

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, February 26, 1975

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

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following written answer to a question be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

PETROL TAX

In reply to Dr. EASTICK (February 20).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Business Franchise (Petroleum) Act, 1974, provides that the Minister from time to time may set out the basis upon which and the means by which a value shall be attributable to any quantity of petroleum products sold during a specified period which is antecedent to the period to which the licence is to apply. In my second reading explanation I stated that the value would be based on the average city retail price, and for the licence period March 24, 1975, to September 23, 1975, a value of 53 cents has been attributed to sales of motor spirit made during the financial year ended June 30, 1974. This compares to the average city retail price for that financial year, and is in accordance with the value set by New South Wales for motor spirit under the legislation in that State.

On the information available to the Government it is expected that a 10 per cent tax on motor spirit at the above value will return the Government about \$13 000 000 in a full year. On that basis, an increase in the retail price of motor spirit of 9c a gallon (if reflected in the value) would increase that annual revenue return by slightly more than \$2 000 000 and not \$4 000 000 as suggested by the Leader. However, I assure members that the Government will adopt a responsible attitude in this matter, having regard to the circumstances that might apply at the time when the next and subsequent reviews are to be made. I believe that responsibility was demonstrated when I stated in the course of the debate on this measure that the value for subsequent licence periods would not include the tax component, a condition that I understand the New South Wales Government is apparently not seeing fit to impose.

MONARTO

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Premier say when he changed the Government's policy on the establishment of Monarto from a need to relocate population growth in Adelaide to one of diversification of industry and how successful the Government has been in obtaining firm commitments from industries to diversify their activities and establish in Monarto? On March 29, 1972, when the Premier introduced in this House the Murray New Town (Land Acquisition) Bill, he went to great pains to explain the need for a new town to, as he said, "sift off some 150 000 people" from Adelaide's expected 1991 population of 1 300 000. The Premier made claims like "we must now take steps to ensure a more even distribution of population throughout the country"; "Australia urgently needs a plan for the distribution of its population"; and "Plainly this Murray New Town is only one prong of our attack on the population problem." The whole tenor of the speech was one of solving an expected population problem in the Adelaide metropolitan area. At no time during that speech did the Premier promote, as a reason for establishing the new city, the need for industrial decentralisation or diversification. In fact, industry received only passing

mention in a sentence in which, after explaining why the city should be located near Adelaide, he said;

In addition, manufacturing industries, tertiary educational institutions and Government departments that may eventually be located in the new town will have close links with Adelaide.

I emphasise the words "that may eventually be located in the new town". It therefore came as a surprise to see in this afternoon's press a statement attributed to the Premier when commenting on the news that South Australia's growth rate would not be as rapid as was earlier predicted, a situation that was not even explained by the Minister of Development and Mines at the annual meeting of the Australian Council for Balanced Development in the Academy of Science, Canberra, on October 23 last, when he said the population might be just marginally less than 1 300 000. However, we find the statement that growth will not be as rapid as was earlier predicted, but the growth rate has been used as the prime reason for creating Monarto. That paragraph attributed to the Premier states:

The report made no difference to the planning of the new city of Monarto which was essential if the Government's policy for the diversification of industry was to succeed.

Therefore, I ask the Premier whether the statement attributed to him is substantially correct and, if it is, when the Premier adopted this changed policy of seeing Monarto as necessary more for industrial diversification than for relocation of population. Furthermore, how successful is the Government proving in attracting these industries to Monarto?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The reply to the Leader's question is that there is no changed policy on the part of the Government.

Mr. Dean Brown: Rubbish!

Dr. Tonkin: He says it so nicely, doesn't he.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not about-face on anything. The honourable member wears so many faces that I think he ought to wear a different one when he comes in here.

Dr. Tonkin: I rather think you don't like me!

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I rather think that the honourable member ought to show a little more public responsibility than he does show.

Mr. Gunn: Look who's speaking.

Mr. Venning: Why don't you—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! When the Chair wants advice from the honourable member for Rocky River, it will ask for it. Otherwise, he will abide by Standing Orders, and that applies also to all other members in the Chamber.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government's policy has been one for diversification of industry and markets within South Australia, and I point out to members that that policy has been markedly successful that, for the first time in any economic down-turn in Australia within the past 20 years—

Mr. McAnaney: Fair go! The population is declining.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: For the first time in any economic down-turn in the past 20 years, South Australia's industrial unemployment is not the highest in Australia. Under every previous Government of whatever political

complexion, when there was an economic down-turn in Australia (until this one) South Australia's industrial unemployment was the highest.

