HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, November 27, 1974

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

PARLIAMENTARY SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

At 2.2 p.m. the following recommendations of the conference were reported to the House:

1. That the Legislative Council do not insist on its suggested amendments No. 1 and No. 6.
2. That the House of Assembly do not insist on its consequential amendment but make the following amendment to amendment No. 3 of the Legislative Council:

by adding at the end of proposed new subclause (5a) the words:

"and in making a determination provided for by this subsection the tribunal shall—

(*a*) pay regard to such matters contained in this Act and any other matters as, in its opinion, are relevant to the basis of representation of members of the Legislative Council that will obtain after that election; and

(*b*) disregard any matters contained in this Act as are, in its opinion, not so relevant;

and the tribunal shall publish its reasons for having regard to or, as the case requires, disregarding any such matters."

and that the Legislative Council agree thereto.

Consideration in Committee.

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

That the recommendations of the conference be agreed to.

The difference between the two Chambers related to a special provision written in by the Legislative Council that the tribunal, when it met, should provide for electorate allowances of the Legislative Council immediately following the next election, which will then have provided that the Legislative Councillors represent the State at large and not districts. The problem was that provisions in the Act for electorate allowances related to districts. They relate quite specifically to the duties of members in relation to districts, and this place expressed the view that the electorate allowances for the Legislative Council should not be considered by the tribunal to be instructed to be some multiple of the electorate allowances of members of this place, on the basis that Legislative Councillors represent the whole State rather than parts of the State in electoral districts. The Legislative Council did not agree to the differentiation that this place wrote in as a consequential amendment but did agree that the way in which the matter should be dealt with was that the question of electorate allowances should be open to the tribunal on any consideration of the Legislative Council electorate allowances immediately following the next election, and the tribunal should consider the facts and take into account in relation to them such matters contained in the instructions to the tribunal in relation to electorate allowances as the tribunal considered to be relevant to the new position of Legislative Councillors. That is in accordance with the view expressed by this place, and I consider that the decisions of the conference improve the proposals that we put.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not care too much about the detail of the arrangements that have been made between the two Houses on this matter, but I take the same view as I took last week when the matter was before us. At that time I opposed having a conference at all and said (and, of course, I was wrong) that that was the last opportunity that there would be to reject the Bill or see it defeated. Now I have another opportunity, because if we do not agree with what the managers have put forward the Bill will go, and that would achieve my objective. I will not repeat what I have said many times before, and probably I would be out of order if I tried to do so. However, I think this is the wrong time for us to be interfering with Parliamentary salaries, and for that reason I ask honourable members, so that this Bill will not pass, to defeat the Premier's motion that we agree to the compromise that has been reached with the other place.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (39)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Becker, Broomhill, Dean Brown, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Coumbe, Crimes, Duncan, Dunstan (teller), Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Groth, Gunn, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, Mathwin, McAnaney, McKee, Nankivell, Olson, Payne, Rodda, Russack, Simmons, Slater, Tonkin, Venning, Virgo, Wardle, Wells, and Wright.

Noes (2)—Messrs. Boundy and Millhouse (teller).

Majority of 37 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

Later:

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the recommendations of the conference.

PETITION: PETROLEUM PRODUCTS

Dr. EASTICK presented a petition signed by 129 electors, taxpayers, and residents of South Australia stating that they opposed the introduction of the Business Franchise (Petroleum) Bill because it would significantly increase the retail price of petroleum products, and praying that the House of Assembly would not continue with such legislation.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

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

AGRICULTURAL OFFICERS

In reply to Mr. BOUNDY (November 14).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Minister of Agriculture states that it is intended to seek temporary assistance to fill vacancies in the Agriculture Department occasioned by the secondment of officers to Libya to establish a demonstration farm. The recruitment of officers as experienced as those who have gone or will be going to Libya will not be possible in all instances. The department is now examining the most effective way of reallocating duties of remaining officers together with the recruitment of temporary assistance to maintain its services in this State. When this examination is completed, specific requests for the filling of the vacancies will be made.

TRANSMISSION LINE

In reply to Mr. McANANEY (October 25).

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Electrical power is required by most areas of the State, and, to ensure continuity of supply, ring systems are developed for all major transmission lines. Thus, duplicate lines are built that are separated by some distance to remove the possibility that both lines will fail at the same time. The intended transmission line, which will ensure the continuous supply of electricity to the southern areas of Adelaide and the State, is the duplicate line from the Para substation north of Adelaide to the Clarendon substation south of Adelaide. The Electricity Trust has worked continuously with the

Environment and Conservation Department to ensure that the power line will have a minimum impact upon the environment.

However, it must also be appreciated that it is not possible to remove all impacts, so there will be some unavoidable effects on some areas and some people, but it is believed that the final route will have the minimum impact possible along its entire length. The intended transmission line must cross the freeway, and this will occur at a point a little to the west of Verdun township. An environmental impact statement is being prepared on this route by the trust, and this will be made available to the public under normal environmental impact statement procedures.

MIDDLE RIVER WATER SUPPLY

In reply to Mr. CHAPMAN (October 15).

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Environmental impact studies are an integral part of all development projects likely to have significant environmental impact. It is Government policy for all Government departments to carry out environmental impact studies whenever considered necessary. The Environment and Conservation Department is awaiting a declaration of environmental factors to be forwarded by the Engineering and Water Supply Department. If, on the basis of this declaration, an environmental impact study is not considered necessary, no delay is expected. If an environmental impact study is considered necessary, responsibility for its implementation will rest with the Engineering and Water Supply Department. It is not possible at this stage, therefore, to indicate how long environmental studies of the intended dam site on Middle River will take.

HIGHWAYS FINANCE

In reply to Mr. COUMBE (November 14).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Australian Government has allocated grants amounting to $100 000 000 to South Australia for road construction, maintenance and planning over three years commencing July 1, 1974. To qualify fully for this sum the State has to provide $85 200 000 over the same period. The Highways Department is responsible for letting contracts and ensuring that work is carried out on roads and projects approved by the Australian Government. Australian funds will be made available to the Highways Department on certificates of work progress and actual expenditure on approved road grant projects. The Australian Government has indicated that it will accept full responsibility for construction and maintenance of national highways and export roads. However, the $53 900 000 provided under the National Roads Act for the three-year period will probably be insufficient to meet all costs involved and, therefore, some work on these roads will be financed from State funds.

STATE FINANCES

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Treasurer say how much money the Commonwealth Government is currently withholding from the use of the State? It has been reported to me that large sums which have been allocated to South Australia by the Grants Commission have not yet been received and that other promised funds have not been forthcoming. It may be that the failure of these funds to come to book is responsible in part for the present spate of cheques which are circulating, which are drawn on departments, and which bear no relationship to the service or the account for which payment should be made by a department. Can the Treasurer assure the House that South Australia is up to date in receiving the funds from the Commonwealth Government that it could and should expect to receive in relation to all matters whereby funds are made available to the State?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I must confess to being mystified by the Leader's allegation. I know of no cheques circulating that do not bear relationship to the account on which they should be properly drawn.

Dr. Eastick: Cheques drawn on the Tourist Department would not relate to the Commonwealth Government, would they?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the Leader will give me details the matter will be investigated; however, as Treasurer I know of no such situation. I have had no complaint from Treasury officers that South Australia has not received Commonwealth funds in accordance with normal Commonwealth procedures. It is true than many months ago the provision of Commonwealth funds in relation to the Land Commission had not come to hand in the time expected, so we had to fund that expenditure from our own working balances. I spoke to Commonwealth Ministers about the matter and we had the funds within 24 hours. That is the only case of which I am aware. I have certainly not had a report from Treasury officers that we are in any difficulties on this score but, if the Leader has heard something that has not been reported to me within my department, I will inquire.

Mr. VENNING: What pressure has the Treasurer applied to Commonwealth members of his Party from this State to use their influence on the Prime Minister so that he will recognise the financial needs of South Australia and act accordingly? For some weeks newspapers have carried many headlines stating that the Treasurer is disappointed with his Commonwealth colleague.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In answering the honourable member's sophisticated question, I assure him that what I have done is keep Commonwealth members from South Australia informed about South Australia's position. I believe that is the proper thing to do. More than that I cannot do and, if the honourable member is concerned about Commonwealth leadership, I suggest that he pay a little attention to the problems of his own side at the moment.

PUBLIC SERVICE

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Premier say what is the policy of the Government (and the Public Service Board for that matter) this year concerning the annual intake of new entrants into the Public Service of South Australia? Has the Government yet determined its policy on the matter, taking into account the natural increase that occurs each year and the present severe state of the economy? I ask my question at this time, bearing in mind that the end of the academic year is approaching.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As it is unnecessary, no policy determination is made each year. At the end of each year, in relation to school leavers, the Government will take into the Public Service the number of people for whom it has created vacancies. We do not have a set intake each year. What we do is fill vacancies where they have occurred.

Mr. Coumbe: Is there an increase in the number of vacancies?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, there is a decrease, as always occurs at any time of economic difficulty, when fewer people leave the Public Service to go elsewhere than is the case in times of considerable affluence and buoyancy.

Therefore, we do not have a great many vacancies in the Public Service. Where we have vacancies and the filling of them is within the terms of the Budget estimates given to each department, we will take on people accordingly. However, we will not be taking on extras on a set figure of intake each year, because we do not have such a set figure of intake. What we have is a provision to fill vacancies at the end of every school year when more people than usual are available to fill vacancies in the Public Service.

FISHING

Mr. RODDA: As the House will adjourn tomorrow for the recess, I ask the Minister of Fisheries when a Director of Fisheries is to be appointed, and what progress has been made, since I asked a question about the matter on October 29, in arranging for a vessel from another State to carry out survey work in relation to the hake fishing industry in South Australia.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: As I can recall the second matter to which the honourable member has referred, I will do all I can to try to obtain information about that for the honourable member by tomorrow. Regarding his first question, I refer him to a Question on Notice about the position of the Director of Fisheries that was replied to on October 29.

FIRE PREVENTION

Mr. ALLEN: Will the Minister of Development and Mines direct the Mines Department to tell staff that it sends to the North-East of the State that a total fire ban is operating in that area? This week, in this area a departmental officer was spoken to by a local fire control officer, who pointed out that landholders in the area did not at present use two-wheel tracks (that is, tracks that are normally used with the vehicle's wheels on two tracks, while spear grass grows between the tracks). Because of the nature of these tracks, spear grass can contact the exhaust pipe of a vehicle. It was pointed out to the staff member that local people did not use these tracks. As a total fire ban was operating in the area, the staff member was requested not to use them. There was no confrontation between these two people, as the staff member readily agreed to the request. On inspecting the vehicle, the patrol officer asked the staff member what he intended to do for food and was told that in the vehicle he had a primus stove on which he intended to cook his meals. It was quickly pointed out to the departmental officer that, as it was a total fire ban area, the use of a primus would not be permitted. That aspect has now been taken care of, because the officer is now using the local town as his base. I believe that not only the Minister of Mines but also all other Ministers should direct their departmental officers to observe the total fire ban in operation in these areas at present.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I thank the honourable member for bringing this matter to my attention. Mines Department officers are given strict instructions to have every regard to the possibility of bush fire outbreaks when they are moving around in the far-flung areas of the State. However, I will again draw this matter to the attention of the department so that we may be doubly sure that no unfortunate outbreak will occur as a result of any such activities.

SOUTH ROAD

Mr. PAYNE: Can the Minister of Transport say whether the contract has been let for the conversion of the pedestrian crossing on South Road, Clovelly Park, to a push-button traffic light installation? My question follows the one I asked about this crossing on September 24. When he replied to my question on October 1, I was pleased to hear him say that he hoped the contract would be let within two months of that date. I know that the Minister is aware of this need and the urgent requirement for this kind of work to be done at that crossing as soon as possible.

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

ADOPTIONS

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Attorney-General say what special arrangements, if any, are made for the adoption of older children? I was told recently about a family of three children, aged eight years, five years, and three years, that has been under institutional care for the past two years and the parents have now agreed to their adoption. Although in the House recently, in reply to a question, the Attorney-General said that almost 1 000 people were waiting to adopt babies, it seems to me that it would be rather difficult to find someone willing to take on these children as a ready-made family. In this circumstance I believe that a special arrangement should be made and I therefore ask my question.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I agree with the honourable member that a special effort is required in the case to which he has referred. Being aware of that case, I discussed it with the Director only a week ago. Without being able to disclose the details, I assure the honourable member that the department is making a special effort to find people willing to adopt the three children as a family.

PORT AUGUSTA HOSPITAL

Mr. KENEALLY: Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Health when it is expected that full nurse training will recommence at Port Augusta Hospital, and why the recommencement has been delayed? At present, trainee nurses at Port Augusta are required to go to Port Pirie to complete their training. I understand that some time ago a decision was made to reinstate the Port Augusta Hospital as a full nurse training centre.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will obtain the information.

RETRAINING

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Minister of Education say which institutions will undertake the retraining of unemployed persons under the National Employment and Training System and whether the resources are adequate for the purpose? Will he also say what financial assistance the Commonwealth Government has provided to enable this training to take place? I expect that colleges of advanced education and colleges of further education will be fairly heavily involved in this retraining scheme, as probably would other institutions. I also understand that the courses in these colleges already are booked out for next year and that it would be extremely difficult to accommodate people who might require retraining under the NEAT system. It seems that Mr. Cameron, who has announced the details of the system, may not have done the necessary homework to ensure that adequate resources will be available next year. It seems from the kind of information that we get from these institutions that the scheme has gone off half-cocked.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is expected that the bulk of the students that we would have to train under this scheme would be in the further education area, although we presume that many will be studying for Matriculation through an adult education centre. At this stage we are not sure what increase there will be in the number of our enrolments. We are concerned that there may be a

substantial increase in enrolments that would be larger than would permit our facilities to handle it, and it is partly with that in mind that I have made a series of submissions to the Australian Minister for Education in recent weeks.

Dr. Eastick: The scheme was introduced without your being consulted?

The SPEAKER: Order! There can be only one question at a time.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Certainly, we were not told that the scheme was to be adopted. Without getting into an argument about the nature of any specific scheme, I do not think any member of this House would suggest that retraining schemes should not be undertaken. I think the argument that we have developed is that, with the expansion in apprenticeships this year and the expected further expansion in 1975, and with an expansion in retraining programmes, together with the normal increase in enrolments, the further education system in this State will be under pressure, despite the increased assistance under the technical and further education grants, and that the pressure will be greater because the grants that are to be made so far are not fully in line with the report of the interim committee that inquired into technical and further education.

Mr. Goldsworthy: What about the time factor?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The grants are spread over two years, instead of 18 months. However, I point out to the honourable member that members of the Liberal Party Opposition in the Commonwealth Parliament said they would postpone this scheme altogether if they got back into Government. Be that as it may, we cannot get ahead with the expansion that we have planned. We have building contracts which are currently out to tender call but which we cannot let at this stage, and we need additional assistance. Following the meeting of the Australian Education Council in Adelaide a couple of months ago, all these matters have been taken up in detail with the Australian Minister and various submissions have been put to him. We have not yet had any indication from Mr. Beazley as to whether further assistance will be provided but certainly, if no further assistance is provided and, if prospective enrolments expand significantly, we will have difficulty in the Further Education Department next year in coping with all those enrolments.

Mr. MATHWIN: Has the Minister of Labour and Industry any figures regarding the operation of the retraining of those people unfortunate enough to be unemployed who may now be employed under the National Employment and Training System? During October, I asked the Minister two questions on this matter. On October 22, I asked:

Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say whether it is a fact that people who apply for retraining under the National Employment and Training System must, before they are accepted for the scheme, first find an employer who will train them and then get permission from the union that they will be allowed to do that work? Is the Minister aware that so many different retraining schemes are now operating . . .

In reply, the Minister said:

I will obtain a detailed report for the honourable member and let him have it as soon as possible.

I have still not received a report. Although many South Australians have applied to engage in the retraining scheme, I understand that only a few of them have been accepted for training on the basis of receiving a payment of $92 a week.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I have not received the report as yet.

PENOLA HOUSES

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Minister of Development and Mines, as Minister in charge of housing, inquire about three houses in Lizzie Street, Penola, owned by the Community Welfare Department, which have been vacant for two or three years, and will he then discuss the position with the Minister of Community Welfare with a view to making those houses available for permanent occupation? Originally the houses were built for occupation by Aboriginal families. However, my information, which I think is entirely reliable, is that they have been occupied only occasionally and for short periods during the past three or four years and that they are now neglected, some having grass about 2 m high around them. Whilst this is the position with those houses, to my knowledge at least five families are awaiting Housing Trust houses in the Penola area. Probably, many more people are also waiting, but I do not know that for sure. In view of the discussions that we have had in this place recently about the housing shortage, it seems a pity, if it is not possible to use these houses for their original purpose, that they cannot be used for another purpose to shorten the list of people waiting for trust houses. For that reason, I bring the matter to the attention of the Minister, but I realise that he alone cannot have the houses tenanted, because the matter involves the Community Welfare Department, which is administered by the Minister who succeeded himself as Minister of Aboriginal Affairs. I hope that the Minister in charge of housing will find out what is the correct position (although I am sure that what I have said will be confirmed) and that he will take the matter up with his colleague so that these houses will be put to good use.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I regret that I have not had the opportunity to inspect the said street, graced as it is with a Royal name. The short reply is "Yes".

WATER LICENCES

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Acting Minister of Works say whether persons holding water licences on the Murray River may increase their water usage during this period of excessive free flow? My Party came out with a policy that this should be done and I understand that the Government has now agreed that people who have licences may increase their water quota during the period of free flow. As we have now had well over a year of free flow, which is likely to continue throughout the summer, can the Minister say what is the Government's policy on this matter, and publicise it, so that people holding water licences will know what is the situation?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am having discussions with the department on this matter and, when they have been concluded, a statement will be made.

GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTS

Mr. BECKER: Will the Treasurer tell the House what policy the Government is adopting on paying its accounts? A constituent has complained to me that his company is experiencing difficulty in getting various Government departments to pay their accounts on a monthly basis. I have been informed that two accounts for one department are respectively 300 days and 150 days overdue, and that another two departments have accounts respectively 90 days and 60 days overdue. Can the Treasurer say whether there has been a change in the Government's accounting system or policy, whether the State's economic position, as outlined in the October Revenue Account, is a true one, or whether the real financial position is worse than we are led to believe?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I find it difficult to know to what the honourable member is referring. The working balances of the State are extremely healthy and buoyant: they have been this way for a long time, and we are making payments of accounts in the normal way. If the honourable member can point to accounts that have not been paid in the normal way, I will have those cases investigated.

UNLEY ROAD CROSSING

Mr. LANGLEY: Can the Minister of Transport say when the pedestrian crossing in the heart of the Unley shopping centre will be changed to one involving push-button traffic lights, and whether ample publicity will be given to the change? Work is now nearing completion on one of the busiest roads and crossings in the metropolitan area, and this change in the lighting system is another instance of the Minister's attitude to progress and to the safety of pedestrians and motorists in this State.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: After obtaining the information for the honourable member, I will let him have it and also let him handle the publicity.

LAND TRANSACTION

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Education ask the Minister of Lands in another place to supply me with details of the location 467 hectares of land, costing $3 500 000, in the Golden Grove district, recently purchased by the South Australian Land Commission to keep prices stable in areas needed for future housing development, and whether this transaction has been finalised?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will take up this matter with my colleague and bring down a reply as soon as possible.

CLELAND RESERVE

Mr. EVANS: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say what sum is to be spent on attempting to improve the Cleland wildlife reserve by installing lights and other equipment? As I have said publicly previously, an excellent documentary on this wildlife reserve was commissioned by the Shell company, and the reserve has been credited throughout Australia as being the best of its kind in the country. However, the State is at present in financial trouble and the Government is short of funds, yet the Minister's department intends to try to improve the reserve. As this will be only experimental work, only time will tell whether or not the work has been an improvement. As I believe that this money should not be spent now, at a time when the State is short of funds, can the Minister say what sum is expected to be spent on this project? This is one type of expenditure that we should not incur at this stage.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: It seems strange that, on the one hand, the honourable member concedes that we are able to establish a park of this nature, which, because of the kind of work we have carefully put into its planning, is the best of its kind in Australia, whereas, on the other hand, I think that most members would agree that we need to continue to ensure that the reserve's good reputation and high standard are maintained. Although the costs involved in this project will not be especially high, I will ascertain what is the estimated cost for the honourable member and let him know. I also point out that, as was made clear when the announcement was first made, we do not intend to rush into this project. Although the whole object of the exercise is to ensure that the community may learn more about our wild life, the well-being of the animals is our first consideration. Many aspects must be considered before we implement the programme to which the honourable member has referred. This project will not be undertaken overnight. We still have much planning to do before we can implement it, although I assure the honourable member that the cost is not immense by any means.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN RAILWAYS

Mr. GUNN: In view of the State's serious financial position, what action does the Minister of Transport intend to take to reduce the substantial loss of the South Australian Railways which is expected to be over $30 000 000 this year? As the Minister is aware, some time ago a report known as the Lees report was presented to him, containing recommendations on railway operations which, if implemented, could reduce losses substantially. I therefore ask the Minister what action he intends to take to reduce this burden on South Australian taxpayers.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Obviously, the honourable member has not kept up with the news of the day, because about a fortnight ago I publicly announced that the Government had decided to increase country passenger fares and rates for by-law goods and livestock.

Mr. Gunn: The amount you gain will be insignificant.

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

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Increased parcel and delivery rates were also announced, and it was stated that several other matters were still being considered and that a public announcement would be made on them in due course. The organisation that the honourable member and his colleagues laud in this place every time they get the chance, namely, United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia Incorporated, has written to me protesting that we have increased the rates. We have the strange situation today, therefore, in which, presumably, the honourable member is asking us to increase these rates further.

Mr. Gunn: I never said that.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The honourable member has asked me what we will do to decrease the cost of operating the railways. Obviously, we have to increase income if we are to reduce the deficit, and we have taken action to do this. The alternative course (and I should like the honourable member to express himself clearly about this) is to close lines.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the honourable member wants us to close lines on Eyre Peninsula (and the member for Heysen wants us to close the line from Mount Barker to Victor Harbor), let him stand up and be counted, and tell the people on Eyre Peninsula that he is advocating closing the Eyre Peninsula railway system.

CONSULTATIVE COUNCILS

Mr. RUSSACK: Can the Minister of Community Welfare say what progress has been made in establishing consultative councils in South Australia? I note from a newsletter of August 3 that 10 councils have been established in the metropolitan area, five in country areas, and six are to be established, namely, at Norwood, Maitland, Salisbury, Port Lincoln, Port Pirie, and Nuriootpa. Also, it is intended to change the names of some councils. The council in which I am particularly interested is at Maitland, and it is to be known as the Yorke Peninsula consultative council. Can the Minister say whether this council has been established and, if it has not been, when it will be established?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I am not able to say precisely when the consultative council will be established, but the process is now taking place. I will find out what stage it has reached and tell the honourable member.

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Minister provide me with further information about the workings of the community consultative councils in South Australia? Some time ago, I asked the Minister a question about these councils, at which time he expressed concern about the possible duplication of certain of their functions and services because of the introduction of the Australian Assistance Plan. I therefore ask whether the Minister has had an opportunity to examine the position and whether he has made representations to see whether the work of the councils (which I laud) and that of his department is not deleteriously affected by any duplication occurring under the Australian Assistance Plan.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I can certainly assure the honourable member that the activities of the consultative councils will not be adversely affected by the Australian Assistance Plan. The real question that exercises my mind is how to achieve harmony between what has been done at State level by the consultative councils and what is proposed in the A.A.P. to be achieved through regional councils. I have expressed my concern about this matter on several occasions in the House and outside. Much work has been done to try to devise machinery that will achieve the maximum degree of harmony between the two systems. Last Thursday, I was in Canberra (I was almost there for longer than I intended to stay) to confer with the Commonwealth Minister for Social Security (Mr. Hayden) on this very matter. Indeed, I spent much of the day with him, exploring in great detail the operation of the two systems and how their activities might be harmonised. I am pleased to say that there is much coincidence of outlook on this matter between the Commonwealth Minister and me. There will now be further discussions with the regional councils for the metropolitan area and the iron triangle area, and there will be consultation by those regional councils with representatives of the consultative councils involved in the two areas in which the regional councils are operating under the A.A.P. I look forward to a speedy solution of the problems that have emerged in the early stages of the development of the A.A.P. I am confident that, as a result of the joint activity of the Commonwealth Minister and me and the co-operation of the regional councils and consultative councils, a system will emerge that will enable us to harmonise the two programmes in South Australia.

COBDOGLA SCHOOL CROSSING

Mr. ARNOLD: Can the Minister of Transport say whether the Highways Department has determined measures necessary to reduce dangers at the road intersection adjacent to Cobdogla Primary School? The Minister may recall that on August 20, following a visit he made to the Riverland, I asked what further action the department had taken to reduce dangers at this crossing. The Minister said that the situation was being reviewed by the department and that, at that stage, he did not know the result of the investigation. Last Friday evening another near fatality occurred at this crossing, and I believe that it is a matter of urgency to examine this problem and, before a fatality occurs, to determine how the crossing can be improved in order to reduce the dangers that exist.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will obtain up-to-date information for the honourable member.

COMPRESSORS

Mr. DEAN BROWN: In the interests of South Australian industry and particularly in the interests of maximum employment in this State, will the Premier make every possible attempt to dissuade his Commonwealth colleagues from proceeding with the present Bill to provide a bounty on certain refrigerator compressors? At present a Bill is before the Senate in Canberra that provides for a bounty of $5 for each compressor produced by a manufacturer and sold by him as a compressor. Three manufacturers of compressors operate within Australia: James H. Kirby and Sons, Email Limited of Orange, and Kelvinator Australia Limited in South Australia. The latter two companies use their compressors in their own refrigerators, and will not be eligible for the bounty if the legislation is passed. The Managing Director of Kelvinator has been reported as saying that between 250 and 300 jobs will be lost in South Australia if this legislation is passed. Furthermore, as the Premier would fully realise, within the next month or so there will be a further tariff reduction of, I think, 11½ per cent, and this action will again place a greater burden on companies such as Kelvinator. We have heard of previous attempts by the Premier to safeguard South Australian industry and do not decry them, because they are in the interests of this State. I hope that this time he will use every opportunity to safeguard our industries. If he is not successful, we will have to rely on Liberal Party members in the Senate to defend this State.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have already announced publicly that representations on this matter were made to the Commonwealth Government many weeks ago, and I made specific representations to the Deputy Prime Minister, Senator Murphy, and to the Minister for Manufacturing Industry (Mr. Enderby) giving them details of this matter. The Commonwealth Government has been fully apprised of the position. I point out to the honourable member that only the South Australian Government has made representations to the Commonwealth Government on behalf of the white goods industry, and it has also made them to the Industries Assistance Commission and previously to the Tariff Board. We are in touch with the needs of industry in this State, and officers, whose numbers Opposition members are constantly requiring me to reduce, have been responsible for protecting South Australian industry, their efforts having resulted in assistance to industry in this State that would otherwise not have occurred. The position in the motor car industry today—

Mr. Dean Brown: You still support the Commonwealth Government's policy!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We make representations in relation to recommendations made by public bodies. In relation to the motor car industry, I remind the honourable member that a proposal was made by the Industries Assistance Commission and not by the Commonwealth Government. The Commonwealth Government, following representations by the South Australian Government (because our representations in relation to the I.A.C. report were central to what occurred thereafter), introduced a policy that not only did not harm the motor car industry in South Australia but enhanced it. Certainly, I will support that kind of policy.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

Mr. LANGLEY: Can the Premier say when the House will rise and when it is expected to resume in the new year?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The House can expect to rise at the end of this week's sitting, and members will be asked to resume on February 18 and to sit until the end of March.

BUS SERVICES

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Minister of Transport say what was the total cost involved in the take-over of metropolitan private bus services earlier this year, whether any other substantial costs have been incurred by the Government as a result of the take-over, and whether any problems, unforeseen or expected, have occurred since the Government has been running the services previously run by private bus operators? I ask the question, notice of which I have given the Minister and which is self-explanatory, because it is a matter of considerable interest to many people in South Australia.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I thank the Leader for providing me with the details of his question in advance: accordingly, I can give him specific replies. First, the total costs involved in the transfer of the metropolitan services amounted finally to $3 573 000; however, two bus service operators who elected not to take part in the transfer earlier this year can, if they so desire, continue to operate until February, 1979, when there will be a further adjustment, if necessary, because the Government has given an undertaking that it will purchase plant and equipment at valuation. Secondly, the cost incurred by the Government as a result of the transfer falls principally into the area of providing proper working conditions for the employees involved in the take-over. These employees, although not operating under the Municipal Tramways Trust award, still work under transport workers' conditions; in fact, a provision has been attached to the M.T.T. award, and the conditions carry over. Notwithstanding this, operators and other staff members were immediately afforded Government over-award and service payments that apply to all Government employees, together with annual leave provisions equivalent to those applying in Government service, and an opportunity to take part in the retiring and death gratuity scheme which, of course, is a non-contributory scheme in the M.T.T. and is worth two weeks pay for each year of service.

