I have been able to achieve again. I believe that, by having some other source of income (it is a profession in my case, and I realise that I am one of the lucky ones to have a profession), I can do my job better than I could do it if I did not have that source of income.

If my constituents do not like that, and consider that I am not doing my job here properly and not giving to the job the time that they think I should be giving to it, that is for them to say. If they say it, I will be out of Parliament and I will do something else. I am not ashamed to say that. I have been a member of this House for more than 19 years. When I first became a member, I was also a member of an amalgamated legal practice, and I found it impossible to remain in that practice. Then I did virtually no outside work for a number of years before we went into Government and during our term in office. When that Government lost office, I suffered a severe drop in income, namely, from that of a Minister to that of a back-bencher. Therefore, I have worked up my practice again so that I can have a measure of independence. I consider that I can do the job here better because I am a barrister. Despite what the member for Heysen says, I do not consider that my practice detracts from the work that I do here but, if it does, it is for my constituents to say.

Mr. Becker: In a safe seat—

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Hanson and his Party are after me, and my district may become a marginal one.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: We got the message that your Party was after Hanson, too.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: We are, and I make no secret about that.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister cannot persecute the honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Until now, anyway, electorally I have been extremely lucky, and I grant the member for Hanson that. My district has been regarded as a safe district for me, but I hope that that does not mean that I have done less work for that reason. I have tried to keep up with the proper demands of a member of Parliament, irrespective of the electoral situation.

I support the Bill in principle and will vote for the second reading, but I find it extremely difficult to work out the precise meaning of the operative clause, clause 3. I am not pleased about the reference to members of a family. At present, my immediate family has no significant income apart from mine. My son soon will have an income, but I see no reason why his income should be disclosed. During the past year, I have had returns of, I think, $600 from dividends from probably about 12 different companies. I have a tiny number of shares in quite a few companies, and I cannot work out whether I will have to disclose that.

Does the honourable member who introduced the Bill intend, by this clause, that each separate dividend must be declared, or does he intend that only the total dividend must be declared? The amount prescribed is $500, but I am not sure from the provision whether I would have to declare a dividend of $10. I have one share in the Mutual Hospital Association, but the association does not pay a dividend. I do not know whether I will have to declare each individual shareholding, but each shareholding that I have is well below $500.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Have you any shares in the trade union co-operative?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, but I will consider any offer. I only have $10 to spare, but I shall be pleased to consider any offer. I am not sure what the provision in the Bill means, and I am sure that the member for Elizabeth will agree that it is messy drafting to provide that we must adapt a schedule to suit different sources of income. I do not know whether this Bill has been modelled on other legislation but, at first sight, I do not think the provision is expressed as well as it could be. As I have said, I am not happy about the reference to a member of the family. I suppose I must apply my own situation to the matter. I do not understand why, when my son takes a job, an apprenticeship, or whatever it may be, at the end of this year (if he is lucky enough to get a job), I should disclose his income. That would be entirely irrelevant and, anyway, the amount of income would be extremely small. I do not suppose that we will be lucky enough to debate this Bill in Committee, because of the stage of the session.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: If you sat down now, I think we could get it through the final stages this afternoon.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister may think that if he wants to. Although I have reservations about the drafting of the Bill and the mechanics of it, I support the principle behind it, not because I think that it is vitally necessary, but because I think that, if there is any question about this matter, members of Parliament should be required to disclose their income, as has been the practice increasingly in other parts of the world.

Mr. GUNN secured the adjournment of the debate.

WATER LICENCE

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Millhouse:

That, in the opinion of this House, the recommendations to the Engineering and Water Supply Department contained in the two reports of the Ombudsman laid on the table of the House on July 23, 1974, and relating to the issue of a water licence and the provision of an indirect water service, respectively, should have been approved.

(Continued from September 11. Page 884.)

Mr. BOUNDY (Goyder): The member for Mitcham, in speaking in this debate on August 14, referred to the occasion as being a historic one, and I agree with that statement. The Ombudsman has fulfilled the role for which his office was created. He is the people's advocate, and in fulfilling his role he has considered all the aspects of the merits of the two cases concerning Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Smith. He has pursued his inquiries through the department and to the Premier: the departments and the Premier have made their points in the correspondence that has passed between them and the Ombudsman, each pointing out the difficulties involved in making exceptions in matters involving policy. Despite the full and frank exchanges that took place between the Ombudsman and the Engineering and Water Supply Department, the Ombudsman remained convinced that the merits of the two cases warranted the ultimate action that he could take, that of presenting the reports on these matters in dispute to the Parliament. In opposing the motion of the member for Mitcham, the Minister of Works canvassed the two cases as they affected his Ministerial responsibility: while recognising the merits of each case, his acceding to the request of the Ombudsman could have made firm policy decisions on his part inoperable.

In supporting the motion, it is my contention that both people whose cases were outlined in the Ombudsman's report were the victims of unfortunate circumstances. The subdivision of an area of land has denied Mr. Smith an indirect service, while Mr. Kennedy seems to have suffered because the previous owner was unable, through physical disability, to develop the property to the full water entitlement. The Ombudsman is charged with the responsibility of defending the ordinary citizen from the seemingly heartless bureaucracy. He has chosen to take the ultimate step of presenting these reports to Parliament and, in order to uphold and support the office of Ombudsman, I believe the Government should accede to his request.

Mr. ARNOLD secured the adjournment of the debate.

COMMERCIAL MOTOR VEHICLES

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Blacker:

That the regulations made on April 18, 1974, under the Commercial Motor Vehicles (Hours of Driving) Act, 1973, relating to exemption of Municipal Tramways Trust employees and laid on the table of this House on July 23, 1974, be disallowed.

(Continued from August 14. Page 461.)

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders) moved:

That this Order of the Day be read and discharged.

Order of the Day read and discharged.

WRONGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

POTATO MARKETING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ART GALLERY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

[*Sitting suspended from* 5.57 *to* 7.30 *p.m.*]

STATUTE LAW REVISION BILL

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to make certain consequential and minor amendments to, and to correct certain errors and remove certain inconsistencies and anomalies in, the Statute Law and to repeal certain obsolete enactments. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is another Bill which, if approved by Parliament, will facilitate and accelerate the programme undertaken by the Government for the consolidation and reprinting of the public general Acts of South Australia under the Acts Republication Act, 1967-1972. The Bill makes consequential and minor amendments to and corrects errors and removes inconsistencies and anomalies in a number of Acts, and repeals other Acts that are obsolete. The Acts listed in the first schedule for repeal are now obsolete and no longer in operation and no person would be prejudiced by their repeal.

So far as the Acts listed for amendment in the second schedule are concerned, all possible steps and all precautions have been taken to ensure that the amendments do not change any policy or principle that has already been established by Parliament and, in some cases, the amendments are consequential on policies and principles that have been, in fact, endorsed by Parliament. In the case of conversions of currency and measurements, exact equivalents have been adopted except where such equivalents are inappropriate, impractical or administratively inconvenient, in which case the most appropriate or the nearest and most practical or the most convenient conversions have been adopted. I seek leave to have the remainder of this second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 (1) repeals the Acts set out in the first schedule. The Crown Debtors Relief Act, 1934, has long been obsolete, and serves no useful purpose by remaining on the Statute Book. The Liquid Fuel Act, 1941, has never been brought into operation by proclamation. Its object was to encourage and ensure a local market during the war years and for a reasonable period thereafter for certain motor fuels other than petrol. The Act has never been used or required since it was passed in 1941, nor have regulations been made under it and it has been a dead letter for 33 years.

The Liquor Licences (Acquired Properties) Act, 1948, is virtually obsolete. It may be said to apply only to three dormant licences which were then known as publicans' licences under the Licensing Act, 1932, which was repealed by the Licensing Act, 1967. The premises to which the licences apply were acquired by the South Australian Harbors Board for wharf expansion and are now owned by the Minister of Marine, who is not interested in the licences. Moreover, neither the classes of licence provided for by the Licensing Act, 1932, and by the Licensing Act, 1967, nor the court procedures prescribed by those Acts are the same nor are the procedures provided for by the later Act adaptable to the circumstances dealt with by the older Act. This Act is therefore also a dead letter.

The Metropolitan Transport Advisory Council Act, 1954, and its amendments are now obsolete, as the Metropolitan Transport Advisory Council which was set up by the Act ceased to exist by virtue of section 5 (1) of the Act, as amended, and the Act now no longer serves any purpose by remaining on the Statute Book. The Act and its amendments are accordingly repealed as a measure of Statute law revision.

The Motor Vehicles Registration Fees (Refunds) Act, 1955, empowered the Treasurer to refund the registration fees paid in respect of the registration of interstate motor vehicles when the registration took effect after January 31, 1955, but not later than September 15, 1955. No action remains to be taken under the Act, and it is no longer operative. The Referendum (State Lotteries) Act, 1965, is no longer in operation. It was enacted for the purpose of enabling a referendum to be held on the question of conducting State lotteries, and all action in connection with the referendum and the Act has been taken.

Clause 2 (2) deals with the case where an Act expressed to be repealed by this Bill is repealed by some other Act before this Bill becomes law. This is an eventuality that is possible and this provision enacts that, in such a case, the enactment by this Bill that purports to repeal that Act has no effect. Clause 3 (1) provides that the Acts listed in the first column of the second schedule are amended in the manner indicated in the second column of that schedule and, as so amended, may be cited by their new citations as specified, in appropriate cases, in the third column of that schedule. Clause 3 (2) deals with the case where an Act expressed to be amended by this Bill is (before this Bill becomes law) repealed by some other Act or amended by some other Act in such a way that renders the amendment as expressed by this Bill ineffective. This is another eventuality that could well occur. In such a case the clause provides that the Bill will have effect as if that amendment had never been included in it.

Clause 3 (3) deals with the case where an Act amended by this Bill is repealed by some other Act after this Bill becomes law, but the repeal does not extend to the amendment made by this Bill. In such a case the clause provides for the repeal of that amendment. I have already dealt with the Acts listed in the first schedule for repeal. I shall now briefly explain the proposed amendments to the Acts listed in the second schedule.

Act No. 30 of 1872 (as amended by the Statute Law Revision Act, 1935): This amendment inserts a section in the Act giving the Act a short title by which it can be cited. Age of Majority (Reduction) Act, 1970-1973: This amendment is consequential on the repeal of the Money-Lenders Act by the Consumer Credit Act, 1972. Apprentices Act, 1950-1971: This amendment is consequential on the enactment of the Superannuation Act, 1974. Benefit Associations Act, 1958, contains references to certain State Acts which have been repealed and superseded by other Acts and to certain Commonwealth Acts which could be updated. The first amendment to section 3 (1) amends the reference to the Friendly Societies Act, 1919-1956, by giving that Act a continuing short title. The second and third amendments add to the references to the Commonwealth Acts entitled the National Health Act and the Life Insurance Act the passage "or any corresponding subsequent enactment".

The fourth amendment is consequential on the enactment of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, 1972, and the repeal of the Industrial Code, 1920-1956. The next amendment is consequential on the repeal of the Road Traffic Act, 1934-1957, and the enactment of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1959. The amendments to section 5 add to the references to the Commonwealth Act entitled the National Health Act, 1953-1957, and the Insurance Act, 1932-1937, the passage "or any corresponding subsequent enactment". The amendments to sections 15 (*c*) and 16 make conversions to decimal currency of references to the old currency.