Dr. Eastick: What about coming back to the question?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the Leader wants a reply, he will get it. The trouble with the Leader is that, all the time, he tries not to get replies that he does not like. If the Leader asks questions in this place, he will get answers all right.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You want to give the answers that you desire to give.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Members opposite do not like to hear facts. The facts are that, in the present economic down-turn in Australia, South Australia does not have the highest proportion of industrially unemployed. I point out to members that they were quick to ascribe the most of the industrial unemployment occurring in South Australia to the State Government when it was previously a Labor Government and there was an economic down-turn. One would think that, if members opposite were ever to be consistent, they would now give some credit to the fact that the present Government has spent many millions of dollars on diversifying industries and markets in South Australia, succeeding to the extent that at present we have a markedly lower proportion of industrially unemployed than have the Liberal-governed States of Victoria, New South Wales, and Queensland.

Dr. Eastick: I hope the car industry stays buoyant.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader says that we are not interested apparently in diversification of employment and have never talked about it. The Labor Party's programme in relation to industry has been nothing else since we came to office.

Dr. Eastick: But not at Monarto.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The reason why we will have an increased population, beyond the population growth recommended in the Jordan committee report based on the Adelaide manufacturers' supply base, is that, in order to get security of employment, we need diversification of industry and markets. Therefore, we will have an increase in population and of industries that cannot be accommodated in the kind of metropolitan area outlined in the Jordan report on the environment.

Mr. Dean Brown: Public servants!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: So we have to generate another area in which that diversification can adequately take place. This involves an increase in population above the limit set for the metropolitan area or recommended in reports that have been made public. As it is apparently difficult for the Leader to understand those facts, I suggest he read my reply over slowly and carefully.

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Premier expand on his reported statement concerning the relocation at Monarto of members of the Public Service? It is reported that the Premier has indicated that the Government will direct members of the Public Service, in many cases against their will, to transfer to Monarto. That statement has aroused considerable resentment among members of the service. In effect, the statement is "You will go to Monarto or else." It is on that matter that I seek clarification from the Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The member for Torrens is not unassociated with a company in South Australia known as Horwood Bagshaw Engineering Proprietary Limited.

That company, with the assistance of the Government, relocated much of its activity at Mannum in the Monarto area. I cannot conceive that the honourable member would defend a position taken by any employees of Horwood Bagshaw who, being relocated at Mannum, said, "We will decide that our job is in Adelaide." The position is that, if decentralisation is to occur in South Australia, it can occur only if the Government is willing to be involved in decentralisation in its own activities. Any other decentralisation policy is nonsense. Anyone who talks about decentralisation, as members of the Opposition have for a long time, and who will not subscribe to the fact that the Government itself must be involved in decentralisation, if it is to occur, is being hypocritical and is deliberately trying to mislead the public as to what he is trying to do.

Mr. Coumbe: That wasn't quite the question.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member asked me to expand, and I intend to take his invitation.

Dr. Eastick: And to try to lose the question!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No. As far as public servants are concerned, if a decision is taken by the Government that, in the overall public good, jobs are to be located at Monarto, that is where the jobs will be. The position of the Government is no different from the position of private industry, which makes the same kind of decision.

Mr. Mathwin: Directed labour!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The day the honourable member gets up and defends a position in relation to private industry by non-Government employees who refuse the direction of their company directors that jobs are to be relocated in a country area, I will give a garden party.

Members interjecting.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No-one raised the matter about Horwood Bagshaw, and no-one got up and expressed concern about other industries whose relocation in other areas of the State both the Government and the Industries Development Committee have supported. Which honourable member here will suggest that an employee of the Education Department can say, if the department posts him to a country area—

Mr. Becker: That is a condition of employment.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: A condition under which public servants are engaged is that they do their work where their jobs are.

Members interjecting.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member has asked me to expand. I have a question for the Opposition.

Members interjecting.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It arises from what the honourable member has put to me. What is the policy of the Opposition in relation to Monarto? Does this series of questions now being asked or the Leader's allowing one of his back-benchers constantly to attack Monarto mean that the Opposition is opposed to Monarto and intends to oppose its continuance?

Members interjecting.