These employees will also be given the same opportunities for free travel on M.T.T. buses and trams as apply to other M.T.T. employees. All in all, this will probably cost the Government about $450 000 a year. Thirdly, the operations we have taken over are now M.T.T. operations, and the Government now has an opportunity to do something it has wished to do previously but has found impossible: introduce a transfer ticket system that people will now be able to use when travelling on any of the services that were previously private operations, or when using either M.T.T. or South Australian railway services. Fourthly, the Government will spend an estimated $23 500 000 on purchasing 376 new buses to replace the unsatisfactory buses that were taken over from the private sector. When the old buses are replaced, South Australia will probably have one of the best bus fleets in Australia. Fifthly, all servicing and depot arrangements will be reorganised, because the multiplicity of small depots scattered throughout the metropolitan area is unsatisfactory for an operation such as the one in which we are involved. Accordingly, two new depots will be built, and the Government is currently negotiating to purchase land to build the first depot in the south-western area. It is important to make the point that, in the last few days in this House (and I expect the opportunity will be taken again later today), much criticism has been levelled at the Australian Government and its financial policy, but it would not have been possible to engage in the activity of upgrading urban public transport in the way we are proceeding currently if it were not for the attitude and policy of the present Commonwealth Labor Government, which is meeting two-thirds of the cost. This is something that was refused consistently by former Commonwealth Liberal Governments.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: We should be fair and give credit where credit is due because, if it were not for the policy of the present Commonwealth Government, we would not be able to do what we have done, and either South Australia would have been without buses in the areas previously serviced by the private sector or the fares of those services would have been so astronomically high that people would not have been able to use them. The first point the Leader raised concerned any problems that might have been unforeseen, to which I can say, "No, there are none." I believe we have foreseen most of the problems and, although there are problems that still have to be solved, none was unforeseen, and I do not believe that any of them is incapable of solution. It is clear that the people of Adelaide will benefit tremendously when the final transfer is completed.

Mr. Venning: Does your Leader agree with that?

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

BRICKYARDS

Mr. EVANS: Is the Minister of Development and Mines, as Minister in charge of housing, concerned at the report that PGH Industries Limited may close two of its smaller brickyards? What action has he taken to impress on his Ministerial colleagues that these plants should not cease operating? At present, building materials could be becoming plentiful, with yards possibly holding surpluses of materials. However, the shortage of houses is still a problem. Undoubtedly, before long, if the building industry's position improves, these yards will need to be operating.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The matter was drawn to my attention yesterday by an organiser of the Australian Workers Union. I have not yet had an opportunity to discuss the matter with the management of PGH Industries Limited, largely because of the very early hour at which we finished transacting business in the House this morning. My informant told me that, despite the retrenchments that had occurred, the management had stated that there was no immediate prospect of closing down. I am concerned about the matter. It is rather cold comfort that it confirms what I told the member for Davenport yesterday that there is, in fact, little shortage indeed of building materials at present and that any problems in the industry lie in areas other than material shortages. I will take up the matter with management to see exactly what is the position.

OUTER METROPOLITAN PLAN

Mr. McANANEY: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say what is the present position regarding the outer metropolitan plan? The understanding was that the plan would be produced some months ago. Much concern has been expressed that the original plan was old fashioned, not complying with modern day requirements for by-passes and town planning. Many people are anxiously awaiting—

At 3.15 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

FAIR CREDIT REPORTS BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

KINDERGARTEN UNION BILL

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

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to promote pre-school education in this State; to confer upon the Kindergarten Union of South Australia the status of a statutory corporation, to provide for its administration, and to invest it with certain statutory powers; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its purpose is to provide for the continued existence of the Kindergarten Union as a statutory body with powers and functions conferred by Statute. This is desirable so that the union may have access to public money for the establishment and administration of kindergartens. The union (and the Education Department) will be subject to the Pre-School Education Committee for approval of both capital and recurrent expenditures. The Bill provides for the registration of kindergartens either as branches of the union, or as kindergartens affiliated with the union. The Bill confers on the union the power to make statutes governing the administration of the union, and the relationship between the union and the registered kindergartens. I understand that, under Standing Orders, the Bill will have to be referred to a Select Committee of the House before it can ultimately be passed. As the remainder of my explanation deals with the clauses, I ask that it be inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF CLAUSES

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 are formal. Clause 4 contains a number of definitions necessary for the purposes of the new Act. Clause 5 defines the juristic nature and capacity of the union. Clause 6 sets out in detail the objects of the union. Clause 7 defines the powers that the union may exercise in pursuing its objects and provides that the union must collaborate with various other authorities that are intimately concerned with the welfare of the pre-school child.

Clause 8 establishes the board of management. Clause 9 defines the membership of the union. Clauses 10 and 11 deal with the conditions upon which members of the board shall hold office. Clauses 12 and 13 deal with procedures of the board. Clause 14 deals with the appointment of a President and Vice-President, or Vice-Presidents, of the board. Clause 15 empowers the board to appoint an executive director of the union.

Clause 16 empowers the board to delegate its powers. Clause 17 provides for the board to make an annual report. Clause 18 establishes the council of the union. The council is to be a representative body with a much larger membership than the board. It is to be concerned broadly with general policies and objectives while the board concerns itself with the matters of detailed administration. Clauses 19 and 20 deal with conditions upon which the members of the council shall hold office. Clause 21 provides that the President of the board is to preside at meetings of the council.

Clause 22 deals with annual general meetings of the council. Clauses 23 and 24 deal with the registration of kindergartens either as branch kindergartens or as affiliated kindergartens. Clause 25 confers on the board power to make statutes governing the administration of the affairs of the union. Clause 26 is a financial provision requiring the board to submit estimates of expenditure to the South Australian Pre-School Education Committee. This committee will advise the Minister who in turn will recommend to the Treasurer what payments should be made from the general revenue to the union for the purpose of promoting pre-school education.

Clause 27 requires the board to keep proper accounts of its financial affairs and provides for an audit by the Auditor-General. Clause 28 enables the union to borrow moneys for the purpose of promoting pre-school education. Any such borrowing is to be guaranteed by the Treasurer. Clause 29 exempts the union and registered branch kindergartens from gift duty, land tax, and local government rates. Clause 30 enables the Governor to transfer unalienated Crown land to the union. Clause 31 is a transitional provision dealing with the existing employees of the union and their rights upon the commencement of the new Act.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY secured the adjournment of the debate.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN COUNCIL FOR EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND RESEARCH BILL

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

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to establish the South Australian Council for Educational Planning and Research; to prescribe its powers and functions; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Committee of Inquiry into Education in South Australia, 1969-70 (the Karmel committee), recommended the formation of a Tertiary Education Committee and the formation of an Advisory Council of Education. The first committee was proposed to advise the South Australian Government and the tertiary institutions of South Australia on the means of meeting needs for tertiary education and of promoting co-ordination, mutual assistance and diversity among tertiary institutions. The second committee was intended to provide a means of conveying advice to the Minister on desirable developments in education and to conduct inquiries itself, or by means of expert committees, and to publish reports of the studies for which it had taken responsibility.

After considering the advice of its departmental officers and others interested in education, the Government announced its policy of combining the activities of these two committees and establishing a Council for Educational Planning and Research. The council to be established under the new Act will be concerned with long-term planning. The research and investigations it will undertake will indicate the nature and direction of planned developments. The council will act in an advisory capacity and will not impinge on the autonomy of separate institutions as created by law in this State, nor on the legal powers entrusted to such bodies as the Board of Advanced Education, the Pre-School Committee, or the powers contained in the Education Act.

There are, as members are aware, a number of commissions, boards and committees of this Government and of the Australian Government that are concerned with the funding and administration of various levels and types of education. The council proposed in this Bill will represent all levels of education and a wide cross-section of educational opinion in this State and will collaborate with other instrumentalities in carrying out common purposes. It will therefore serve as a major means of communication between these bodies and will provide an opportunity to reach agreement on mutually acceptable lines of development in an overall plan. Transposing the words of Professor Peter Karmel, it will advise on the "development and due co-ordination of education in this State and will promote co-ordination, mutual assistance and diversity among tertiary institutions". Members will appreciate that at a time when there is unprecedented activity in education, there is a need to maintain a careful balance between economy and efficiency, on the one hand, and the need to ensure equity for all affected by the provision of educational resources and facilities on the other. The council will give material assistance in maintaining this balance by providing objective and informed advice. The remainder of the second reading deals with the clauses of the Bill, and I seek leave to have that portion of the explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF CLAUSES

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 are formal. Clause 4 contains a number of definitions necessary for the purposes of the new Act. Clause 5 establishes the council. Clause 6 deals with the constitution of the council. Clause 7 provides for the appointment of a Chairman, under conditions determined by the Governor. Clause 8 provides for the term of office of members appointed to the council and for their independence of expression. Clause 9 describes the conditions under which meetings of the council are called. Clause 10 describes the procedures of the council. Clause 11 is a saving provision. Clause 12 provides for the establishment of an executive board. This board will exercise such powers as the council may delegate to it to maintain the activities of the council between meetings of the full council.

Clause 14 sets out the functions of the council. The council is empowered to carry out through its own resources, or commission in other ways, such investigations and research as the council considers desirable in pursuing its objects of long-term planning. The council will promote the development, rationalisation and co-ordination of educational services. It is empowered to accumulate such statistical data and other materials that are relevant to its function. It will have power to publish the reports of its investigations and proposals concerning educational planning and research, thus providing a means of public discussion. The council will be empowered to co-operate with other authorities in this State and elsewhere in carrying out research and assisting in the development, rationalisation and co-ordination of educational services. The council will advise the Minister on matters referred to it for investigation. Clause 15 provides for the appointment of an executive director and for the continuance in office of the person currently acting in that capacity.

Clause 16 provides for the appointment of staff to carry out the purposes of the Act. In common with the practice of certain other commissions, boards or authorities in South Australia, provision is made for the council to employ certain staff, principally clerical or administrative staff under the Public Service Act. The technical and professional staff will in general be appointed independently of the Public Service Act and under the powers of this clause. Clause 17 provides for certain conditions of service and superannuation to be applied to employees of the council. Clause 18 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 19 requires the council to keep proper accounts of its income and expenditure and for the audit of these accounts by the Auditor-General. Clause 20 requires the council to report annually to Parliament through the Minister. Clause 21 empowers the Governor to make regulations in relation to the new Act.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY secured the adjournment of the debate.

NARCOTIC AND PSYCHOTROPIC DRUGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

It makes a number of miscellaneous amendments to the Narcotic and Psychotropic Drugs Act. The first and most important of these is to amend the definition of "Indian hemp". Indian hemp has up to this time been defined as the plant *Cannabis Sativa L.* However, it now seems possible that there are two other species of the plant, namely *Cannabis Ruderalis* and *Cannabis Indica.* The definition is therefore amended to include any species of the *Cannabis* plant. The definition is also amended to remove from the definition fibrous material from which all resin has been extracted. The fibre is of course used in hempen rope. The Bill also overcomes a deficiency in the section of the Act dealing with consumption of prohibited drugs. New offences of administering such a drug to another person, and allowing another person to administer such a drug to oneself, are created. A new power is included in the principal Act enabling a court to forfeit to the Crown any money, substances or articles used or received in connection with the commission of an offence under the principal Act. Advertisements promoting the use of drugs to which the principal Act applies are prohibited. This new prohibition does not, however, apply to a magazine, journal, circular or paper that is circulated only amongst legally qualified medical practitioners, registered dentists or veterinary surgeons, or exempted by the Minister from the provisions of the new section.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends the definition of "Indian hemp" in the manner described above. Clause 3 creates the new offences of permitting another to administer a drug, or administering a prohibited drug to another person. Clause 4 enacts the new powers of forfeiture. Clause 5 restricts the publication of advertisements relating to prohibited drugs.

Dr. TONKIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

Later:

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): It is pleasing, in considering such a Bill as this, to be able to indicate wholehearted support for it, in direct contrast to the exercise in political cynicism that we have had earlier. This is purely amending legislation and it relates directly to the drug problem affecting our community at present. When I became a

member four years ago, I spoke on the drug problem as I had observed it in the United States, and I said that we would be fortunate if we did not have serious drug problems in this country. That was not only my opinion: the opinion had been expressed by many other experts in the field.

Sadly, what I said has come to pass and we have in Australia, including South Australia, problems of drug dependence that we hoped would not arise. The incidence of crimes of violence associated with breaking and entering surgeries and pharmacies and of stealing from doctors' cars has increased tremendously. The acceptance by the community that drug dependence is now a problem is one of the most frightening things about it. Whereas previously public opinion was aroused easily by an instance of drug abuse, drug abuse has now become accepted as a part of our way of life.

I do not think anyone accepts that it is a good part, but just as we have become blase about men setting foot on the moon, so we have come to accept the increasing drug dependence picture. One of the other things that concerns me and other authorities active in the field is the change in the incidence regarding the various drugs that are abused. First, it was a matter of the barbiturates and amphetamines, the depressants and the stimulants. Now it is a matter of the so-called hard drugs. Heroin particularly is being abused on an increasing scale.

This situation is extremely serious, because, whilst alcohol can induce chronic drug dependence in a matter of years, heroin can induce physical dependence in weeks or days. Whilst alcoholism can cause death from chronic abuse of the drug in 10 or 15 years, heroin can cause death in six months. I have not heard anything to change the view that the expectation of life of the average heroin dependant is six months. That is an appalling situation and it must be overcome. We must do everything that we can to support the activities of the Public Health Department and the Alcohol and Drug Addicts Treatment Board.

We are now seeing only the beginning of the heroin problem in this State. The drug has been imported into this State from the Eastern States and overseas in increasing quantities. This has been done deliberately by criminal concerns that are out to make money from the illness, misfortune, or death of other people. This is a miserable situation. The Alcohol and Drug Addicts Treatment Board is providing improved facilities and is doing a good job, but the board's work and that of the other authorities will not relieve the problem in the foreseeable future. Because of that, the problem is frightening, and we must ask why young people become dependent on drugs. The easy answer is twofold: first, because certain young people are susceptible; and, secondly, because certain young susceptible people come into contact with sources of supply, whether they are accidental contacts or whether, as is more frequently the case, they are deliberate contacts on the part of the pushers. They come into contact with that supply, and on that degree of contact depends the availability of the drugs. These drugs are becoming more and more easily available. I believe that much attention should be paid to some of our seaports, not necessarily Port Adelaide or Outer Harbor, but especially Port Lincoln, which is a port where drugs are being imported into this country. I believe that the Customs and Excise Department should pay considerable attention to that port. I think there are other ports where trading, particularly with the Far East, takes place and where measures must be taken to prohibit or at least contain the import of these drugs.

I have no doubt at all that heroin is becoming more widely available every day. For all those cases which are treated and which come to notice, probably 95 per cent of the total goes unnoticed and untreated. In other words, only 5 per cent of cases actually come to our attention. The Bill is necessary because it tidies up certain loose ends, but it does not get over that question of availability of drugs from outside, or the question of susceptibility, which is very much a case of whether life is worth living for a young person or whether life is so miserable that it is necessary to seek a way out by taking drugs and retiring into a dream world. Susceptibility is the crux of the whole drug problem. I believe that that aspect of the problem is being treated by the drug educators, and it is necessary that parents understand their responsibilities to their children, that teachers understand what their responsibilities are, and that we ensure that young people's lives nowadays are challenging enough and worth living sufficiently so that they want to get on with living their life and will not opt out. That is the fundamental problem which we must face and which, as the Attorney-General knows, is a tremendous one in our social structure and in many other aspects of community living.

Mr. Simmons: The trend in the U.S. is away from drugs.

Dr. TONKIN: I am happy to agree with the honourable member that this is so. Indeed, there is an increase in the degree of alcoholism among young people in the U.S. This, I suppose, is a good thing from one point of view, but it also brings other related problems which, in their own way, are just as difficult. As the incidence of heroin consumption in the U.S. has been contained and is on the decrease, it is believed that criminal elements will move more particularly into Australia and become more organised, so young people in our community will be even more at risk. The Bill amends section 5 of the principal Act by striking out paragraph (*b*) of subsection (1) and inserting in lieu thereof the following paragraph:

(*b*) smokes, consumes or administers to himself, or permits any other person to administer to him, or administers to any other person, any drug to which this Act applies.

This is a new offence as far as the Act is concerned. It will cover cases where people have drugs administered to them both with their knowledge and without their knowledge. I think that one of the most heinous things that can happen is that drugs should be administered to people without their knowledge or that dangerous drugs can be put into, in the case of lysergic acid diethylamide (L.S.D.), almost any form and quite often, in the case of heroin, into tobacco or marihuana, and that these drugs can be administered to people who experience their effects without their knowledge in the first instance.

I believe that this is a particularly unpleasant business, and the practical joke which has been indulged in by the practical jokester at parties for many years of lacing fruit cup or a non-alcohol drinker's drink with alcohol is deplorable. Having seen what can happen to some people who have had their drinks laced with L.S.D. or heroin, I believe that such action is totally reprehensible. This attitude must be firmly discredited. If we had to examine penalties and determine whether they should be graduated, I believe that some of the penalties which have been imposed have not been quite realistic. If we had to consider the way in which penalties should be graded, I would say that penalties for a first offence should perhaps be far greater than penalties for subsequent offences. One could say that, once a person is a dependant, not much further harm is being done by giving him more drugs. However,

the initial step of giving a drug in the first instance and inducing dependency by starting a person on the road to drug abuse and total physical dependence is by far the worst aspect of the crime.

I put that forward as a hypothesis, but I do not really think it is possible to distinguish between the two. I simply point out (and I say this with the greatest respect) that some members of the Judiciary, who perhaps may be guided by their experience in other spheres, believe that a first offence does not deserve as severe a penalty as a second offence. I can only say that, in this case, I believe the first offence is deserving of a penalty greater than or equal to that for any other subsequent offence. After all, that first offence, that first introduction to a drug of dependency, may be the first step along a six-month trip to death. Section 5 (2) (*e*) is amended by inserting after the passage "drug to which this Act applies" the passage "or for the cultivation of any prohibited plant". Sufficient publicity has been given to recent cases in which people have grown all forms of the *cannabis* plant, but people growing the plant have frequently tricked the proprietors of the garden or house and asked that the plants be watered while they were away. The proprietor has watered the plants, and young people have grown *cannabis* without the knowledge of other people involved.

The member for Elizabeth will probably take some action to clarify the present position, and I will support his move. Generally, I support the legislation. We may pass all the legislation we wish and commend the work of the Drug Squad of the Police Force in this and other States, because they have done a magnificent job considering their difficulties. We can commend customs authorities for their efforts in preventing drugs being imported. However, basically the problem must be tackled at the consumer level. The answer is with the individual, and with the responsibility of parents to their children. If they are real parents, they need not fear that their children will become drug dependants.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I support the Bill. Recently, I wrote a letter to the Minister asking for information about drug offences in this State. From my limited research I have found that, whereas previously six or seven offences were committed each year, more than 400 offences are now being committed, and that is in addition to the alcohol problem.

Mr. Nankivell: They are the detected offences.

Mr. EVANS: Yes, and people in my district are concerned. Recently, people associated with youth work showed a dramatic film that pulled no punches about the effect of drugs on young people, generally resulting in death. Even after that film, some people in the group said that they would take drugs for the first time to see whether they liked them or not. There may be a tendency for young people to try something for the first time for a thrill, a dare, or to prove they are growing up, but this sort of situation has caused concern. No doubt there has been a massive increase in the number of young people particularly who drink alcohol to excess, compared to the number some years ago, and many young people will become alcoholics by the time they are 30 to 40 years of age.

I support the member for Bragg's suggestion that activities at our seaports and airports should be scrutinised most carefully, but these days chartering a small aeroplane is easy, and we are not an island that is difficult to reach, so that drugs can be brought into this country. I do not support the suggestion that people who do not know they are growing a drug plant should be excused in any way. If people allow these plants to be grown or stored on their property, some penalty should be imposed on them, although they may have found it difficult to prove that they did not know that such a plant could produce a dangerous drug. Old and young people are taking drugs and ruining their bodies and minds, often ending up in a coffin.

I deplore the people who traffic in drugs, and they should be hit with heavy penalties. I understand that penalties imposed at present are not severe enough, particularly for those producing or trafficking in drugs. These people are an aid to suicide or murder, and penalties for trafficking in drugs should be as severe as possible. For that reason I support any move to make it more difficult for people who traffic in or produce drugs in this country. It could be too late after a first offence for people caught taking drugs, as the member for Bragg said. We have to try to educate young and old people against the harmful effects of drugs that can ruin their lives. Heavy penalties will not achieve much success: treatment is the answer in that case. However, no mercy should be spared for the person trafficking in drugs.

Mr. Nankivell: Give them life!

Mr. EVANS: Yes. It must be a severe penalty because people who exploit human beings, leading them into great harm or even death, have no excuse for making money out of those who are easily led. I support the legislation but do not like the tenor of the amendment that has been foreshadowed.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I support the Bill. In doing so I register my disappointment because the Attorney-General, although he has amended section 5 of the principal Act, has not seen fit to increase the penalty beyond $4 000. The penalty as it now stands provides for a fine of $4 000 or imprisonment for 10 years or both. Recently I asked the Attorney whether he would consider increasing the penalty, but he has not seen fit to do so. There is nothing too bad for people committing offences against the Act. Pushers, in particular, are at fault. When one speaks about people who can earn in a short period thousands of dollars from selling "blotting paper" or a similar narcotic substance, a penalty of $4 000 is not very great. I believe the penalty could be doubled or even trebled, because the present penalty will not cause hardship to people selling drugs. I support the Bill but register my disappointment that the Attorney has not seen fit to increase the penalty beyond $4 000.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Prohibition of manufacture, administration, etc., of drugs."

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

After paragraph (*a*) to strike out "and", and to insert the following new paragraph:

(*c*) by inserting after subsection (3) the following subsection:

(3a) It shall be a defence to a charge under paragraph (*e*) of subsection (2) of this section to prove that the defendant did not know—

(*a*) that a substance produced, prepared, manufactured, sold, distributed smoked, consumed or administered on premises to which the charge relates was a drug to which this Act applies;

or

(*b*) that a plant cultivated on premises to which the charge relates was a prohibited plant,

as the case may require.

The purpose of the amendment, which was originally circulated in error in the name of the member for Elizabeth, is to make clear that a person who does not have knowledge that the substance which is being produced or the plant which is being cultivated is a prohibited plant does not commit an offence; however, the amendment places the onus of establishing that on the person who is accused. It seems to me that it would be unreasonable to impose on a person criminal liability in such a serious matter if he has no knowledge that the plant which has been growing on his property is indeed a prohibited plant. It would be unreasonable and not in accordance with our notions of justice that he should commit an offence in such circumstances, because we are dealing here with a serious criminal offence carrying heavy penalty. It is only after serious consideration that it has been decided that the accused person should be required to carry the onus of proving want of knowledge in these circumstances. I believe that the difficulties of enforcement and the difficulties of proof justify the reversal of the onus of proof in this case.

Dr. TONKIN: I support the amendment, and I believe the Attorney has made a good point. It is one thing to say that nothing else looks like *cannabis*, which is true, but when *cannabis* has been seen growing it is then easily recognised. People who have not seen it growing and who are not keen gardeners or botanists would not have the slightest idea of what may be growing at the bottom of their gardens. For that reason people should be given an opportunity of proving they have not committed an offence.

Mr. EVANS: I do not support the amendment. I appreciate the reasonableness that the Attorney and the member for Bragg place on it. Where a court is convinced that a person did not really know this plant was growing on his property he is liable to a small fine only. By that method at least the community will learn that it is an offence to grow the plant. If we leave it for good liars to prove that they did not know it was growing on their property, this type of offence will continue. The way the drug problem is increasing in this country frightens me. The amendment is a retrograde step and does not make it more difficult for people to grow the plant. In fact, we are making it a little easier, and that is something I do not intend doing. The Police Department has enough trouble in apprehending people, anyway, so why should it be put to the extra trouble of proving that an offence has been committed? That is a difficult task and there are cunning operators who could take advantage of the measure. We could be helping people in this matter because they could look after gardens in the community and say to people, "I will look after your garden for you"; they could grow the plant there and the people concerned would not know *cannabis* was planted on their property. All they could say would be, "I didn't know it was planted in my garden." I do not support the amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (4 and 5) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

NATIONAL PARKS AND WILDLIFE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 21. Page 2185.)

Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey): In supporting the second reading of this important Bill, I find it extremely difficult to understand why it was not until the last two days of the session that the Government saw fit to introduce such an important measure. Previously, we have run into exactly the same trouble, similar legislation being introduced in the last two or three days of the session and the Government wanting us to vote for it without speaking to it. If we are to do the job that we on this side of the House are meant to do, we have a responsibility to look at legislation, to analyse it critically and to ensure that it is in the interests of the people of South Australia. This Bill is more extensive than was the Bill introduced previously. In his second reading explanation, the Minister said:

Many of the conservation measures which have been in operation in South Australia for a number of years are only now being adopted by other States, and I think it is true to say that South Australia leads the field in the matter of conservation legislation.

I stress the words "conservation legislation". I have no doubt that if this measure is enacted we will have one of the best Acts of its type in Australia. Although the legislation is good, it is worth very little unless the necessary finance to put the provisions of the Act into effect is available. This measure provides for the introduction of permits that will be issued at the discretion of the Minister on application from persons wishing to hunt in this State. I am pleased to see that the Government will put this revenue into the Wildlife Conservation Fund. In the Estimates of Expenditure for 1972-73, under the line "Improvements and general expenses incurred in normal operations and maintenance", relating to national parks and wild life, Parliament voted $353 959, $322 860 being spent that financial year.

I know a considerable amount of cross-funding takes place from one department to another, but I point out that this money was voted to the department to carry out the necessary practical workings of wildlife protection, propagation and provision of the habitat necessary for wild life in this State. In 1973-74 the vote on this line was only $307 496, whereas the actual expenditure was $319 496. In 1974-75, the Government voted only $271 850 to the department for improvements and for general expenditure in operation and maintenance. Therefore, the provision was reduced by $82 109, compared to the provision in 1972-73, whereas, having regard to the inflation rate in Australia in recent times, the Government should have provided about $400 000.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: One department took over—

Mr. ARNOLD: I have referred to the cross-funding and, if the Minister can clearly indicate the extent to which that occurred in relation to the Public Buildings Department, that will help clarify the point. Whilst the money expected to be collected from licence fees, permits, and gun-licence fees when the firearms legislation is introduced to provide for those licences, the money from those sources will only go to offset the money taken from the National Parks and Wildlife Service. I should be pleased to know how much money has been cross-funded from the Public Buildings Department to the National Parks and Wildlife Service.

I refer now to the advisory council. This Bill provides that the council shall have a permanent Secretary. Provision should be made for the advisory council to report to Parliament, as soon as possible after June 30 each year, on its activities for each year ahead and on the matters it has investigated. Members of the council are competent and they do work that is extremely valuable to South Australia and even to the whole of Australia. However, at present the council reports only to the Minister on matters that he refers to it or on matters that he considers important.

This action limits the value of the council's work, and a report to Parliament would become a public document and a reference document. I am not saying that all the council's decisions are correct, and on some matters the council's thinking may differ from that of other people in the community. However, the remainder of the community should know what the council thinks, and a report to Parliament would greatly enhance the council's enthusiasm. This authority would know that the people generally, not only the Minister, would see its decisions.

Another matter provided for in the Bill has been grossly misunderstood by the people. I refer to the provision about reptiles. Much publicity has been given this matter, and in Committee I will move an amendment to this provision if the Minister has not already arranged to do so. I think that we can clarify the intent of the Bill. The other important provision is clause 21, which makes provisions about hunting and the illegal entry on land. These provisions are important and should have been enacted 12 months ago. The only reason why they were not was that the legislation was introduced only a few days before Parliament adjourned for the Christmas recess.

It is essential that landholders be protected. It has become increasingly difficult for the authorities to apprehend trespassers, and there is no control on out-of-hand shooting. The Bill also provides for hunting permits, and I understand that there will be no restriction regarding age. I think the only restriction imposed will be imposed when the Firearms Act is amended to provide for gun licences. The Minister may say later whether I am correct about that matter.

The final clause repeals schedule 8 and schedule 9 and inserts new schedules that will make it easier to keep certain birds. I consider that, by and large, it is a good Bill, although we will move some amendments. If the Government does not starve the department of the funds necessary to put the legislation into effect properly, we in South Australia will lead in wildlife conservation. But we certainly cannot do that if the National Parks and Wildlife Service remains on the bottom rung of the Government's ladder of priorities. If the Government does not recognise the importance of our wild life, it is high time that members of the public voiced their opinions to ensure that the necessary steps are taken and that the necessary money is made available to the department to put into effect the purposes not only of the Bill but also of the National Parks and Wildlife Act. I support the second reading.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I, too, support the Bill. I am in a frame of mind similar to that of the member for Chaffey, because I believe that some of these measures could already be in operation if the Government had introduced (and I take it that the Minister was responsible) the previous Bill it had before the House somewhat earlier or if at that time the Minister had been willing to accept an amendment that would have ensured that moneys raised by the issuing of hunting permits would go into the Wildlife Conservation Fund. The Minister was told last year that that was one of the Opposition's ambitions and one of the measures it wanted to see implemented under the Bill. The Minister was told by his colleagues at that time that, if he proceeded with the Bill and it was debated, there would be little time for debating it because it was the final week of the Parliamentary session. That is the reason why we congratulate the Minister and his colleagues and accept the fact that moneys from the issue of hunting permits should go into the Wildlife Conservation Fund. That is a sound proposition, even though it took the Minister and his colleagues some time to accept it as being the correct decision. We appreciate the change of mind; indeed, it shows that sometimes a change of mind is to the benefit of the State.

Undoubtedly we need to protect our wild life and we need to have sensible legislation that affords people the opportunity of appreciating wild life, without causing unnecessary damage or without over-hunting and, at the same time, without interfering unnecessarily with the private land or property of others. I believe that that is the Bill's main intention. The opportunity was given to the Minister to spend 12 months to improve the previous Bill he introduced, and I believe that the Bill now before us is an upgrading of that legislation, apart from the provision for payment of money raised by the issue of hunting permits into the Wildlife Conservation Fund. Not only is that money to be paid into the fund, but also any moneys raised from the sale of any animal and, I take it, other objects that may end up in the Minister's possession.