Crown Lands Act Amendment Act, 1974: This amendment repeals section 44 of the amending Act of 1974 because it purports to enact an amendment to section 289 of the Crown Lands Act, 1929-1973, which was redundant, the same amendment having already been made by the Statute Law Revision Act, 1974, second schedule. Inflammable Liquids Act, 1961: The amendment to section 3 extends the meaning of "Government Analyst" to include any assistant to the Government Analyst while exercising his powers pursuant to section 19 and any other person acting on behalf of and with the written authority of the Government Analyst. The amendment to section 18 (1) updates the reference to the Chief Inspector. The amendment to section 31 (3) is a conversion to decimal currency. The amendments to sections 32 (1), 32 (2) and 34 (1) substitute for references to the South Australian Harbors Board (which is no longer in existence) references to the Minister of Marine and make conversions to decimal currency. The amendments to sections 34 (2) and 34 (3) also substitute for references to the South Australian Harbors Board references to the Minister of Marine.

Landlord and Tenant Act, 1936: Section 18 (1) provides that every person distraining for rent shall deliver one copy of the warrant under which the distress is levied, and a copy of the inventory mentioned in section 17, to every person claiming an interest in the distrained goods, on payment of a charge at the rate of 3d. a folio for such copy. The equivalent of 3d. under the Decimal Currency Act, 1965, is 2½c, but the charge a folio or page for obtaining copies of documents as prescribed by rules under the Local and District Criminal Courts Act is very much more than 2½c. For the sake of consistency, the amendment to section 18 (1) provides that the charge be "at such rate or basis as may be prescribed from time to time by rules of court made under the Local and District Criminal Courts Act, 1926-1969, as amended". The amendment to section 18 (2) makes a conversion to decimal currency. Section 35 provides that, where any distress is made under Part II of the Act, the charges in schedules G and H of the Act, and no others, shall be made in respect thereof. Schedule G prescribes solicitors' charges and schedule H prescribes certain costs of distress. These schedules have not been altered since they were enacted in 1936, and they are not consistent with charges and costs approved by courts in comparable circumstances. The section is accordingly repealed and re-enacted to provide for such charges and costs as are appropriate to be as prescribed by the rules of court under the Local and District Criminal Courts Act, 1926-1969, as amended. Consequentially, schedule G and schedule H will also be repealed. The amendments to section 45 (1), section 45 (2) and schedules A, B, C and F make appropriate conversions to decimal currency. The last amendment repeals schedules G and H in consequence of the enactment of new section 35.

Margarine Act Amendment Act, 1956: Subsection (2) of section 3 of this Act referred to amendments made to section 20 of the principal Act which was repealed by section 3 of the Margarine Act Amendment Act, 1973. That subsection, which was only a transitional provision, is no longer relevant. Section 4, which also was a transitional provision and related to notices relating to the maximum quantity of table margarine a person may manufacture in 1957, is also no longer relevant. Metropolitan Area (Woodville, Henley and Grange) Drainage Act, 1964-1972: The amendments to section 2, section 4 (2) and section 8 (2) merely alter references therein to the town of Henley and Grange to the city of Henley and Grange and the other amendments are conversions to decimal currency.

Metropolitan Drainage Act, 1935: The amendments to section 3 strike out the definition of "Commissioner" as the Commissioner of Public Works and insert in its place a definition of "Minister" as the Minister of Works or Acting Minister of Works. Section 4, which attracts the provisions of the Compulsory Acquisition of Land Act, 1925, is repealed, as that Act has been repealed and superseded by the Land Acquisition Act, 1969, the provisions of which are made applicable to the acquisition of land for the purposes of the principal Act by virtue of the amendment to section 5. The amendment to section 6 substitutes "Minister" for "Commissioner". The first amendment to section 7 (2) updates a percentage referred to in the old currency while the second amendment strikes out the reference to "municipal and district" councils mentioned in Part I of the first schedule, the district councils originally mentioned in that schedule having since become municipal councils and the distinction between the two being no longer relevant.

The amendments to section 7 (3) are precisely the same as the amendments to section 7 (2). The amendments to sections 8 (2) and 8 (3) are conversions to decimal currency and consequential amendments. The amendments to sections 8 (5), 9, 10 (2), 10 (3), 11 (2), 11 (3), 12, 13, 14 (1) and the first amendment to section 14 (2) are consequential on the earlier amendments referred to. The second amendment to section 14 (2) equates a disputed claim under that section to a disputed claim under section 23 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1969. The other amendments to the Act are consequential or make exact conversions to decimal currency, or update references to district councils which are now municipal councils.

Metropolitan Milk Supply Act, 1946-1971: The amendment to section 3 (1) strikes out the definition of "living wage" which at present is tied to the Industrial Code, 1920, which was repealed by the Industrial Code, 1967,

the relevant provisions of which have now been replaced by corresponding provisions of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, 1972. The amendment enacts a new definition of "living wage" as the living wage as defined in section 6 of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, 1972. The amendment to section 6 (1) substitutes a reference to the Public Service Board for the reference to the Public Service Commissioner. The amendment to section 9 (2) substitutes "one hundred cents in the dollar" for the expression "twenty shillings in the pound". The amendments to section 14 (1) and section 14 (2) update the references to the Superannuation Act, 1926-1946. The amendment to section 16 updates the reference to the Public Service Act, 1936-1946, which was repealed by the Public Service Act, 1967. The amendment to section 32 (5) corrects an erroneous citation of the Food and Drugs Act, 1908.

Noxious Insects Act, 1934-1955: The amendment to section 11 supplies a drafting omission. Opticians Act, 1920-1971: The first amendment makes a consequential amendment to the heading of Part III which had been overlooked in the 1969 amending Act. The amendment to section 27 (3) makes a conversion to decimal currency. The amendments to section 30 (1) are consequential on the repeal of the Registration of Business Names Act, 1928, and the enactment of the Business Names Act, 1963. Petroleum (Submerged Lands) Act, 1967-1969: These amendments make grammatical corrections to section 11 (2) and section 88 (1).

Phylloxera Act, 1936-1969: The amendment to section 37 (2) makes a conversion to decimal currency. The amendment to section 38a supplies a drafting omission. The amendments to sections 48, 49 (2), 50 and 52 make conversions to decimal currency. The amendments to the second schedule change the reference to the district council district of Tea Tree Gully to a reference to the municipality of Tea Tree Gully and the reference to the district council district of Port Elliot to a reference to the district council district of Port Elliot and Goolwa. These changes are in accordance with the changes that have taken place in the status and names of those two local authorities respectively.

Primary Producers' Debts Act, 1935-1941 (as amended by Primary Producers Assistance Act, 1943): The amendments to section 26 (*a*) convert the references to "pound" and "penny" to references to "dollar" and "cent" respectively. Although these are not conversions to exact equivalents in decimal currency they are the most logical and convenient conversions in the circumstances. The amendments to section 26 (*b*) convert the proportion of 5s in the pound to 25c in the dollar and the conversions of the passage "amount in the pound" to "amount in the dollar" and the passage "five shillings" lastly occurring in paragraph (*b*) to "twenty-five cents" are consequential on and consistent with the earlier amendments. The amendments to section 26 (*c*) and section 26 (*d*) are all consequential on and consistent with the amendments earlier referred to. These amendments are considered essential for consolidating the Act, and do not include amendments that involve questions of interpretation or could be avoided with the aid of footnotes or other editorial annotation.

Road Traffic Act, 1961-1974: The amendments to section 5 of the Act update the definitions of "area" and "council" by omitting from those definitions the specific references to the "City of Whyalla as defined by the City of Whyalla Commission Act, 1944-1964," and to the "City of Whyalla Commission established under the City of Whyalla Commission Act, 1944-1964". The last amendment to section 5 cleans up the superfluous "or" that follows the definition of "stopline". The amendment to section 86 (1) is a grammatical one. The amendment to section 97 (2) also removes a superfluous "or". The amendment to section 144 (1) removes a superfluous "the". The amendments to section 169 (1) clarify the provisions of the section. The amendment to section 174 redefines "industrial award" without specific reference to any Act. Previously the definition referred specifically to "the Industrial Court or any industrial board constituted by or under the Industrial Code, 1920-1958". That code was replaced by the Industrial Code, 1967, which in turn has been partially replaced by the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, 1972.

Veterinary Districts Act, 1940: The amendment to section 19 (1) converts the expression "twenty shillings in the pound" to "one hundred cents in the dollar". The amendment to section 53 (5) and the first amendment to section 58 alter the minimum age of voting at elections under the Act from 21 years to 18 years. The other amendment to section 58 and the amendments to sections 68, 69 and 70 convert references to the old currency to their exact equivalents in the present currency. The amendment to section 76 converts the reference to £5 per cent to five per cent. The other amendments convert references expressed in the old currency to their exact equivalents in the present currency.

White Phosphorus Matches Prohibition Act, 1915-1934: The amendment to section 4 supplies a drafting omission by giving a subsection designation to the first subsection of section 4. The amendments to section 4 (2) double the penalties which had been fixed in 1915. The first amendment to section 5 changes the reference to the Industrial Code, 1920, to a reference to the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, 1972, as amended. The other amendment to section 5 and the amendment to section 6 double the penalties which had been fixed in 1915. The amendment to section 9 (1) increases the witness fee which had been fixed in 1915 as one guinea to $10.

Mr. NANKIVELL secured the adjournment of the debate.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MUSEUM BILL

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister of Environment and Conservation) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for the administration of the South Australian Museum; to repeal the Museum Act, 1939; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill is identical with a previous Bill relating to the South Australian Museum which passed the House of Assembly in November, 1973. Unfortunately, the Legislative Council made amendments to the Bill which were unacceptable to the Government, and the Bill lapsed. I need not reiterate the general introduction to the Bill which was previously given, but for the convenience of honourable members I shall reproduce the explanation of the clauses.

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 are formal. Clause 4 repeals the present Museum Act. Clause 5 contains a number of definitions necessary for the purposes of the new Act. Clause 6 continues the Museum Board in existence. The board is a body corporate and has full power to enter into

contractual rights and obligations incidental to the administration of the museum. Clause 7 deals with the constitution of the board. The board consists at present of five members. In future the Director of Environment and Conservation will be an *ex officio* member of the board.

Clause 8 deals with the terms and conditions upon which members of the board hold office. Clause 9 validates acts or proceedings of the board during vacancies in its membership. Clause 10 provides for the appointment of a Chairman to the board. The Chairman is to hold office for a four-year term. Clause 11 deals with the procedure of the board. Four members of the board constitute a quorum. Clause 12 provides that the Director of the museum shall attend at every meeting of the board for the purposes of giving detailed advice to the board on the day-to-day running of the museum and other matters within his knowledge and experience.