The SPEAKER: Order! If members are going to totally disregard Standing Orders, I am prepared to stand here while they do so, but it will reduce Question Time and be at their expense.

Mr. CHAPMAN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, a question has been directed to the Premier by the Opposition, and the Premier has ignored Standing Orders totally and directed a question to the Opposition. In order to accept what he has done in this instance, is it not fair that the Opposition answer him?

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order. Questions are asked and answered as is determined by the House itself. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: What I want to know from the Opposition (in expanding as the honourable member asked me to do) is this: is the attitude expressed in the honourable member's question regarding the relocation of the Public Service to Monarto evidence that the Opposition opposes the continuance of the Monarto concept?

Dr. Eastick: Until it is reassessed, yes.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am grateful to the Leader for telling us that now the Opposition opposes Monarto.

Mr. Coumbe: That wasn't stated.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: He says he opposes Monarto until it is reassessed in some way. Members opposite supported the Bill for Monarto. Their spokesman was the member for Murray, who supported the Bill.

Dr. Eastick: It was projected on false premises.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If that is the position of the Opposition, let us know where we stand because, if the Opposition is now in full flight against the continuance of the Monarto concept, we will fight that publicly.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Premier say what effect the greatly reduced forecast of South Australia's population growth rate will have on the establishment of growth centres such as Monarto? Apparently, the Government has realised for some time that the growth rate at Monarto will be considerably less than that originally expected. I understand that a report commissioned by the previous Commonwealth Government indicates that what I have referred to is the case. Statements have appeared in several publications, quoting a number of authorities, and stating that the growth rate at Monarto is expected to be cut back from 7 500 a year to fewer than 4 500 a year. Will this have any effect on current planning? In addition, will it have any effect on the provision of Commonwealth funds, which are obviously necessary for the project to proceed.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Planning for Monarto is proceeding in the normal way of proper planning: that is, with due flexibility, taking into account all the latest statistical information. The question of reassessment of population projections for South Australia as a whole has been considered by this Government for a long time, and well before the projections of the Borrie committee's report were published. I expect that the projections concerning Monarto will involve a somewhat different growth rate from that based on the original projections, but nevertheless it will be a real and substantial one. That matter had been discussed some time ago with the Commonwealth Government, which is well aware of projected planning in relation to Monarto and has committed its funds on that basis.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: As the Premier and his colleagues cannot see Monarto in its true perspective and light (and

this relates particularly to the need for it), will the Government immediately appoint a Royal Commission to ascertain the facts and to present them to the Government?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: No! Question!

The SPEAKER: Order! The question has been directed to the Premier. The honourable member for Davenport.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Question!

Mr. DEAN BROWN: It seems that the Minister of Education cannot face the facts:

The SPEAKER: Order! "Question" having been called, the honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As the hypothesis that the honourable member has advanced in explaining his question before he asked it is incorrect, the reply is "No".

SUBSIDISED HOUSING

Mr. KENEALLY: As Minister in charge of housing, will the Minister of Development and Mines explain the criteria currently existing with regard to eligibility for Housing Trust accommodation, especially subsidised housing? Can he say whether consideration is being given to widening this criteria to include people such as single women without dependants (widows, and so on), and pensioners other than age pensioners? With most other members, I find housing the greatest single problem in my district, particularly housing for single women without dependants and for pensioners other than age pensioners.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I assume that the honourable member is referring to the States Grants (Dwellings for Pensioners) Act, which has a triennial life and which was renewed last year. At its inception that Act provided for grants to the States to provide accommodation for single pensioners in receipt of a rent allowance. Last year the ambit of the Act was widened to include single invalid pensioners, service pensioners who are permanently unemployable, and what are called class B widow pensioners. The accommodation we make available through the South Australian Housing Trust for pensioner couples occurs because of money we get from other channels. That is the present situation. The Commonwealth Minister for Housing and Construction (Mr. Johnson) has a committee set up at present to recommend to him a further broadening of the Act to cover other classes of people. At the honourable member's bidding, I will see to it that our contacts through the trust to that committee bring this request before the Minister.

CLARE HOUSING

Mr. VENNING: Can the Minister of Development and Mines say what progress has been made on the development of house building by the Housing Trust in the Clare District Council area? I understand that several weeks ago attempts were made by the trust to secure land for long-term house building in the Clare district. As recently as February 1, a statement appeared in the press that \$10 000 000 would be made available to the trust in order to keep the show on the road. The article also states:

Mr. Ramsay said the money was to be used for South Australia's needs and not just Adelaide's.