I, too, am concerned about the definition of poisonous snakes and believe that the present wording of the relevant clause is unsatisfactory. Many people are afraid of snakes: just the sight of a snake in or near a person's house might make him afraid to venture into the house. New subsection (2) of section 54 provides:

> It shall be lawful for any person without any permit or other authority under this Act, to kill any poisonous reptile that has attacked, is attacking or is likely to attack, any person.

I believe it possible in an urban area, in particular, for a family to be enjoying a Sunday afternoon barbecue in the backyard, with 10 or so friends who have a keen interest in conservation and a wish to preserve snakes and who have no fear of them, poisonous though some may be. A neighbour in the backyard, with two or three children, might see a snake within a distance of about 60 metres of the children, pick up a weapon or object, and kill the snake. I believe that the person who killed the reptile would, under the wording of new subsection (2), be liable to prosecution, because he might not be able to prove that it was about to attack the children if they were about 60 metres away.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Why not?

Mr. EVANS: I think it would be impossible for that to be proved. The object is to preserve poisonous snakes and to prevent them from being traded or handled in such a way that people could profit by it. I believe that the clause should be amended. As I am aware of the kind of wording the member for Chaffey is trying to introduce, I believe that that would be a more acceptable form than the present wording. I also fully support the proposal of the member for Chaffey to make it obligatory on the Wildlife Advisory Council to present its report to the Minister annually so that he may make it available to both Houses of Parliament. It is utterly wrong, when talking of open government, and when we have an advisory council established to inquire into conservation matters and the preservation of wild life, that its thoughts, ideas and research are often lost because the Minister or the department cannot see the benefit of implementing the proposals. It could be the Minister and the department, or one or the other, that decided that a proposal should not be proceeded with.

I hope that the Minister will accept the amendment of the member for Chaffey. I know that it is not normal practice for an advisory council to bring down a public report, but the environmental field is now a topical

subject in the community and one in which the community has a keen interest. In recent times we have undertaken major projects within the State without proper environmental studies being carried out. That has caused much community ill feeling, outcry, and criticism of the Government, Government departments, companies and private interests, because the necessary studies were not carried out. I am not suggesting that the council would have expertise in all fields but it would, undoubtedly, have information on recent instances. For that reason, I believe that this kind of information could not harm the Government. A Government that says it believes in open government (and it does not matter whether it is the present Government or the future Liberal Party Government—the only other alternative) must accept the fact that, if we provided that the council must present its report on an annual basis—

Mr. Millhouse: That's not the only alternative Government.

Mr. EVANS: Yes, it is. The honourable member knows that full well, as much as he hates to admit it. No doubt, people in the community would expect that of any responsible Parliament, and I hope that the member for Mitcham would support such a provision, so that the report would be made available to him and his colleague. His colleague would have the time to study it, in the House, whereas that is certainly not the case with the member for Micham. I strongly support such a proposal. New subsection (2) of section 9 provides:

> Where a notice of intention to acquire land has been served, any person who wilfully damages the land or destroys or damages any flora or fauna upon the land shall be guilty of an offence and liable to a penalty not exceeding two thousand dollars or imprisonment for twelve months.

I believe that the term "flora or fauna" is incorrectly used and that the words "wild life" would be more appropriate. In his second reading explanation, the Minister said:

> Where a notice of intention to acquire land has been issued, the Minister may instruct wardens to protect the land from damage in the interim period before acquisition is completed. This provision has been included because of threats which have been made that natural vegetation will be destroyed if any move is made by the department to acquire certain lands for national park purposes.

I support the Minister in that statement, because it would be totally irresponsible for any person who owned land, after receiving a notice of intention to acquire from the Minister, to destroy natural vegetation or wild life on the land. This move by the Government should be supported by the whole community. However, I am concerned about the use of the words "flora or fauna", and I illustrate by quoting a case in which the Environment and Conservation Department is not concerned. A Government department has served a notice of acquisition on an owner whose land contains much African daisy. At least 12 months will elapse before the department acquires the property and, in the meantime, the owner is subject to other laws including the need to destroy noxious weeds on his property. This legislation provides that, if the owner destroyed African daisy after the Minister had served an acquisition notice, he would be liable for a penalty not exceeding $2 000 and imprisonment for at least 12 months but, if he left the weed on his property, he would be liable to be prosecuted by the council for not destroying a noxious weed. New section 68b (5) provides:

> Where it is proved, in any proceedings for an offence against this section, that a person had in his possession or control any dog, firearm, device, poison or bait capable of being used for hunting it shall be presumed, in the absence of proof to the contrary, that that person was on the land for the purpose of hunting.

The words "any dog" that have been used should be replaced by "any animal", as that would cover a person who used ferrets or one who used a falcon for hunting. I now turn to the matter of finance for national parks and recreation areas. Money is scarce at present. We are spending money on the exciting concept of wild life conservation, and the Government is hoping to receive revenue from the issue of licences. Although the actual monetary value of these grants may be high, their purchasing power will be reduced because of inflation. Yet we are allocating money to Theatre 62 and the South Australian Film Corporation. Surely this indicates the attitude of the Government towards national parks and recreation areas, because it has not accepted its responsibility. Although its public statements suggest that it intends to do something about our parks and recreation areas, nothing much seems to be happening. I would not spend money on Cleland Wildlife Reserve at present. It is a successful venture and the new project may improve it, but this money could be used in other places with better results.

Perhaps we should try to improve it when money becomes more plentiful, but it is not the time to do that now. I suggest to the Government that an admission fee should be charged to enter Belair Recreation Park: this would be a fee imposed on a motor vehicle and not on pedestrians, or groups of schoolchildren visiting the park. This money could be spent on upgrading the park, rather than the Government's allocating $90 000 to upgrade the golf course at the park. People will pay to use the golf course but, when a motor vehicle enters the park, it should be charged an admission fee. People in these motor vehicles enjoy the facilities of the park, whereas many other people do not appreciate these facilities.

Mr. Mathwin: Why not charge to go on the beaches!

Mr. EVANS: The Government should consider the question of an entrance fee to Belair Recreation Park for motor vehicles. The member for Glenelg can argue about beaches, but metropolitan councils, because rental accommodation and business development takes place in those areas and because seaside councils gain substantial sums from tourists, and receive rate revenue, have an advantage over country areas. For the information of the member for Glenelg, each recreation and wild life park in a country area is a burden on the community because no rates and taxes are received in respect of such parks. I know rates and taxes are not paid on beaches, either, but let the member for Glenelg deny that the business development within the beach-front area at Glenelg and other places does not contribute considerably to the revenue of local councils. Recreation parks produce no revenue for the community (a point members should consider) because South Australia is one of the few States in Australia that does not charge an admission fee for people entering recreation parks. Such an admission scheme should be supported by the member for Glenelg and other members, unless they believe in a totally Socialist system.

The member for Chaffey asked about the age of people holding hunters' permits. I agree that if a person carries a firearm there should be an age limit, but I do not know at what age the Minister wishes to draw the line for hunting purposes. As a boy, I hunted without a gun from about 10 years of age. Has the Minister considered reducing the age in some areas where permits are necessary or whether the type of permit could be varied? Many people believe that a hunting licence (and the same principle applies to firearms) should not be issued to a person under 18 years of age. Other people, however, believe the age should be 16 years. I believe in some forms of hunting that young people

could hunt responsibly if they were with their parents or with another older person. Of course, that would need to be clarified. Moreover, in a group of people will only one person need a hunting permit? Such a group could consist of a father and two sons out hunting; one son could be carrying nets, the other carrying ferrets, and the father carrying a gun. Will they all need a hunting permit? That is a question I should like clarified in the Minister's reply on the second reading.

Overall, I congratulate the Minister on introducing the Bill. I am sure that rural people appreciate that the Minister, by introducing the Bill, is placing a burden on the hunter to obtain a written statement from the owner or caretaker of a property to the effect that the hunter wishes to hunt on the land concerned and has permission to do so. By using such a provision I believe much ill feeling against the general hunter will be avoided and, at the same time, South Australia's wild life (our indigenous animals and plants) will be protected and preserved. The Minister had an opportunity to introduce these measures 12 months ago; nevertheless I congratulate him on introducing the Bill and hope that he will accept the one or two minor amendments foreshadowed by the member for Chaffey.

Mrs. BYRNE (Tea Tree Gully): I support the Bill. I am pleased that the two Opposition members who have spoken to the Bill also support it. I was interested to hear their remarks, because they obviously support the Bill in principle, although they have raised one or two queries and will perhaps move a few minor amendments. I wish not to refer to the Bill as a whole, but merely to some of its clauses. New Part VA deals with the control of hunting through a permit system. Revenue to be derived from this source will be used for wild life conservation. I am pleased that will be the case, because this is the part of the Bill that I like least of all. I cannot understand why some people are attracted to hunting and shooting animals and birds as a recreation when they do not need to kill for meat. However, I accept that such action is inevitable and is already part of our way of life.

We are told, by those responsible for a programme for the perpetuation of wild life as part of the total ecology of the State, that most species produce an annual surplus that will be removed by predators, disease, parasites and, if allowed to exceed the available food supplies, starvation. I should like the Minister to explain how the department intends to police the permit system to ensure that hunters kill only the number of animals they are allowed to kill under a permit. We are all aware that some hunters will unfortunately shoot anything on sight.

Clause 8 amends the powers of a warden to take someone to assist him when entering places where prohibited animals are kept. This extra power seems essential because some unscrupulous people will continue to defy the law and will catch and keep prohibited animals and birds for the purpose of selling them, a practice that has been reported in the newspapers from time to time as being too prevalent. The penalty for an offence against this provision is increased to $1 000 or imprisonment for six months. This seems severe but, considering the number of people who have been detected and the number who are active in trapping and selling such animals and who are not detected, the severer penalty is obviously justified.

Clause 14, which has already been referred to by one or both of the previous speakers, provides that it is lawful for any person without a permit or other authority to kill a poisonous reptile that has attacked, is attacking, or is likely to attack a person. In all other respects poisonous reptiles will now be treated as protected animals. This provision is made necessary because recent press reports have revealed that in Sydney, Melbourne and Adelaide many snakes are being supplied and consumed as gourmet delicacies in exclusive restaurants. Therefore, I agree that, in principle, the clause is necessary, although, as one member has already suggested, perhaps a minor amendment may be necessary. My information is that apparently the area from which these reptiles are mostly supplied is the Murray Valley, with tiger snakes, copperheads and black snakes being primarily the reptiles involved. Their habitats are easily accessible and relatively restricted in extent, so that decimation of small populations to extinction level is a real threat. Unfortunately, as a result of the recent publicity, other indiscriminate people will probably decide to catch and kill these reptiles this spring and summer as a means of making money. I should have thought this was not an easy way of making money, but it is surprising to see the lengths to which some people will go to make money. Unfortunately, when some of these people have caught and killed the reptiles they will be unable to dispose of them, so that the reptiles will simply be wasted.

In addition, a health hazard is involved in eating snakes, as such reptiles are subject to parasites and diseases. Tiger snakes suffer particularly from tapeworms. We know that the snakes are not screened but are simply taken from the wild, killed, and then consumed in such restaurants. I realise that some members of the public are under a misconception in relation to this clause, but I point out that venomous snakes will not have total protection. Although people will not be permitted to collect snakes, if a man or his family are threatened by a nearby snake they may kill it. I understand that legislation protecting reptiles was passed in New South Wales last year and in Queensland in August this year. Such legislation is imminent in Victoria. To the best of my knowledge, herpetologists will be permitted to continue to keep reptiles, as they are allowed to do at present, by obtaining a scientific permit from the National Parks and Wildlife Service. As I believe this practice should be allowed to continue, I should like the Minister to give an assurance that it can. Possibly, it is already permitted under the Bill. I believe that the people who keep these reptiles perform a service, as they contribute to the preservation of the species. Unfortunately, in the past little research has been done in this regard.

Clause 27 repeals the original schedules, replacing them with additional lists of species of rare, threatened, and unprotected animals. I have had a look at the list of mammals, birds and reptiles and, like any other average person in this respect, I would be unable to recognise most of them.

Mr. Millhouse: Aren't you an expert?

Mrs. BYRNE: No, not in this respect. If the average person reads the list of animals in the schedules, he will find that he has probably seen some of them but that he cannot recognise them properly by name. It may surprise some members opposite to know that I was brought up on a farm, living there until I was 15 years old. I remember one occasion when my family saw some people at the side of the road busy with sticks, obviously killing a reptile. We thought that it must be a large snake, so we decided to look at it. Someone in the family asked, "Have you killed a large snake?", and the reply was, "No, we have killed a death adder." We thought it unusual that there should be

a death adder in that section of the Hills, as we had not seen one there before. When we had a look, we found that they had killed a sleepy lizard.

I do not think that such ignorance still exists, as children are now being educated about these matters in the schools. However, this education does not go far enough. I understand that a recommendation was made to a committee set up by the Education Department that field study centres be established throughout Australia. Such centres are already established throughout England. The object of setting them up is to enable students to stay there, observing animals in their native habitat. Of course, in supporting this recommendation, I realise that the expenditure of money is involved. All members know that many primary schools already make use of unused rural schools for camps. On such trips, the children look at various industries, townships, and so on, in these areas. However, as far as I know, little attention is paid to the native animals in the area, mainly because few teachers are trained in this regard. Such training is necessary if this proposal is to be effective.

Most members have probably read that the Marion High School has obtained land at Deep Creek for this type of educational purpose and I commend it for doing so; I hope that other schools will follow suit. Members know that Cleland Wildlife Reserve is used for this purpose, but its use is limited. In reply to my question in the House, the Minister told me that a display of reptiles at Cleland on the walk-through principle was impossible. Therefore, it was considered that the herpetology display should not be established there. I have been told that a suitable site for such a display would be near Marineland at West Beach. This type of display would be a tourist attraction, with one exhibition complementing the other and both being educational.

I have previously promoted the idea of establishing a clinic for sick or injured native animals and I think it is recognised that this is necessary from a humane point of view. Unfortunately, for financial reasons, such a clinic cannot be established yet, but I believe it will have to be established eventually, despite the costs involved. Veterinary surgeons at such a clinic should be able to undertake research into illnesses of these native animals. I support this Bill and I hope that some of my suggestions, which are certainly not original, can soon be implemented for the preservation of threatened species of animals.

Mr. ALLEN (Frome): I support the Bill. I do not intend to speak at length, as I believe the subject has been well covered by the previous speakers. However, I refer to the effects the Bill will have in my area district. Section 5 of the principal Act is amended to provide a much wider definition of "owner" which was previously restricted. In most pastoral areas few properties are occupied by the owners, the owners often being companies, and managers occupy the land. The provision has been widened to include the occupier of the land or a person to whom its care, control and management has been committed. I believe that is a step in the right direction.

The definition of "private land" will now mean any land except Crown lands. It has been difficult to interpret the meaning of "private land", because Crown lands include only road reserves and outback areas that have not been occupied. Section 44 of the principal Act is amended by clause 10 so that it will be possible to revoke the declaration of a sanctuary. In the past it was not possible to have the declaration of a sanctuary revoked. Many years ago some land-owners had considerable problems with people hunting on their land and, in order to overcome this, they had their land declared a sanctuary. This stopped shooting altogether and was effective, but when the problem had been solved there was no way in which the declaration of a sanctuary could be cancelled.

Section 54 of the principal Act is amended, by clause 14, and this provision applies to snakes. It is unfortunate that the press reported the provisions of this clause in such a way as to create amusement and attract criticism from people who did not know the basis of the clause. I understand it to mean that it will prevent snakes being taken commercially, and I believe that this is a step in the right direction. Aborigines have been eating snakes for hundreds of years, but since white men have been occupying this State for about 140 years snakes have been destroyed. Most people believe they must destroy a snake the moment they see one. Despite the number of snakes killed by white men, I do not think the number of snakes has decreased; in fact I believe there are as many snakes now as there have ever been. If snakes are killed commercially and people acquire a taste for snake meat, a large trade could eventuate. I can therefore understand the necessity to stop trading in snake meat. I understand that the present Act exempts Aborigines from the provisions relating to the killing of snakes. Many Aborigines still live in the outback in their native state and I believe these people should be permitted to take snakes for their own food.

I do not think it should be restricted only to reserves, because many Aborigines go walkabout and do not live on reserves, and I think this matter should be looked at closely. The areas where Aborigines will be permitted to take snakes should be defined clearly. However, I believe Aborigines living in the built-up areas should be prohibited from taking snakes so that they will not be able to trade and deal in snakes. The provisions of new section 68b are welcomed by people who have to administer the Act, such as police officers and officers of the department. Landowners are happy that the section is set out so clearly. New section 68b provides, in part:

(1) A person shall not be on any private land for the purpose of hunting unless the owner of that land has given him, not more than six months beforehand, permission in writing to be on the land for that purpose. Penalty: One hundred dollars.

(2) If the owner or occupier of any land, or a servant or agent of the owner or occupier of the land, suspects that a person on the land has committed, is committing, or is about to commit an offence against this Act, he may request that person—

(*a*) to state his full name and usual place of residence; and

(*b*) to leave the land.

(3) A person of whom a request is made under subsection (2) of this section shall comply with it forthwith. Penalty: Two hundred dollars.

(4) A person who has been requested to leave land under this section shall not re-enter the land without the permission of the owner.

Penalty: Two hundred dollars.

Most people in the country have been waiting for that provision. Police officers in my district, which consists of much pastoral country with an abundance of wild life, have considerable difficulty in controlling people who visit the area to shoot animals. This provision will give the police a free hand to overcome the difficulty that they have had for many years.

One evening last week, a police officer in a northern town apprehended the occupants of nine motor cars. These people were shooting rabbits, aided by the headlights of the cars. Rabbits are plentiful in the North at present and, naturally, people living in built-up areas like to shoot

rabbits and eat them. However, the people to whom I have referred were shooting in country where spear grass was about 1 metre high, and the police officer pointed out that they were using a combustion engine. As we know, a person who uses a combustion engine in such country must comply with the Act, which requires that he have with him a knapsack spray and a shovel. However, not one of those persons was complying with the Act, and four of the vehicles had faulty exhausts.

The provisions in this Bill give the police and landholders what they have wanted for a long time and will enable them to put people off properties. It is pleasing that the revenue from the measure will go to the Wildlife Conservation Fund. At present, wild life is plentiful throughout the State, with many wet areas and much food available. Because of that, the hunter will be well catered for and many animals and plenty of wild life will be left. There is no fear that our animals and bird life will become scarce. In fact, I venture to say that at present there are more kangaroos in the State than ever before in the history of the white man since he settled here.

The member for Fisher has referred to the possibility of imposing charges for admission to national parks. This is done in most oversea countries, and there are few parks there that one can enter without paying a fee. However, although the idea may sound good in principle, the number of people who visit national parks in this State is such that the cost of collecting the fee would probably be more than the amount of revenue received. I do not think the proposal would be economically sound.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I strongly support the measure. It is important to note that it will have the wholehearted support of the landholders, who will play a significant part in protecting our native fauna and flora. We do not want a situation to develop with the National Parks and Wildlife Service similar to that which has developed with our State Planning Office, which, probably through ignorance, has caused much animosity and strong feeling against it in the rural industry.

New section 68b, to which the member for Frome has referred at length, is extremely important, because it gives landholders the opportunity to remove from their property people who are illegally on the property to shoot. They not only create a bush fire hazard but also fire bullets at anything that moves.

Mr. Coumbe: And at immovable objects!

Mr. GUNN: Yes, they do. We must consider controlling the use of high-power rifles. I do not consider that the Sunday shooter needs a rifle such as a ·303. People now can buy even Armalite rifles. The ·22 rifle is quite sufficient for the shooter.

Mr. Jennings: You're quite right.

Mr. GUNN: I am pleased to have the support of the member for Ross Smith. There has been much speculation about one provision in the Bill, and many people approached me about it last weekend. They were under the misapprehension that in future they would not be able to kill reptiles. Having read the provision, I was able to put their mind at ease. People must have the right to destroy snakes, and anyone who has had the experience of having snakes around his house knows the concern that they cause to wives and families. Only last Sunday evening I was confronted by a not-too-friendly gentleman, and I disposed of him quickly.

It is important to let the people know that they can destroy any snakes that are near their house or place of work, and it is unfortunate that there has been publicity of the kind that breeds ill feeling towards those who will administer the legislation. Perhaps people who read the Bill did not understand it, and that was unfortunate. I commend the member for Chaffey for the work that he has done on the measure and for the way he spoke to it. I will support his amendments strongly, and I think that the one that requires a report to be placed before Parliament is an excellent one. We on this side support that fundamental principle in legislation, and it should be adhered to in all cases.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): The matter that prompts me to speak in the debate is the unfortunate publicity that was given last week about what was thought to be a declaration that snakes would be protected. Part VA, which deals with hunting, gives protection to landholders who have been suffering the ravages of indiscriminate shooting on properties, and it is always the minority that causes the difficulties. On the piece of country that I own, I have one of the three running streams in South Australia, and a man once told me that it was a God-given hole. He told me that it was there for the people to enjoy, but he was more than enjoying it: he was carrying on activities that a person does not carry on around God-given holes. The Bill tends to preserve the sanctity of God-given holes. Last weekend I received more phone calls about the alleged protection of snakes than I have received on any other matter since I have been in Parliament. New subsection (2) of section 54 provides:

> It shall be lawful for any person without any permit or other authority under this Act, to kill any poisonous reptile that has attacked, is attacking or is likely to attack, any person.

I have lived in the South-East for many years and seen the prevalence of snakes around homesteads, especially in the early autumn, when one does not go outside without a flashlight or rubber boots because, normally, a tiger snake or brown snake is in the vicinity. By the same token, I understand that a snake will get out of a person's way and, unless bailed up, it cannot be a menace. In this regard, it was unfortunate that the publicity attaching to the introduction of the Bill last week tended to convey to people that the snake would be protected and that it would be an offence to kill one.

Because of its part in the early days of creation, the snake was forced to crawl on its belly for the rest of its life, and we have seen other reptiles doing that kind of thing. Snakes are unwelcome among animals, and homesteaders always display a certain vigilance towards them. The Minister should take steps to spell out more clearly what the Bill intends to achieve, namely, the prevention of trafficking in reptiles and animals, as referred to by the member for Tea Tree Gully, because I do not think that anyone wants to see that kind of practice taking place. As has been pointed out by the experts, the indiscriminate killing of any animal upsets the balance of nature and, distasteful as a snake may be, it has its uses.

In the district I represent, which is in the wetter areas of the State and adjacent to swamps, lagoons, rivers and creeks, there are many reptiles. The floods that come down from Victoria tend to wash them down, and snakes are prolific breeders. Although they may keep out of sight, they are usually about in large numbers; so, I do not think we need have any fear for their becoming extinct. The Bill has been covered adequately by my colleagues. I ask the Minister to take steps to spell out, with all the publicity at his command, what is meant by the control of

snakes, so that no-one will be committing an offence by continuing with business as usual by keeping the precincts of his property free of reptiles.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister of Environment and Conservation): I express my appreciation for the support given by members on both sides of the House to the activities of the National Parks and Wildlife Service. There has been certain grudging support for the Bill, because criticisms have been made about the activities of the Government with regard to the role that it is undertaking in supporting the service. Regrettably, I do not have the figures with me, but the member for Chaffey referred to the Estimates this year relating to improvements to and general expenditure on national parks and said that the allocation was less than last year's. What happened during this year, the first full year of the service's operations, was that many of the provisions relating to improvements and general construction works were transferred from lines under the Public Buildings Department. When that is taken into account (and I will obtain the relevant figures) the honourable member will see that there has been a marked increase in the provision. We have had a significant increase in the staffing of the service and, in addition and perhaps more important, we have continued with the purchase of new conservation and recreation parks throughout the State. Fortunately, with the Commonwealth Government's interest in the National Estate, we expect more than $500 000 this year.

Mr. Evans: Has that been guaranteed?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: No, but I understand that an announcement will be made within three or four weeks on projects the Commonwealth Government will be funding, and I am confident that that will be the result. This will mean that we will be able to do what all members want us to do: direct our attention to urgent purchases. In the past, we have been required to purchase land quickly without being able to study the ramifications of its being sold to someone else, and then possibly cleared and lost for all time. We will be able to purchase wetland areas, and substantial areas such as Deep Creek Park, more quickly than has previously been the case.

Mr. Arnold: Did you say that South Australia's share would be $500 000?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I think the honourable member is talking about the national parks allocation, whereas I am referring to both the National Estate provisions and the national parks allocation, which are two separate Commonwealth provisions. I am certain that the action being taken will meet with the approval of all members. I think it fair to say that we have been markedly improving the National Parks and Wildlife Service as regards both manpower and land purchases, and this perhaps was not correctly reflected by the allocations for improvements and general expenditure under the national parks line. When I introduced this legislation in 1972, I said (and I still believe) that it was the most advanced national parks and wildlife legislation in Australia. However, some problems have arisen and have been brought to my attention, and I hope they will be solved by these amendments.

Newspaper reports referring to more newsworthy parts of the legislation about controlling reptiles overshadowed the intentions of the legislation. As we must control the sale of reptiles, the legislation is drawn to ensure that we have no legal difficulties in apprehending persons for that offence, as this situation may cause a significant problem if we do not act now. Although it is an offence in some circumstances to kill a poisonous snake, protective measures can be taken when a snake is attacking or likely to attack a person. Some different interpretations may be placed on this provision and, as I have pointed out privately to Opposition members, it may be necessary to expand this provision to make clear that any person who may be anxious about a snake near his house or any other place may be justified in destroying the snake. This alteration can be made in Committee.

The member for Fisher referred to the provisions that would ensure that, upon receipt of a notice of intention to acquire the land, people would not destroy natural growth or animals. We have faced the situation once or twice in recent years that, if we were to acquire land that had significant fauna and flora, the owner would bulldoze it or set it on fire so that it would be a less attractive proposition to acquire. Fortunately, this has not happened, but we must ensure that that sort of situation will not arise. I can see that some complications may arise in relation to removing noxious weeds, but I do not think it will occur, because, under the Weeds Act, the Government as the likely purchaser is required to clear the area of weeds. However, that point can also be clarified in Committee. The member for Tea Tree Gully suggested that there may be some difficulty in policing bag limits and controlling people with hunting permits. This would always be a minor difficulty but the staff of the wildlife service, who are situated at various places during the hunting season, are aware of these problems, and they are also supported by officers from other parts of the State. This supervision ensures that bag limits and other controls on hunters are properly policed. I thank members for their attention to the Bill, and support the second reading.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—"Power of acquisition."

Mr. ARNOLD: I move:

In new subsection (2) to strike out "flora or fauna" and insert "wildlife".

This amendment is in keeping with the interpretation set out in the principal Act.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 6 and 7 passed.

New clause 7a—"Report."

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

7a. The following section is enacted and inserted in the principal Act after section 19:

19a. (1) The council shall, as soon as practicable after the thirtieth day of June in each year, present a report to the Minister on the work of the council during the financial year ending on that day.

(2) The Minister shall, as soon as practicable after receipt of a report under this section, cause a copy of the report to be laid before each House of Parliament.

The reason for moving the amendment, as I pointed out in my second reading speech, is that the council has much to contribute to wild life conservation in South Australia and Australia. I believe most of its work and investigation never sees the light of day. If its work for the year was detailed in a report to the Minister and the Minister tabled the report in Parliament, it would become a public document that could be referred to by the community at large, and it would be of considerable benefit to many organisations throughout Australia. If Governments in other States follow suit (after all, the Minister indicated in his second reading explanation that he considers South Australia leads the field in this type of legislation) he should have nothing to fear from accepting the amendment. If he

genuinely believes in open government and has nothing to hide, the work of the council could be of considerable value to the other States of Australia. I commend the amendment to the Committee and hope that members will support it.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister of Environment and Conservation): I cannot accept the amendment, because it is wrong in principle for Parliament to provide in legislation of this nature for a report by an advisory council to be tabled in Parliament. Members would be aware that, under this measure, a report on the activities of the National Parks and Wildlife Service is laid before Parliament. The advisory council, as the honourable member will recall, was established under section 19 of the Act, which provides:

(1) The council shall, at the request of the Minister, investigate and advise the Minister upon any matter referred by him to the council for advice.

(2) The council may, of its own motion, refer any matter affecting the administration of this Act to the Minister for his consideration.

The council was established to provide the Minister with an independent view on any issue that may be of concern to him. The system has worked effectively, and I have frequently used the services of this body. I agree with the point the honourable member makes that there is no real reason why the information and matters dealt with by the council should not be made public. I am at present discussing with the council the possibility of its producing, for the benefit of the community, material and publications on a number of issues, including identification and points of interest associated with South Australia's national parks. I have no objection to requiring the Director of the National Parks and Wildlife Service to approach the Chairman of the advisory council for information and material to be included in the report that is already tabled in Parliament. That would provide the information sought by the honourable member without creating a situation where we are providing by legislation that the advisory council should present a report to Parliament each year. With those assurances, I am certain we can achieve the same result, without the advisory council's being obliged to furnish Parliament with a separate report.

Mr. EVANS: I am surprised that the Minister is willing to state that he can see no reason why the material should not be made available but that his department should be asked to include material from the advisory council in its report. If he is willing to do that, why is he unwilling to allow the council to provide its own report? Does he want control over what is included in the report, or does the National Parks and Wildlife Service want control over the report which the advisory council wishes to submit? If the Minister is genuine, we should report progress and draw up amendments to provide that the authority will include the advisory council's material in its report to Parliament.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: I want the Bill to go to another place by 6 p.m.