Clause 13 sets out the functions of the board. The board is to undertake the care and management of the museum and of all lands and premises vested in or placed under the control of the board. The board is empowered to carry out or promote research into matters of scientific or historical interest in this State. The board is empowered to accumulate and care for objects and specimens of scientific or historical interest and to accumulate and classify data in respect of any such matters. The board is empowered to disseminate information of scientific or historical interest and to perform other functions of scientific, educational or historical significance that may be assigned to the board by the Minister. The board is empowered to purchase or hire objects of scientific or historical interest, to sell, exchange or dispose of any such objects and to make available for the purpose of scientific or historical research any portion of the State collection. Clause 14 provides for the appointment of a Director of the museum. The Director and other officers of the museum shall hold office subject to the Public Service Act.

Clause 15 provides for the board to make a report upon the administration of the museum in each year. A copy of the report is to be laid before each House of Parliament. Clause 16 provides for the board to keep proper accounts of its financial dealings. The Auditor-General is to audit the accounts of the board at least once each year. Clause 17 provides that any person who, without the authority of the board, damages, mutilates, destroys or removes from the possession of the board any object from the State collection or any other property of the board is guilty of an offence. Clause 18 provides for proceedings for an offence against the new Act to be disposed of summarily. Clause 19 provides that the moneys required for the purposes of the new Act shall be paid out of moneys provided by Parliament for those purposes. Clause 20 empowers the Governor to make regulations in relation to the new Act.

Mr. ARNOLD secured the adjournment of the debate.

SAVINGS BANK OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 3. Page 1283.)

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): The purpose of this Bill is to provide additional income for South Australia. Although we have come to expect the introduction of income-earning measures in this way, I point out that the effects of this Bill are retrospective. We find for the first time that a charge has been applied against the profits of the Savings Bank of South Australia. This charge is retrospective, as it applies to the 1973-74 trading year.

Opposition members have consistently said that the perilous state of South Australia's finances results from the failure of the Commonwealth Government to meet its commitments to South Australia. This afternoon the Treasurer said that he hoped funds would be made available from the Commonwealth Government for the construction of the Rundle Street mall. At the time he introduced the Budget, he said that he was almost certain South Australia would receive additional Commonwealth funds, that would thereby alleviate the necessity to levy further taxation and other revenue-raising measures on the people of South Australia.

Subsequent statements have clearly shown that the Treasurer's forecasts and hopes of moneys forthcoming from the Commonwealth Government were not to be realised. As we have come to expect since December, 1972, there has yet been another broken promise and a failure by the Commonwealth to deliver the goods. The Commonwealth Government has refused to cut back its spending in its area of responsibility, and the Government of South Australia has refused to reassess its spending in this State, not on matters of social importance (for example, hospital development, social welfare, or education developments), but in respect of expenditure on non-essential and certainly non-productive undertakings.

Therefore, we believe that there is no real need for the Government to attempt to raise additional moneys from the people of South Australia through massive increases in taxation and other revenue-increasing measures, as have continually been presented to this House. Opposition members are especially opposed to a Bill that includes retrospective provisions. The Treasurer, having given notice of his intentions in this area and having made many statements on this matter, must eventually face an election. However, the Opposition will not be party to the passage of a Bill including retrospective provisions. Amendments are to be placed on file; I think they are on file.

Mr. Nankivell: Yes, they are on file.

Dr. EASTICK: These amendments, if accepted, will allow the operation of the Bill from the time it was announced publicly. I will not accept a Bill that seeks to deal with financial transactions of the 1973-74 financial year. We are told that the sum of $500 000 will be raised, if the Bill is passed. True, this is a large sum in South Australia's finances. However, the Government has a responsibility to reassess its whole programme, including its areas of over-spending, especially in non-productive areas, so that it can organise its programme for the next financial year. It must draw on the trading results of the Savings Bank of South Australia for 1974-75. I make that point, which is also relevant to another Bill that will be before us soon. Although I do not accept the Bill as it stands, I support it to the second reading stage for the purpose of moving amendments in Committee. I do not hesitate to tell the Treasurer that, consistent with action I have taken previously, I will vote against the Bill at the third reading unless the amendments are accepted.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): Like the Leader, I support the Bill to the second reading stage, but I am somewhat disappointed that, to assist the State's finances, we must consider legislation that takes from the Savings Bank its profits. The Savings Bank was established for the people. As it is the people's bank, I believe that it belongs to its depositors. Although I recognise that the deposits are guaranteed by the Government, it is unfair to take part of the profits from the bank, thereby depriving it of some of its working capital. The bank's profits, which are retained in the business, are used by the bank to expand

and to undertake its programme in various fields; this is something the bank has done successfully over the years. The bank has provided keen competition to the free-enterprise banks, but free enterprise should not be frightened of that competition. Free-enterprise banks manage to survive and to supply the people's needs.

I believe that a bank which has a wonderful opportunity to control, encourage and attract the savings of school-children should retain the profits it earns on school savings accounts. I know that the profit the State Treasury will acquire will not retard completely the bank's progress, but I still consider it somewhat unfair that the bank, which was established for its depositors (I have always considered it to be a mutual organisation, but I may be wrong in that belief), should lose this portion of its profits. The bank should be free of taxes, which would mean that those who used the bank would have complete safety and protection, because its deposits are guaranteed by the State Government.

The higher rate of interest offered by the bank has proved an attractive way of obtaining new depositors and holding them. The people of the State jealously regard this bank as their own. In the past, when it was thought that it could be taken over completely by the Government and merged with the State Bank, we saw a slight temporary run-down in deposits; that reflected the people's feeling. It was their reaction at the time, and I would not want to see such reaction recur. I think it unfair that the Treasury should be seeking to take a percentage of the profits for the 1973-74 year. Whether or not the bank's board knew that this action was forthcoming, I think it unfair to ask any organisation to part with its profits after it has closed its books. So, in principle, I do not like the idea behind the Bill. I realise that it was a Liberal Government that taxed the State Bank's profits; even so, I would still like to see the Savings Bank remain free and completely at the disposal of its depositors. As it is the people's bank, all of its profits should remain for the benefit of its depositors.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I do not think much of this Bill, but the Government must have revenue, as it is really scraping the bottom of the barrel in some of the revenue-raising activities in which it is indulging this year. As the Treasurer has from time to time alluded to the fact that the Government is finding it difficult to raise revenue, we must give due recognition to that fact. For this reason, I will not vote against the second reading. Of course, the more money that is bled from the Savings Bank and from other profit-making organisations, the less they have to lend; their activities are inhibited. I like even less the kind of revenue-raising activities in which the Government is indulging by leaning on the profits of the Electricity Trust and the Gas Company, thereby ensuring that the tariffs for both commodities will be increased. The idea of leaning on these instrumentalities simply because they are successful and profit making is poor business and, of course, it adds to the inflationary spiral. Although I do not like the Bill, as I give due weight to the fact that the Treasurer must raise revenue I do not oppose it.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): I oppose the part of the Bill that places a levy on the profits of the Savings Bank last financial year. I cannot see how any organisation can budget for certain circumstances that might be changed by a subsequent Act of Parliament. As the payment to the Treasury for last year will have to be taken from the bank's reserve funds, this will mean that it can lend less money for house building and other activities to the benefit of the people of the State. I go along to a certain degree with the principle that the Government-owned Savings Bank should pay a tax similar to that paid by private-enterprise banks. I am not altogether against Government ownership, provided that fair competition exists between it and private enterprise; this is something we must accept. However, I deplore the way in which the Treasurer says that he must increase taxation here and there in order to keep South Australia going, when Government expenditure this year is to be increased by 24·5 per cent. This increase in expenditure is out of proportion with the population increase and the inflation rate increase, but the Government expects the private sector and private people (every man, woman and child), whatever their income, to make a further contribution to the State, which tells them how their money should be spent. I strongly oppose such a principle.

The Treasurer has screamed in the House that our policy would create unemployment, but that taking money away from people and handing it to the Government does not cause unemployment. Although some people are paid too little in wages, certain militant unionists have created a cost level in some industries so that they cannot compete with imports.

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the honourable member that, although the Savings Bank of South Australia Act Amendment Bill is a budgetary matter, at the same time, it does not open up the Bill to a complete debate on the Budget itself. The House is dealing with a specific Bill, and thus far honourable members have confined their remarks to the Bill. I request the honourable member for Heysen to do so, too.

Mr. McANANEY: Any tax that is raised from the private sector (and this tax is being raised from the Savings Bank, which will in turn make available less money to the private sector) must adversely affect it. I have made my point. We cannot continue collecting more and more money from the private sector to enable an increase in Government expenditure of 24·5 per cent this year. This is not practicable if we are to retain the system under which we have lived and which we have come to enjoy.

This sort of action is crippling the way of life that we like. Dr. Cairns says that the system is failing today. However, the lack of good financial management and excessive Government spending are causing the failure. There are other ways than this of raising revenue. I accept that a Government-owned bank should pay the same contribution to the Government as its competitors in the private field pay. However, I am opposed to making such legislation retrospective. The trustees of the Savings Bank, having assessed the situation last year, paid out the interest that they considered they were capable of paying to their depositors, and put some in reserve. The only way in which they can get back some of this money is to take it out of reserve or to deduct it from the interest that they will be able to pay this year. Although I accept the principle of imposing a levy on the Savings Bank, I object to retrospective legislation.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I have listened with interest to what honourable members have said and, I must say, I am somewhat bemused.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Amused?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, because I do not think it is funny; indeed, it is tragic. I should like first to deal with the point raised by the Leader of the Opposition. He was not a member of the House when the principle of putting part of State Savings Bank profits into the Treasury was established. It was established by the Hall Government, and that Act is now on the Statute Book. I suggest that the Leader read it.

Dr. Eastick: This is Savings Bank legislation.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am referring to the State Bank legislation, and this was the first time that this principle, of part of the profits of the State Bank (and the Savings Bank is a State bank) being paid into the Treasury, was established here.

Dr. Eastick: You were fairly critical about that.

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

Mr. Coumbe: And still are?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Honourable members opposite supported that measure by their vote in the House.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Have you been a convert to the principle?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, and I will tell the honourable member why; I do not mind doing that.

Mr. Goldsworthy: It's because you're now the Treasurer.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No. If the honourable member wants to know, I will tell him. However, I suggest that he sit and listen and not try to change the subject, which will be unfortunate for him.

Mr. Goldsworthy: I'm not trying to do that; I'm right on the nose.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Then I suggest that the honourable member listen because I will give it right back on the nose to him. The State Bank Act Amendment Act of 1968 was passed and assented to on November 14, 1968. Section 4 thereof repealed section 34 of the principal Act and inserted in its place a new section, subsection (2) (*a*) of which provides:

Nine-twentieths of the net profits, as certified by the Auditor-General, for the financial year ended the thirtieth day of June, 1968, and for each subsequent financial year shall, within nine months after the end of that financial year, be paid to the Treasurer who shall place the same to the credit of the Consolidated Revenue of the State:

The Hall Government, supported by the member for Heysen—

Mr. McAnaney: I accepted the principle.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, but the principle of retrospectivity is included in this legislation.

Mr. McAnaney: I don't like its being retrospective.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: But the honourable member voted for it.

Mr. McAnaney: Yes, and I agree with the principle now.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am talking about retrospectivity, and I suggest that the honourable member listen to me.

Mr. McAnaney: Stick to the facts!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am. After the Budget in 1968, honourable members opposite voted that the profits for the year ended the previous June 30 were to be paid to Consolidated Revenue.

Mr. McAnaney: You've got me now.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, I have. It is here in the Act, and the honourable member voted for it.