As many people in Clare have asked me whether they can expect to be allocated trust accommodation, I ask the Minister whether he can report any progress in this respect.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Not all of the \$10 000 000 is required to keep the show on the road. We were told by Mr. Johnson at a conference last year to continue to let contracts on the understanding that the additional money would be made available towards the end of the financial

year. About \$7 000 000 will be needed to meet commitments already made and the additional money will allow further expansion to take place. I will get a report on the situation in Clare.

VALE PARK INTERSECTION

Mr. SLATER: Will the Minister of Transport ascertain what progress has been made on installing traffic signals at the intersection of Ascot Avenue and Harris Road, Vale Park? I understand traffic lights are to be installed at that intersection, and I believe it is a matter of urgency, because amendments to the Road Traffic Act which will apply shortly and which relate to motorists giving way at "stop" signs to traffic from both directions will make the need for these traffic lights more urgent. Ascot Avenue is a dual carriageway which carries an increasing volume of traffic across this intersection. Will the Minister treat as a matter of urgency the need to install traffic lights at the intersection as soon as possible?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall be pleased to get the information for the honourable member.

AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

Mr. BECKER: Can the Premier say what action his Government has taken to ensure stability within the motor industry in South Australia, and does he support the implications of the Prime Minister that unemployment has not been caused by tariff cuts? I understand the Prime Minister was reported to have said at the Tasmanian conference of the Australian Labor Party in Launceston on Sunday, February 23, "I do not want to hear, particularly from Labor people—political or industrial Labor people—any more of this garbage that unemployment has been caused by tariff cuts." I understand threatened retrenchments by General Motors-Holden's were due to the effect of declining sales caused by tariff cuts. Is the Premier also aware of the large number of retrenchments in South Australia due to tariff cuts affecting the textile, electrical, leather, and general manufacturing industries? One large South Australian automotive parts manufacturer has been forced to reduce production by 75 per cent. I understand that sales of new Australian-made cars have not improved greatly since the reduction of sales tax and that Australian manufacturers are at present stockpiling. I have been told that there is a stockpile of 60 000 Australian and 40 000 Japanese cars standing at grass. In view of the uneasiness in the motor industry and the fact that Australian car manufacturers are once again stockpiling, can the Premier say what he and his Government are doing to ensure continued growth, stability, and preservation of jobs of motor vehicle and allied industry employees?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: One would think that the honourable member had not been a member of this House for the past few months.

Mr. Becker: Why?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I point out to the honourable member that, in relation to the car industry, this State alone, of all the States involved in the car industry, made submissions to the Industries Assistance Commission and to the Commonwealth Government, with the agreement of the car industry. On the day on which our submissions were being considered finally by Commonwealth Cabinet, which was a long time after the Industries Assistance Commission report on the car industry had been published, I was telephoned by the Victorian Premier, who was interested to know what we might be doing, because he wanted his officers to be interested in the matter. That is

the attitude the Liberal Governments took. We put up the measure, which was finally adopted, of an 85 per cent local content plan, which would ensure the production of small cars in Australia. Our submission was accepted, and it earned praise from the componentary manufacturers and the vehicle manufacturers alike throughout this country.

However, it became apparent that the market was being affected in the short term before the 85 per cent local content plan necessary for restructuring of the industry, which was running into difficulty anyway, could take effect. That stockpiling and difficulty in the market occurred not merely because there had been importations of Japanese cars (and the continued importation of Japanese cars at the level at which it was occurring has been stopped by the Commonwealth Government) but also because Australian manufacturers had mistaken their own market, as those companies concerned in Australia have done in every other car market in the world. The position of General Motors, Ford Motor Company and Chrysler in the United States is such that motor vehicle industry employment is down to one of the worst positions ever. It does not occur only there: it occurs in every other area where they have plants. Their position here is better than the position in any other area in which they are trading, and in this State and this country they have received the assistance of Labor Governments to do something, in the short term, about their market difficulties. We had consultations with not only the unions but also the Commonwealth Government and the car industry on the question of what should be done in the short term in the reduction of sales tax, the provision of reductions in price to the market by the manufacturers themselves, and reducing imports. In fact, of course, the car industry has had the most signal assistance that it has had publicly since its inception in this country.