Mr. EVANS: If the Minister is genuine, amendments can be drawn up now if he is unwilling to accept the amendment of the member for Chaffey. As the Minister responsible for the measure, he admits that it would be desirable and beneficial for the material to be available to the public. I cannot accept his word that he will ask the authority to include the advisory council's report in the report he tables in Parliament; that is unsatisfactory and is not sound legislation or common sense. Is the Minister willing to accept an amendment in the manner suggested in lieu of the amendment moved by the member for Chaffey? I believe that that is a fair question and that the Minister can answer it.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I believe the assurance I have given will be adequate.

Mr. ARNOLD: I was somewhat surprised at the Minister's interjection, when the member for Fisher was speaking, that the Bill had to be in another place by 6 p.m. I made the point during the second reading debate on this measure that we were faced with the same situation at the end of a previous session when he introduced an amending Bill in the last two or three days of the session and got upset because the Opposition responsibly wished to discuss matters placed before the House instead of agreeing to a Bill without knowing its contents. The new clause will give additional status to the advisory council, which will have a more important role. We do not suggest that the council's conclusions will always be correct, but its point of view, if it is published in a document, will be available for all to consider.

Mr. RUSSACK: I support the amendment. Is the present procedure that the advisory council is called on to investigate matters only when approached by the Minister? If that is the case, the council would be more useful if it were able to present a report regularly.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Section 19 of the Act provides:

(1) The council shall, at the request of the Minister, investigate and advise the Minister upon any matter referred by him to the council for advice.

(2) The council may, of its own motion, refer any matter affecting the administration of this Act to the Minister for his consideration.

Both provisions have been exercised, as I have often referred matters to the council and, on a few occasions, the council has referred matters to me.

The Committee divided on the new clause:

Ayes (16)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold (teller), Becker, Dean Brown, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, McAnaney, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Noes (22)—Messrs. Boundy and Broomhill (teller), Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Crimes, Duncan, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, McKee, Millhouse, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, and Wright.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Blacker and Chapman. Noes—Messrs. Corcoran and McRae.

Majority of 6 for the Noes.

New clause thus negatived.

Clauses 8 to 13 passed.

Clause 14—"Certain animals may be destroyed."

Mr. ARNOLD: I move:

In new subsection (2), after "that", to insert "(*a*)", and to insert the following new paragraphs:

(*b*) is in dangerous proximity to any person; or

(*c*) is, or has been, in such proximity to a person as to cause reasonable anxiety to that person.

I believe that the new paragraphs will clarify the situation for members of the public and will achieve the same result as the original provision.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I support the amendment. Paragraph (*c*) will make clear to anyone that he has latitude to kill a poisonous reptile that is causing him anxiety.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 15 to 20 passed.

Clause 21—"Hunting Permits."

Mr. EVANS: Some 14-year-old boys go ferreting with nets. Would that be considered to be hunting? I believe they should be given an opportunity to have a hunting permit so that they could obtain permission from the landholder and then hunt legally. Firearms would be covered by different legislation. Will under-age children accompanied by adults have to have a permit as well as the adult in charge of the group? At the moment it would be difficult for a police officer to decide whether traps and nets could be deemed to be hunting devices.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: These matters will be dealt with by regulation. Officers of my department have discussed these issues generally but at present it is contemplated that children accompanied by an adult person who has a hunting permit will not need separate permits if they are carrying devices considered not to be inappropriate for children under a certain age to be carrying. The age limit may well be 15 years. A person between the age of 15 years and 18 years requires a firearms licence under the Firearms Act. If he has reached the age of 18, he has only to register the firearm. We may require persons between the ages of 15 and 18 years to obtain a hunting licence if they use certain devices and are accompanied by other persons. Depending upon the age we decide on we may waive the fee but we may require the licence for adequate control. This could also apply to pensioners. Many aspects of this Bill have not been clearly determined, but members will have the opportunity to consider these things because they will be introduced by regulation.

Mr. EVANS: I appreciate what the Minister has said. I know of one instance where two 11-year-old boys do some trapping and I think they would have to obtain a hunting permit because the trap is a device that could be defined as a hunting device and they are not accompanied by adults. I hope the Minister will consider such situations as these before bringing in the regulations because it is not possible to amend regulations: they must be defeated. Opposition members should have an opportunity to look at the regulations before they are allowed to stand for the required 14 sitting days, so that, if necessary, a member can move to have them disallowed. The Minister would save himself difficulties if he allowed members to see the regulations because many young people hunt with traps or nets and they do no harm to our natural environment. I believe children from 12 years of age onwards are responsible enough to hunt. I move:

In new section 68b (5) to strike out "dog" and insert "animal".

I believe ferrets and other animals could be used for hunting purposes. Falcons can be trained to trap rare species of birds and small animals. I ask the Minister to accept the word "animal" in lieu of "dog".

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (22 to 27), schedules and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

PRIVACY COMMISSION BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

NATURAL GAS PIPELINES AUTHORITY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1. Page 3—After clause 8 insert new clause 8a as follows:

8a. Enactment of s. 10a of principal Act—The following section is enacted and inserted in the principal Act immediately after section 10 thereof:

10a. Authority not to carry on business as petroleum refinery—Nothing in this Act shall be held or construed as authorising or empowering the authority to carry on the business of a petroleum refinery.

No. 2. Page 3, lines 36 to 38 (clause 9)—Leave out all words after "out" in line 36 and insert:

subsection (1) and inserting in lieu thereof the following subsection:

(1) With the approval of the Governor the authority may, either by agreement or compulsorily, acquire or take land for the purpose of constructing a pipeline or petroleum storage facilities connected to or to be connected with a pipeline and for purposes incidental thereto.

Consideration in Committee.

Amendment No. 1:

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Development and Mines): I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 1 be agreed to.

This Bill was introduced in this place last session. It went to another place but became one of the slaughtered Innocents (I think that is the age-old term by which to refer to matters that lapse on the Notice Paper). It was restored to the Notice Paper in the Legislative Council this session and referred to a Select Committee. Members of that committee know that this place carried a motion authorising me to attend that Select Committee and give evidence before it.

The concern of the committee was that the alteration in the definition of the material to be transported by the Natural Gas Pipelines Authority so as to include petroleum could give the Government certain powers in relation to pipelines which carry petroleum and other liquids, which have been in existence for some time, and which are owned by the various oil companies in this State, whereas the Government never intended that it should have such power.

The intention behind the amendment was to allow the authority to construct and operate a pipeline to convey hydrocarbon liquids from the Cooper Basin to the Redcliff project and, possibly, since alkalisation is a real possibility at the Redcliff project, to allow the construction and maintenance of a pipeline to bring the alkali from the project to where it was to be further handled. There was never any intention by the Government, in introducing the legislation, that it should have any powers broader than that.

I still consider that the wording in the Bill that we introduced was such that we would not have been able to move in any other area. For example, the only power of compulsory acquisition in the principal Act is that over land for easements. However, members of the other place considered that any power of compulsory acquisition over land under an existing pipeline might give us some control so far as material in the pipe was concerned, even though we were not acquiring the pipe compulsorily, or acquiring what travelled through it, but merely the piece of dirt above or below it.

Through the Select Committee, members of the other place have moved to put into the Bill two amendments that make clear that the only right of compulsory acquisition is in respect of land for new pipelines or installations, rather than existing pipelines or installations. This first amendment is really all-embracing and it makes clear that, whatever other wording there may be, this cannot happen.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 2:

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 2 be agreed to.

I have largely canvassed this matter when speaking about amendment No. 1.

Motion carried.

INDUSTRIAL ORGANISATION (BUILDING GRANTS) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 26. Page 2261.)

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): This Bill is a potentially emotional one. I do not think any member of this House would disagree with that statement. First, opposition could be construed as a blow against the worker, but I want to make clear that such an attitude in these circumstances would be a misconstruction.

Mr. Keneally: You'll oppose it?

Dr. EASTICK: Yes, for the benefit of the member for Stuart, I say that I will oppose it.

Mr. Keneally: That's a blow against the worker.

Dr. EASTICK: If the member for Stuart wants to be facetious about what I consider has been put before the House as a responsible piece of legislation, I can be facetious with him. But I come back to the point that, because of the emotional issues involved in the Bill, it could be misconstrued outside the House and elsewhere that, by opposing the measure, we are attacking the worker. However, I make clear that that kind of construction would be (and if it is in the mind of the member for Stuart) a complete misconstruction. I say it now, I have said it in the House before, and I will say it for many a long day to come: I have a high regard for the responsible worker and for the responsible worker organisation. Similarly, I have a high regard for the responsible professional body, responsible professionals, and for the responsible employer organisations and their members, so long as they accept and show responsibility.

However, there are within society members of the worker organisations, professional organisations, and the employer organisations that do not always show responsibility. It is not possible for members on either side of the House to throw brickbats and not have them thrown right back, because each of us in our sphere, whether at the worker, trade, or professional level, would be able to pinpoint areas in which there had been failures and where certain organisations, to use a colloquialism, had let the side down. That apart, I believe that we should consider those comments as generally irrelevant when considering this sensitive matter.

Having accepted that they are irrelevant, I believe that these aspects had to be canvassed so as to bring the whole matter into proper perspective. I believe that opposition to the measure (that is, a vote against the Bill) is the only responsible attitude that can be adopted. To accept the passage of the Bill would be to condone preferred treatment, which I believe is totally wrong. The Bill should not and cannot be put on the Statute Book by virtue of a decision of this Parliament.

I take that attitude at a time when, in the community around us, so many areas of difficulty are directly associated with a down-turn in confidence, an inability to make ends meet, the problems of high interest, and of all the other aspects of galloping inflation, which is clearly the root of the reason why this organisation first sought help from the Government and, subsequently, the Government has considered helping it. I accept the information the Treasurer has made available and, indeed, the discussions I have had with Government members and with people outside the House. I do not believe that the problem of the Trades Hall is one of incompetence or that it has been caused by the lack of use of facilities in the total sense. It may well be that its halls and meeting rooms have not been used as extensively as was intended at the time the feasibility study into the project was first considered, and I do not believe that the problem is the result of a lack of planning.

I believe the problem is one purely and simply associated with the ramifications of the economic situation in which we find ourselves and which is made even worse by the Commonwealth Government's attitude. Leave that Government out, however, other than to pinpoint the fact that the economy of Australia (indeed, of each of the Australian States) is causing concern. We are being asked to give preferred treatment to this organisation at a time when the Government, having had representations made to it by various organisations, has closed the door, albeit reluctantly, in their faces because of the economic situation. Many of these organisations were not seeking a handout, and that, in the bluntest and crudest of terms, is what this measure is all about. These people sought either a loan, with some consideration relative to the amount of interest to be paid, or they sought help by way of a guarantee through a financial organisation. They had that help denied them: again not because of their incompetence or failure to plan or because they lacked sales, or because management was at fault, but purely and simply because they had become embroiled in the current economic circumstances.

If one looks at the curtailment of what I believe every member would agree were essential community services, one finds that the Government has reduced or been unable to increase funds at a time when inflation has reduced the purchasing power of its commitments already made. There has been a general downturn in spending on cancer research because additional Government funds could not be made available in that area.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member must come back to the Bill.

Dr. EASTICK: I believe that what I am saying is pertinent to the Bill we are now debating, because we are asked on the one hand to make funds available on a gratis basis at a time when the economy cannot, I suggest, help it and when the economy has been unable to help other vital areas in the community. I have referred to the downturn in cancer research because additional Government funds have not been forthcoming. Only this week I received a letter from people vitally interested in the commendable work associated with marriage guidance, in which area there has been a deferment of plans because the Government has been unable to increase the sum made available to that organisation, which helps the community in such a positive way. I am led to believe, taking the most recent financial year's figures, that the organisation has helped on about 13 500 occasions. A growing need exists in the community for help, guidance and support, and for the lecturing and the various other activities associated in that important social area.

The two areas I have mentioned do not comprise the entire list. There are many others, and all members could add to the list from their own knowledge of urgent community activities within their own community, whether such an activity be Lifeline, Youthline, or an activity associated with hospitals. I might continue by dealing

with the problems that beset many of our community hospitals. They are slightly different from the organisations to which I have referred, but all our community hospitals are now moving away from the concept of simple community hospitals. Some hospitals vital to the South Australian scene have had to defer or reduce their expenditure.

Subsidised hospitals could also be considered, as many important projects have had to be abandoned because of lack of funds. Not only have they been abandoned but, where funds have been promised, because of escalation of costs the money has been inadequate for the projects and that money is now in limbo until value can be obtained for the dollar. The Minister of Transport could indicate that Commonwealth funds, made available for community activities in the Marion area, are now inadequate, and the community is being denied a swimming pool complex and associated facilities.

Mr. Evans: They shouldn't have had it in the first place.

Dr. EASTICK: I do not wish to argue that point, but these facilities that are being denied the community would have helped in youth and social work and might also have improved the way of life of these people. If we consider what may be called the private sector, no doubt all members would have received representations from people who want a house. Young married people, as well as others who want to be married but cannot because of the unavailability of a house, are facing many problems. Perhaps $200 000 would not house many young people at present.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader must link his remarks with the Bill: it is not an open debate on a financial Bill.

Dr. EASTICK: We are being asked to appropriate $200 000 of the State's funds as a direct grant, at a time when we should consider alternative uses for that money. Many young people cannot raise families as they would like because they cannot obtain adequate housing. I refer to the refusal of the Government to help important business organisations that are suffering hardship for a variety of reasons, none of which is of their own making. Yesterday evening the member for Eyre referred to the Andamooka Co-operative Society, which had been seeking assistance from the Government. One of its problems was the extensive flooding in the North of this State that prevented the co-operative from trading, because it could not use normal transport methods. It had been forced to freight its goods by air at a much higher cost. The Waikerie Co-operative Winery has been seeking about $200 000, without success.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Is the Leader certain he is up to date on this matter?

Dr. EASTICK: A considerable change of heart must have been shown, if I can take the Minister's interjection as an admission that the Government has finally recognised the merit of this company's application made a long time ago. This company does not want a hand-out, but it has sought a guarantee from the Government so that it could relocate its operations. Its present location has been placed in jeopardy because of the flooding of the Murray River. Also, the company had sought to relocate its premises earlier when the problem would not have been so urgent, but it encountered considerable difficulties with a Government department concerning the availability of land. Unless the Minister's interjection is an admission that the company will receive the money, as far as I know the money is not available to the company.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Maybe the letter had not reached them, but the company has been invited to apply to the Industries Assistance Corporation.

Dr. EASTICK: This situation has been continuing for some time.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Previously, the company was to apply to the State Bank for help through the Loans to Producers Account.

Dr. EASTICK: Many groups, such as scouts, kindergartens, sporting bodies, and even the Nurses' Memorial Centre, were told that funds were not available and that it would be necessary to work for the money or find an alternative source. The Naracoorte meat works, which had some difficulty maintaining its operations, sought support from its shareholders and obtained $100 000 from this source. These would be small people who found the money to put the organisation back into production because they were willing to assist themselves. I suggest that those involved in the organisation referred to in the legislation have the ability to do the same thing, as many groups belong to it and perhaps at 50c or $1 a member the sum required could be obtained. This would mean that the money would not be a grant or a hand-out from the Government.

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

Dr. EASTICK: An opportunity exists for members of the organisation to correct the situation that exists, which, as I have indicated, I accept is not the result of mismanagement. Organisation members are involved in the economic problem facing Australia, and are as much involved as anyone else. Their problem arises more particularly because they are unable to service a loan, which is a reflection on the heavy interest rates that exist throughout the Australian community now. The principle of the Bill is totally wrong. The Treasurer referred in his explanation to action taken in New South Wales and Western Australia by the respective Governments. My inquiries indicate that four years ago the New South Wales Government, under the Government Guarantees Act, guaranteed the trustees of the New South Wales Labor Council for a $2 000 000 loan. It was understood that such action would not cost the Government anything, which has been the case so far. The balance outstanding on the loan as at June 30, 1974, was $1 844 000. In other words, the New South Wales organisation has offset the original $2 000 000 loan by $156 000 in four years. The Western Australian Government's action was somewhat different: it involved the Tonkin Labor Government, which guaranteed a loan to the Labor organisation, and arranged that the Public Health Department would occupy part of the building as tenants. The guarantee, which was made in 1972 under the Industrial Advances Act, was for the sum of $1 900 000. The security was a first mortgage interest free for five years, followed by 40 half-yearly annual instalments. In addition, the Tonkin Labor Government undertook that the Public Health and Medical Department would for 20 years rent about 7 700 square metres of the building at $3·40 for each 0·1 m^2. The rental includes rates and taxes, air-conditioning and cleaning, the total annual cost to the Government being $282 000. The agreement was opposed by the then Liberal and Country Party Opposition.

I am happy that the South Australian Government should enter into a guarantee, but that will not relieve the difficulties that exist for the organisation, because it is the servicing of the debt that is causing the problem. It is

conceivable that a low interest loan might receive more support by the House than the present provision is receiving, but I even question that, because there are many other worthy organisations in the community that have been denied assistance by the Government. A hand-out of this nature is completely against the principles that any member of this House should accept. I believe it is scandalous for the Government to proceed with the measure.

Dr. Tonkin: I don't think they're really serious.

Dr. EASTICK: The Treasurer, in his second reading explanation, offered something of a sop to employer organisations. Let me make quite clear that I would not accept the responsibility of making a hand-out of this nature to employer organisations.

Dr. Tonkin: They wouldn't want it.

Dr. EASTICK: Even if an employer organisation approached the Government for assistance—

Mr. Harrison: Are you competent to say that they wouldn't need a hand-out?

Dr. EASTICK: I would not be party to making this sort of assistance available to such an organisation. The Treasurer stated:

> If assistance is to be given to employee organisations in this way, it is only proper that similar assistance should be granted to employer organisations. At this stage there is no application before the Government by employer organisations for such assistance, and, in fact, the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, the largest employer organisation, does not provide facilities for employer organisations generally.

Inquiries I have made tend to rebut that statement. The Chamber of Commerce provides facilities for more than 80 associations; even the Trades Hall organisation does not incorporate all the unions, and its situation is therefore on a par with that of the chamber. The Miscellaneous Workers Union, the clerks union, the builders labourers union, and, I believe, the Australian Workers Union are certainly not members of the organisation and are not housed in its building. Finally, I reiterate that our attitude has not been determined just because the organisation receiving the hand-out is part of the Labor movement. The decision has not been taken because the A.L.P. happens to have its officers in the same building and is a tenant. The point I make is that the potential that this organisation has to obtain funds to overcome its financial difficulties is fantastic when we consider how many members of organisations are directly associated with bodies that are housed in this building. I cannot accept that this Bill is in the best interests of the people of South Australia. I believe that, even if the Bill passes the second reading and is referred to a Select Committee, it will be a scandal with which the Parliament should not associate itself.

Mr. WELLS (Florey): I support the Bill. I am amazed to have heard the outburst of the Leader, who began by saying that the Bill had an emotional basis and proceeded to become emotional in almost everything he said. He gave many instances of what he claimed were cases of organisations that had applied for grants and been refused by the Government. I will not deny that such things have occurred. However, if it is possible I want to take emotion out of this issue. We must consider attitudes, because it boils down to the fact that either the Parliament is willing to assist the trade union movement in South Australia to maintain its base of operations or it is not willing to do so. Either it wants the trade union movement to proceed on an even keel in the same headquarters or it wants to see the disintegration of that movement at its base of operations.

Dr. Tonkin: Do you say the trade union movement should have special concessions?

Mr. WELLS: I certainly do think it should have certain concessions. The Leader said that what he was saying was not an attack on the workers of this State. This was said with tongue in cheek—

Members interjecting:

Mr. WELLS: —because the whole tenor of the Leader's speech indicated hostility towards the trade union movement.

Dr. Tonkin: Rubbish!

Mr. McAnaney: That's a lie.

Mr. WELLS: It is well known that most members opposite have no affection whatever for the trade union movement. On this occasion a proud and honourable organisation has come to this Parliament to put forward a case that can be justified and proved. The situation is that the trade union movement, in an effort to base itself in a building which would honour the movement and of which its members could be proud, put itself into debt very heavily. At that time, the movement thought that it would be able to honour every commitment made.

Mr. Arnold: This sounds like the case of a winery I know.

Mr. WELLS: Talk to Reg Curren and he will put you right. Having committed itself to the erection of this beautiful building—

Dr. Tonkin: It is, too.

Mr. WELLS: —it found itself in financial difficulties. What are you on about?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must not use that form of expression.

Mr. WELLS: I am not allowed to say anything stronger. The position is that, when the building had to be financed, a substantial loan was negotiated. At that time, it was considered that rental payments for space in the building, plus the proceeds of hiring facilities and the hall, would return enough to meet interest commitments. Unfortunately, this did not eventuate, because the rental proposition failed and people have not utilised the facilities as expected. The return on the facilities has fallen to such a low ebb that interest payments have not been able to be made.

I maintain that $200 000 is a small price for the community of South Australia to pay to assist the trade union movement to retain its building, and the dignity that it has always deserved. It should be able to retain the base of power where so many important issues are discussed and decisions made that affect all members of the community. The Bill provides for the payment to employer organisations of a similar sum if they wish to avail themselves of the offer. It has been said that they would not do this, because employers would not humble themselves to ask for a grant. I resent the continual use of the term "hand-out" because the trade union movement does not beg hand-outs from anyone. This is no hand-out: it is a grant. I want to bring members opposite back to their own policy which states, in the industrial relations section, that there should be effective communication between Governments, employers and employees with the objective of preventing industrial disputes through greater understanding and co-operation. In this case the trade union movement wants co-operation but it is getting ridicule. Members opposite are damned by their own policy. The policy also states:

Support and encourage members to take a responsible and active part in their respective associations or unions. The objective of members opposite is to have trade unions thrown out of a building that they have struggled to possess, for the sake of a measley $200 000 grant. I shall refer to some other things that Liberal Governments have done. Let us consider the *Advertiser* building.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I rise on a point of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! When a point of order is being taken, it is always the procedure of this House to hear the point of order with decorum. That applies in this case.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Certain members opposite are wagging their fingers at members on this side.

Dr. Tonkin: You just did it yourself.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I was merely showing what members opposite were doing. There is a rule against public display and obscene gestures in this House.

Dr. TONKIN: On a point of order—

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not uphold the point of order taken by the honourable Minister.

Mr. Venning: It was a stupid point of order.

The SPEAKER: I warn the honourable member for Rocky River. Apparently, he has no respect for the authority of the Chair, and I warn him accordingly. Interjections are a part of Parliamentary debate, but far too many interjections are being made at present. People must take down what is being said in this House, and it is impossible to hear what is being said. Whilst I always have allowed latitude regarding interjections, they must be made under control.

Mr. WELLS: The *Advertiser* building—

Mr. McANANEY: On a point of order, what has the *Advertiser* building to do with the Bill?

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not uphold the point of order. The Bill is for the consideration of the House, and I will rule on any remarks that are not confined to the Bill.

Mr. WELLS: The *Advertiser* building in Adelaide was built by a loan from a Commonwealth Liberal Government, but immediately it was completed the Commonwealth Liberal Government moved the Taxation Department there, at an enormous rental, and the loan was completely paid off in eight years. That was a direct gift.

Members interjecting:

Mr. WELLS: I am sorry about your attitude, but you do not like a bit of truth being rammed down your throats.

The SPEAKER: I call the attention of the member for Florey to the fact that an honourable member does not use the word "you" in any Parliamentary debate. Honourable members are referred to as members, honourable members, or members for the district that they represent.

Mr. WELLS: I apologise and say that honourable members opposite do not like the truth being rammed down honourable members' throats. That puts the matter in order fairly well. Apart from the fact that this Bill was stated by the Leader to be one of emotion, and then immediately opposition to the trade union movement became evident—

Mr. Venning: Rubbish!

Mr. WELLS: Interjections such as those made by the member for Rocky River show hostility towards the trade union movement from the Opposition in this Parliament.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The debate will not be allowed to get out of hand.

Mr. WELLS: A proud organisation was forced to the point where it had to come to this Parliament to seek relief from a financial situation which was absolutely unavoidable. The organisation did everything in its power to rectify the situation. It used levies and contributions, and many employer organisations made generous contributions towards the Trades Hall building.

Mr. McAnaney: We bought a drink for you.

Mr. WELLS: I will guarantee that, if the honourable member bought a drink, he would want two back. This proud body, the trade union movement, in desperation, came to the Parliament of this State, seeking relief. At least I would have expected that its case would be treated sympathetically. I did not expect that ridicule would be heaped on it or that antagonism would be shown. I did not expect that the general rule of union bashing would operate in this Parliament in such a situation. I am extremely concerned about this measure, and I will conclude by saying something that I have stated previously.

Mr. Goldsworthy: I hope it is the truth this time.

Mr. WELLS: I do not tell lies.

Mr. Goldsworthy: No, you just exaggerate.

Mr. WELLS: The honourable member is on the wrong side of the House. We must recognise the trade union movement, the importance of its function in this State, the fact that at least it controls and governs to some extent every person's right in the State, and that it should receive sympathetic consideration and assistance. Otherwise, it is to be brushed aside without consideration.

Mr. Venning: That was a shocking speech.

The SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member for Rocky River wants to flout the authority of the Chair continually, I warn him for the second occasion this evening. The honourable member for Torrens.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): This debate began on a calm and logical note, but suddenly within the last 20 minutes it has erupted into a virulent and vicious attack by the member for Florey. That is regrettable, and it does no credit to him or to the responsible body he purports to represent. I say that advisedly, because I am aware of the influence he exerts on that important section of the community, the trade union movement. Regrettably, the speech of the member for Florey was not one of his best. When one analyses what the honourable member had to say, one realises a significant flaw in it. To paraphrase what he said when he was complaining that there were certain debts in connection with the building and that certain of its facilities were not being used to their fullest, he was saying, in effect, that the trade union members themselves were not supporting their own building or organisation and the facilities provided in the building.

Mr. Goldsworthy: They can't let their office space.

Mr. Duncan: That's not true.

Mr. COUMBE: The main complaint made by the member for Florey was that the management committee could not completely use all the facilities planned for the building; for instance, certain of the hall's facilities cannot be let. In full justice to the member for Florey, he referred not to liquid assets but to letting facilities.

Obviously, from that, we can draw the conclusion that the members of his own organisation are not using the building's facilities to their fullest. I regret that the member for Florey used the term "union bashing", which was not used by the only other speaker thus far this evening, the Leader of the Opposition. I believe that the use of that term lowered the standard of the debate immediately.

It would be the greatest understatement of the year to say that the Bill has been introduced by the Government with trepidation and in the hope that some caustic remarks would not be made about it. One would have to be most naive to expect that that would be so. The responsible view the Opposition takes on the Bill is that it is founded on the wrong basis. The method of funding proposed in the Bill is wrong, and we suggest that it be done on a different basis. Because we suggest that and put up a contrary view on the method of funding, the Opposition has been subjected to unnecessary abuse, and the term "union bashing" has been used against us. It is a fact of life, and members have heard me say this many times, that we believe and recognise the principle of the trade union movement as an integral part of life in South Australia. I say this particularly on behalf of those organisations within the industrial sector of the State that have democratically elected leaders. That is a fundamental principle and, if the member for Florey were to study our platform, he would see this spelled out clearly: we believe it is a fundamental principle of industrial relations in this State and throughout Australia. As some of my good friends are tenants in the Trades Hall, I have had the privilege of taking interstate friends to the hall to meet some of the trade union officials. It is a fine building and I am envious in some ways that the Australian Labor Party is one of the tenants of such a fine building.

The Hon. L. J. King: Very fine people occupy it, too.

Mr. COUMBE: I will not comment on that remark. I only wish that my Party could afford such luxurious accommodation.

The Hon. L. J. King: And find as fine people to occupy the building, too.

Mr. COUMBE: How is it that the managers have got into such trouble at the hall? They have not the advantages of the Attorney-General, who came somewhat late into this sphere, and I am not sure how long he will remain in it.

Mr. Goldsworthy: He's going to be the Chief Justice.

Mr. COUMBE: The position with the management committee is that two things have happened. I think that the member for Florey, who played a prominent part in the original negotiations involving the move from Grote Street to South Terrace, as well as in the building of the new edifice, would agree that the management committee of the day grossly under-estimated and made a grave mistake in its feasibility study on the return that would result from letting the building; that is one aspect of the matter. The second aspect is that interest rates on the loan raised to erect the building on South Terrace have risen so dramatically between then and now that the management committee now finds itself in the invidious position that has led to the introduction of the Bill.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Whitlam has killed them.

Mr. COUMBE: Yes. Logically, by argument, one must ask why interest rates from the original date of the building have increased to the astronomical rates now applying to the loan.

Dr. Tonkin: It's the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. COUMBE: Right! I am most interested in hearing the comments of our academic non-union member, the Attorney-General, but the point is that I am sure that the member for Florey agrees with the two hypotheses I have put forward. First, there was a fundamental mistake about the return from the occupancy of the building (and not all unions are housed in it); and, secondly, the Bill has become necessary because interest rates, which are now astronomically high, have imposed a severe burden on the trustees. It is only since the Labor Government has been in power in Canberra that the interest rate has risen so dramatically.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Can you tell me what they're doing for industries that have gone to the wall?

Mr. COUMBE: The Bill provides for a grant of $200 000; let us consider employers who provide employment but who have been forced to go to the wall because they have received no assistance.

The Hon. L. J. King: The Bill provides for such organisations to receive grants.

Mr. COUMBE: I consider that that would be their right, and I support the principle, but I do not appreciate the snide remarks of the Attorney. I am concerned about the number of small industries that have been forced to the wall. The Leader of the Opposition has referred to what happened in New South Wales and Victoria, but I remind the Treasurer that in New South Wales it was a guarantee by the Government and in Western Australia it was a guarantee by the Government with a leasing arrangement by which some sections of the Public Service were housed in the building. In both cases, there was no cost to the Government or taxpayers. This Bill is completely different from the examples cited by the Treasurer, because it provides a gift of $200 000 with no strings attached. However, the Government would be better advised to conduct this exercise in a different way. A term loan with a detailed moratorium on the interest rates would relieve the trustees of any immediate problems. Such a term loan could have the moratorium on the interest payments for a specified period, there would be an obligation to repay the loan to the Treasurer (and thus to the people of this State), and the Treasurer could specify the terms and conditions to be applied. My suggestion would enable the Trades Hall trustees to get out of trouble and, eventually, the money would be repaid. I would be interested to hear any arguments against my proposal.