Dr. Eastick: You voted against it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, I did. The fact is that since then the Government has accepted the argument of Opposition members that South Australian public corporations should pay to Consolidated Revenue a proportion of their profits that will put them in a position comparable with that of their private competitors. The Government did this in relation to the State Government Insurance Commission and the State Bank, and it is now doing it in relation to the Savings Bank. That was the proposition, and I point out to the member for Hanson, since he has raised this matter and differed from his colleagues on it, that this has constantly been urged by the Liberal Party in this State in relation to every public corporation. It has said that it is unfair that a public corporation should not pay to Consolidated Revenue an amount equivalent to that being paid by the private sector.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You've now accepted that, have you?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, I have.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Then we've had a win with you.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Very well, the honourable member can say that. However, I do not know what political point he is trying to make if he is suggesting that this Bill ought to be opposed.

Mr. Goldsworthy: I didn't say that.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am pleased about that. This situation is not new. Indeed, the State Savings Bank of Victoria has been required by a Liberal Government to pay half its net profits to State revenue, and the Rural Bank of New South Wales has also been required by a Liberal Government to do so. The Commonwealth Savings Bank and the Commonwealth Trading Bank have both been affected by Liberal Governments in the same way, half the net profit of the Commonwealth Savings Bank being paid into Commonwealth Consolidated Revenue. An equivalent of half the Commonwealth Trading Bank's net profit after tax is paid into revenue. Those principles were established by Liberal Governments. The principle of retrospectivity in relation to previous net profits was established by the previous Liberal Government in South Australia. So, as to those two points I suggest that members opposite had better be a little consistent with their own practice.

Mr. McAnaney: It is the first time you have caught me out in 10 years.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am very grateful for the honourable member's admission. I do not know that it is entirely accurate, but I am grateful for small mercies.

Mr. Coumbe: You have been converted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have been converted to the idea of State corporations paying a portion of net profit to State revenue, and I have specifically incorporated it in legislation: I have not waited for amendments from the Opposition to measures I have introduced about State corporations. If members find delight in my conversion, I am glad to provide them with pleasure.

Mr. Coumbe: How far are you going to go with that pleasure?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I think the honourable member has a fairly accurate gauge of that. It is not much use members opposite raising objections of that kind; I simply say they ought to be consistent with their own previously expressed principles and practice.

Mr. Goldsworthy: If you can do a switch, why can't we?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Members opposite are now suddenly raising retrospectivity as being unpleasant, and they say that the present Government should not—

Mr. Gunn: It's bad in principle, and you know it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know anything of the kind. This House has approved the Expenditure Estimates, and it approved them on the basis of the Revenue Estimates that were placed before members. This

is one of the revenue measures, and the revenue was explained to the House at the time of the Treasurer's statement on the Revenue Estimates.

Dr. Eastick: Including $6 000 000 extra from the Commonwealth.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I forecast that I would get that sum and, because I will not get it, I will now have to introduce other measures in that connection, but that has nothing to do with this measure. The Leader cannot change the subject, which is the raising of the $500 000 involved here. If the Leader votes against the raising of this money, he is saying that we must reduce our expenditure by $500 000. Instead of going on with his vague statements about productive and non-productive areas of expenditure, he must accept the responsibility of saying where expenditure is to be reduced and whom we are to sack, because that is what is involved. I point out to the Leader and his supporters that time and again in this last year they have introduced measures requiring additional Government expenditure. The member for Hanson had a motion in this House about establishing a Ministry of Recreation and Sport, and we agreed to it. Subsequently, we provided the necessary officers recommended by the Public Service Board. Does the Leader now say that this is a non-productive area of Government expenditure and that we must therefore sack those people? Where is it that the Leader takes the responsibility of saying that we are to cut down our services?

Mr. Gunn: Start on your own department.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Which section of my department? Where will I save $500 000 on my department?

Mr. Gunn: What about the monitoring service?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That cost $7 900. That is a start toward $500 000! Where is the rest? Come on! Let members opposite stand up and be counted! If members opposite are so irresponsible as to demand a reduction in Government revenue of $500 000 when this State is facing considerable trouble in meeting basic expenditure for State services, the Leader of the Opposition is showing how utterly incapable he would be of running the State.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Disposal of surplus of income over expenditure."

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

In new section 65 (1) to strike out "1974" and insert "1975".

It is clear that this legislation is retrospective, and it has been made clear to the Government over a long period that Opposition members do not accept retrospectivity in legislation. It is all very well for the Treasurer to relate what took place earlier. I have read his contribution to the debate where he opposed the principle, and he has acknowledged that. In the debate on October 9, 1968 (at pages 1779-81 of *Hansard*), nowhere did he oppose the retrospectivity aspect. That apart, I do not see any reason why, because the Treasurer does not buck at retrospectivity, I should not do so. The Treasurer will not glance around at his empire and find places to reduce expenditure, such as the monitoring system and the inefficient railway workshops. I do not look for retrenchments. If people were relocated where they could be more productive, we would not be looking for this $500 000 and other sums. As a result of the actions of the Government's friends in another place, we are in our present perilous financial situation. There is no reason why the transactions of organisations such as the Savings Bank of South Australia should be pilfered to this degree in 1973-74. If the Treasurer wants to make a charge against the trading for 1974-75, that is a matter for which he will have to stand up and be counted on another day—at the next election. I will not support retrospective legislation, and I ask the Committee to support the amendment.

Mr. GUNN: I am totally opposed to retrospective legislation, and it is hypocritical of the Treasurer to criticise us for standing up for a principle. The Auditor-General's Report for the year ended June 30, 1974, states that the Quorn service earned $21 000 but, after costs had been allowed for, it lost $304 000. I should be surprised if anyone could justify a continuation of that kind of service. Either the charges must be increased to cover losses or an alternative service must be provided.

There are many other services in addition to the Quorn service to which I could refer. The railway operations, in my district, would probably do as well as anywhere else in the State, and I refer the Treasurer to the Kevin gypsum works and the Thevenard port. I suggest that the Government examine the costs for passenger lines. The Semaphore line ought to be closed and replaced by a Municipal Tramways Trust service. Any responsible Government that talks about losing $30 000 000 should find out whether the losses on the South Australian Railways could be reduced.

Mr. BECKER: I support the amendment. Two wrongs do not make a right, and what the Hall Government did was not necessarily correct. If Mr. Hall had been a good Leader, he would still be in office. The deficit at the end of September was $2 600 000, and the final amount could be greater. If we take $500 000 from the Savings Bank, we will be robbing one organisation to benefit the State Treasury. That Bank is the people's bank and the profits belong to the depositors.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): The Leader still objects to retrospectivity, although members of his Party, including many of those who sit behind him now, introduced and voted for this very thing when they were in office. That was as recently as 1968. Some members of the Opposition front bench were on the Government front bench then and took part in making the Cabinet decisions.

Mr. Goldsworthy: One did, out of seven of us.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Perhaps that one will persuade his colleagues to adopt the principle that was adopted then or say that he thinks that the principle was wrong. I did not oppose the principle then. Whilst I did not like taking money from State Government corporations, I did not oppose charging on the basis of what had happened during the previous year and on the money that was still available to the State Government corporations then. The Leader has been his usual vague self regarding State expenditure, saying that it is not for him to tell us what he would do if he was in office. He says that it is up to us to decide.

Dr. Eastick: I gave some examples.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader was not very specific about the railway services, except that he suggested that we consider the Islington workshops, not on the basis of sacking anyone employed there but somehow on the basis of transferring employees to another activity.

Mr. Harrison: It's the most efficient operation in the Government.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the Leader wants to close the Islington workshops down, I wish he would say so. The member for Eyre has spoken about the goods and livestock service, but not about passenger services.

Mr. Gunn: I mentioned them, too.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member did not give figures about the passenger services, but he gave specific figures regarding the Quorn service. I am dealing with the carriage of goods and livestock from Quorn, from the northern pastoral areas of the State, south of the line serving Leigh Creek to Marree. All the area from Quorn, Hawker and Blinman, right through the north is served by the Quorn line. It is a service for the country people of South Australia, carefully subsidised by revenue from elsewhere in the State to look after the people in the pastoral areas. The honourable member apparently wants to close the line. Perhaps the member for Frome will say whether he wants the Quorn line closed. We made a loss on the Cambrai line, too. Then we come to Spalding and Robertstown, which is also in the district of the member for Frome. The loss on the Robertstown line was $331 000. Does the honourable member want to close that line? That was for the carriage of goods and livestock, not for passenger services; it was for looking after the rural people of South Australia, the primary producers who have been to me in a deputation this afternoon about the difficulties they face in costs of maintaining their services to the people of this State. Does the Opposition really want us to close this line?

Mr. Mathwin: It is a small chunk of the $27 000 000 lost.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I thought we were talking about $500 000. That was the point in issue. If members opposite, as a Party, want the Government to close the Robertstown line, I hope they will tell us, and no doubt the member for Mallee will tell us whether he wants the Government to save money by closing the Loxton line. We lost $406 000 for his constituents in the carriage of goods and livestock from the Murray Mallee area. Do members opposite want the Government to close that line? If they do, as a Party, will they say so?

Mr. Nankivell: How about—

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We have been trying to give service to the honourable member's constituents, and I think the people from the area are grateful. If members opposite want to get down to cases, perhaps the member for Eyre would get down to something the rest of his Party would support and he could be taken as speaking for the Party. I assure the honourable member that I shall proceed to tell the people in the areas concerned his view on goods and livestock losses on the railway services and what he intends to do in relation to the railways.

Dr. EASTICK: Members on this side have consistently advocated the closure of the Victor Harbor line. Page 200 of the Auditor-General's Report shows that the earnings on that line were $31 000 while the costs were $485 000, resulting in a loss of $454 000, which is close to the $500 000 the Treasurer hopes to raise by this retrospective action. Let me quote a question and answer appearing at page 1202 of *Hansard* on September 2, 1970. A question was asked by Mr. Clark, the then member for Elizabeth, as follows:

I am interested in this question because I am Chairman of the Public Works Standing Committee which recently investigated the possible closure of the Victor Harbor line. One of the main reasons for recommending against closing the line was that the committee believed that too little publicity had been given to this line concerning holiday resort facilities at Victor Harbor. I understand that plans were made to run an all-inclusive excursion trip to Victor Harbor today. Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether this arrangement has been successful?

The reply of the Minister (Hon. G. T. Virgo) was as follows:

I think I should warn the railway knockers that perhaps they might like to leave the House while I give this reply:—

that is his usual courteous preamble—

The trip has been an outstanding success. The train comprised the maximum number of cars and the department even robbed one of the country trains to put an extra car on this train. The result was that in the 262 available seats on the train 262 passengers left Adelaide on time at three minutes to nine this morning. An officer of the Railways Department told me on the platform this morning that, although no accurate records had been kept, it was generally agreed that over 1 000 applications for seats were turned down. So let us hope that this will see the end of some of the knocking.

The Minister further stated:

I cannot answer the honourable member's question for two reasons: first, it is out of order but, more important, this trip was run as a trial to see whether this type of thing attracted the public.