Dr. Eastick: Do you agree—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Has the Leader something else to suggest that should be done to cure what, in some degree, was a mistake by the car manufacturers themselves regarding their markets, what also in some degree was the reflection of increased costs to car manufacturers, and what also in some degree, by one of the manufacturers at least, was the refusal to price cars to the market in such a way that manufacturers used some of their profits against their present market down-turn to encourage the market for their cars? If he has something else to suggest, I should like to know what it is, because no other suggestion has come from the car manufacturers or the componentary manufacturers with whom this Government is in close contact. Regarding the long-term development of the industry, I point out to the honourable member that, in concert with the car industry, we have made constant representations to the Commonwealth Government that, in terms of the plan put forward by my Government and accepted by the Commonwealth Government, it could well be the requirement of government that manufacture by the Japanese small car manufacturers take place here, and that will be to the advantage of our industry, our employees, and the component manufacturers.

SPEED LIMIT

Mr. PAYNE: Will the Minister of Transport say whether he is considering reducing South Australia's absolute highway speed limit from the present 110 kilometres an hour to 100 km/h as a further road safety measure? Recently the Commonwealth House of Representatives Standing Committee on Road Safety appealed

to all States to impose an absolute speed limit of 100 km/h on all highways, and it was reported in the press that that had been done following the lead given by Victoria. As the Minister knows, Victoria has had this lower speed limit for some time, and I understand that statistics available at present tend to show that there has been some improvement in road safety with the lower limit in operation.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I did see the report in the press and, in addition, the matter has been listed on the agenda for the Australian Transport Advisory Council meeting in Sydney on Friday. I think some factors in relation to this matter bear examination. True, the Victorian statistics were declining, and it was believed that this was as a result of the reduction of the speed limit to 100 km/h. However, the statistics now are increasing, and I am not sure whether we can say that that also is because of the speed limit of 100 km/h. In short, everyone has his own pet theories on this matter, and there are no statistical facts to substantiate what is stated. The second point that rather disturbs me is that ATAC, which comprises the six State Ministers, the Australian Minister for Transport, and the Minister for the Australian Capital Territory, about three meetings ago, I think, agreed that the absolute speed limit throughout Australia should be 110 km/h. That decision was made on the advice of the experts that we have in the various committees to which these matters are referred, and it is somewhat disturbing that a committee of the House of Representatives can now produce a report contrary to the decision of a meeting of which an Australian Government Minister was Chairman. Some cross-purpose would seem to be involved in that. Nevertheless, the matter will be examined on Friday. At this stage, I cannot indicate whether there will be any reduction.

SOUTHERN WATER SUPPLY

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Minister of Works ascertain what progress has been made in investigating a water scheme for the Callington, Hartley, and Strathalbyn area?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will do that for the honourable member.

SEX SHOP

Mr. EVANS: Can the Premier say whether an application has been made to or inquiry made of any Minister or Government department in relation to establishing a sex shop at or near that part of Maslin Beach that has been declared an unclad bathing area? If it has, does the Government intend to approve such a project? I have heard that such an application or inquiry has been made with regard to establishing this type of project in a tent or marquee for weekend operation only. If that is the case, I believe the community should be made aware of such an application before any type of approval is considered. In fact, I would not support such a project. I ask this question before what may now be only a rumour becomes a reality.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know who thought up the rumour to which the honourable member refers. I urge him that, before he asks a question in this House, he check his facts out, at least to the extent that he is able to give the House information as to the source of his query rather than say that he has a rumour.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Members on both sides have been excited about rumours from time to time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: When I get excited about rumours, I can quote the source. The Government not only has no knowledge of any such application but it must

be obvious to the member for Fisher, upon the most cursory observation of what he has put to the House, that no such application could be entertained, for the zoning regulations in the area would not allow it. Surely the honourable member should take a bit more care before he puts forward something such as this in order to get a headline.

HANCOCK ROAD

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Transport supply me with an up-to-date report on the widening and reconstruction of Hancock Road between Milne Road, Redwood Park, and Yatala Vale Road, Fairview Park? My previous information was to the effect that this road was under the care and control of the Corporation of the City of Tea Tree Gully, being maintained by that council. The road is a declared class 6 arterial road. A design for duplicating the existing carriageway was prepared by the council in conjunction with the Highways Department. Construction, which was scheduled to commence during 1974, was to be financed by the Highways Department, with the expectation that the department would assume responsibility for maintenance, following construction.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall be delighted to do that for the honourable member.