The remaining provisions of the Bill are a complete sop. If the Treasurer thinks that, by including this second part in the Bill, it will do anything to cement or improve industrial relations, he is more foolish and naive than I thought he was. The part of the Bill dealing with employer organisations will not operate satisfactorily, because none of them is looking for this sort of money. There was a flaw in the Treasurer's speech when he referred to the Chamber of Commerce and Industry. This organisation, as the Treasurer would know, represents the largest number of employer organisations in South Australia. Another large organisation would be the South Australian Employers Federation, which has its own offices and property on the fringe of the city. The South Australian Automobile Chamber of Commerce is another large organisation. However, the reference in the Bill to employer organisations is nothing but window dressing.

I have put forward what I regard as a realistic suggestion as to how the Bill could be amended in an acceptable form. As the measure now stands, and especially after listening to the member for Florey in his rather pathetic outburst,

I have no alternative but to oppose the Bill. How can we vote for such a measure that makes an outright grant to an organisation? Only about four weeks ago the Nurses' Memorial Centre of South Australia, Incorporated (Guarantee) Act Amendment Bill was before the House, and that organisation's loan was increased by a Treasury guarantee. Such an organisation represents a valuable section of the community; many of its members are members of the trade union movement. However, if we try to compare that legislation with the measure we are considering this evening, we cannot compare them. If the Government wishes to get the measure through the House before it goes to a Select Committee it should consider the moratorium suggestion seriously.

I oppose the Bill in its present form. It does not do the trade union movement much good, and I am sure that most trade unionists appreciate that. I am certain that the taxpayers of the State will not appreciate the measure for one moment. If any measure smacks completely of patronage, this is it.

Dr. Tonkin: It's cynicism.

Mr. COUMBE: It takes us almost back to the days of Tammany Hall, so members should look closely at the provisions of the Bill. I have been most careful to spell out in a constructive manner how I believe the problem can be solved. I have cited what has happened in Western Australia and New South Wales and the methods by which the Governments of those States have funded similar halls. I have also expressed appreciation and recognition of the important part played by the trade union movement in South Australia. No member opposite can doubt my sincerity in this and other speeches I have made. I believe a fundamental principle is involved in the Bill that is hard to take when one considers the denial and refusals of Government assistance that have been made to many industries that are struggling to keep going. The Treasurer could have offered term loans on Treasury guarantees on the one hand to such industries, whereas, on the other hand, we are considering a Bill which provides a grant, not a loan, of $200 000. I oppose the Bill.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I oppose the Bill and go much further in my opposition to it than the idea behind the suggestion of the member for Torrens. I cannot for the life of me see much more morality (if there is any at all) in the suggestion he has made about a loan than there is in the Bill as it now stands. I do not agree with him, and I wonder whether other members of his Party agree with him on the matter. I do not believe that the United Trades and Labor Council should be the recipient in any form of public funds that are denied to other similar bodies. That goes for the provisions contained in the Bill and for the suggestion made, for a reason I cannot imagine, by the member for Torrens.

Mr. Coumbe: It's on the same basis.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am perplexed to know where to begin in considering the legislation. I could scarcely believe it yesterday afternoon when I saw duplicated copies of the Bill being distributed.

Mr. Venning: You're not the only one who couldn't believe it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Copies have been again distributed today. I have never seen such bare-faced effrontery as there is in respect of this Bill.

Mr. Venning: It's crook!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is obvious that, because it has been produced in duplicated form without being printed, it has been brought in hurriedly to catch the end of the session so that it may be passed and sent to a Select Committee in the hope that it will attract the minimum of publicity and will be swallowed up in other matters. The Bill is yet another sign that the Government, becoming entirely over-confident, believes that it can do anything and get away with it.

Dr. Tonkin: I'm not sure that's the case; I think the Government is being forced to do it by the trade union movement.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will deal with that matter soon. The fact that the Bill has been introduced and that the Government has given in to what is undoubtedly trade union pressure shows over-confidence. The Government has done well and has profited by the divisions and quarrels on this side of politics, but no-one (whether it be the Government or anyone else) can go on for ever believing he is entirely beyond reproach or that he will never come to grief. When a Government introduces measures such as this it is a sure sign of over-confidence, and of a belief that it is immortal and can do anything it likes. It is not the only sign of this that I have seen recently, but it is certainly the most obvious.

The United Trades and Labor Council is not a public body, whatever its function may be and whatever good it may do for the State. It is not set up by Statute; it does not depend on public funds; and it has no more claim on public funds than has the Employers Federation, the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, the Australian Medical Association, or the Law Society. As it is a private body, it should not be assisted by public funds.

By this measure the Government is making a present to its greatest political friends and its strongest political supporters. Whether that is right or wrong, no member on the other side can deny that that is what the Bill sets out to do. Members of the trade union movement will benefit from the Bill.

Mr. Dean Brown: Do you think that all those members with vested interests will refrain from voting on the measure?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not, and I do not believe that such an interjection is helpful. I suggest to members opposite that this is a question of straight out morality, whether or not the Government that happens to be in power is willing to use public funds to help its friends when they are in financial difficulties. I do not believe that the answer to that question is in any doubt at all. Even if on some basis of morality a grant to the Trades and Labor Council could be justified, it would still be a most unwise thing for the Government to do. We all know (and it is bandied about often) the saying that justice must not only be done but must be seen to be done. Even if this grant were just (and I do not suggest for a moment that it is), it is most unwise for the Government to do something which appears so partisan and which seems so strongly to assist its own friends.

Mr. Payne: The last Government to which you gave advice is now in Opposition; that's how much your advice was worth.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not expect that the honourable member, who has interjected in that rather defensive way, will accept my suggestion, because he is bound by Caucus.

Mr. Payne: That old—

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Does the honourable member deny that Caucus made a decision on this or that he is bound by that decision, whatever he may think?

Mr. Payne: You can hold your Caucus meeting in a telephone box and have room to spare.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I guess that is true, but it is no answer to the question I asked. The fact that the honourable member tried to get out of the question in that way shows the difficulty he is in in giving a straight answer to it, and there is no answer. The Treasurer tried to use examples in New South Wales and Western Australia as some sort of precedent. I need go no further than look at what he has said to see that it shows that there is no parallel to be drawn from these cases. In New South Wales, the Askin Government gave a guarantee, and not a straight-out gift or grant, as the member for Florey insisted on calling it (whatever it is called, it is a gift of money to the Trades and Labor Council). In Western Australia, the Tonkin Government gave a guarantee, and an undertaking to lease part of the building. Again, this was a guarantee, with a business arrangement for a lease. Whether or not that was criticised in Western Australia, I do not know; it probably was. That is certainly not nearly as bad as the suggestion embodied in the Bill for a straight-out grant, without Parliament in any way attaching any conditions to it. Under the Bill, the only body that can make any conditions is the Government itself. It is beyond our power, as Parliamentarians, once the Bill is through.

The member for Bragg wondered why this action had been taken. Obviously the financial situation of the Trades Hall must be fairly bad for this step to be taken. Regardless of whether over-confidence is involved, the Government would not do this unless the situation was fairly bad. As other honourable members have said, the Trades Hall is in no different situation from that of many other organisations and individuals in this State and the Commonwealth, and those people cannot go to the Government and get a grant to get them out of their trouble. It is rather ironic to look back at the opening ceremony at the Trades Hall. I was present as a guest, representing the former Leader of the Opposition. There was a great clashing of cymbals, banging of drums and self-congratulation on the part of the Treasurer, who spoke (I cannot remember whether he performed the opening ceremony). There was no suggestion from him then about any financial trouble, or that the Trades Hall was anything other than a glorious creation of the trade union movement, or that it would need help in the future. One thing I remember (and the member for Torrens will probably remember it, although he did not refer to it) is that when we were in office an approach was made by the Trades and Labor Council to the then Government for financial assistance, and we turned it down.

The Hon. L. J. King: Surprise, surprise!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I cannot remember how much was wanted, but an approach was made for assistance. What I want to remind members about is that the then Premier (now Senator Steele Hall) told the trade union movement that it was most unwise to go ahead with its plans for the South Terrace building, as that proposition would never be financially viable. At the end of the 1960's that was the advice he gave when we turned down that request for financial assistance. On that occasion, Senator Hall seems to have been right, and it is a jolly pity that members opposite did not take a bit of notice of what he said. It is a magnificent building. In fact, until this bombshell exploded, I had been rather envious of it. I have thought how good it is for the trade union movement to be able to afford to put up a magnificent building such as that. We cannot do it. The A.L.P. is able to be housed as an honoured tenant, and this is a direct benefit. In the Liberal Movement, we cannot get anything like that.

Mr. Langley: You can meet in a telephone box.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: There are a few more members than that in the Party, as the honourable member knows and will feel in due course. No other political Party can afford premises such as the Trades Hall building. The very fact that the political Party to which members opposite and their supporters belong would be a beneficiary of the Bill is an added reason why they should not go ahead with it.

Mr. Payne: That's a very unfair comment.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: There is nothing unfair about it. The political Party of members opposite will get a direct benefit from the passing of the Bill; there can be no mistake about that. Let us now come to the question of why this was done and what it shows. I have often said in the past (and this has not been accepted by members opposite) that the A.L.P. is dominated by the trade union movement.

Mr. Max Brown: Have we ever denied that?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I hope that the honourable member's interjection shows that he will not deny it any more, but it has been denied frequently in the past. This domination is shown more clearly by the Bill than could be shown in any other way imaginable. The Government, which depends on the trade union movement, must, in the last resort, always accept its dictates.

Dr. Tonkin: Members opposite and members of the trade union movement are all part of the same movement.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I find it difficult to disentangle the two. To be charitable for the purposes of the debate, I shall try to differentiate between the Party and the movement. The trade union movement dominates policy, even if the two branches can be disentangled. The Bill shows that this is true. There is virtually no way that any Labor Government can avoid doing what is insisted on by the trade union movement. I wonder what the reaction of the members of Cabinet and of the Government Party who are not trade union members would have been when this suggestion was made. I wonder what the reaction of the Attorney-General and the Minister of Education would have been. Of course, the Treasurer is proud of his membership of Actors Equity, and he says that he is a trade unionist because of that membership.

I wonder how the Treasurer and those Ministers could square a thing like this with their conscience and the reputation as honourable men that at times they try to sustain. I do not know whether the Attorney will defend this Bill, but it would be hard for even him to justify it on any ground of logic or justice. I wonder how he squares his conscience and I wonder what explanation he gives to his friends. Probably, he would say, "I must either stick with them or get out."

Dr. Tonkin: He's leaving soon.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: He will not have left before he must take responsibilty for this legislation. Clause 3 provides:

"the Corporation" means the Trades Hall, Adelaide Incorporated, an association deemed to be incorporated under the Associations Incorporation Act, 1956, as amended.

I wonder why it is only deemed to be incorporated, whether it is incorporated, or whether there is some mistake about its incorporation. The term is extraordinary, and perhaps we will hear more about that. I agree with the member for Torrens that clause 5 is merely a sop. I notice that there is not provision for any political Party other than the Government Party. Clause 4 provides that the Treasurer

may, on such terms and conditions as he seees fit, grant an amount to the corporation. This confirms that, when Parliament passes the Bill, the matter will be out of our hands.

Dr. Tonkin: Do you think the Legislative Council will pass it?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I hope it does not. Clause 6 provides:

The moneys required for the purposes of any grant made pursuant to this Act shall be payable out of the general revenue of the State which is hereby to the necessary extent appropriated accordingly.

As someone outside Parliament said to me today, it is funny that a bankrupt Government can afford to give a hand-out to another organisation. This Government, rightly, is crying poverty and has had to introduce two most unpopular and undesirable taxation measures this week, because it cannot get sufficient money from the Commonwealth Government to balance its books, yet it can find $200 000 to give to its political friends and supporters. How can one reconcile those two attitudes?

Mr. Venning: One cannot.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Of course one cannot. The member for Rocky River has stated the obvious. The next extraordinary situation is that the money to be used will come from the general revenue of the State, but it will go for a capital purpose, namely, to increase the capital asset of the Trades and Labor Council. We will not even use Loan money for this grant. There are no other words that I can use to oppose the Bill and there are no other arguments that I can think of.

Dr. Tonkin: You're too polite.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am not too polite, as the member for Bragg knows, and perhaps he will speak to the member for Victoria, who will tell him a few things. The member for Victoria already has spoken to me about the matter. We know that the Bill will pass, because Government members have made a decision. They knew the storm that it would create. but they have the numbers. The decision shows gross over-confidence, and I warn that in Government that can lead to a speedy end if it is persisted in. I oppose the Bill and will oppose the second reading.

I also will oppose the appointment of a Select Committee, and I hope that no member on this side will serve on any such committee appointed. I do not know what members of the Liberal Party have decided and I do not know whether the Leader of the Opposition, so called, has referred to this matter. There is no chance of my being appointed to the Select Committee, but I suggest that, if members of the Liberal Party are appointed, they should refuse appointment. If the House insists on appointing them, they should not attend meetings.

There is no other way in which those members can genuinely show their disapproval of the Bill. If any members on this side go on a Select Committee, having regard to what the Leader and the Deputy Leader have said, they will show that they are not genuine and not willing to push their opposition to the utmost limit. If members of the Liberal Party go on a Select Committee, they will be co-operating with the Government in the very thing they are opposing.

Mr. Evans: Do you think they could wipe off the debt if the trade unions made contributions to the Trades Hall, instead of to the A.L.P.?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That did go through my mind, but the honourable member may raise it if he wishes.

Mr. DUNCAN (Elizabeth): I support the Bill.

Dr. Tonkin: You have to.

Mr. DUNCAN: I do not have to, and I do not ever have to speak in this House. I am speaking to the Bill because things should be put on the record to show how hypocritical members opposite are being and how politically corrupt and dishonest the member for Mitcham has been in this debate. The honourable member obviously sees some cheap political mileage in this matter and intends to wring out every ounce of political capital he can from this debate and the Bill we are now considering.

It will be interesting to see whether Opposition members are really genuine in the attitude they have taken this evening or whether they are being led by the political maverick from Mitcham when they decide whether or not to serve on the Select Committee. The Bill has been introduced not as some great new measure that has never seen the light of day in South Australia before: it follows a practice undertaken by the South Australian Government and this Parliament on many previous occasions. I will go into this matter in greater detail later. For many years during the last century and in this century it was the South Australian Government's practice to make annual cash grants to the Chamber of Manufactures in South Australia.

Mr. Millhouse: When was the last grant made?

Mr. DUNCAN: The last annual grant was made in 1909. In 1910, a grant was made to the chamber to purchase its building. That is an exact copy of the principle embodied in the Bill, and it has been done before with Opposition support. However, when the Government introduces a balanced Bill to give financial assistance by way of a grant to the Trades and Labor Council and offers similar assistance to the group that supports the Opposition Party, the Opposition decries the measure. It seems to me that we are seeing an appalling act of political opportunism committed by the Opposition. The kind of hypocrisy we have heard from the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Torrens, and the member for Mitcham indicates the low depths to which Opposition members are willing to go.

The member for Florey referred to the various attitudes being displayed by Opposition members this evening. As I do not want to turn this into a great emotional debate and stir the House, I will not use terms which the member for Florey has used, but those terms could well be applied to some Opposition members. The Leader devoted the main part of his speech to a comparative argument. He asked, in effect, where is the precedent for this Bill? He said this had never been done before. That was a lie, and I expose that lie this evening. I go even further and quote from the 39th Annual Report of the South Australian Chamber of Manufactures for the year 1907, which shows a £200 grant to the chamber; in 1906, the chamber was again granted £200; in 1905, it was granted £200; in 1882, it was granted £500. In 1882, it is interesting to note that the chamber's total receipts were £1 056. So, virtually one-half of the chamber's entire income was donated by the Government that year. But how much did the Government give the trade unions that year? Not a penny!

Members interjecting:

Mr. DUNCAN: In 1870, when the grant to the chamber was £500, the salary of a surgeon was only £150; so, £500, which was a large sum at the time, was granted to the chamber by its political friends. The total amount of grants made to the chamber during this period was £40 000, a considerable sum in those days, which no doubt went a

good way towards the construction and development of the chamber and other employer organisations in this State.

Mr. Payne: They're not so loud now.

Mr. DUNCAN: No doubt Opposition members are embarrassed by what I have said, because they have gone out on a limb this evening. Their Leader has clearly been shown to be a dishonest man who misleads the House. He should apologise to the House, because his statements earlier this evening clearly indicated that he believed that never before had such grants been made. We are seeing the real truth now. How can the member for Torrens say that he would have supported a loan to the Trades Hall with a moratorium on the interest for a period of years, when such a moratorium would effectively be a grant? The principle is the same.

Mr. Coumbe: Rubbish!

Mr. DUNCAN: Of course it is. A moratorium on the interest is effectively a grant.

Mr. Coumbe: The principal must be repaid.

Mr. DUNCAN: The member for Torrens said that we were throwing away the people's money. What an outrageous statement to make! How does that tie up with the honourable member's suggestion that there should be a loan with a moratorium, because the same principle applies? He knows, as a business man, that it would have the same effect.

Mr. Gunn: You're protecting your endorsement; that's what you're doing.

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

Mr. Goldsworthy: You'll get the Attorney's job after he leaves.

Mr. DUNCAN: The contribution that I have exposed as having been made to the Chamber of Manufactures over the years really shows up Opposition members for the shallow way they have opposed the Bill.

Dr. Tonkin: It's being given to them to help the workers!

Mr. DUNCAN: Allegations have been made that this grant will help the Australian Labor Party: they are lies and must be thrown back to Opposition members in the same spirit in which they have been made. Not one word has been spoken to substantiate those allegations, and not one word of evidence has been given to indicate how substance can be given to those allegations. They are corrupt and untrue.

Members interjecting:

Mr. DUNCAN: Opposition members know that full well.

Mr. Goldsworthy: We reckon the Bill is pretty smelly.

Mr. DUNCAN: The member for Mitcham referred to the financial situation of the Trades Hall management committee, and Government members have not denied that the committee is in financial difficulties.

Dr. Tonkin: What about Mainline and other companies that have gone to the wall?

Mr. DUNCAN: They are in a different category from industrial organisations.

Dr. Tonkin: In what way?

Mr. DUNCAN: The big difference is that those companies are in business to make a profit. The Trades Hall organisation and the organisation referred to in the Bill exist for the benefit of the people of South Australia.

Members interjecting:

Mr. DUNCAN: I refer to the financial situation of the Trades Hall. The member for Kavel, who knows nothing about this business, has said that office space is to let at the Trades Hall, but that statement is completely incorrect and untrue. Office space is not to let: it is fully taken up at competitive rentals similar to those offering in other parts of the city and in that part of it.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Why are they broke?

Mr. DUNCAN: The financial situation of the Trades Hall has developed to the present stage because the Trades Hall management committee sought to build a hall that would provide Adelaide with a first-class theatre and hall.

Dr. Tonkin: Are you the honorary solicitor?

Mr. DUNCAN: I do not intend to answer gutter-sniping from the member for Bragg.

Dr. Tonkin: I thought you would know more about the affairs than you seem to know.

Mr. DUNCAN: The hall is not making money, but that is not directly part of the Trades Hall activity.

Dr. Tonkin: Are you the honorary solicitor?

Mr. DUNCAN: No, I am not, if that makes the honourable member happy. That was a low and scurrilous interjection, trying to imply that I had a financial interest in this matter, and that is completely incorrect.

Mr. Becker: Are they your clients?

Mr. DUNCAN: They are not my clients: not one trade union is a client of my firm.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. In this House the member for Elizabeth should be able to have his say without having to put up with such a barrage of interjections—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: —and without having to put up with the most unpleasant reflections on his person.

Mr. Gunn: Look who's speaking: you're reflecting on the Chair.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Honourable members opposite have suggested by a series of interjections that the member for Elizabeth has some financial interest in the matter, and that is a lie and a reflection on him.

Mr. Goldsworthy: What's your point of order?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: My point of order is that in this supposedly democratic House—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: —Opposition members should give the member for Elizabeth a hearing.

Mr. Nankivell: That's a reflection on the Chair.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I warned the honourable member for Eyre a few moments ago. I uphold the point of order raised by the honourable Minister. If there are to be persistent interjections, then Standing Orders will prevail. I ask honourable members to give the honourable member for Elizabeth the chance to put his point of view before the House.

Mr. Dean Brown: What about—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Davenport will be the first one to suffer the consequences if he disobeys the Chair. I warn the honourable member for Davenport, and if the honourable member wants to continue in that mood, he can do so. I issue a warning to him, but there will be no more. The honourable member for Elizabeth.

Mr. MATHWIN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. You scolded the member for Eyre when you were speaking, but at that stage the member for Eyre did not open his mouth. I bring this matter to your attention this time. Although the member for Eyre has overstepped the mark previously, he did not at that time open his mouth. You scolded him for something he did not do.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not uphold the point of order. I took the view that the remark was made by the member for Eyre. If that had not been so, then I would have been wrong, but there were plenty of times previously when he had offended. However, that is not the point at issue. I do not uphold the point of order, and ask the honourable member for Elizabeth to resume the debate.

Mr. DUNCAN: Before Opposition members started the barrage of interjections I was referring to the fact that the present financial difficulties of the Trades Hall management committee resulted from the fact that it built a magnificent hall as part of the Trades Hall complex. It is no secret that the hall is not paying its way. No-one has made any secret of that fact. With the money put into building the hall by the trade union movement, it was set up as a full drama complex, but it is unable to pay its way at present. I refer to that fact to indicate to the member for Kavel that it is not a case of bad business practice, as suggested by him, when he said that office space in the Trades Hall was not being used.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Then drama space is not being used, but you're still broke.

Mr. DUNCAN: The Trades Hall is operated as a business concern, and the rent charged is comparable to rentals charged in that area on South Terrace. They are not high, considering the capacity of many of the tenants to pay. The rentals charged by the Trades Hall management committee are comparable—

Mr. Goldsworthy: How much does it get out of renting the hall?

Mr. DUNCAN: —and economic rentals.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DUNCAN: It was obvious that, before I started to expose the attitude of members opposite, they thought they were on a political winner. Unfortunately, the wind has been taken out of their sails and they will not be able in the next week or two to parade themselves as being the great protectors of the public purse. It is historical that when the then Chamber of Manufactures purchased its building it received financial assistance.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DUNCAN: Members opposite are peeved to find out about that; they did not do their homework on the matter and are disappointed about that fact. Opposition members have gone out on a limb this evening, and it will be interesting to see whether they support the politically corrupt approach referred to by their *de facto* leader sitting in the corner, and whether they will opt out of the procedures that take place later. I want to emphasise that, to refer to Tammany Hall, was a most scurrilous allegation with no substance at all. Moreover, there has never been any substance in an allegation that this Government is corrupt: it is not and never will be corrupt. The South Australian Government has a particularly fine record. How can members opposite make such an allegation when their Party year by year in the past made a cash grant to the main employer organisation in South Australia? For them to have made the sort of allegation they have made is completely and utterly corrupt and an absolutely appalling approach to the whole political process.

Mr. PAYNE (Mitchell): I support the Bill and, for the information of the member for Kavel, I have no ambition to become the new Attorney-General.

Members interjecting:

Mr. PAYNE: I hope to be able to exercise my right (a right that belongs to all of us in this place) to make a speech in a reasonable atmosphere, as is required by Standing Orders. I wish to correct the scurrilous interjection made by the member for Torrens (which was less than befitting of him) that, when I was leaving the Chamber previously, I had given instructions to the member for Elizabeth. When a member on this side speaks to another member it is simply a sign of friendship and comradeship in the Party: it is not, as members opposite are accustomed to thinking, a signification that they are receiving instructions on how they are to behave and speak on a particular matter.

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

Mr. PAYNE: This evening we are considering a Bill that seeks to authorise the Treasurer to make a grant. Members opposite have suggested that there is something dirty about the measure.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! My previous warning continues. The honourable member for Mitchell.

Mr. PAYNE: The Bill seeks to authorise the Treasurer to make a grant to Trades Hall Adelaide Incorporated or any organisation or organisations representing employers and for other purposes. We have heard much from members opposite about what they regard as being the impropriety of making a grant to the Trades Hall. However, we have not heard quite so much from them about the other provisions, which allow grants to be made in a balanced manner to employer organisations and—

Mr. Goldsworthy: It's only a sop to square up.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. PAYNE: Members opposite suggest that similar precedents cited by the Treasurer are not in the same category as that proposed in the legislation, but that is patently untrue. Normally, I would not commend the retiring New South Wales Premier (Sir Robert Askin), but I commend him on this occasion for having the courage to do what has been suggested the South Australian Government should not do. The Askin Government recognised that trade unions are important in Australia. One could even suggest that such recognition does not require high intelligence. The New South Wales Government had the ability to recognise trade unions as worthwhile organisations that should be assisted financially.

Members interjecting:

Mr. PAYNE: It provided not only a grant but also the land on which to build a hall. If that is not a grant in kind, what is it? Is anyone opposite suggesting that the land cost nothing? The member for Mitcham said he could not understand why the member for Torrens had tried to suggest that an alternative method should be used. One can only wonder at the attitude of Opposition members.

Mr. Dean Brown: What about the percentage of votes at the convention—

Mr. PAYNE: Some of these matters need airing, yet the member for Davenport, who has no knowledge whatever about them, keeps blaring on in the background. If he will be silent for a couple of minutes, I shall tell him something he does not know about.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Continual interjections must cease.

Mr. PAYNE: The member for Davenport is interested in a smear, and bases his remarks on guesswork. I am an endorsed Labor Party member, and I have never given any undertaking to anyone other than the pledge that everyone is welcome to know about.

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

Mr. PAYNE: I have never been approached in any way about what I will do about—

Mr. Dean Brown: What has this to do with the Bill?

Mr. PAYNE: All the time we have these inane, slanderous interjections of the honourable member.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member has suggested that my remarks have been insignificant and a smear.

The SPEAKER: Order! Points of order are not to be debated. What is the point of order?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The point is that the remarks I made were not a smear on members opposite. I was simply referring to the fact that 90 per cent of the votes at the convention of the A.L.P.—

The SPEAKER: Order! I have pointed out that a point of order can be raised by any honourable member at any time, but an honourable member does not have the right at such a stage to debate the matter. The honourable member's point of order is not upheld.

Mr. PAYNE: In case members opposite are in any doubt about this, I have never had any instruction—

Mr. Dean Brown: What has this to do with the Bill?

Mr. Mathwin: Tell us about the time there was a Country Party candidate—

The SPEAKER: Order! If honourable members think they can take over the authority of the Chair, they have another think coming. Standing Orders will prevail. Certain honourable members have been warned once. Further warnings will be in accordance with Standing Order 169. On the third occasion, an honourable member will be named.

Mr. PAYNE: The suggestion has been made that members on this side are obliged to support this Bill because of certain trade union connections. I am saying that I have never been obliged to support this Bill. Reference has also been made to the matter of preselection being involved. My preselection was not contested before the last election.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must come back to the Bill. Although interjections are permitted in normal Parliamentary debate, debates may not continue purely along the lines of interjections made. Remarks made in debate must be linked to the Bill under consideration. If honourable members persist in interjecting, they will be out of order and will be dealt with accordingly by the Chair.

Mr. PAYNE: I take it as a tribute that members opposite are trying to prevent my speaking; I must be saying something that is distasteful to them. In his second reading explanation, the Treasurer made no bones about the aim of the legislation. He said:

After an investigation of its situation by the Under Treasurer, it is apparent that the only way in which the Trades Hall can remain viable is by a reduction in the capital liability on the hall to an amount which the Trades Hall management committee's income could service. The amount necessary for this purpose is $200 000, and it is intended that a grant be made to the Trades Hall management committee of such a sum.

The member for Torrens has suggested that alternative methods might have been used. Apparently, the honourable member tacitly admits the legislation, in principle anyway, is not objectionable. Even though he opposes this Bill, he suggests alternatives that do not differ in principle from what is sought in the Bill. One way in which a Party's stand on a matter may be judged is to look at its behaviour in relation to earlier matters. If members opposite are now advancing a certain argument, it is reasonable to examine their attitude to allied matters. The *News* of November 7, 1973, contained an article by Rex Jory headed "Liberal and Country League calls on union boss to help with policy". I suggest that at that time the Opposition Party, through its organiser—

Mr. Mathwin: You're floundering.

Mr. PAYNE: No-one is floundering.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member is referring to some completely irrelevant matter. I suggest that he should look at Rex Jory's article on October 17.

The SPEAKER: Order! In raising a point of order, the honourable member has made a suggestion. His point of order is not upheld. The honourable member for Mitchell must deal with the Bill under discussion.

Mr. PAYNE: It is reasonable to see whether members opposite are consistent in their attitude, as they are now castigating a proposal to assist the trade union movement, whereas at the time to which I have referred it was more fashionable to give some recognition and standing to this organisation. In fact, at that time, Mr. John Vial said:

For some reason it is felt the L.C.L. is against trade unions.

Dr. TONKIN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think that if the Bill related to direct financial help for the L.C.L. and not for the A.L.P. reference to Mr. John Vial would be in order. However, in these circumstances, I suggest it is not in order.

The SPEAKER: I do not uphold the point of order. I am still awaiting from the honourable member for Mitchell an explanation how what he is quoting is relevant to the Bill. I hope he is explaining the connection. A Bill is under discussion, and the debate will not get out of hand. The honourable member must speak to the Bill under discussion.