The reply then goes on to indicate that the passengers were given chicken and champagne, if I remember correctly. That service was going to be of such value that, on that one specific occasion in 1970, about 1 000 people were turned away.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Crimes): I ask the honourable Leader to keep to the amendment.

Dr. EASTICK: The amendment relates to the period in which $500 000 will be obtained by the State Treasury. The Treasurer seeks to obtain that sum immediately on the passage of this Bill by raising money on the trading activities of the Savings Bank. The sum of $450 000 was lost on the Victor Harbor line in 1973-74. With escalating costs, that figure could justifiably be expected to exceed the $500 000 required.

Mr. ALLEN: The Treasurer suggested that the member for Frome should give his views on whether his Party supported the closing of the Robertstown line.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I trust the honourable member is addressing himself to the amendment.

Mr. ALLEN: It was suggested that the $500 000 to be obtained from the Savings Bank could be derived from economies in the railway system. As long as I have been in this House I have advocated that, if rail freights on grain were reduced to the point where they were competitive with road transport freights, the railway losses would be at least halved. At present, empty goods trains with only one truck are running on this line. If freight rates were reduced to compete with road transport the trains could be fully loaded with wheat, with a resultant considerable saving on these lines.

Mr. RUSSACK: First, the Treasurer said that an earlier Government set the precedent, and it was also said that a comparison should be made with other States. However, when the boot is on the other foot, I hope the other States will be compared, as it will show that we could be much better off, for example, in respect of rural land tax. Secondly, resulting from the retrospectivity of the Bill, this is the first time that the Savings Bank of South Australia has been obliged to contribute in this way. The sum of about $500 000 has been referred to, but it is not clear if that is from one years trading or from two years trading, because figures have not been provided. I did not think this Bill was retrospective, because of the Treasurer's statement in his Budget explanation, as follows:

The State Bank of South Australia has contributed 45 per cent of its profits for several years now, but to date no charge has been imposed on the Savings Bank of South Australia. The Government is extremely reluctant to

introduce measures of this nature, but is conscious of the need to raise funds from all available avenues if standards of service are to be maintained. Accordingly, both banks in future will be required to contribute 50 per cent of their profits to revenue. This statement merely confirms my earlier announcement.

I understood the Treasurer to mean that this would apply only to future profits, and that it would not apply retrospectively. I believe I am consistent and am doing the right thing in supporting the Leader's amendment.

Mr. VENNING: I support the amendment, because it reflects the truth of the situation. The Treasurer has referred to various railway lines in the country, and he has challenged members to say that such lines should be closed. The loss from the Spalding line last year was $306 000. The Treasurer has asked where funds can be saved. Although the Railways Department has constantly been asked to reduce rail freights at the Andrews silo, comparable to a road transport price of 10c a bushel to Port Pirie, the department has insisted on its freight charge to Port Adelaide of 15c a bushel, showing a lack of common sense in the matter. I do not appreciate the Treasurer's remarks on the railways.

Mr. McANANEY: I have often stated my views on the economics of our railway system, but I must reply to the challenge of the Treasurer. The Strathalbyn railway line should have been closed years ago. Indeed, I was a member of the Public Works Committee which I believe decided wrongly in the matter. The member for Rocky River—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The honourable member must link up his remarks to the amendment.

Mr. McANANEY: I am linking up my remarks through the member for Rocky River to the Treasurer's challenge. The Railways Department is losing much money on the Strathalbyn line, although its road competitors can carry freight at competitive rates, pay reasonable wages, and stay in business. The sooner this line is closed the better it will be, because it is upsetting town planning at Mount Barker. The only people using this line are pensioners and students enjoying fare concessions. The Treasurer pays the Railways Department for these concessions, which could be given to the bus operators without any additional loss to the Treasury. It is completely uneconomic to run a railway line over an old-fashioned grade, because trains cannot be speeded up on such a line.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member has wandered from the amendment.

Mr. McANANEY: The sooner the Strathalbyn line is closed the better it will be for the State. I am not anti-railways; indeed, I believe the railways should be updated to provide a better service, but half the country lines will never be economic, and they exist only as a monument to the inefficiency of Government-owned railways.

Mr. GUNN: I support the remarks of the member for Gouger, and I should like to answer some of the charges the Treasurer levelled at me concerning my comments. The member for Rocky River referred to some of the things I had in mind. If the Treasurer wants further information, he should refer to page 186 of the Auditor-General's Report for the financial year ended June 30, 1973.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member is wandering too far from the amendment under discussion.

Mr. GUNN: I am seeking to find out where we could save $500 000. The Auditor-General stated:

A weekly count during the year of the four suburban lines revealed that, of the 871 services provided, 460 (53 per cent) had five or less passengers including 74 (8 per cent) with none.

If the Treasurer will not look at this situation, I believe he is falling down badly on his job.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I support the Leader's amendment, because I believe the Treasurer's Government has been undisciplined in its administration of Government departments over the past 12 months. Yesterday the Treasurer released details of a 12·6 per cent increase in the South Australian Public Service.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The amendment is far-reaching, and I think the member for Davenport is capable of understanding it. Therefore, I ask him to stick to the terms of the amendment. The honourable member for Davenport.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I suggest to the Treasurer that he save $500 000 by restricting the growth in the Public Service which, in the last year, had a growth rate of 12·6 per cent and an expenditure growth rate of 23 per cent. There is no better way of curbing Government expenditure than by reducing the growth rate of the Public Service, particularly in the Premier's Department.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member is, as usual, entirely irresponsible. He knows that reducing the growth rate in my department could not conceivably save such a sum. The honourable member, as usual, persists in distorting. Regarding Opposition members who suggest that money could be saved on railway services by reducing freight rates, they really ought to do their homework. South Australia is a claimant State before the Grants Commission. Freight rates on country goods and livestock services are lower here than they are in the standard States. We could not conceivably reduce freight rates without receiving an adverse adjustment from the commission. Opposition members, if they had read the commission's report or had attended its hearings, would know that. They cannot save themselves from requests to be specific as to how we should make cuts adding up to the sum involved.

Mr. Dean Brown: Save on the Public Service.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member believes that we should sack $500 000 worth of public servants, I shall be pleased to publish that on the front page of the next issue of the *Public Service Review*.

Mr. BECKER: The Treasurer has not really answered the remark made by the member for Gouger, who said that this charge would be made on the Revenue Account in future.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I'll answer that quickly.

Mr. BECKER: The Treasurer did not say that it would be retrospective and he did not bring to the Committee's attention that the revenue and expenditure had been approved.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Chronology in the English language is simple. The provisions are that $400 000 is to be raised in this area this financial year; that is the original provision. How do we establish the profits that we relate to this financial year until the end of the financial year? Therefore, if we are to get a profit this year and include it in revenue, it must relate logically to the profit already established, namely, the profit for the previous financial year; otherwise, it could not be established. "In future" means on all subsequent occasions from the time the announcement is made. I could not say to members that I was going to introduce this Bill before I introduced it. In other words, when I said "in future", I

meant from that time on, and I should have thought that that was the simple meaning of the phrase.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Just so that the Treasurer does not misquote me when he publishes his statement on the front page of the *Public Service Review*, I hope he fully appreciates that—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member must deal with the amendment before the Committee. He is completely out of order in pursuing his line of argument.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: As the Treasurer said he would take certain action, it is only fair that I should be allowed to reply and ensure that he quotes exactly what I have said.

Mr. RUSSACK: Regarding the Treasurer's asking how we could estimate for the future, I suggest that it be done in much the same way as provisional tax is estimated. A taxpayer must estimate for the future, and in this case an estimate of the bank's future profits could be made.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (17)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick (teller), Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, McAnaney, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, and Venning.

Noes (24)—Messrs. Boundy, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Crimes, Duncan, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Keneally, King, Langley, McKee, McRae, Millhouse, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Nankivell and Wardle. Noes—Messrs. Corcoran and Jennings.

Majority of 7 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

Dr. EASTICK: I do not intend to proceed with my other amendment, which was consequential on the passing of the amendment with which the Committee has just dealt.

Clause passed.

Clause 3 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 3. Page 1283.)

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): This is a short Bill, and the Treasurer's second reading explanation was also short. Although my remarks will be reasonably brief, I will refer to three points alluded to in the second reading explanation. The Treasurer said that this provision was included in the legislation that was introduced last session, which legislation also included a provision relating to life insurance. He asserts that this was the reason for the failure of that Bill. In his second reading explanation of this Bill, the Treasurer said:

The previous provision obtained the agreement of both Houses at that time.

Having examined the debates on the matter, I do not know where the Treasurer draws that conclusion, as the life insurance provision completely overshadowed any other provision in the debate at that time.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You eliminated the life insurance provision. That was the only amendment.

Dr. Eastick: And a significant one, too.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Perhaps that is so, but that certainly was the cause of the Bill's failure. However, this provision hardly rated a mention in any of the debates in this place or, indeed, in another place. I have no objection to this Bill, which simply seeks to give the State Government Insurance Commission greater scope for the investment of funds at its disposal. The Treasurer admits that we are living in inflationary times and that the investment programme previously considered suitable for the commission is not considered suitable at present. Of course, this is a grave indictment on the operations of his colleagues in Canberra, who are incapable of coming to grips with the present inflationary trend. It is that inflationary trend that has made it imperative for the commission to move out of the trustee fields in which it is at present placing its funds for long terms and at relatively low rates of interest. In other words, because of the inflationary times in which we are living, the commission has had to chase higher rates of interest.

The other point that makes it imperative for the commission to try to seek added revenue is the parlous state of its finances. When we were considering the Bill providing the machinery for setting up the commission, we were told that we could expect that it would make modest profits. The Opposition said that this was not possible. I should like now to refer to the Auditor-General's Report for the financial year just concluded, in which the commission's financial position is referred to. I advance this as a reason for supporting the Bill. The Opposition believes it is imperative that the commission invest its funds at higher rates of interest, and this is one of the compelling reasons that leads the Opposition to support the Bill. The Auditor-General said the following about this organisation which, the Government confidently predicted, would make not an excessive but a modest profit—

Mr. Payne: Over a time, though.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Well, how long should it take? The Auditor-General said:

The improvement for 1973-74 of $2 319 000 in earned premium income was insufficient by $2 399 000 to meet the increase of $4 718 000 in the cost of claims and expenses—

The SPEAKER: Order! I have said many times that, when the House is discussing a Bill, the debate must be confined solely to that Bill and the subject matter contained therein. It does not open up a general debate on something outside of the ambit of the Bill. If the honourable member for Kavel examines this Bill, he will see that it contains only one clause, which provides the commission with power to invest. He must therefore confine his remarks to the Bill and not refer to extraneous subjects.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The funds that the commission will be investing are its own funds, to which I am directly alluding in this quotation. The Auditor-General continued:

. . . resulting in an underwriting deficiency of $3 339 000 ($940 000 in 1972-73). After bringing into account investment income—

to which, of course, this Bill relates—

of $399 000 ($91 000), a loss of $2 940 000 ($849 000) resulted from the year's operations.