COUNCILS' FUNDS

Mr. GUNN: Can the Minister of Local Government say whether the Government is now able to assist local government financially—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: So now you want—

Mr. GUNN: If I may be allowed to continue over the interjection of the Minister—

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order, and that applies to honourable Ministers on the front bench as well as to other honourable members.

Mr. GUNN: Can the Minister of Local Government say whether the South Australian Government is now able financially to assist councils in this State, as they are suffering greatly? I have been approached by several councils in my district that are facing a serious situation in relation to continuing the employment of their staff. If funds are not soon forthcoming, they will have to retrench several employees who have been with them for many years—not a prospect they relish. I understand that the Highways Department has been contacting several councils, endeavouring to find out their true position. Can the Minister say what is the present situation?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: On February 14, the Premier went to Canberra for the Premiers' Conference, where he successfully presented South Australia's case, coming back with a considerable sum, thanks to the generosity of the Australian Government.

Dr. Eastick: You'll get on.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not know about that, but I do know that members opposite are disappointed that the Premier has been so successful.

Mr. Venning: It only keeps the show on the road.

Mr. Dean Brown: What about the petrol tax?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: As a result of the Premier's coming home with this money, \$2 700 000, I think, was allocated to this State for road work. Again, from memory, I think \$359 000 has been allocated to assist local government. As a result of a discussion between the Highways Commissioner and me about this matter and other matters relating to the allocation of funds, engineers of the various

districts are currently discussing the position with every council (and not just the one or two councils referred to by the honourable member) in order to ascertain the true financial position of these councils. When that work has been completed, decisions will be taken with regard to allocating money. I am sure that the councils that are assisted will greatly appreciate the assistance and what has been done by the Commonwealth Government.

NATIONAL HEALTH SCHEME

Mr. MATHWIN: Does the member for Bragg consider that the action of the Australian Medical Association, in querying the deficiencies of the proposed Medibank scheme and pressing for more specific details, is disgraceful, as suggested by the Premier yesterday and, if he does not, can he suggest why the Premier should make such a statement?

Dr. TONKIN: I am grateful to the honourable member for being so thoughtful as to ask me this question. In answer to his first question, I consider that the actions of the A.M.A. and all medical groups and organisations associated with health care in querying the deficiencies of the proposed Medibank scheme and pressing for more details are entirely motivated by a deep and abiding concern for the health and welfare of the citizens of this State.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. TONKIN: If Government members do not subscribe to that view—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Bragg.

Dr. TONKIN: It is apparent that members opposite will not listen to the truth.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Try us out with some.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. TONKIN: In the Medibank proposals, there are, as I said previously, major deficiencies which are being examined by Ministers of Health in Victoria, New South Wales, Western Australia and Queensland, and those Ministers will not agree to the proposals in their present form. Numerous questions must be answered. It is only right that the A.M.A. and all other organisations concerned with this matter should be ventilating and publicising those deficiencies. Regarding the honourable member's second question as to why the Premier should make such a statement, I believe that that is the most disgraceful part of the whole episode. Once more, the Premier is on the defensive following a situation where on one day he made an announcement that made it sound as though the State Government had agreed to the Medibank scheme, and was then forced into the situation of having to admit, in reply to a question asked yesterday, that his Government had not entered into an agreement with the Commonwealth Government regarding the Medibank scheme. Incidentally, I did not see a report of that statement in the press. Having been forced into that situation, I can only assume that the Premier went on to the defensive and resorted to personal abuse. I find such action surprising from a man of his standing in this Parliament and from a man of his stature and his wide experience. That action resulted in the Premier, together with his deputy by way of interjection, imputing that I was acting for personal gain or that I was being directed by an outside body as to how I should act in this House. You, Sir, will know just how serious are those

accusations. If they were made outside this Chamber it would be a matter affecting the privilege of members of the House. I believe the Premier's action is not only disgraceful: it is disgusting.