Mr. PAYNE: The Bill refers to the provision of finance for a trade union organisation and for employer organisations, and the matter that I am introducing refers to trade union organisations and a political organisation. Surely the link is that at least two Opposition speakers have suggested that there will be advantage to the political Party that I represent if this matter proceeds. At the time to which I have referred, the L.C.L. had decided to appoint a special committee to consider trade union relations. Obviously, it recognised the importance of the trade union body.

Mr. McANANEY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, what connection has this with the Bill? We have trade unionists in their hundreds wanting to join the Liberal Party, but that has nothing to do with the Bill.

The SPEAKER: I do not uphold the point of order, in the terms in which it has been raised, but the Bill must be the main consideration before the House, and any remarks made must be linked with it. In initiating opposition to the Bill, the honourable Leader was given much latitude in talking about the attitude of trade unions. I am giving that latitude to all other honourable members, but the Bill is the main matter of debate.

Mr. PAYNE: Members opposite, as part of the State Opposition, clearly recognised the importance of one of the organisations named in this Bill. If referring to that is not linking the matter, there is something wrong with my thinking process. I am trying to show that members opposite had that view of that organisation only a year ago. That Opposition Party went to great lengths to set up good relations with the trade union body. It must have had good reason for doing this, and the reason was that it knew the value of those good relations. In order for this body to continue to exist and, as the member for Florey has stated, to have a proper home base in which to conduct its affairs, for the benefit of its members and all the other people of the State, it is vital that this Bill be passed. No Opposition speaker so far has suggested what will happen if this vital support is not given. Not one of them has had the courage to deal with that aspect. All they have done is suggest that a special favour is being extended, even though I have reminded them that the preamble to the Bill refers both to employer organisations and to employee organisations.

Mr. Evans: I don't care about either of them.

Mr. PAYNE: The honourable member will be able to make that point if he so desires. So far in the debate, speakers have directed all their attacks and vituperation against one side and one organisation. Other members have the right to pursue another line if they so desire, but the whole argument so far has been based on the false foundation that the Bill sets out to give a special favour to one side. It is scandalous that this line of attack was used.

Dr. Tonkin: It's scandalous—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Bragg has interrupted continually. Interjections are part of Parliamentary debate, but second reading speeches by way of interjection are not. If the honourable member persists, Standing Order 169 will prevail.

Mr. Mathwin: By the attitude of—

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Glenelg. I have warned many honourable members many times that the debate will go on in accordance with proper decorum in the House. It is apparent that they will not allow—

Dr. Tonkin: It's a stupid Bill that should not have been debated.

The SPEAKER: I warn the honourable member for Bragg. He has interjected persistently.

Mr. PAYNE: If a Bill is introduced, it is our duty to consider its merits and, on behalf of the people of our districts, to make a decision. I have been trying to do that for about 20 minutes. The legislation does not offer any special favour to anyone, but it offers the possibility of a grant to an employer organisation or an employee organisation. Employer organisations already in existence may apply for a grant. Whether they do apply is a matter for them. If the Bill is passed, the Trades Hall administration may be able to get a grant of up to $200 000, which will allow the organisation to survive. I say that the Bill warrants support on that point alone, because it is vital for the workers of the State that the Trades Hall continue in existence to function as the home base for the United Trades and Labor Council of South Australia. The council has already been able to establish operating relations with the employer organisations and, for the benefit of the State, clearly we as Parliamentarians should be entitled to authorise the expenditure of public money, which is what we are required to do under the Bill. I have no hesitation in indicating my full support for the measure.

The House divided on the second reading:

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

Noes (18)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Becker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick (teller), Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Corcoran and McRae. Noes—Messrs. Blacker and Evans.

Majority of 5 for the Ayes.

Second reading thus carried.

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

That the Bill be referred to a Select Committee.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I oppose the motion and, as I said in the second reading debate, I oppose the second reading and the setting up of a Select Committee.

The SPEAKER: Order! Before the honourable member continues, I seek information on whether he is the principal speaker on behalf of the Opposition in regard to this motion.

Dr. Eastick: No, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If I may say so with the utmost respect, Mr. Speaker, I would have thought that that was a superfluous question. I said in the second reading debate that I opposed the setting up of a Select Committee. I do not believe that any Opposition member should serve on the committee if the opposition which has been expressed both by speech and by vote is genuine. My opposition is genuine.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Rubbish! Your opposition is only denying—

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not quite understand the Minister's interjection—

Mr. Venning: Don't try to.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —and I am not going to bother to try. I do not believe that the Bill should be taken one step further and, therefore, I oppose the setting up of a Select Committee.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): Not to accept responsibility to sit on a Select Committee, which is one of the requirements of the procedures of the House, would, I suggest, be completely against the best interests of the State. I have indicated that I am totally opposed to the measure.

Mr. Millhouse: Yet you'll co-operate with the Government to further it.

The Hon. L. J. King: If a Select Committee on the Privacy Bill had been set up, you would have served on it if you'd been able to have it amended.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Millhouse: I have never known a Bill to be opposed like this and furthered by—

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Mitcham. He knows that when the Speaker is in the Chair total regard must be paid to him.

Mr. Millhouse: You aren't in the Chair.

The SPEAKER: I warn the honourable member for Mitcham a second time, in accordance with Standing Order 169. The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

Dr. EASTICK: The position is simple. Certain features of the Bill are, I believe, against the best interests of the State, and that fact has been indicated during the debate. The Government, by weight of numbers, has forced this obnoxious measure through the second reading, so it is now the responsibility of responsible Opposition members to take their places on a committee that will have the opportunity of questioning those people who seek to appear before it. I have nominated the member for Eyre and myself to occupy—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That's an airy-fairy one.

The SPEAKER: Order! At this stage, no nominations are before the Chair.

Dr. EASTICK: If the arrogance of Government members, as exhibited particularly by the Minister of Transport—

The SPEAKER: Order! We are dealing with a substantive motion moved by the Treasurer, and that is the only subject matter of the debate. The reason why this motion should be carried is the only matter I will allow to be debated.

Dr. EASTICK: I was making the point that we accept the responsibility not to allow an arrogant Government to steamroll through measures that are clearly against the best interests of the people of this State. The attitude being expressed by some Government members to this incident is a real reason why Opposition members should be members of that committee, so that the interests of the people are safeguarded.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (40)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Becker, Broomhill, Dean Brown, Max Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Chapman, Coumbe, Crimes, Duncan, Dunstan (teller), Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Groth, Gunn, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, Mathwin, McKee, Nankivell, Olson, Payne, Rodda, Russack, Simmons, Slater, Tonkin, Venning, Virgo, Wardle, Wells, and Wright.

Noes (2)—Messrs. McAnaney and Millhouse (teller).

Majority of 38 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

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

That a Select Committee be appointed consisting of Messrs. Dunstan, Eastick, Gunn, Payne, and Wright.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I oppose this motion for the same reasons I have given before. I have never known a Bill to be opposed at the second reading and then a majority of those who opposed it to support its furtherance in this way. That is what we have had this evening. As I have said three times now, if members on this side are genuine in their opposition to this Bill, as they should be—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You're not genuine.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —they should not do anything to further its objects and progress through the House. That is precisely what they are doing. The only object the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Eyre will achieve by going on this Select Committee is that they will give it some aura of respectability. They will be out-voted, yet the Government will be able to say that the Select Committee represented both sides of the House. They are aiding and abetting the Government, as they so often do, and acting as junior partners of the Government. It was extraordinary to hear the Leader of the Opposition a few minutes ago supporting the motion of the Treasurer that this Bill should be referred to a Select Committee, although from his speech one would have thought that he opposed it. On this Bill, he is obviously trying to have a bet each way. I know that I have put the Liberals on a spot by making the suggestion because, as soon as I made it in the second reading debate, I saw the Leader of the Opposition going about among his Party to see what he should do.

Mr. Becker: That's not true.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes it is. I watched him.

Mr. BECKER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! The point of order?

Mr. BECKER: The member for Mitcham said that the Leader was going around among the Party seeking to find out what to do; that is not true. The Leader spoke to me on an entirely different matter, so I ask that the remark be withdrawn. I am sick and tired of the member for Mitcham's lies.

The SPEAKER: Order! The question before the House is "That the motion be agreed to".

Mr. RODDA: Are you putting the motion?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well, Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Order! I rose to put the motion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Hanson took a point of order on me. You have not ruled on it yet.

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest that the honourable member for Mitcham wake up. I ruled that I do not uphold the point of order, and then put to the House the motion "That the motion be agreed to".

Mr. MILLHOUSE: You did not.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Victoria.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I was speaking in opposition to the motion when the member for Hanson took a point of order arising out of something I said to which he objected.

Mr. Jennings: Thoroughly justified, too.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I sat down while the point of order was taken and was ruled on. Sir, your normal practice (and I ask you to follow it here) is that—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —when you put a point of order—

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —unless Rafferty's rules—

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

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —are to prevail in this place, you will allow me to continue to speak.

The SPEAKER: Order! I name the honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. Venning: You can't do that!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Sir, that is an outrage—an absolute outrage. You have been most unfair in what you have done and said.

The SPEAKER: Order! I name the honourable member for Mitcham under Standing Order 169 for acting in complete defiance of the authority of the Chair.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Sir, what you have done by naming me is the most outrageous and unfair thing I have ever heard in this House. The member for Hanson took a point of order on me. I sat down and yielded to him so that he could explain his point of order, as has been done on every occasion and as is the practice of the House. You, Sir, should then have called on me, I believe, to continue after he had put his point of order. I did not hear you rule on this and you certainly did not call on me to continue, as is my right to continue. If you are in any way an impartial Speaker, you will allow me to continue what I was saying. If you want to gag me and other members at your will, then you will persist in naming me, but that is the only way you can continue in this way if you are to preserve any dignity for your office at all and any sense of fairness at all. You will allow me to continue where I left off when the member for Hanson raised his point of order. I now take that point of order, and ask that I be allowed to continue.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call on the honourable Premier.

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

That the member for Mitcham be suspended from the sitting of the House.

Mr. Rodda: How can you?

Mr. Venning: Be fair!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Millhouse: A bad mistake, Mr. Speaker, on this occasion.

The SPEAKER: In accordance with Standing Orders 169 and 171, I ask the honourable member for Mitcham to withdraw from the Chamber.

Dr. Tonkin: There has not been one seconder for the Premier's motion. Was the motion put? No! What's wrong with you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the honourable House that, while the suspension is being considered by the House, the member so named must leave the Chamber unless there is a substantive motion moved by any member that the explanation from the member named shall be accepted by the House. The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

Dr. EASTICK: I believe we are seeing a tragedy of events. I believe that an explanation has been given which, in great measure, is a correct interpretation of the action taken. In saying that, I do not condone in any way the attack that was made on the authority of the Chair by the member for Mitcham subsequent to your having given a ruling. However, I do believe that the explanation given by the member for Mitcham is a correct chronological interpretation of the events that took place in the House in the fairly recent past. I therefore move:

That the honourable member's explanation be accepted.

Mr. BECKER: I second the motion. In doing so, I think that there was confusion in the situation. I raised a point of order, and there was a request for a ruling on a further point of order. There was no ruling. You rose, Sir, and called for a vote on the motion before the House. What the member for Mitcham has said by way of explanation, I believe, is correct. I think it is a tragedy that this should happen at this late stage of the sitting.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I oppose the motion for the very obvious reason that is known to every member of the House. The clear authority of the Speaker is to call for order in order that he may preserve the authority of this House and give such rulings from the Chair as he is called on to do under Standing Orders. You, Sir, were on your feet, having already warned the honourable member twice. While you were on your feet and calling for order, the member for Mitcham persistently stood in this Chamber and shouted at and abused you.

Mr. Millhouse: Absolute nonsense!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is exactly what occurred. You did not name the member for Mitcham until he had persistently refused your calls to order while you were on your feet.

Mr. Millhouse: That's absolutely untrue and you know it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We all saw and heard the member for Mitcham defy the authority of this House repeatedly. The position was that the Speaker was on his feet, repeatedly calling for order. He was defied by the member for Mitcham who stood on his feet and shouted at the Speaker continually.

Mr. Millhouse: The Speaker never ruled on the member for Hanson's point of order. I asked him to rule on it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It was not a question of your being able to rule on anything, Sir, for the simple reason that, the matters having been raised by members opposite and by the member for Mitcham, you rose and called for order and the member for Mitcham defied you.

Mr. Millhouse: That's not right. I wanted to continue my speech.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member stood on his feet and defied the Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Every member here knows it, and the Leader has acknowledged it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Millhouse: You're completely wrong Dunstan; you're wrong and you know you're wrong.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The member for Mitcham has acted in this House, as he condemned a schoolgirl for doing recently. He has completely defied the authority of the House. If members opposite support him—

Mr. Dean Brown: That's a lie! You're a liar.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I ask for the withdrawal of that remark. The member for Davenport called me a liar.

Mr. Millhouse: You are, too.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I demand the withdrawal of that remark, too.

Mr. Millhouse: You're deliberately falsifying the situation to try to support the motion you moved.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier has requested the withdrawal of a statement that he claims was made by the honourable member for Davenport. I ask the honourable member for Davenport whether he will withdraw it.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: What were the words objected to?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The words objected to are "You're a liar."

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier has requested, through the Chair, the withdrawal of the term used. I ask the honourable member for Davenport whether he will withdraw the remark.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: If those remarks worry the Premier, I will certainly withdraw them, and I do so.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have stated exactly the position that has occurred, and it is a position where there has been continual defiance of the Chair by the member for Mitcham. No member can deny that and no member can support that.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I support the Leader's motion. I do not believe the position is quite as the Premier has outlined it. The whole situation is clouded in complete confusion. I am not clear in my mind whether the member for Mitcham has been called on to give an explanation. The facts in sequence, as they appear to me, are that the member for Mitcham sat down when a point of order was taken and then sought to continue his remarks, but was not allowed to do so. You, Sir, assumed he had finished his speech, when in fact he had not done so. That is what led to the outburst of the member for Mitcham.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: And the defiance of the Chair.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: What I am saying is that I believe that the ruling given to stop the member for Mitcham from continuing was incorrect. The member for Mitcham made some remarks, apparently in the heat of the moment, that I for one would not condone. Nevertheless, it has been taken as an explanation, and that is obviously the way it has been taken by you, Sir, as the motion of the Leader has been accepted. I take it that the remarks made by the member for Mitcham during the course of the ensuing part of the proceedings were his explanation.

Obviously, this has been accepted by the Chair as an explanation of the events. The fact that the Leader's motion has been accepted by the Chair indicates to me that the remarks of the member for Mitcham have been taken as his explanation. Government members cannot have it both ways: they cannot suggest that the member for Mitcham is being accused of impropriety during the course of saying what you, Sir, have accepted as his explanation. The motion has been accepted by you, Sir, and the honourable member said nothing else in his defence other than the words to which the Premier has referred. There is a motion before the House: "That the honourable member's explanation be accepted". I listened to what he said, and that was all he said after making his original remarks. In those circumstances, I believe genuinely that your original ruling, Sir, was not justified, and I believe justice would be done if this explanation were accepted.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You're talking in defiance of the Chair.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am not. I believe that two mistakes have been made in this case. A mistake was made in the first instance in assuming that the member for Mitcham had concluded his remarks when there was no evidence whatever that he had done so. Secondly, I believe a mistake was made in the manner in which the member for Mitcham sought to make his explanation. I believe justice would be done if members let common sense prevail and were willing to support the Leader's motion "That the honourable member's explanation be accepted". No other remark has been made by the member for Mitcham in respect of the charges. You, Mr. Speaker, have obviously accepted those words as the explanation, otherwise the motion of the Leader would have been unacceptable to you. I say in all sincerity that I believe members would act wisely if they accepted the motion, because I believe there are obviously faults on both sides in this argument.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The member for Mitcham was warned twice by you, Mr. Speaker. Whatever the position was regarding your ruling, when you were on your feet the member for Mitcham continued on his feet and abused the Chair. There is no doubt about what happened before the honourable member was named. It was the most complete flouting of the authority of the Chair I have seen in my experience in the House, and it was a flouting of authority of the Chair that would not be carried out by any other member of the House. The honourable member's so-called explanation that the Leader has asked us to accept did not in any way offer an apology to the authority of the House, namely, the Speaker. Even the member for Davenport, when asked to withdraw, was willing to withdraw, but the member for Mitcham has offered nothing by way of apology to the authority of the Chair. If the authority of the Chair on this occasion is not supported and a proper explanation required of the member for Mitcham, no matter what the previous events were, there can be no justification for the abuse of you, Sir, in which the member for Mitcham indulged, after being warned twice. Then, with you on your feet, he got up and abused your authority.

When his so-called explanation was given, he made no attempt whatever to apologise to you, although he had the opportunity to apologise, because he was speaking without interruption. In an explanation that the Leader now asks us to accept, the member for Mitcham did not apologise. If Opposition members support this motion, all I can say is that the L.C.L. parents of the schoolgirl member of this House (namely, the Liberal Movement progeny) are defying the authority of the Chair and are not willing to support the Speaker in the exercise of his legitimate authority.

Dr. TONKIN: I support the motion. I think feelings are running a little lower now than they were running previously. I shall quote a Standing Order with which I am sure you, Sir, are familiar, although I am not sure that the Premier and the Minister of Education are familiar with it. It provides:

> Whenever any such member shall have been named by the Speaker or by the Chairman of Committees, such member shall have the right to be heard in explanation or apology . . .

I submit that, at the time the member for Mitcham rose to his feet while the Premier was still standing fumbling for the right Standing Order and trying to work out what to do, the member for Mitcham obviously believed he was entitled to give an explanation and proceed to give it. I submit that he gave it without any abuse.

Members interjecting:

Dr. TONKIN: I believe a careful examination of *Hansard* tomorrow will show just that: that he explained

the situation. It was an unfortunate occurrence and a misunderstanding. I believe you, Sir, gave him (if not by call, by understanding) the right to make that explanation by virtue of the fact that you sat the Premier down when he was on his feet and allowed the member for Mitcham to continue. Because of that, I believe that what the member for Mitcham said was, in fact, a true explanation of the state of affairs. You, Sir, have accepted the motion we are now debating: "That the honourable member's explanation be accepted". Apparently, the Premier does not yet believe that the member for Mitcham has explained.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That's got nothing to do with it. The events about which we are talking occurred earlier than that.

Dr. TONKIN: The Premier has been talking about events that he has so completely muddled in his mind that he does not know what the true sequence was, and I can understand that, because feelings have been running high. There has been much tension during this debate, but it is entirely understandable.

The SPEAKER: Order! We are dealing with a motion.

Dr. TONKIN: I consider that the member for Mitcham has explained the situation satisfactorily. I think that the member for Hanson, if given the opportunity, would corroborate that this was the sequence of events, and the honourable member's explanation should be accepted.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The member for Bragg has either misunderstood or completely misrepresented the sequence of events and, of course, misrepresented the ruling that you gave. The sequence of events simply was that, during the course of a speech by the member for Mitcham, the member for Hanson took a point of order. Subsequently, you rose to your feet, and the member for Mitcham rose to his feet. True, I think, you assumed that the member for Mitcham had completed his remarks. The member for Mitcham claimed that he had not completed his remarks. You indicated to the member for Mitcham that you considered that he had completed his remarks and you were about to put the question.

The member for Mitcham at that time had his opportunity to put to you in a proper way that he wished to continue his remarks. Instead of doing that, he remained on his feet while you were on your feet, and he shouted at you. He shouted at you, Mr. Speaker, and insisted on remaining on his feet shouting at you, the Speaker. It was in those circumstances that you twice warned him and then named him. I really do not understand how any member of the House can condone the behaviour of a member who refuses—

Dr. Eastick: That's not what we're debating.

The Hon. L. J. KING: It is. Let me continue. The Leader of the Opposition has said that that is not what we are debating. We are debating the Leader's motion that the explanation given by the member for Mitcham be accepted. That explanation did not purport to explain in any way why he had remained on his feet shouting at you, Mr. Speaker. In other words, he did not try to explain the behaviour that had led to his being named.

He contended during the course of his explanation that he was entitled to continue his remarks, that he had not completed them. That may be right or it may be wrong. No member who contends that he has had a rather raw deal from the Speaker or has had an adverse ruling given against him is entitled to stand on his feet and shout at the Speaker.

What the member for Mitcham was required to do in his explanation, if it was to have any validity at all, was explain why he was on his feet shouting at the Speaker at any time. There has been no valid explanation of that. The only proper thing for a member to do in those circumstances is say, "I was carried away in the heat of the moment and I apologise." If he had done that, there would be no doubt and the Premier would have moved that the honourable member's explanation be accepted.

However, the member for Mitcham did not do that. He did not at any stage seek to apologise for having stood on his feet shouting at the Speaker. The Leader has said that that is not what we are debating, but it is the only thing we are debating. The member for Mitcham was named for only one reason: because he would not resume his seat while the Speaker was trying to control the House and restore order. Had he resumed his seat then and taken his point in a proper way, saying that he had not finished his remarks and that he had intended to continue them after the point of order raised by the member for Hanson had been disposed of, I have no doubt that you would have accepted what he had to say on that point.

This was an occasion when a member simply defied all orderly conduct in this House by standing up and shouting while the Speaker was on his feet. It was something that I have not seen in the four years I have been here, and I am sure that other members who have been here longer than I have not seen it either. I am surprised that members opposite have supported the member for Mitcham in these circumstances.

Let me pay a tribute to the member for Davenport. He used an expression that was unparliamentary, and he apologised. I thought it was proper of him to do so. If the member for Mitcham had apologised to the Chair, the incident would be over. However, this House cannot condone a member's standing up and defying the Speaker when the Speaker is trying to maintain order. If we condone that, all orderly discussion in the House will be at an end.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the member for Mitcham has been heard in proper explanation and I seek your ruling on that point.

The SPEAKER: I cannot uphold that point of order, because there is a substantive motion now being considered by the House that the explanation given by the member for Mitcham be accepted. That is the only matter to be determined by the House at present. Therefore, I cannot uphold the point of order.

Mr. RODDA: I find this rather confusing, because I rose to speak only when I realised that you, Mr. Speaker, were putting the motion "That the Bill be referred to a Select Committee", and I wanted to say something on that motion. When the member for Hanson rose, I thought you were rising to rule on the point of order, when in fact you were putting the motion. That is the only reason I was on my feet. That has not been canvassed by the Premier or any member on this side, but that is the only occasion on which I rose.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I should like to get straight the sequence—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —of what happened.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is a motion before the House. The subject matter of that motion is that the

explanation given by the honourable member for Mitcham be accepted. The honourable member cannot speak at this stage.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Why should I not speak? It is a motion before the House.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has been named. He made his explanation and the honourable Leader of the Opposition moved that the explanation given by the honourable member be accepted. That is the motion before the House. The honourable member for Mitcham has no right to speak in this debate at this time.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I ask you why I have not. I am still in the House. I have not been asked to withdraw. I am still a member of the House. I have not been sent out. This is a motion that is being debated in the House.

The SPEAKER: Is the honourable member raising a point of order?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, if you insist that I raise a point of order. I raise the point of order that I should be entitled to speak on this motion.

The SPEAKER: The Standing Orders provide (and I can only interpret the Standing Orders as they are determined by this House) that, when a member has been named, he shall have the right of explanation and, if a motion is moved "That the explanation be accepted", the House can consider that. If the explanation is not accepted, the honourable member leaves the House. The honourable member has no right of discussion under Standing Orders.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: On a point of order, under which section of the Standing Orders has the honourable member no right to speak to the motion? I refer to Standing Orders 171, 172 and 173. Nowhere do they provide that the honourable member does not have a right to speak to the motion.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member sought my ruling, and I have given a ruling in accordance with Standing Order 171.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I take a further point of order: that in the Standing Orders there is no prohibition against my speaking in this debate. There is just nothing there that says I cannot speak or that a member in my position should not be allowed to speak. All I want to do is put, as I understand it, the sequence of events, and I do not propose to argue it. Every member who has spoken so far—

The SPEAKER: Order! A point of order is not a matter for debate. In accordance with Standing Orders, the honourable member cannot give two explanations on a subject matter. He has the right of explanation. A substantive motion has been moved and, therefore, that is the subject matter before the House.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If you, Mr. Speaker, rule that way, I must move to disagree to your ruling.

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out that, until such time as the motion has been dealt with, the honourable member has no rights at all.

Dr. TONKIN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, as the honourable member has not been suspended from the service of the House, he has every right to speak as a member of the House. I should like to know where is the Standing Order stating that his rights have been taken away from him, before such a motion has been carried.

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot uphold the point of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well, I move to disagree to your ruling, Sir.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member, in accordance with Standing Order 171, cannot move for the suspension of the Standing Order until this motion has been disposed of.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well, I certainly move to disagree to that ruling.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have warned the honourable member that he cannot take further part in this debate until this motion has been disposed of.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well, I ask you for your authority for doing that, because there is nothing in Standing Orders, and you have not pointed to anything yet. Is there anything in Erskine May which says this?

The SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member is persistently and continually going to disregard the ruling I have given, I will simply have to apply Standing Orders again. I have already pointed out that, as regards giving an explanation, the honourable member has not complied with Standing Order 171.

Mr. Millhouse: It wasn't even a formal explanation.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member cannot move until such time as this debate has been disposed of.

Mr. MATHWIN: I support the motion of the Leader of the Opposition, and I do so because of a complete misunderstanding that I suggest has occurred. Coming back to the events, I would not wish to blame any member in particular, but I suggest, with due respect, that a mistake has been made by both the member for Mitcham and you, Mr. Speaker, as a result of a complete misunderstanding. The position was that the member for Mitcham sat down when a point of order was taken by the member for Hanson and, when the member for Hanson had completed explaining his point of order, the member for Mitcham and the member for Victoria stood up simultaneously. The member for Mitcham, as a result of your ruling, was not allowed to continue to speak. I suggest, quite honourably, to you, Sir, that you thought (and I am sure that it was a genuine mistake) that the member for Mitcham had concluded his speech. However, the position was that he had not finished speaking, and that is the crux of the whole matter: that is when all the trouble and confusion began. You, Mr. Speaker, believed that an explanation had been made, and you told the member for Mitcham that he would have to withdraw from the House. Confusion then arose then, when three or four members took points of order more or less at the same time. The Treasurer was on his feet speaking, and he, too, was under a misunderstanding. It was chaos at that stage, and every member was grasping at straws; it was a heated situation. The member for Mitcham, quite rightly, thought that his position had been upset and, in the heat of the moment, took the bull by the horns, as it were. True, the Minister of Education said that that was naughty, but the Minister himself is quick to lose his temper at times. I remember one time when we were crossing the Chamber, and when, if I had said another word to him, he would have hit me.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Why don't you—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MATHWIN: Why must we find excuses for people who lose their tempers? I suggest that it has all been a complete misunderstanding. Genuine mistakes have been made by members who thought that the situation was somewhat different. The confusion began when the member for Victoria and the member for Mitcham were on their

feet. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to reconsider your attitude seriously and to accept the explanation given by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. EVANS: I reluctantly support the Leader's motion. I am sorry that we have reached this stage this evening, only a day or two days before what we hope will be the adjournment of Parliament. I think we have now set the stage so that when we come back you, Mr. Speaker, will be able to name members more quickly and dispose of some of them in a certain way, perhaps solving some of the problems we have had in the House. I genuinely believe that an error occurred earlier in the proceedings when the member for Victoria and the member for Mitcham both rose, the member for Mitcham believing that he had a right to continue and the member for Victoria believing that you were going to put the vote. I believe that that was when the error occurred. But the sort of thing which the member for Mitcham is doing now and which the member for Kavel and the Minister of Education have been doing is the cause of problems in the House.

If we are going to have control, those things must stop. The member for Mitcham, at the point when he thought he had the right to continue to speak, rose and refused to sit down while you, Mr. Speaker, were standing. I believe that you could have helped if you had asked him to resume his seat. Undoubtedly, in the time I have been a member, the member for Mitcham has been the greatest offender against Standing Orders in this Chamber, and there is no excuse for that. I believe that was the first incident involving a misunderstanding that finally caused the naming of the member for Mitcham, who was apparently asked to apologise. However, I do not believe that he was asked to apologise, and he just rambled on.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: As though he doesn't know Standing Orders.

Mr. EVANS: The Minister of Transport is doing much the same thing.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must return to the motion.

Mr. EVANS: The member for Mitcham rambled on, and that was taken as his explanation. No member has caused me more difficulty during the last year than has the member for Mitcham, and no member has stretched Standing Orders to the limit and abused them at times as much as the member for Mitcham has. However, I hope that when we come back, Mr. Speaker, you will say to each and every member, regardless of who it is, that there must be no interjections or the interjector will be named, and that you will be tough on that point, because that could solve our problems. Because we have ended up like rabble and made interjections when we felt like making them, we are all at fault. I support the motion reluctantly, because I believe there was a misunderstanding at the beginning. I accept the point that the member for Mitcham is childish in his approach to Standing Orders and believes that he has a divine right to do what he likes although other members do not have this right.

Mr. McANANEY: I have heard many explanations, but it is difficult to remember the order in which various things have taken place. It seems to me that the member for Mitcham has been in the House long enough to know what to do when he thinks he has been wrongly judged by you, Mr. Speaker, or by any member. Rather than take a point of order and try to make an explanation, he starts screaming like a frustrated old maid who has missed out on an expectation, behaves in a puerile manner, and abuses the Chair.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McANANEY: I have risen—

The SPEAKER: Order! I have ruled on the member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well, I am not going to stand for what he is saying.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am not going to stay in this House and be insulted by the member for Heysen or anyone else, whether I am—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —being judged or not.