If that is an example of modest profit, I should not like to be involved in a governmental operation that was expected to make a loss. The Opposition opposed the Bill setting up the State Government Insurance Commission. This Bill does not seek, as the previous Bill did, to give the commission the right to enter into the life insurance field. Although I think it is a vain hope, it is obviously imperative that the commission's operations become profitable. For this reason, I support the second reading.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): With reservations, I support the Bill. It amends section 16 (*a*) of the principal Act to provide that investments made by the commission may be any investments from time to time approved by the Treasurer. I am concerned that the Bill removes the

present limitation in section 16 (*a*) on investments to those that may be termed trustee investments. If the commission is to act on behalf of the people of the State, I think its funds should be invested in trustee securities. We do not know what "any investments from time to time approved of by the Treasurer" will be. They could be investments in the Hindmarsh Building Society. Certainly they would not be in finance companies; I am sure of that. Although the investments of the State Government Insurance Commission will not really be in the hands of the Treasurer, he will authorise the management of the commission to invest the funds, so he will have the overriding authority. Of course, the commission must obtain the maximum possible return on its funds. Whilst it has a considerable accumulated loss (in excess of $4 000 000) it has a considerable sum invested at present to provide for meeting future claims. The commission was very cunning when it sought the backing of the Government to take more of the third party motor vehicle insurance in this State. Most insurance companies were glad to get rid of such policies. At present Lumleys is the only other insurance company in South Australia handling third party motor vehicle insurance, and I would not be surprised if that company relinquished this field on July 1, 1975.

The SPEAKER: Order! As I have pointed out, the State Government Insurance Commission is not the subject matter of this Bill. There is only one clause in the Bill, and any remarks must be linked to that clause.

Mr. BECKER: The commission should invest its funds in appropriate organisations. At present the investments must be in trustee securities. At present there is a large build-up of premiums in the third party field because claims have not been settled, and it is imperative that the commission's funds be invested in a manner that will give the maximum return while at the same time affording policy holders absolute protection. This is the crux of the matter. I am not happy about widening the investment portfolio of the commission beyond trustee securities. We should insist that the investments be in trustee securities, because in that way there is a safeguard for the policy holders. However, the Treasurer wants to widen the investment portfolio, and he will have to bear the responsibility. He must remember that he has a duty to the taxpayers of South Australia to ensure that the funds of the State Government Insurance Commission are soundly and wisely invested.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): The investment portfolio of the State Government Insurance Commission should be widened. When the original Bill was introduced in 1970, the Treasurer said that the commission would have a large sum for investment. I said then that, if we restricted the commission to investments with a limited return, it would not be able to show a profit in competition with private insurance companies, which invested their money at a high rate of interest. Though I have sympathy with the view of the member for Hanson that investments should be only in trustee securities, I believe that we should have some confidence in the Treasurer (though some of his actions do not give grounds for confidence), and we must remember that he is subject to questioning in Parliament about those investments. If the State Government Insurance Commission is to survive without being a heavy burden on South Australian taxpayers, it should be permitted to invest under a wider portfolio. Private insurance companies even invest in land; indeed, some policyholders may doubt whether they will get full value for their money.

Mr. McRae: Would you widen the scope of the commission to include life assurance?

The SPEAKER: Order! There is nothing in the Bill about life assurance.

Mr. McANANEY: I was going to support you, Sir, and say that I could not get away from the Bill. I would have liked to say that it would be impossible to invest in the railways and make a profit.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is out of order in referring to the railways.

Mr. McANANEY: We must take some risk in giving the Treasurer full authority in relation to investments, but he is responsible for replying to Questions on Notice about the investment portfolio, irrespective of the cost to the taxpayers. I support the Bill, and I repeat that three years ago I made remarks in this connection, and many of the things I have said in this House over the years are now becoming the practice.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): I fully support this Bill. It is only common sense that the State Government Insurance Commission should have the right to invest in the same manner as can any other enterprise. This Bill will allow the commission to make a greater profit on its invested funds. The responsibility is now being given to the Treasurer, and I hope he will be willing at all times to give broad details of how the funds are invested. Obviously, the responsibility as to whether the investments succeed or fail will be on his shoulders. I hope that the Treasurer will be willing to account to this House in general terms on those investments. In the second reading explanation, he implies that this change is necessary because the present investment in trustee securities has no hope of keeping pace with inflation. With an inflation rate of 20 per cent a year, I doubt that any financial institution in Australia could keep pace. I support the Bill, although I point out to the Treasurer that the commission may not be much more profitable even after the change has been made.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Disposal of surplus of income over expenditure."

Mr. COUMBE: My colleagues have raised several points about investment. The member for Hanson has raised the question of trustee investments, and the member for Davenport has asked about the type of investment that the Treasurer has in mind. Therefore, I ask the Treasurer to indicate the type of investment that he would be likely to approve. I realise that he will try to get the best possible rate, with the greatest amount of security.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I have not approved a specific type of investment yet. I have not had an application from the commission about it, and the commission would have to make such application. I do not initiate proposals regarding investment: that must be done by the commission. It will be proposing investments that have as their object, as the honourable member has stated, obtaining the best rate of return with the maximum security, consistent with the commission's responsibility. I assure the honourable member that I would not approve any investment that seemed to me to have the slightest risk in it. It would have to be an investment that I had been well advised was entirely sound. Regarding questions asked by members about investments made, I shall be pleased to reveal those to the Chamber and to state any investments that I approve.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I hope the Treasurer realises that the two objects he has stated for investments are not compatible. I refer to the maximum security and the

highest possible interest rate. The higher the interest rate, the greater the risk will be and the lower the security. Does the Treasurer intend to tend towards debenture funds or more towards equity capital in these investments? If the investments were made in equity capital, would the commission strive to control equity capital, or would it have a minority holding?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It would be unlikely that I would approve the taking up of equity capital by the State Government Insurance Commission.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

FOOTBALL PARK (RATES AND TAXES EXEMPTION) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 3. Page 1284.)

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I support this measure, which is a hybrid Bill and will be referred to a Select Committee. I support the measure because of the principle outlined by the Treasurer in introducing it, namely, the exempting of Football Park from certain water charges and, particularly, from land tax. It is difficult, in the time available to an Opposition member, to obtain exact information that would be necessary to explain to the House how much this measure will save the South Australian National Football League, which operates Football Park. However, I have found out that the cost to date of the development of stage 1 is estimated at about $3 000 000 and that probably development from now on will depend on the success or otherwise and the acceptance or otherwise of Football Park. I do not think the league has anything to worry about regarding acceptance. During the year, and particularly during the finals and on grand final day, it has been shown that Football Park can handle at least 58 000 patrons and that the car parking facilities are good. Having driven my car—

The SPEAKER: Order! It is quite apparent that, if the honourable member intends to continue speaking on the matter that he already has spoken about, he has not considered the Bill. The clauses of the Bill grant concessions regarding certain charges. If the honourable member wants to continue in the vein in which he has been speaking, his remarks must be linked up to the clauses of the Bill that give certain exemptions and concessions.

Mr. BECKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is all part of linking in what I was about to say. Football Park must be a viable proposition, or the Government will have on its hands a thumping white elephant. If it is to be a viable proposition, it will be necessary to exempt it from certain water charges and particularly from land tax. To be able to ensure that it is a viable proposition, one needs to be satisfied that it can be an economical proposition, as it is at this stage. Already $3 000 000 has been spent. The Woodville council has told me that, for its rating purposes, it has placed an assessment of $1 716 000 on the property, and council rates will be $13 728. I have not been able to find out the exact figures regarding water and sewerage rate assessments or the assessments for land tax purposes. I believe this is where difficulty is experienced in arriving at a valuation, and I have been unable to find out whether a valuation has actually been arrived at. For this reason a Select Committe would be of great benefit in obtaining the best information and in interviewing certain people to find out how the valuation is arrived at and what will be the cost to the State. Football Park has a 198-year lease, and during the occupancy by the National Football League of the area being leased this legislation will remain in force. If the league decides to leave the area this legislation will lapse.

The league will be required to pay for the drainage and the removal of sewage, and for any water it uses. Water consumption will be more or less for domestic services, in washbasins and toilets, as well as drinking water in the bars, and so on. The usage of water would not be great. The league is fortunate in having its own bore, which produces high quality water and which can pump about 54 560 litres an hour to supply an involved automatic sprinkler system. If Football Park were to be assessed for water and sewerage rates in the same way as any other organisation or householder is assessed, the rates, on a valuation of $3 000 000, would be tremendous, and the water allocation considerable.

The need for this legislation demonstrates that the method of valuation of property for water and sewerage rating purposes is not the best system. We have here a classic example; if we were to use the method now in force in this case, the football league would find that Football Park was not a viable proposition. The same situation applies with land tax. Although $3 000 000 has been spent, the valuation would not be as high as that, but land tax charges on such valuation would be about $100 000 a year, which would be a tremendous amount to take from any sporting organisation, whether professional or amateur.

Here again, we have proof that this type of tax is not enjoyed by the citizens of South Australia and that the method of valuation is neither fair nor equitable. I agree with the remarks of the Treasurer who said, in introducing the Bill, that the development of Football Park was a matter of great interest. Tremendous public interest has been created, and all credit must go to the league. The Treasurer could not see any other organisation with the same degree of public interest that could require similar legislation, but if that situation should arise in the future consideration would no doubt be given to the matter.

I understand that the development of Football Park was not accepted by the league until a letter or an agreement had been received from the Treasurer that this type of legislation would be introduced and that the league would be exempted from certain rates. This could have been achieved under the Recreation Grounds Taxation Exemption Act, 1910, but it was thought that a separate Bill would be more beneficial. We are supporting the undertaking given by the Treasurer to the league to ensure that Football Park would be developed. In time, the people of South Australia (whether followers of Australian rules football or of any other sport) will agree that Football Park is a tremendous asset to the State. Certainly, it will be a tremendous asset to the city of Adelaide, because it will not necessarily be used only for football. The area could be taken up and an athletic track incorporated, and it could be used for equestrian events, and so on. It is important for the House to approve this legislation to ensure that the South Australian National Football League can continue the development of this park for the future enjoyment of followers of Australian rules football as well as of the other sports for which it can be used. I commend the legislation to honourable members.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I support the measure. I have had a considerable interest in this Bill because I was on the original committee that investigated the matter and ultimately reported in favour of a recommendation going to the Treasurer to support the establishment of what is now known as Football Park. The Bill amends

section 68 of the Sewerage Act and section 37 of the Waterworks Act. The Football Park authorities will still be liable for charges, but the important thing for honourable members to realise is the implication of the Recreation Grounds Taxation Exemption Act. That would normally apply, as it does in many other areas in this State.

The Act is designed specifically to give relief from the normal charges involved with recreation purposes, but in relation to this project it is going further. While these exemptions will be granted, there will also be exemptions from land tax. I am wholly in favour of some relief being given in relation to this project, but we have in South Australia two major stadiums, and I do not believe we are likely to have more. South Australia can and should be able to support two such major projects. I refer, of course, to Football Park and to the Adelaide Oval, the latter being in my district. I have seen at Football Park the bore from which the water is drawn for watering the main oval, but I specifically make the point that the Adelaide Oval works under a lease from the Adelaide City Council, which is responsible for the care and control of the park lands on behalf of the Crown. No council rates are paid, because the land is leased, and no land tax is paid, but considerable sums are paid for water and sewerage, as well as a considerable amount for excess water. This, of course, is in addition to the water pumped from the Torrens River, although that water is not always available because of the quantity used by the Adelaide City Council for its own purposes at certain times of the year. That water is available under a section of the Waterworks Act.