Mr. McAnaney: I was praising you.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Heysen should behave to me as he does to other members.

The SPEAKER: Order! As no Standing Order of this House applies to this matter, I refer to Erskine May, whose interpretation of practice I will implement. I call the attention of the House to the fact that recourse to force is necessary in order to compel obedience to my direction, and I direct the Sergeant-at-Arms to remove the honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I make one more attempt: may I say that this has become an absolute farce.

The SPEAKER: Order! I order the Sergeant-at-Arms to remove the honourable member.

The member for Mitcham having left the Chamber:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I think I would be under-stating the situation if I said that this is the greatest shemozzle that this House has ever seen. The genesis of it was a misunderstanding, and a complete defiance of the authority of the Chair followed that misunderstanding. That situation is not denied, nor is defiance of the Chair condoned by me or other members. Unfortunately, the attitude of several Ministers, with their inane interjections and baiting of Opposition members, has not assisted the situation, nor have some of the statements made from this side.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You can say that again.

Dr. EASTICK: The manner in which the Minister of Transport is carrying on now is a fair indication of the situation, which has become ridiculous. Whilst the Minister continues his present behaviour, this situation will become an even greater shemozzle. I moved a substantive motion because, arising out of the confusion that has been acknowledged by both sides, an explanation of a sort was made by the member for Mitcham, having due regard to the difficulties which have arisen and which are not completely understood by any member now.

The Attorney-General showed that, when he gave what he claimed to be (and he was fair in his attempt) a chronological and detailed explanation of what had taken place, but in his explanation he failed to indicate that, associated with the events, the member for Victoria was on his feet and seeking from you, Mr. Speaker, at the same time as the member for Mitcham was on his feet, an opportunity to speak to the motion before the Chair. Tomorrow, all members will have the chance to have a proper look at the debate and all of the events as recorded by *Hansard*. I believe that the *Hansard* report is always truthful, and certainly it ill behoved the member for

Unley to make the comment he made about doctoring the report. I do not get any pleasure from seeking to remove the responsibility of the honourable member's actions by moving this motion, but I believe sincerely that, because of the sequence of events, members will support it.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: And support anarchy!

Dr. EASTICK: We see much anarchy when one or two Ministers on the front bench (who are past masters at it) defy the directions of the Chair and obtain discrimination and benefits denied many other members.

Mr. Venning: Hear, hear!

Dr. EASTICK: This has been a disastrous set of circumstances, but I believe it can best be corrected, but never erased, by supporting the motion.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (16)—Messrs. Arnold, Becker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick (teller), Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

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

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Allen and Blacker. Noes—Messrs. Corcoran and McRae.

Majority of 7 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

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

That the member for Mitcham be suspended from the services of the House for the remainder of this week's sittings.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Standing Order 171 prevails.

Mr. Coumbe: You said for one week?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: No, I said for the remainder of this week's sittings: the rest of this evening and tomorrow.

Mr. Dean Brown: That's absolutely disgusting.

Dr. Eastick: Sheer arrogance!

Motion carried.

The SPEAKER: The motion now before the House is:

That a Select Committee be appointed consisting of Messrs. Dunstan, Eastick, Gunn, Payne, and Wright.

Motion carried.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN moved:

That the committee have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to adjourn from place to place; the committee to report on February 19, 1975.

Motion carried.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN RAILWAYS COMMISSIONER'S ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 26. Page 2251.)

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): In rising to speak to the Bill I wish to make clear that the Opposition supports the principle outlined in the Minister's explanation but parts company with the Minister regarding clause 4. The Minister, in his explanation, stated:

As members may be aware, further renovations have been carried out to the Overland dining-room at the station. The Railways Commissioner has proposed that full advantage should be taken of these upgraded dining-room facilities by the introduction of dinner dances open to the general public and the extension of catering services to wedding receptions, private parties and similar functions. By extending the closing hours on Mondays to Saturdays from 10 o'clock in the evening to 12 midnight, this measure would enable the Commissioner to give effect to that proposal.

The Opposition entirely supports that proposal. Most members on this side of the House have visited the railway station and taken advantage of the facilities provided by the Railways Commissioner. Members have done this on a Thursday evening or at other times during the session but, more particularly, on occasions when the House is not sitting. Members are always well treated and the prices are reasonable. The Minister continued:

Secondly, the Railways Commissioner has proposed that he be able to dispense liquor with meals to passengers on the railways and the general public on Sundays.

We do not disagree with that provision, because hotels and clubs enjoy that privilege. However, the Opposition parts company with the Minister's following statement:

The Government also considers that the sale of bottled liquor to the considerable number of persons who pass through the Adelaide railway station daily should be permitted.

This is in deliberate opposition to hotel proprietors on North Terrace. I believe that the House has to consider that such people pay a substantial sum for their licences and have to provide other facilities to the public to maintain those licences. I understand this matter was not discussed with a representative of the hotel industry. Therefore, members on this side cannot support clause 4 and will take the appropriate action when the measure is considered in Committee. I am fully aware that railway catering services are facing problems. The Lees committee, which investigated a number of the activities of the South Australian Railways, referred to the refreshment and ancillary services at page 19 of its report, which states:

The purpose of the railway refreshment services is to provide refreshment to the travelling public.

We all agree with that. Obviously, facilities should also be made available to members of the public, but it should not be in direct competition with people engaged in the hotel industry. I realise the South Australian Railways is making sustantial losses on providing these services. The dining-room and cafeteria incurred a loss in 1972 of $25 000 and the No. 2 kiosk incurred a loss of $1 600. One or two other services also operated at a loss. The Opposition appreciates that the Minister and the Commissioner have a responsibility for operating services in the railway station and must take every step possible within reasonable bounds to rectify the losses. However, I do not believe they have the right to enter into direct competition with another industry that has to pay a substantial sum to remain in business. I need say nothing further except that the Opposition supports clauses 1 to 3, but does not agree to clause 4, which amends section 133 of the principal Act by empowering the making of by-laws relating to bottle sales from any bottle department established at the railway station. With those few remarks, I give my qualified support to the Bill.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): My comments will be similar to those of the member for Eyre. I will support the Bill at the second reading stage, so that I can obtain further information from the Minister in Committee. The Bill deals with extending the closing hours of the Overland dining-room on Monday to Saturday evenings from 10 p.m. to 12 midnight. Therefore, under this Bill, we are providing something that is not in line with provisions in the Licensing Act. In some cases, ordinary hotels and restaurants must

have a permit after 10 p.m. New subsection (2) of section 105 refers to the railway refreshment rooms at the Adelaide railway station and any other part of the Adelaide railway station set aside for the purpose. I wonder whether this provision is meant to include the Overland Tavern. Will the Tavern now be able to stay open to 12 midnight from Mondays to Saturdays? I should like the Minister to clarify this point, as I do not think he is really suggesting that the Tavern should open for those hours. I support the suggestion that the dining-room should be upgraded, with provision for dinner dances, and so on. However, I do not think the Tavern should be able to be open until 12 midnight on Monday to Saturday evenings.

I support the provision dealing with the supply of liquor to passengers with their meals, as I think this is civilised. The Bill refers to sealed containers that may be sold, although the second reading explanation refers to bottled liquor. Of course, sealed containers could include cans. I believe it is wrong in principle to operate a bottle shop near the Tavern on the main concourse, or thereabouts, at the Adelaide railway station. The Attorney-General referred to the problem of selling liquor in containers when we were considering the licensing legislation. There is the question of protecting hotels, with regard to bottle sales, from licensed clubs, and other outlets. It would be inappropriate to have a bottle shop at the Adelaide railway station. Members of the travelling public who wish to buy liquor in containers to take on the train (and they can do this on suburban journeys, as well as on journeys to the country and other States) need only go across the road to the Strathmore Hotel, for instance, or to any other nearby hotel to buy their liquor supply. A bottle shop at the railway station would strike at the heart of bottle sales at the Strathmore, although I use that simply as an example, having had no representation from it.

It is wrong to provide for a bottle shop at the Adelaide railway station because of the effect it would have on hotel sales, and to establish such a shop in this case would be inconsistent with what is being done under the Licensing Act. Although I support the other measures in the Bill, I think the provision relating to the sale of liquor in sealed containers goes a bit too far. I will not canvass the quesion of people taking liquor on trains, as that is another subject altogether, and people can obtain liquor anywhere. It could well be that, from a social point of view, the Minister would regret providing for a bottle shop at the Adelaide railway station. I hope that the Minister will reply to my query about the Tavern.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): In supporting the Bill, I also support the remarks of the previous two speakers. I see an advantage in using fully the facilities of the dining-room at the Adelaide railway station. In accordance with modern transport practices, it is wise to have available good catering facilities, with meals provided at all hours at main traffic terminals. These days it is necessary to have a bar. I find it difficult to oppose establishing a bottle department at the Adelaide railway station, although I would not be terribly happy about it. At the Adelaide Airport good bar facilities are provided, with an extensive bottle department having a range of liquor that probably would not be envisaged at the Adelaide railway station. At the Adelaide Airport, mainly wines and liqueurs in gift packs are available. I would not like to think that the South Australian Railways was going into competition with hotels, although I do not really fear that.

What I fear is a return to the position that obtained at the station many years ago. It was regrettable that after certain hours a type of person would frequent the concourse, and railway detectives had a problem controlling the behaviour of these people. I would not like to think that, if alcoholic drinks were available and a bottle department was provided, people would hang around after closing time. I do not think that that happens now.

Of course, the dining-room will be a first-class restaurant type of facility and we need have no fear about patrons there. I realise the merit and need for the bottle department. We must upgrade the facilities at our only railway terminal to meet the needs of people who have to wait at the railway station for other trains, and the improvement of our interstate trains, together with the standardisation of our railway gauges, will make travelling by train more popular. The different gauges and change-overs have made it fairly difficult to operate a coast-to-coast service efficiently. It must be extremely difficult and frustrating for the catering staff to know how many people to cater for at any one time. On page 201 of the Auditor-General's Report for 1973-74, under the heading "Catering and trading services", the Auditor-General states:

> The operations of catering and trading services for the year resulted in an overall deficit of $190 000 compared with a deficit of $138 000 in 1972-73.

It is fair and reasonable that the Railways Commissioner, having a deficit of that kind, should seek ways in which to use fully the facilities at the railway station so as to try to reduce that deficit. The Auditor-General also states:

> Departmental shops (which include the Tavern) situated at Adelaide station showed a surplus of $43 000 compared with $48 000 for the previous year, but there were losses on the Adelaide station dining-room and cafeteria of $99 000 ($65 000, 1972-73).

This is the crux of the Bill, and I see its point. The extension of hours for the dining-room will not provide any difficulty. We are merely bringing the hours into line with normal restaurant hours, and the provision of meals there on Sundays is an excellent idea, because people travelling to other destinations must wait at the station. The only matter about which I am concerned is the sale of bottles. We used to catch the 6.5 p.m. drunks' special to Brighton and we used to get our bottles of beer at the nearest hotel. Now people travelling to the suburbs take their beer home in a briefcase. Human nature is involved in the policing of a bottle department, but I think the merits outweigh the possible difficulties.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I support the Bill, except in regard to the matter raised by the member for Eyre, which is dealt with in clause 4. The Minister said in his explanation that the Railways Commissioner intended that full advantage should be taken of the upgraded railway facilities by introducing dinner dances open to the general public, catering services, and wedding reception facilities, and by providing for parties and similar functions. I assume that catering facilities will be provided outside and that the railway premises also will be open. I wonder whether a bride would have to catch a train, coach or bee-line bus to the reception centre. Then she would have to walk down the stairs.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: She could go down in the lift.

Mr. MATHWIN: There would not be much objection to that if the department redecorated the lift. However, brides are usually choosey, and I wonder how many brides will walk down all those stairs in a white wedding gown. We may have parking difficulties similar to those now being experienced by people who get married at the new office in King William Street. People there have to go out and

delay a bus so that the bride's car can park. The Minister may provide special parking facilities near the railway station.

Closing hours will be extended from 10 p.m. to midnight from Monday to Saturday, and I agree with this change. I was not able to find out at what time the facilities opened, but I should hope that they would be open at the same time as other licensed premises opened. The Bill with which we dealt recently provided that hotels had to open at 9 a.m.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: No.

Mr. MATHWIN: It was a 10-hour period. I hope that they will have to abide by the same rules as the hotels. The matter of meals on Sundays has already been well canvassed. I agree with this provision, because people need these facilities, but I part company with the Minister regarding the provision contained in clause 4. The Minister suggested the possibility of people drinking near the premises, the reason being that they will be able to obtain bottles and remove them from the premises. The Bill provides for the sale of liquor in sealed containers from the Overland Tavern, or, etc. Did the Minister intend to include "or", which could mean from a bottle department established at the station? As well as the nuisance angle, the railways would be in strict competition with nearby hotels.

I know that the Minister would be only too pleased to laud the fact that we support private enterprise, which is only healthy competition. However, the railways, as a nationalised industry, would be protected and, if the system made a loss, it would be made up by the taxpayers. In this case, the taxpayers could be subsidising the project, and that would be unfair competition to the hotels and to private enterprise adjacent to the station. For those reasons, I oppose clause 4, although I am pleased to support the remainder of the Bill.

Mr. RUSSACK (Gouger): I support what other speakers have said and commend the meal service provided at the railway station, where I, together with other members, have enjoyed many meals. However, I am concerned at the provisions of new subsection (2) of section 105, which provides:

The Commissioner may, at the railway refreshment rooms at the Adelaide railway station and any other part of the Adelaide railway station set aside for the purpose, without obtaining any licence or permit, sell or supply subject to the appropriate by-laws made pursuant to this Act, liquor in sealed containers and not for consumption within those refreshment rooms or such other part of the Adelaide railway station to any person between the hours of eight o'clock in the morning and ten o'clock in the evening on any day except Sunday or Good Friday.

That is a wide provision and one which I do not support. In his second reading explanation, the Minister said:

The Government also considers that the sale of bottled liquor to the considerable number of persons who pass through the Adelaide railway station daily should be permitted.

It is one thing to provide a service for the travelling public, but I interpret the provision as meaning that the patronage of the hundreds of people who pass through the station daily will be solicited as passing trade and that it will not be used primarily for the purpose of providing a necessary service for the travelling public. I, together with other Opposition members, oppose the provision.

Mr. WARDLE (Murray): Why has the Minister chosen to open the railway station every night until midnight, whereas I believe that the Act, which was amended by the Attorney-General a few weeks ago, provides for only Friday and Saturday trading until midnight? Should not the competition be fair in this regard? Is there much evidence to prove that a demand exists for bottles to be taken away from the railway station when hotels are close handy across the road?

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): I oppose this provision, because I believe that the facilities at the railway station are adequate for the public. This move by the Minister to change the *status quo* I take to be a further socialistic move by the Government. Hotels on North Terrace supply the needs of the public, in respect of both accommodation and liquor. If the Bill is passed, it will take away some of the services the North Terrace hotels provide to the community. I believe that the present set-up at the station has already cut into the business of the North Terrace hotels. The station was set up to provide a service to the travelling public, and that is where I believe the matter should end. I oppose the provision.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I oppose the provision to allow bottles to be sold at the station. We have problems with alcohol throughout the world. I know that people can buy liquor from the North Terrace hotels and take it on to the trains, but the Bill would encourage and make it easier for passengers to buy and take drinks on to trains, on which the guards would have to worry about whether they consumed the liquor on them. People already do this, but the provision in the Bill will make it one step easier. I appreciate the services given at the station in other fields and we are giving the Railways Department a greater opportunity to use its dining facilities by allowing the station to sell liquor at later hours. I would prefer not to see the provision allowing for the sale of bottled liquor, and I will vote against it.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport): First, to correct the member for Murray, we are not providing anything for the Railways Department which is better than what is now provided for the hotels. The legislation the Attorney-General recently introduced provides the authority for hotels to keep their bars open until midnight on Fridays and Saturdays, but the Bill does not extend the Tavern's trading hours. The Bill simply gives the station the right to serve liquor with meals in the dining-room until midnight on six nights of the week. The comparable position in the hotels is that they can serve liquor six nights a week, not until midnight, but as late as 1.30 a.m. on Fridays and Saturdays. We are not giving the Tavern equality with hotels. Opposition members also suggested that to establish a bottle shop would be detrimental to the hotel industry, but I remind them that only one hotel is situated in North Terrace at a reasonable distance from the railway station.

Mr. Coumbe: There will be another soon.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: That is correct. However, if Opposition members are genuine in their efforts to preserve the business of the existing hotel, perhaps we should do away with a bottle shop in the new hotel. What would the attitude of Opposition members be to other services provided at the railway station? Should we take away the barber shop and make those who want a haircut walk up the street? Should we shut the cafeteria and make everyone go up Bank Street? Should we shut the cake shop and make everyone walk to Balfour's or somewhere else? The Railways Department is trying to enter this service in the same way as it has entered other services. In reply to the member for Torrens, I cannot give a legal interpretation of the Act or the Bill, but from the instructions given to the Parliamentary Counsel (and my reading of them), it is plain that we are amending section 105 of the principal Act, which provides:

The Commissioner may, at the railway refreshment rooms at the Adelaide railway station, without obtaining any licence or permit, sell or supply, subject to the appropriate by-laws made pursuant to this Act, liquor for consumption within those refreshment rooms to any person between the hours of eight o'clock in the morning and ten o'clock in the evening on any day except Sunday or Good Friday.

That section is being amended to include the hour of midnight, but it is plain that that will apply within the railway refreshment rooms. Clause 4 of the Bill deals with by-laws and this is a crucial provision. I can assure the member for Torrens that the Government intends that the Tavern will trade for the same hours as now apply and that the bottle shop will have the same hours, namely, to 10 p.m., but the dining-room facility available for those who wish to have a meal will remain open to midnight Monday to Saturday, and will be able to serve liquor with meals on Sunday.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Sale of liquor at Adelaide Railway Station."

Mr. COUMBE: I move:

To strike out new subsection (2).

It seems that the effect of this measure is to allow the Commissioner to construct a bottle shop at the Adelaide railway station. The Minister's references to the barber shop, cafeteria, and other facilities were facetious, because here we are dealing with a subject that is controlled by the Licensing Act: that is, the sale of liquor in bottles. This Bill gives the Commissioner the right to sell liquor, although he is not to be controlled by the Licensing Act in many respects. But the sale of intoxicating liquors in containers is thought to be so important by this and other States that the various licensing Acts contain a large section governing the sale of liquor in sealed containers. Indeed, some clubs are prohibited from selling liquor in sealed containers. When speaking recently on the Licensing Act Amendment Bill, the Attorney-General made a strong plea that trade should not be taken away from the hotels by the clubs, yet here the Government is taking trade away from the hotels.

I have enjoyed and hope to continue to enjoy facilities in both the dining-room and the Tavern, but surely the Railways Department has not got to the position of relying on the sale of bottled and canned liquor to survive. Many passengers on the Overland can use the facilities provided by the club car, and the department would not have to rely on the sale of bottled liquor and canned liquor to keep going. I am sorry that I have not had time to let the Minister know of my amendment, but he has the sense of what I mean.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport): I am not fussy about the amendment not being available. I know what the Deputy Leader is trying to do. It is a simple matter of extending the licensing provisions to allow bottled or sealed containers to be sold. The Government's attitude is that the facilities should be provided and the Opposition's attitude is that they should not: it is simply a matter of opinion.

Mr. GUNN: I support the amendment. It is clear that the Minister is unwilling to accept a proper and reasonable amendment. I do not believe it is up to the Railways Department to engage in direct competition with people in the industry. Hotels must pay substantial fees under the Licensing Act and provide liquor services with meals. For the Railways Department to enter yet another commercial activity is not the right thing to do.

Mr. BECKER: Will the bottle shop at the railway station be along the lines of a normal hotel, or will it be similar to the facility provided at West Beach at the Adelaide Airport?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: A final decision has not yet been taken. We must first determine whether Parliament is willing to pass the legislation. Appropriate steps can then be taken. I do not foresee the Adelaide Airport type of operation being used, because that is really a shop window for South Australian wines and would not be the function of the Adelaide railway station. The department would be catering principally to the metropolitan traveller who, after a day's work, wishes to have a couple of beers in the Tavern and to buy a couple of bottles of cold beer to take home and drink with his wife during dinner. It could be argued that he could go to the Strathmore Hotel, but people come to the railway station and have to wait around for perhaps 20 minutes, during which they can drink a couple of beers at the Tavern, buy a couple of bottles, and catch a train home. People should have that facility.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

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

Noes (22)—Messrs. Broomhill and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Crimes, Duncan, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, McKee, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo (teller), Wells, and Wright.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Becker and Blacker. Noes—Messrs. Corcoran and McRae.

Majority of 5 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Clause 4 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LISTENING DEVICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

FORESTRY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This short Bill is intended to resolve certain difficulties that have arisen in relation to the application of the principal Act, the Forestry Act, 1950-1956, to forest reserves. As members will appreciate, generally the dedication of land as forest reserve is intended to be a permanent one. However, at times it is necessary that all or portion of a forest reserve be released for some other use. As the law stands at the moment forest reserves have been established (*a*) under the Crown Lands Act, as to which, see section 5 (*f*) (III) of that Act; or (*b*) under one of the Acts antecedent to the present Forestry Act.

Little difficulty has been found in relation to forest reserves established under the Crown Lands Act, since machinery exists under that Act to release land on the rare occasions when it has been required. However, there is no power at all to release any forest reserve established under Acts antecedent to the present Forestry Act. A further complication has occurred in that the present definition of "forest reserve" under the Forestry Act provides that "any land vested in the Minister of Forests, or held

by him under licence" is forest reserve. This has led to the somewhat unexpected result that, for instance, dwelling houses vested in the Minister of Forests have become "forest reserves" by virtue of the operation of that definition, and as a result of the operation of the proviso to section 16 of the Forestry Act the power of the Minister to dispose of such property has been restricted. As the remainder of the explanation deals with the clauses, I ask that it be inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF CLAUSES

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends section 2 of the principal Act by striking out the present definition of "forest reserve" and inserting a new definition of "forest reserve" and also by including a definition of "Crown lands". This new definition of "forest reserve" is in aid of proposed new section 2b of the principal Act. Clause 4 proposes the insertion of sections 2a, 2b and 2c. Proposed section 2a in effect provides that until a former forest reserve is declared under proposed section 2b it shall cease to be a forest reserve. Proposed section 2b provides for the declaration of forest reserves and also provides for the removal of land from a forest reserve. It is proposed that this removal will be subject to Parliamentary approval because, as has already been mentioned, forest reserves are generally expected to be dedicated in perpetuity.

The combined effect of these two clauses is to, as it were, wipe the slate clean and enable the existing forest reserves to be redefined and to be readily ascertainable. Proposed new section 2c validates what are thought to be somewhat doubtful releases of forest reserves, being purported resumptions under the Crown Lands Act of land that had been dedicated, not under the Crown Lands Act, but under Acts antecedent to the present Forestry Act. Clause 5 amends section 16 of the principal Act by validating purported transfers of property that may have been invalid by virtue of the operation of the proviso to section 16 adverted to above.

Mr. RODDA secured the adjournment of the debate.

ARTIFICIAL BREEDING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

For some little time now it has become apparent that the Artificial Breeding Board established under the principal Act, the Artificial Breeding Act, 1961-1974, can no longer provide the services it was established for and at the same time remain financially solvent. Evidence of this situation may be obtained from a perusal of the Auditor-General's Report for the financial year ended June 30, 1974, at page 244. Two reasons are suggested for the present situation: first, the growth of "private" inseminators and the demonstrated preference of users for their products with a corresponding decline in the demand for board semen; and secondly, the necessarily high and irreducible overhead of the board with a resultant worsening of its financial position.

With the foregoing in mind the board has proposed to the Government that an arrangement be entered into with the Victorian Artificial Breeders Co-operative Society, an organisation having experience in this work, to the end that the organisation carries out such of the functions of the board as are still economically viable in combination with its own activities. In the circumstances the Government agrees that such a proposal is probably the best solution to the problem, since it will still leave the board in existence so that if, at some time in the future, there is a demonstrated need for a resumption of some or all of its activities the legal framework will be there.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 3 of the principal Act and sets out the definitions necessary for the purposes of the Bill. Clause 3 amends section 22 of the principal Act by providing the machinery to, if necessary, give effect to proposed new section 24a. Section 22 deals with the making of land and facilities of the Crown or a public authority available to the board. Clause 4 by inserting a new section 24a in the principal Act empowers the board, with the approval of the Minister, to enter into an agreement of the kind referred to in that section. Clause 5 provides an appropriate regulation-making power to ensure that only semen from proven sires is used in artificial insemination programmes.

Mr. DEAN BROWN secured the adjournment of the debate.

EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

PRICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following suggested amendment:

Page 4 (clause 11)—After line 35 insert "which duty may be denoted by an adhesive stamp".

Consideration in Committee.

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

That the Legislative Council's suggested amendment be agreed to.

It provides that the duty to be denoted under clause 11 may be denoted by an adhesive stamp. Although the Government would prefer that this did not happen, I do not think the change made by the Legislative Council is serious enough to provoke disagreement between the two Chambers. Therefore, I intend to accept the amendment.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I am pleased that the Treasurer has accepted the amendment. This matter was discussed when we dealt with the Bill previously. The Treasurer's explanation then was not completely acceptable to people outside. I am not surprised that their voice has been heard in another place.

Motion carried.

[Midnight]

ADELAIDE FESTIVAL CENTRE TRUST ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 20. Page 2109.)

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): This is a short Bill and I support it. It reduces from two to one the number of trustees appointed from the Adelaide City Council, and the total number of trustees is six. Because of another amendment made to legislation, the council has been relieved of much liability in connection with the Adelaide Festival Theatre. However, I am pleased that one representative of the council has been left on the trust. That

is good, because the council has played an important part in this matter. I understand that this is not a hybrid Bill and, therefore, will not have to go to a Select Committee.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): That is correct.

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

Later:

Bill returned from the Legislative council without amendment.

BUSINESS FRANCHISE (PETROLEUM) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following suggested amendments:

No. 1. Page 3, lines 30 to 33 (clause 4)—Leave out all words in these lines and insert " 'relevant period' in relation to an application for a licence means the period commencing on and including the first day of July, 1974, and concluding on and including the thirty-first day of December, 1974."

No. 2. Page 6, line 32 (clause 11)—Leave out "On and from the twenty-fourth day of March, 1975," and insert "During the period commencing on and including the twenty-fourth day of March, 1975 and concluding on and including the twenty-third day of September, 1975."

No. 3. Page 9, line 14 (clause 14)—Leave out "twenty-fourth day of March, 1976", and insert "twenty-fourth day of September, 1975."

No. 4. Page 9, lines 15 and 16 (clause 14)—Leave out "ended on the thirtieth day of June, 1974."

No. 5. Page 9, lines 29 and 30 (clause 14)—Leave out "period of twelve months ended the thirtieth day of June next preceding the twenty-fourth day of March" and insert "relevant period".

No. 6. Page 10, lines 30 to 36 (clause 14)—Leave out all words in these lines.

No. 7. Page 10, line 39 (clause 14)—Leave out "three-quarters" and insert "one half".

No. 8. Page 11, lines 25 to 46 (clause 18)—Leave out all words in these lines and insert—

"(2) the instalment referred to in subsection (1) of this section shall be two in number the first being due and payable before the grant of the licence and the second being due and payable before the expiration of the third month next following that grant."

No. 9. Page 12, lines 32 to 44 (clause 20)—Leave out the clause, and page 13, lines 1 to 6.

Consideration in Committee.

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

That the Legislative Council's suggested amendments be disagreed to.

The effect of the suggested amendments is to restrict the relevant period in respect of the calculation of the amount of licence fee to six months, from July 1, 1974, to December 31, 1974, and to restrict the period of operation of the licence from March 24, 1975, to September 23, 1975, and they appear to be entirely arbitrary dates. The effect of the suggested amendments is twofold. First, it would be impossible to administer a licensing system where the period of the licensing is as short as is proposed, and where there is no clarity whatever as to how the licence will operate or whether it will operate from year to year.

What is more, it is necessary constitutionally for a licence of this kind to be for an indefinite period. This has been clear in a series of cases. Because the State's constitutional authority to access to this kind of taxation is an extremely delicate matter, it was necessary for the Parliamentary Counsel and Crown Law officers to work closely in concert with constitutional lawyers and advisers of the New South Wales Government in order to prepare this measure. I point out that the history of the failure of measures of this kind constitutionally in the past is long and, for the States, unhappy.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Tasmania won its case.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It did not win the case on the basis proposed by the Legislative Council. I point out that a previous attempt by South Australia, under the Gunn Government, to impose a petrol franchise tax failed in the 1920's before the High Court as an excise tax. The Dennis Hotels case, which is the general case for franchising taxes by the States, makes clear that what is proposed by the Legislative Council would completely defeat the measure. Mr. Justice Menzies was in both majorities in that case, because one group of judges found that the permanent section for licensing was not an excise tax, and a majority of judges also found that the temporary licences were invalid as being excise taxes. The majority judgment makes clear that the Council's proposition would completely defeat this measure.

If the Council intends to defeat the Bill and to refuse the State the necessary revenue to pay the bills for the people who are at present employed by it, and to continue our services, let those members stand up and be counted; let them refuse the Bill and be charged with the responsibility of sacking people in the employ of the State. If they are not willing to do that, let us not accept that they do it by the back door by simply writing in amendments that make the whole measure unconstitutional. If that is what they intend to do (if they are setting out to destroy the measure), let them stand up and be counted on their defeat of the Bill. Let us not have any of the hanky-panky going on here. The Legislative Council must know (and those members have been told this clearly) that this kind of amendment to the Bill will mean that it will be defeated in a challenge to the High Court.