Here we have two major sporting facilities which, in my view, should be on a similar footing. Cricket will not be played at Football Park. That is the idea of the South Australian National Football League. However, football of one kind or another will be played at the Adelaide Oval, and shortly we will be seeing the English team here for the test cricket series. I should like the Treasurer to say, when he replies, whether Football Park is to be treated on the same basis as that applying to the lease of the South Australian Cricket Association for the Adelaide Oval, or whether one area will have an advantage over the other. It is important that this be spelt out to ensure that both the major stadiums in South Australia are on an equal footing. We are considering the area of doubt involved in the application and operation of the Recreation Grounds Taxation Exemption Act. Apparently there is an area of doubt, and the Bill is to clear up that doubt.

Mr. McRAE (Playford): Like other members, I support the Bill. I wish to raise three matters, the first relating to clause 2, which provides, in part:

"the League" means the South Australian National Football League Incorporated a body corporate being an association incorporated under the Associations Incorporation Act, 1956-1965:

I trust that this is the case, because as recently as a couple of months ago it was found that no public officer of the league was in existence, and all documents had to be evaluated for a period of seven years. I trust that the Select Committee, which will in due course consider the matter, will say that we have an association of incorporation before us. Perhaps it could be an association that is incorporated under the Act mentioned. It is necessary, of course, to have a public officer, and that person was not to be found on a recent search, and I trust that now or later such a person will be duly nominated, appointed and registered under the Act.

Secondly, I draw attention to the fact that under the original arrangement (as the Treasurer has explained, this is to further certain undertakings given under the original agreement between the South Australian Government and the S.A.N.F.L.) a provision was made, I think by the Select Committee that considered the matter, for the provision of a Government nominee on the committee of management of the league. I believe that, because of the involvement of public funds, it would be useful to appoint a Government nominee to the committee of management, not because of any person being named as a member of the committee from time to time, but simply acknowledging the fact that this is the biggest single investment in Australian rules football in South Australia, and it is highly necessary that professionals be involved in its administration.

Thirdly (and I hope this will be looked into in due course), I hope that all debts have been honoured by the league at the point of inquiry which is to follow. Subject to those remarks, I support the Bill and also express the wish that the success enjoyed by Football Park so far will continue and that it will be for the benefit of the code in South Australia.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): In supporting the Bill, I hope that Football Park is a financial success as well as a sporting success, and I say this not so much in relation to public interest and entertainment generally but rather in relation to promoting sport for the benefit of those who participate in it, be it football or any other sport. The development of such a stadium provides a goal for participants who seek to play on what is considered to be the premium sporting ground in the State. However, I am disappointed that the S.A.N.F.L. has moved from Adelaide Oval, and I am not sure that in the long term—

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the honourable member that there is nothing in the Bill dealing with Adelaide Oval. The remarks of the member for Torrens about that oval were linked up with the Bill. I will not allow reference to matters that do not directly deal with the Bill and, unless the honourable member links up his remarks with the Bill, they will be out of order.

Mr. EVANS: I shall be linking up my remarks, Mr. Speaker. Adelaide Oval could have been developed without such a public commitment as we have found necessary in the past through guarantees, and as we find necessary now through this financial arrangement that provides a concession to the S.A.N.F.L. that may not be available to other sporting bodies controlling recreation reserves, be they controlled by local government or by other groups in the local community.

It may have been wise to stay at the Adelaide Oval and to make a public commitment to that one sporting ground. Through this Bill we are making a public commitment. Certainly, I make no attack on the S.A.N.F.L.; I am a football enthusiast, as most honourable members know, and I still play football. However, I am concerned about certain aspects, and I hope that the press will give much publicity to this issue, not for the benefit of members who speak on this Bill but to ensure that all sporting groups will know what action is intended. If this is done (and I hope it will be), when the Bill is considered by a Select Committee every sporting or other group that believes it faces a similar disadvantage to that faced by the S.A.N.F.L. will then have the opportunity of going before the committee to put its point of view so that its situation can be considered in the future.

This Bill involves a professional body, the S.A.N.F.L., and we are considering providing a concession to the league that it does not have now, although I do not suggest that

it is not entitled to it. However, there are many smaller groups in the community, which, though perhaps not gaining the same public interest as is shown in the league, are of interest within their own community. They are sporting bodies which, in many cases, are amateur bodies trying to promote sport for the benefit of society, especially young people.

These groups should be made aware of what we are doing, in case there is a need for us as Parliamentarians to rectify similar hardships being faced by such groups. I can think of other groups that could be considered in this area. What is the position applying to Globe Derby Park? I know that a small amateur sporting club of which I am president has to find $1 100 a year for charges, about $600 of which goes to meet water charges. That is the burden carried by my club and, proportionately, it is a much bigger burden than that carried by the S.A.N.F.L. If we are to consider sporting interests (and we are now moving into the field of considering sporting interests and of giving a concession to a professional sporting interest), we must consider other areas of sporting interest and give them the same opportunity. Another area exists in which a concession may need to be made. I refer to the amateur athletics track at Kensington, the officials of which are facing difficulty because of the charges and commitments the club must meet. I hope that that body is aware of what is happening here this evening or will be made aware so that, if it needs a concession on a similar basis, it may apply for it, or at least give evidence before the Select Committee. If ever publicity should be given through the news media to an issue, it should in this case.

Representatives of many small sporting clubs do not have the time to read the public notices in the press to see that a Select Committee has been set up. We have established a Ministry of Recreation and Sport. The Commonwealth Government is considering giving benefits to sporting and recreational groups, and we are now considering a somewhat similar proposition. I support having the Bill referred to a Select Committee. I hope that small clubs can tell the committee of the many financial burdens that must be met and can show that they are justified in making an approach for a concession similar to what the football league will receive if the Bill is passed. I support the Bill to the second reading stage.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): Reluctantly, and with certain enlightenment I hope, the Government has introduced this Bill. The people at Football Park apparently do not use much water, because the park has its own bore. The Government has said that it will accept a certain standard in relation to this matter and exempt the league from paying water rates in respect of the park. That is fair enough; it is an admission by the Government that, if water is not used, it need not be paid for, at least in certain cases. If that is fair enough for the league at Football Park, why is it not fair enough for the people of Burnside, Glenelg and other areas? The Government has decided that, in relation to Football Park, it will give a fair and equitable system of rating for water and sewerage charges. However, as residents in private houses want the same kind of justice, I hope that the Government will see fit to implement such a system for these people. The Government claims to be a Government of equality, representing and treating all people on an equal basis.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Bill deals with certain subject matters, but it does not give an open slather for a debate on the Waterworks Act or any other Act. The debate must be confined to this Bill and to the subject matter contained in it: that is the only permissible debate.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker; I accept that. I am debating the principle on which clause 4 is based; that clause refers to the Waterworks Act, 1932-1974. As a certain principle has been adopted for the park, I hope that it will be adopted elsewhere. A man in my area whose property is not connected for water and sewerage pays $128 a quarter for water and sewerage charges.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member apparently has an interpretation of legislation that is different from mine. Although the Bill provides certain exemptions under certain Acts, it does not give him the right to discuss those Acts. The subject matter in the Bill is Football Park; the Bill consists of six clauses, and they will be the subject matter to be discussed this evening.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think I have made my point. I support the Bill and hope that the Government accepts my point and applies this principle elsewhere.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I, too, support the Bill. I do not think it would be appropriate if I let this occasion pass without congratulating those responsible for the construction of Football Park. I have until recently been the Vice-President of a club that has the unique distinction of having won the first premiership at Football Park.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must not be parochial.

Dr. TONKIN: Jealousy will not get you, Mr. Speaker, or any other member anywhere. Although the park is a remarkably well conceived concept, I believe that certain teething troubles, relating to the playing surface and the terraced accommodation for standing spectators, must be dealt with. I believe that the principle involved in the Bill, whereby the park will be exempt from certain rates and taxes, is sound, reasonable and rational; perhaps the Government should be congratulated for taking this step. However, I will not congratulate the Government, because it will not be paying the bill. The whole point is that, on the assessment value of $3 000 000, the water rates would be astronomical and way beyond the league's capacity to pay. It will not be the Government, which is responsible for the concessions that are being given to the park and to football generally, that will pay the bill; the people of the metropolitan area who pay rates on a property valuation basis will pay it.

I hope that, when these people go to the park, as I am sure many of them will, they will realise that the excessive rates they are paying on their own properties will be paying for the park's water and sewerage charges. I suppose that, from one point of view, it could be said that they will get more value for their money (those of them who are football supporters) than will other members of the community who pay excessive rates but do not follow football.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is not going to get around my ruling in that way. He must speak to the subject matter contained in the Bill.

Dr. TONKIN: Indeed, I was speaking very much to the exemptions contained in the Bill.

Mr. Dean Brown: Would you agree that the league can pass its costs on, whereas pensioners and people living on fixed incomes can't?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Bragg does not need prompting.

Dr. TONKIN: It would be improper of me to answer the interjection, however much I agree with it. Having dealt with that matter (the inequality is that the bigger the project the more it can apparently get away with), I support the Bill. I think that, if the park is to go ahead, as I believe it deserves to, it must be given every assistance. In this case, the assistance is being given in a tangible form by relief from what would otherwise be highly excessive charges that would destroy the viability of the whole organisation. The fact that relief is being given by the people of the metropolitan area and not the Government does not alter that fact.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I support the Bill in its entirety. It alters the whole situation regarding ovals and parks throughout the State. I refer particularly to clauses 3 and 4, whereby the park will be exempt from charges under the Sewerage Act and the Waterworks Act. I do not disagree with the principle of the Bill, and I hope the Government sees fit to extend this provision to other ovals such as those at Brighton and Glenelg that are faced with heavy sewerage and water costs. Whether a football match or an athletic meeting is being held at Football Park (and I hope that eventually cricket will be played there), the people who attend such sporting functions will have to pay the bill and, if other areas are to be subsidised, difficulties will be involved. As the member for Bragg said, my district was picked out by the Government for extra water and sewerage rates.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have already ruled that the Waterworks Act is not being debated by the House tonight: the House is debating a Bill relating to Football Park, and the honourable member must speak to that Bill only, as must all other honourable members.

Mr. MATHWIN: With respect, Sir, I am relating my remarks to clause 4, which refers to the exemptions to be given to Football Park in respect of water rates. Surely I would not be out of order in referring to water and sewerage rates being paid by my constituents.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have already given my ruling; the honourable member must not disregard the authority of the Chair. The House is dealing not with the Waterworks Act but with a Bill relating to Football Park. I warn the honourable member. He must refer to that Bill before the House.

Dr. Tonkin: You can't talk about a hole in the ground without talking about the dirt around it.

The SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member for Bragg wishes to disagree with the ruling I have given the honourable member for Glenelg, he has the right to do so.

Mr. MATHWIN: I support the Bill and the principle behind it to exempt Football Park from the payment of water and sewerage rates. I hope that this principle will be applied to other ovals throughout the area, and that it will eventually rub off on to the people who live in my district and those who live at Burnside—

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Glenelg for the second time. He is totally disregarding the determinations made by and the authority of the Chair.

Mr. MATHWIN: I support the Bill.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I point out to the member for Glenelg that the Government made perfectly clear in the second reading explanation that it did not intend to extend this provision to other facilities. The member for Torrens raised the matter of the Adelaide Oval, asking whether the position of the South Australian Cricket Association at the Adelaide Oval would be on all fours with that of the South Australian National Football League at Football Park. The answer is "No". However, in an overall assessment of the situation the honourable member will find that the South Australian Cricket Association is better off. Its assessment for the current year in relation to State taxes is $1 687 for water rates and $1 519 for sewerage rates. As no land tax is payable, that makes a total of $3 206.

Mr. Coumbe: Including excess water?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No. The association does not pay council rates in relation to the oval, stands and offices, although about $89 is payable to the Adelaide City Council in respect of a cottage occupied by one of the association's employees. However, I understand that a charge is made for excess water. Under the provisions of this Bill, the South Australian National Football League will pay a minimum charge of $16 a year for water, plus 11c a kilolitre for water used. The league will pay $2 for sewerage for each toilet, and it will be exempt from land tax. However the league's current assessment for council rates in respect of Football Park is $13 728. Therefore, in relation to the basic charges in each case, the South Australian Cricket Association is about $10 000 better off, each organisation being charged for water used.

Mr. Coumbe: On the same basis?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I think so, but I will check the matter for the honourable member; I do not think there could be a significant difference. Overall, the South Australian Cricket Association is better off. Although the improvement in this position arises because no council rates are payable in relation to the Adelaide Oval, the Government was unable to include such a provision in this Bill relating to Football Park because the council rates payable to the Woodville council were vital to it, and the Government could not deprive the council of that revenue.

Bill read a second time and referred to a Select Committee consisting of Messrs. Becker, Evans, Harrison, Hopgood, and Olson; the committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to adjourn from place to place; the committee to report on October 24.

GAS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 3. Page 1285.)

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I suppose I must indicate my support for the Bill, as it arises out of the Budget, and, under Parliamentary practice, it is not normal to try to defeat such a Bill. However, I am not terribly pleased about the whole matter. This Bill was envisaged as part of the Budget that the Treasurer introduced. As I understand the Bill, it provides that the South Australian Gas Company and the Mount Gambier Gas Company will, in the first year of operation of the Bill, have to pay in tax to the Government 5 per cent of their gross revenue received from sales. We are talking about the gross revenue, not the net revenue; there is a significant difference here. So, the cost of producing the commodity is not taken into account. My interpretation is that it will be paid in quarterly instalments and, therefore, the first amount was probably due on October 1, 1974. However, I presume that no payment will be made until the Bill is passed, although the due date has passed. In his Budget statement, the Treasurer said that the two companies would provide $700 000, and I think the member for Mount Gambier would be the first to admit that the bulk of that sum will come from the South Australian Gas Company. I was

interested in the Treasurer's nomenclature; he collated these companies under the heading of statutory corporations but, of course, they are not statutory corporations: they are private companies.

Mr. Duncan: They are set up under Statute.

Mr. COUMBE: The honourable member should be careful: they are companies supported by shareholders, but they work under a private Act.

Mr. Duncan: That's the only point I made.

Mr. COUMBE: They are not statutory corporations, although they are lumped in the Budget papers with the Electricity Trust of South Australia and several other semi-government authorities. The South Australian Gas Company is a public company listed on the Stock Exchange of Adelaide. The Treasurer of the day exercises the right to fix the maximum dividend that can be paid to shareholders and also the terms and conditions of the public bond issues, which are a trustee investment in South Australia, and they also meet Commonwealth requirements in this regard. The sum of $700 000 was taken on last year's figures; this point was canvassed strongly by the Leader earlier this evening when debating another Bill. It is retrospective, and it has had the effect of increasing tariffs.

We are dealing here only with piped gas, not bottled gas. In connection with piped gas, we are dealing not only with the metropolitan area but also with country areas. Apart from the city of Adelaide and environs, we are dealing with Whyalla, Port Pirie, Christies Beach and Mount Gambier. Some country towns are served by bottled gas, but they are outside the province of the Bill. Increased tariffs have been imposed on consumers as a result of this Bill. Further, as a result of another measure, increased electricity tariffs have been imposed on consumers. Having dealt with the State Bank, the Savings Bank of South Australia, the Electricity Trust of South Australia, and other organisations, the Government is now getting into the realm of private companies which, admittedly, have worked under a franchise. I certainly do not believe that the provision for an annual licence will be a threat to the continuance of the companies; I would certainly hope not. The companies should not feel insecure because of the need to get an annual licence.

I hope the member for Spence will agree with my sentiments, and I hope the Government does not intend to take over the companies: it would be tragic if the Government did that. The Electricity Trust of South Australia appreciates the contribution made to consumers by the gas industry. The companies have operated under what has been loosely called a franchise: under a private Act, the Government has granted a franchise to the companies, which in turn must have the quality of their product tested by the Chemistry Department several times a week to see that it has the right calorific value. Now, we are to have an annual licence. In his second reading explanation the Treasurer cited the case of Tasmania. We are all aware of the troubles that the Tasmanian Government got into in connection with the tobacco case. I refer to two cases: *Dennis Hotels Proprietary Limited v. The State of Victoria* and *Dickenson's Arcade v. The State of Tasmania.* The High Court came down in favour of the States concerned. South Australia was represented at the hearing by Mr. Cox, the Solicitor-General, and by Mr. Prior. In the case involving Dickenson's Arcade, the judgment stated:

The fee payable under Part III of the *Tobacco Act*, 1972, (Tas.) to the Tasmanian Treasurer for a licence to sell tobacco by retail, the quantum of which is determined by reference to the monthly stock value for the premises of tobacco handled over a previous period of twelve months ended six months before the commencement of the licence year with a minimum fee of $2, is not a duty of excise within the meaning of s. 90 of the Constitution. So *held* by Barwick C. J., Menzies, Gibbs, Stephen and Mason J.J. (McTiernan J. dissenting).

This clears up the doubt that may have arisen about the annual licence. I do not think the question of an annual licence will lead to any feeling of insecurity. These are the only two companies of their kind operating in the State, and the South Australian Gas Company is the major one. At present it is floating a loan guaranteed by the State Government at a record rate of interest. Under the private Act, the conditions of the loan have to be approved by the Treasurer. I have made two main points. First, I regret that the increase in tariffs that has been imposed on the consumer will further engender inflation. Secondly, we are now getting into the area of private companies in this regard, and it seems strange that these companies are classified under statutory corporations.

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

STATE BANK ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 3. Page 1285.)

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition's position on this Bill is similar to its position on the Savings Bank of South Australia Amendment Bill, which was debated earlier this evening. As the Treasurer has stated in the earlier debate, action was taken in respect of the State Bank during 1968 and, in effect, all we are asked to do is increase the percentage of income that is transferred to the State from 45 per cent to 50 per cent.

However, I again make the point that that is being done on a retrospective basis in relation to the State Bank's transactions during 1973-74. We are dealing with a much lesser income to the Government than was considered in the other measure, the estimated income to the State from the additional 5 per cent being $60 000. I am rather interested in the variety of comments that we hear from the Treasurer about his disenchantment with the Commonwealth Government. In his second reading explanation of this Bill he states:

This short Bill is one of a series of measures designed to improve the revenue position of the State and, as already has been indicated, this need arises from the reluctance of the Australian Government . . .

That is a rather amazing statement, when not long ago we were told that we had every hope of success in obtaining funds from the Commonwealth Government. That Government has divorced itself from its colleagues in this place and has refused to meet commitments that it made. Those commitments were to be of special value because we would have a Commonwealth Labor Government and a State Labor Government. I trust that never again will the Treasurer stand here and try to hoodwink the people of this State or members of this House.

The SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable Leader intends to make remarks such as he has been making, he must link them with this Bill, which deals with the State Bank. I realise that in the Budget debate there is certain latitude, but any debate on this Bill must relate to the clauses.

Dr. EASTICK: What I am saying relates to the purpose for which the Bill has been introduced and to the Treasurer's statement in support of the measure. I consider that the retrospective provisions in this Bill are as abhorrent as were similar provisions in the Bill dealing with the Savings Bank. In the Committee stage, I will give

the Treasurer the opportunity to take the same action as I wanted him to take in relation to the other measure.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I support this Bill because it is a financial measure, but the State Bank now will have to contribute 50 per cent of its profits to the Treasury, whereas previously it was contributing 45 per cent. When the contribution of 45 per cent was fixed, company tax was 47½ per cent and it is still at that figure. However, the State Bank now must contribute 50 per cent. It is interesting to note that the contribution to the State Treasury by statutory corporations in 1971-72 was $2 600 000, whilst in 1973-74 it was $4 200 000, and in this financial year it will be more than $7 000 000. The State has capitalised considerably on the contributions of the statutory corporations.

The tax on the State Bank was introduced by a former Liberal Government, whether rightly or wrongly and regardless of whether some other tax could have been imposed. When the Liberal Government came into office in 1967, it inherited a deficit on Revenue Account of $2 800 000. In the financial year 1968-69 it had a surplus of $460 000, and in 1969-70 it handed to the present Government a surplus of $2 900 000. There was a small surplus in 1970-71 of $21 000. The deficit in State revenue in 1971-72 was $1 000 000; in 1972-73 it was $3 900 000; in 1973-74 it was $3 400 000; and this financial year we are budgeting for a deficit of $12 000 000. While we are penny pinching from statutory corporations such as the State Bank, we find that the retrospectivity in this case will be worth about $60 000, although we will receive considerable benefit in this full financial year and in the future. The business of the State Bank has continued to grow and is profitable, but the bank has not really expanded in the same way as any other banking organisation.

Mr. Rodda: Is that because it's a milking cow?

Mr. BECKER: I believe it is more than a milking cow. The growth of the bank has been retarded. It has established branches in various areas, but I do not think the Government has fully exploited the service of the State Bank to the advantage of the State Treasury. It now seeks additional revenue. Now that it has this principle of taxing the profits of the bank, I should like to see something done to expand its operations and its branch network to serve the community better. Like any other operation that is taxed in this way, the profits retained for the use of the bank are being depleted. The fact that the Hall Government introduced the tax on the State Bank does not mean that it is a good tax, but that Government was faced with a deficit of $2 800 000. Other taxes introduced at that time were also not popular with Liberal voters in South Australia.

Mr. Nankivell: They were not too popular with the back-benchers either; we were blackmailed.

Mr. BECKER: I am interested to hear the member for Mallee say that; it would not surprise me.

Mr. Rodda: They were blackballed, too.

Mr. BECKER: Yes. Having been associated with that ex-Premier of the State, I know what his tactics were like. It is to be regretted that that situation happened in the history of South Australian politics. As this is a financial Bill, reluctantly I support it.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Disposal of profits."

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

In paragraph (*a*) to strike out "1973" and insert "1974".

The purpose of the amendment was canvassed earlier this evening. It is an important issue. I do not believe it is necessary to elaborate further, but I hope that on this occasion at least the Treasurer will see fit to accept the amendment.

Amendment negatived.

Dr. EASTICK: As the remaining amendments were consequential on the acceptance of the first, I do not intend to proceed with them.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.26 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, October 10, at 2 p.m.