Mr. Coumbe: Will you give the details of why you say that is so?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The details arise from the fact that a temporary licence will be held by the court not to be a valid exercise of a franchising power, and that has been found specifically previously.

Mr. Coumbe: And you maintain that this wording makes it temporary?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Of course it does; it makes it for a very limited period. It is not an indefinite period, as was specifically prescribed in the judgments of the judges in the Dennis Hotels case and repeated by the judges in the Tasmanian tobacco case. Our Crown Law officers were in concert over a long period looking carefully at this measure. As it is, we know that the New South Wales measure will be challenged. What the Bill has been designed to do is stick carefully within the judgments already laid down in the High Court. The suggested amendments will take it clearly outside those judgments and can only be designed simply to defeat the measure.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): The histrionics we have just seen should be levelled against the whole genesis of this measure. We have been told that the State will find it difficult to balance its Budget because of the failure of the Commonwealth Government to supply the funds it had promised.

Mr. Nankivell: The $6 000 000 that the Treasurer spoke about.

Dr. EASTICK: Yes. The Government has consistently failed to admit that it misread the economic climate. It has failed to admit that it punted and lost when it prepared its Budget. It has failed to acknowledge that, three weeks after it introduced the Budget in this place, it included other proposals when the Budget was dealt with in another place.

It has consistently failed to accept that, by taking several actions in relation to land, there would be a down-turn—

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, we are considering the Legislative Council's suggested amendments. If the Leader intends to reintroduce a second reading debate, I suggest that we are not dealing with what is now before members.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the honourable Leader to deal with the amendments.

Dr. EASTICK: I am doing that and pointing out why the Bill was introduced in the first place. I am also pointing out that it has been stated consistently, publicly and in this House, that we are in a difficult financial situation for 1974-75 because of mismanagement by this Government and the failure of the Commonwealth Government to make funds available.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable Leader to confine his remarks to the suggested amendments.

Dr. EASTICK: I will have no difficulty in doing that. It is clear that this State is seeking to provide funds for 1974-75 to offset the mismanagement and the failure of the Commonwealth Government to provide funds. Therefore, it is consistent to accept a situation that raises funds for the State on that basis and, as the Government has the opportunity to rearrange its priorities and reassess its position for 1975-76 and thereafter, it should not need this oppressive legislation that has been stated publicly to be for 1974-75.

Dr. TONKIN: The Treasurer has dealt thoroughly with the difference between an excise and a true franchise tax and he tried to lay at the door of the Legislative Council some form of blame for the mess into which this State has been guided under his helmsmanship, untenable though it may be. If the suggested amendments restrict the application of the tax or excise (and I do not care which it is) for six months, as they do, there is no harm in them and the whole idea commends itself to me. I do not like the tax much anyway, and I support the suggested amendments. No blame can be attached to the Legislative Council. If blame is to be laid anywhere, it must be laid at the direct sources of the trouble. One source is at the feet of the Treasurer, who has been trying desperately to find ways to raise revenue, and the other source is at the feet of the Commonwealth Government, which has not honoured its promises.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The suggested amendments appeal to me. They take the permanence out of what everyone agrees is a most objectionable tax. The Treasurer imputed to the Legislative Council the motive that, by a backdoor method, it sought to defeat the legislation. I do not accept that at face value. The Treasurer may have information that I and other members on this side have not got, but I am not convinced by his emotional display that he may have given us the final answer about these suggested amendments. With heat, he has expounded on previous court cases. He may be right and he may be wrong, but certainly he will not induce me to reject the amendments out of hand by the emotional display he has given. He has said that the Legislative Council is seeking to defeat the Bill. Other people in his own Party would seek to defeat it.

Mr. Langley: Name one.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Dunford. A report in this magazine—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member to confine his remarks to the Legislative Council's suggested amendments.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Other people wish to defeat the Bill, and I have been invited to say who they are. I have pointed out that Dunford, who intends to enter the Chamber to which the Treasurer has referred, is referred to in this way:

. . . and when he, Dunford,—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: —feels it necessary—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member to link his remarks to the suggested amendments.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Let me finish the quotation.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have ruled that out of order, and I ask the honourable member to confine his remarks to the suggested amendments.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: On what basis do you rule me out of order, when the Treasurer has stated that the Legislative Council seeks to defeat the Bill by making these suggested amendments? What nonsense!

The CHAIRMAN: The question is—

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am pointing out that there are in the community people who would like to see this Bill defeated. The Treasurer has accused the Legislative Council of trying, by these suggested amendments, to defeat the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: We are discussing the suggested amendments.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: So am I.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the honourable member to confine his remarks to the amendments.

Mr. Gunn: That's what he's doing.

Dr. Tonkin: He's never left them.

The CHAIRMAN: I warn the honourable member for Eyre.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: On a point of order, the member for Eyre did not speak. He did not speak at the point at which you warned him. Therefore, I think it only right and proper that you should withdraw the warning.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the honourable member for Eyre whether he made the remark.

Mr. GUNN: Prior—

The CHAIRMAN: Did you, or did you not?

Mr. GUNN: You asked me a question.

The CHAIRMAN: I want "Yes" or "No".

Dr. Tonkin: "Have you stopped beating your wife?"

The CHAIRMAN: Order! It is a plain question: "Yes" or "No"?

Mr. GUNN: I will answer it in my own way or I will not answer it at all. Surely that is a proper course of action. I ask whether I am permitted to answer it.

The CHAIRMAN: "Yes" or "No".

Mr. GUNN: No. I cannot answer that unless I can explain.

The CHAIRMAN: The question before the Chair is "That the amendments of the Legislative Council be disagreed to."

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The article continues:

We had this recently when the South Australian Premier Don Dunstan proposed a surcharge of 6c—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: In speaking to these amendments the Treasurer has suggested that the Legislative Council has moved the amendments in order to defeat

the Bill. I believe that that is an untrue accusation and, to illustrate this point, I point out that I was challenged by Government members to name any member of the Party who was opposed to the legislation. In referring to the specific point made by the Treasurer, I am referring to Mr. Jim Dunford, who is quoted as opposing the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The honourable member was ruled out of order by you, Sir. He rose on a point of order, and you ruled on it. At that stage he did not take any motion, and no motion has been put for disagreement to your ruling. Therefore, no motion is now competent under Standing Orders for disagreement to your ruling. Your ruling stands, and the honourable member is persistently defying it.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the honourable member to confine his remarks to the amendments.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I have not been on my feet on a point of order; the member for Davenport has. I completely refute the Treasurer's argument that the Legislative Council has moved these amendments for the sole purpose of defeating the Bill. If the Treasurer believes that is the effect of the amendments, that may be a different situation. I am certainly far from convinced by what the Treasurer has said so far that that would be the effect of the amendments. I believe that the Treasurer (certainly members of his own Party, including Mr. Jim Dunford) would like to think that this regressive tax would not be permanent. I believe the Legislative Council's intention is that the import of the amendments is to ensure that the legislation does not become permanent, but is something in the style of the prices legislation. Some people believe that the Prices Act is undesirable, and I believe that is why that legislation is considered annually. The effect of these amendments is to ensure that the legislation will come under the scrutiny of Parliament regularly. If the Treasurer is unwilling to accept these amendments in that light, I believe he is being completely unjust in his approach to them. Until I have further evidence as to the legality or otherwise of what is proposed, I intend to support the amendments.

Mr. EVANS: I support the Legislative Council's amendments and oppose the Treasurer's motion. This tax was introduced because the State was in a critical financial position. The tax is to cover a specific problem we have this year as a result of high inflation and a deficit of over $36 000 000, unless the Government can find other areas in which to raise the revenue. Inflation is still increasing. It is because the Treasurer's colleagues in the Commonwealth Government fail to recognise—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member must come back to the amendments we are discussing.

Mr. EVANS: I am discussing these amendments; that is the reason for the Bill, and the Treasurer has admitted that. Now the Treasurer tells us that, because of the Dennis Hotels case, if these amendments are accepted the Act could be ruled to be invalid, if challenged. Can the Treasurer say whether the Act unamended, as introduced in the Upper House, has ever been challenged? Doubts exist whether it is valid. We are looking for a temporary tax to cover a year in which, through bad State administration in particular, we are placed in a bad situation with regard to our economy.

The Government has the opportunity on a short-term basis to overcome the problem into which it has got itself and the State. It rests on the Government's shoulders, but it wants to make a temporary tax a permanent tax. Surely that is not the purpose of the legislation. Surely the Government is not saying that we must face this imposition year in and year out. Who has ever heard of a tax being rescinded, unless it had been brought in for a short time, providing a specific time during which Parliament must review it? We know that once this legislation is placed on the Statute Book it will be there until the present Administration is out of office. I do not really believe that the Treasurer can claim that the Dennis Hotels case and the amendments now before us are identical.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Can the Treasurer say who is likely to challenge the New South Wales legislation? He has said that it will be challenged and it is therefore only reasonable for him to say who is putting forward that challenge, so that we will know whether a similar challenge is likely to be made in South Australia. Having seen the judgment handed down by Menzies J. in the Dennis Hotels case *versus* Victoria, I do not believe that what the Treasurer has said could be upheld. I accept that the Treasurer has said that a temporary tax would be illegal under the Australian Constitution, but I do not believe that under his definition of a temporary tax the amendments could be described as such. I challenge what the Treasurer has said.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am unaware of precisely who is going to challenge the New South Wales legislation, because I have not been given the precise names by the New South Wales Government. That Government's solicitors have told us that it has known that a challenge will be taken.

Mr. Coumbe: On what grounds?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: On the ground that it is an excise.

Mr. Goldsworthy: And theirs is similar to ours?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Our Bill is based on the New South Wales Act.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: What guarantee is there?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The guarantee is that it has been carefully drawn by the Crown Law officers of both States out of the judgments in the Dennis Hotels case and the Tasmania tobacco case. Until the Tasmanian tobacco case, it was thought that the franchise licensing system was probably confined to liquor licensing. In the Tasmanian tobacco case, it was held that a franchising system was available in relation to consumer franchising generally. The confines of any such operation are strict indeed, according to the judgments: so strict that, in the Dennis Hotels case, three of the judges held that both of the provisions of the Act under discussion, the permanent and the temporary licence, were invalid. Three judges held that they were both valid, and one judge held that the permanent licence was valid but the temporary licence was not valid. There was a majority to say that the temporary licence was not valid, and a majority to say that the permanent licence was valid. The permanent licence was the licence on which the Tasmanian case was based. There is a clear difficulty, but clearly the court has said in the Dennis Hotels case that a temporary licence was an excise because, during a temporary licence period, it must be expected that people were purchasing in respect of the period of their sales. Mr. Justice Menzies said that, in his judgment, in that case it became an excise. What is necessary for it to be non-excise is for it to be an undefined licence period and the fee to be fixed in respect of a previous period. That is the difficulty that the Legislative Council was warned about but, apparently, disregarded.

Dr. TONKIN: From what the Treasurer has said it is just as likely that the present legislation will be challenged. If it is on such thin ice, I do not see that we can depend on it. The other place has acted most responsibly in introducing these amendments to provide a stimulus to the Government by putting a limit (if it is to operate) of six months, during which it is clear that the Treasurer and his Government will have to take action to reduce their spending or to receive a fair share from the Commonwealth Government, so that they can bring back the administration of this State to a reasonable level.

Mr. Langley: Or sack people.

Dr. TONKIN: I will not be drawn into that argument. It is apparent that, unless this Administration has the incentive as proposed in the amendments, it will not take any responsible action to bring the economy of this State back to an even keel.

The Committee divided on the motion:

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

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

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Corcoran and McRae. Noes—Messrs. Blacker and Evans.

Majority of 4 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

The following reason for disagreement was adopted:

Because the suggested amendments make the measure unconstitutional.

Later:

The Legislative Council requested a conference, at which it would be represented by five managers, on its suggested amendments to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

The House of Assembly agreed to a conference, to be held in the Legislative Council conference room on Thursday, November 28, at 10 a.m., at which it would be represented by Messrs. Dunstan, Evans, King, Russack, and Wright.

Later:

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

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

Motion carried.

LAND AND BUSINESS AGENTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with an amendment.

SWINE COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendment and suggested amendment:

Page 2, line 38 (clause 4)—Leave out "excess" and insert "surplus".

Page 3, line 3 (clause 5)—Leave out "five" and insert "three".

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment be agreed to.

This is a drafting amendment.

Motion carried.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I move:

That the Legislative Council's suggested amendment be disagreed to and that the following alternative amendment be made:

Clause 5, page 2, line 43—Leave out "ten dollars or part of ten dollars" and insert "three dollars or part of three dollars".

Page 3, lines 3 and 4—Leave out "not exceeding five cents, as is prescribed" and insert "of one cent".

The purpose of the Legislative Council's amendment was to substitute for the duty payable into the fund a rate of 3c for each $10 or part thereof. The Legislative Council's suggested amendment, which has been made on that basis, is not entirely what the industry wants. As it is the industry's own money that is involved in these funds, the Government believes that it should proceed along the lines that the industry has suggested. The industry prefers a rate of duty of 1c for each $3 or part thereof (which is similar in total effect to a duty of 3c for each $10 or part thereof), as it believes that this gives a fairer result over the whole range of sales. The Government accepts the industry's point of view that this will give a more even gradation than would the Legislative Council's amendment. I think the industry has had second thoughts on the matter.

Mr. ALLEN: As this request has come from the industry, I accept the amendment.

Motion carried.

The following reason for disagreement was adopted:

Because the suggested amendment does not accord with the desires of the industry.

WHEAT INDUSTRY STABILISATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 29. Page 1730.)

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): I support the Bill, which is complementary to a Bill initiated at Commonwealth level, and similar legislation must be passed by all States before the Bill can operate. It interests me greatly when I read reports of statements made by people regarding this Bill. The Minister who introduced the Bill is reported as having said:

I thank honourable members for their contributions to the debate, in which they have stated quite categorically that this legislation is complementary to the Commonwealth legislation.

That is all perfectly clear and is known by everyone. The Minister continued:

This is the first occasion that the Labor Government has had the opportunity to negotiate a wheat stabilisation agreement ever.

I point out, however, that the original wheat stabilisation plan was drawn up by a Labor Government in Ben Chifley's days about 28 years ago. Yet the Minister has said that this is the first time a Labor Government has negotiated a wheat stabilisation agreement. However, the initial plan, which was introduced by a Labor Government, has been the basis of subsequent wheat stabilisation schemes. It is interesting to look at the history of wheat stabilisation. I am sorry that the House must debate this important Bill at such an early hour of the morning. As members know, the Second World War came to an end in 1945. In 1946, grower organisations throughout the Commonwealth moved a motion that, following the existence during the war of the Wheat Stabilisation Board, a wheat stabilisation plan should be drawn up. Most of the States favoured stabilisation, except Queensland and Western

Australia, which held out against the legislation. In the meantime, the Commonwealth Government had implemented legislation to commence wheat stabilisation in Australia. Before wheat stabilisation could become operative for all Australian primary producers, it was necessary for the States to pass complementary legislation. Queensland and Western Australia stood out against the stabilisation plan.

Mr. Tom Stott went to Western Australia and debated with Sir John Teasdale the question of wheat stabilisation. Mr. Stott tells an interesting story in this regard. He attended a meeting of many growers who were opposed to the move. There was a debate as to who should speak first. Mr. Stott says that he was looking to be the second speaker, so that he could get the feeling of the growers. Actually, he was told that he had to speak first. He put the points in connection with wheat stabilisation. He says that he stated that, if the legislation was passed, never again would primary producers be expected to grow wheat at below the cost of production. It was that statement of Mr. Stott that turned the meeting in favour of wheat stabilisation. It is significant that the legislation on a Commonwealth basis was passed in 1946.

The wheatgrowers of Australia contributed to the wheat stabilisation plan in the years leading to the legislation being passed on a Commonwealth basis. So, the growers were keen to bring in a stabilisation plan. They introduced it in a period when the industry was flourishing, and they were willing to put their finance into a fund. The Wheat Stabilisation Board ceased to operate in 1948, when legislation was passed by the States to establish wheat stabilisation throughout the Commonwealth.

The first Chairman of the board was Mr. John McPherson, who was followed by Mr. Fred Cullen. I can recall Mr. Cullen's appointment very well; he was appointed by the then Labor Government. His salary was increased by 100 per cent when he was appointed Chairman of the board. I can remember the Labor Government's saying that it considered the wheat industry did not want its business transacted on the cheap. Later, Sir John Teasdale was appointed by Mr. John McEwen, and Sir John was followed by Mr. James Moroney. More recently the Chairman was Dr. Callaghan, who was followed by Mr. Jack Cass. The legislation we are dealing with gives stabilisation a further five years of existence. Tied up with wheat stabilisation are the activities of the Wheat Board. Until about 10 years ago, the legislation was such that the Wheat Board would have ceased to operate at the cessation of wheat stabilisation, but the Act was altered so that at any time when wheat stabilisation ceased to receive support there was a period when the Wheat Board could carry on. Wheat is sold for cash and on terms, and it was considered necessary that a period of two years should be allowed.

Concern has been expressed about the provision stating that the board may be directed by the Minister. However, this aspect of the legislation has been operating since the 1958-59 stabilisation plan was debated throughout Australia. So, I do not know why concern has been expressed about the provision stating that the board may be directed by the Minister. Perhaps some people are fearful about what the Commonwealth Minister may do. The teeth of the legislation are in the Commonwealth field. Section 18 of the Commonwealth Act provides:

(1) The Minister may give directions to the board concerning the performance of its functions and the exercise of its powers, and the board shall comply with those directions.

(2) If—

(*a*) the Minister directs the board to make a sale of wheat on terms involving a longer period of credit in respect of payment of an amount, being the whole or a part of the purchase moneys, than the period of credit that the Minister is satisfied, after consultation with the board, is the period that the board would have been prepared to allow on a strictly commercial basis;

(*b*) the board incurs loss by reason of failure of the purchaser to pay that amount, or interest in respect of that amount, within the extended period of credit applicable to that amount; and

(*c*) the Minister is satisfied that the board has taken all reasonable steps to recover from the purchaser the amount of the loss;

the Treasurer shall, out of moneys appropriated by the Parliament for the purpose, pay the amount of the loss to the board and the amount so paid to the board shall, for the purposes of this Act, be deemed to be part of the proceeds of the sale of the wheat by the board.

The Australian Wheatgrowers Federation has negotiated with the Commonwealth about the new stabilisation plan. There is a Commonwealth Government guarantee that deficiencies will be made up. Consequently, it has been difficult to bring the legislation forward in the States. In the Legislative Council, an amendment was moved to add paragraph (*e*) to subclause (5) as follows:

there shall be taken into account payments made to the board in accordance with subsection (2) of section 18 of the Commonwealth Act in relation to wheat of that season.

Any shortcomings in the State legislation have been covered by that Legislative Council amendment. The high market price of wheat is also dealt with in the legislation. Members know that the present oversea price of grain is high. In the United States, wheat is bringing between $4·50 and $5 for ·03 tonnes, which means that at Australian values it is over $4 for ·03 t. Since wheat stabilisation has applied the home consumption price has been set on the basis of the cost of production. Therefore, consumers in Australia have received wheat at a reasonable price. I understand that at present the saving to the consumer in Australia for the 1973-74 season is about $120 000 000, having regard to the oversea price. Primary producers in Australia are subsidising the price on home markets. They have done this up until the present plan, having been happy to do so, because they have stabilised their industry.

However, they are not as happy about the present stabilisation plan. The Australian Wheatgrowers Federation had difficulty in negotiating the cost of production with Senator Wriedt. He has said he will not change the present scheme, although he is willing to look at it next year to see whether any alterations are necessary. I was most concerned when the Commonwealth Labor Government was elected in 1972. At that time, Senator Wriedt said that he did not believe that boards should be dominated by primary producers. I fear what effect this statement might have on the Australian Wheat Board, which has been dominated by primary-producer representatives from the States. I hope those members stood firm, regardless of the comments of the Minister. I think Senator Wriedt may have tried to shake their confidence, hoping that they would eat out of his hand for fear that he would alter the constitution of the board if they did not do so.

Concern is felt at the Minister's having power to direct the board. In the days of the previous Commonwealth Labor Government under Ben Chifley in 1948, William James Scully was in charge of agriculture. He went out of office soon after negotiations had taken place with the

Australian Wheatgrowers Federation in relation to establishing wheat stabilisation. Mr. Scully, when he was Minister, sold wheat to New Zealand at a price considerably below the oversea market price. This fact has continued to concern primary producers when they consider the powers of a Minister. As I have said, the Minister's power to direct the board has operated since 1957-58, and there has never been a problem, because during most of that time there has been a Commonwealth Liberal Government that has allowed the Wheat Board to do its business as it has desired. It did much business with the Chinese, when the Government of that country was not recognised by the Commonwealth Liberal Government, but that Government permitted business to be done. Under the previous Commonwealth Liberal Government there has never been a problem. However, we now have a socialistic Commonwealth Government.

Wheat stabilisation was introduced by the Commonwealth Labor Government under Ben Chifley, and there is now a Commonwealth Labor Government, but there is a great difference between those two Labor Governments. There was not a great deal wrong with the old type of Labor policy, but today Labor policy is different altogether, and we have a Socialist Government, with a different policy. I have heard many comments comparing the present leadership of that Government with the leadership of the previous Commonwealth Labor Government.

Mr. Wells: Your people aren't very happy about Snedden.

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

Mr. VENNING: The plan before us has been approved by the Australian Wheatgrowers Federation. As I have said, the Commonwealth Minister has said that he will look at aspects of cost of production, having regard to the home consumption price, in 12 months. The present plan varies from the previous plan, since that plan guaranteed about 5 500 t of export wheat at the home consumption price. Many people have said that perhaps at present we do not need a wheat stabilisation plan, because of the high oversea market value of wheat. On the same basis that the wheatgrowers of Australia brought in stabilisation, they were in a position to bring in a scheme that has worked well for the wheatgrowers, and at present the organisation has seen fit to continue with the plan, although it would have been better off at this moment accepting oversea prices. I support the legislation, and I hope my colleagues will support the wheat stabilisation plan. The harvest is well under way, and this plan will apply to it. So that the first advance can be paid to the growers, this legislation must be passed.

The Minister made one comment that should be clarified. He spoke about what the Commonwealth Labor Government had done about the first advance. For some time the first advance had been $1·10 a bushel, but last year the Commonwealth Government decided to make it $1·20. It is true that the Australian Wheatgrowers Federation wanted the first advance to be $1·80, and I suppose, on the price of wheat and the cost of production, that would have been reasonable. The fact that the Commonwealth Government may have been responsible for the increase in the first advance to $1·20 does not mean a thing. The industry will be paying interest on the advance to the Reserve Bank. It does not cost the public a cent. For the Minister in this State to laud his Commonwealth colleagues is nothing more than a lot of poppycock. Anyone familiar with the industry knows that. I support the Bill, and I hope it will have an expeditious passage through this House.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I am disappointed that we must debate this Bill at 1.55 a.m. Again, we see a Bill of the utmost importance to the Australian nation and the Australian people treated in such a way that it has been allowed to remain on the Notice Paper for a considerable period of time before being debated in the dying stages of this sitting. The Bill deals with an industry that has, for the first time, returned more in export income than has the wool industry. That is a most significant feature, and I am in no way casting any aspersions on the wool industry and what it has done for the Australian nation.

In examining the legislation, however, we must be quite practical. It is the Wheat Stabilisation Act that has guaranteed a reasonably stable income for wheatgrowers. Any group of people advocating the abolition of the wheat stabilisation scheme could not be fully informed of the effect such an action would have on the industry in general. A great deal has been said about the subsidy received by the wheat industry. We are all aware, however, that the motor vehicle industry, through tariffs, receives a subsidy of more than $3 000 000 a year. What the wheat industry does for the needy and hungry people in this world cannot be estimated in monetary terms. I refer honourable members to an article appearing in the *Advertiser* of Friday, November 8, quoting the United States Agriculture Secretary (Mr. Butz) as follows:

> The United States Agriculture Secretary (Mr. Butz) brought the world food conference down to earth yesterday by declaring that farmers, not Governments, produce food—and farmers have to make profits. Mr. Butz, speaking on the second day of a meeting on which the future of millions of people could depend, urged the 2 000 delegates and observers to become "hunger fighters", adding, "We will speak the language of bread to a hungry world."

Perhaps I should continue the quotation. Mr. Butz also stated:

> Farmers produce food, not Governments. Farmers produce food, not world conferences.

Those points are relevant, and the Commonwealth Government and our present State Government must understand that, if they want the wheat industry and other agricultural industries of this nation to continue, the people in those industries must be given proper incentives. They do not want unreasonable assistance, but simply a fair go so that they can play their part in serving the hungry millions.

Australia is the fourth largest producer of wheat in the world, following the U.S.S.R. The figures I have are from the Australian Wheat Board report for the 1972-73 year, in which it was estimated that Russia would sow 58 500 000 hectares and would produce 85 800 000 t of wheat. Russia was followed by the United States, China and Australia. In that year, it was estimated that Australia would sow 8 000 000 ha and would produce more than 6 510 000 t of wheat. Members opposite should understand, in talking about the wheat industry and the wheat stabilisation legislation, that, because of the Wheat Stabilisation Act, the Australian industry is subsidising the consumer. We recognise that we have a guaranteed price, and because of that we are making a considerable subsidy for the consumers. In the legislation before the House, the stabilisation price is set within the limits of this legislation at about $2 a bushel. About six weeks ago wheat was selling at the Kansas City grain exchange at $4·61. The figure in American currency is over $5 a bushel. Any reasonable person should realise that rural producers are subsidising the consumer.

Mr. Venning: It was by $20 000 000 last year.

Mr. GUNN: Yes, and it will be more this year. South Australia has one of the best systems of handling grain in the world and we are fortunate to have on the administering board the member for Rocky River. He has played a significant part in wheat handling. Even if we give grain to the starving millions, they have not the facilities to handle it so as to make the best use out of it.

The Government gives large quantities of wheat to these people, and it may be desirable to go to those places and assist with facilities. We have a method of insect-free growing that is probably one of the best in the world. Australia has the potential to greatly increase production, and all that the graingrowers require is assistance. I understand that 5 000 000 people are starving in Bangladesh, and if the Commonwealth Government is concerned about the starving millions, it should reintroduce the superphosphate bounty and introduce other measures in the taxation field. Otherwise, there will be a reduction in production.

The wheat industry and its stabilisation are founded on family units and, if the two Governments do not take stock of the situation, the family unit will be destroyed. I hope that the Australian Labor Party policy supports the family farming unit. The legislation with which we are dealing has had a chequered history. There have been lengthy negotiations with the Commonwealth Government, the initial discussions having taken place before 1972. Good progress was being made but, unfortunately, we had a change of Government and there have been problems.

I think one of the worst aspects of what has happened to the legislation is in relation to the owner-operator allowance. It is based on the 1968 Pastoral Workers Award. Since 1968, that award has increased by about 70 per cent, and this matter has not been considered. I understand that the Minister has agreed to examine the matter, but that does not mean that his colleagues in Cabinet necessarily will agree. Judging by their past record, I do not think that they will show any sympathy for the rural industry.

We and other States must pass legislation as soon as possible, because the only way to have stabilisation is to have a scheme operating throughout the country. I hope that this Government and the Commonwealth Government accept the challenge about whether we want the Australian wheatgrower to continue to produce and expand production to the benefit of the whole nation and to help to feed the 500 000 000 starving people in the world. We have not only the best farmers in the world but also the best bulk handling system, and we can export the technology and the fibre that these people need.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Mallee): I am extremely interested in the Bill, because it affects a large section of the Mallee District. There would be no good purpose in debating the various clauses, because we are endorsing legislation that the Commonwealth Government has passed and, if that legislation is to be effective for the coming season, it would be in the best interests of the wheatgrowers if I gave this measure my blessing. The season referred to in the Bill commenced on October 1, 1974. We have a harvest on our hands at present without having an effective Bill, so we are operating on a gentleman's agreement so far as the farmers and the deliveries to the Wheat Board are concerned.

I agree with the member for Eyre that the home consumption price is extremely low in comparison with the price prevailing on world markets. Unless that price increases, it seems to me that there is no likelihood of a surplus of wheat being produced during the currency of this legislation. One difficulty has been that, in fixing the home consumption price, we have used an old figure for the cost of the manager-worker component. The member for Eyre has said that the costs have increased by 70 per cent, and the Australian Workers Union Pastoral Workers Award has increased during the past six months from $65 a week to $92 a week.

Unless the price is adjusted, a grave disservice will be done to the farmer-operator. He will be allowed anly $50 or $60 a week in the home consumption price. Members probably know that there is a saving from 5c to 6c on every loaf of bread being sold at present. We are selling wheat for about $1·93 on the home market, whereas the export market price is more than $4, so a substantial concession is being given. The amount of about $80 000 000 that the Commonwealth Government has given as a compensatory factor cannot be said to be a significant counter to the contribution made by the farmers.

Notwithstanding that, I do not consider that the reserve fund will have to be called on. I am pleased that an announcement has been made that quotas will be lifted after this season. I have always believed that the introduction of quotas, while necessary in 1968, has not proved to have been a very significant factor to the Australian wheatgrowers subsequently. I say that because I do not think there has been one year since 1968 during which the Australian States have collectively produced up to the aggregate that was permitted under the quota system. Although the quotas were important in 1968 because of the peculiar circumstances then existing, since then they have been only a disability to many farmers, particularly the farmers I represent in the Mallee. I shall be pleased to see the quotas lifted, to see the first advance payment increased to at least $1·80 a bushel, which is only a little when one considers that that is not even the home consumption price, and to see encouragement given to the wheatgrowers to continue to expand production not only to meet our local needs but also to help satisfy the needs of a hungry world.

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

ADJOURNMENT

At 2.17 a.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, November 28, at 2 p.m.