Mr. RUSSACK: Can the Premier say whether the Government considers that the principles of the Trade Practices Act will be contravened by the Commonwealth Government in creating a monopoly for health care by implementing the Medibank scheme? Following reports in the media, and also statements and announcements by the Premier, that this State will co-operate with the Commonwealth Government in the new national health scheme, many people are apprehensive and fear the loss of freedom of choice for their health care.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Obviously, the honourable member has not read the simple explanations published in the press by the Commonwealth Government in relation to the Medibank scheme. No monopoly is provided in the Medibank scheme—none whatever. There is no lack of choice of medical practitioner or medical services involved in the Medibank scheme. The scheme is based on the Saskatchewan scheme which is already operating and which allows full freedom of choice of medical practitioner and form of medical services. Further, with relation to health insurance it is still open to people to proceed with private medical insurance if they wish to do so. How in the world can this be said to be monopolistic! I can only say to the honourable member that it is certainly not a breach of the Trade Practices Act and, obviously, the honourable member has been misled by the sort of untruthful propaganda that I rightly stigmatised in this House yesterday.

M.V. TROUBRIDGE

Mr. CHAPMAN: Will the Minister of Transport, in his capacity as Minister responsible for the operation of the m.v. *Troubridge*, reconsider his previous attitude towards sponsoring the free transport of racehorses to Kangaroo Island in order to help the horse-racing sport generally and as it applies especially to that community? The Minister no doubt appreciates the encouragement for many years granted to the Kangaroo Island Racing Club by the Adelaide Steamship Company, the previous owner of the service. Reports have come to my notice that recent amendments to the Lottery and Gaming Act have not enhanced the income of the Kangaroo Island Racing Club as has been experienced by the racing fraternity across the State generally. Therefore, in order to restore at least a semblance of encouragement in recultivating that sport the Minister's help would be greatly appreciated. Racing authorities and patrons have hastened to recognise the previous claims of the Minister of Transport that the m.v. *Troubridge* operation is heavily subsidised, as is the railway system across the State. However, the distance rate to Kangaroo Island is so exorbitant in freighting racehorses that it is claimed to have destroyed a most popular sport that has been practised on the island since the early days of the settlement. On behalf of the racing fraternity and patrons generally who support the sport of kings, I call on the Minister to reconsider his previous attitude and extend a liberal attitude towards the freighting of horses from the mainland.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall be pleased to have a further look at this question. However, it has been examined in some depth previously. The honourable member is correct when he says that the operation of the m.v. *Troubridge* is being heavily subsidised by the taxpayers of South Australia.

Mr. Gunn: Like the railways.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The railways are being subsidised, too, but not to the same extent as Kangaroo Island. Indeed, the subsidy now amounts to about \$500 000. That is an awful lot of money. The m.v. *Troubridge* is run from Highways Department funds and any further concessions granted in respect of it will increase the operating loss and will therefore make less money available for local government assistance and for road works. It is a matter of trying to get some sort of balance. Having said that, however, I shall be pleased to get a report for the honourable member.

UNDERGROUND WATER

Mr. RODDA: Can the Minister of Works say whether a report is available in relation to the 1973 proclamation of the regulations under the Underground Waters Preservation Act in respect of the South-East region of the State? In addition, can he say what improvement has taken place regarding the potability, the rate, and the preservation of supply of the underground water table in that area? Landholders in the area welcomed the decision of the Government to invoke the regulations under the Act and have co-operated in every way. The main area concerned is the Padthaway Basin. There is always speculation whether this basin has been overdrawn or adequately preserved. I therefore ask the Minister whether his department can supply a report on the reaction to the 1973 proclamation.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I assume that the honourable member is talking about the reaction regarding the supply of water to the people involved. I shall be happy to obtain a report from the Underground Waters Advisory Committee, the committee that advised me on this matter. As the honourable member knows, a Bill concerning this matter is now before the House, and no doubt he will take the opportunity to seek further information when that Bill is being considered. His question may have been out of order, but I will get a report for him.

TYRE LOADING CAPACITIES

Mr. BOUNDY: Can the Minister of Transport say whether the Motor Registration Division of the Transport Department is reducing or has reduced the accepted tyre loading capacity regulations observed by the tyre industry in this State when assessing gross vehicle weight and gross combination weight ratings of trucks now being registered or re-registered? It has been suggested to me by men involved in the transport industry that this statement is correct, thus creating the anomaly that our ratings on new vehicles differ from those applying in other States because of different tyre ratings, and also that the lower tyre ratings lessen the load capacity of trucks already registered.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Following the amendment of the Road Traffic Act when gross vehicle weight provisions were inserted, authority was provided to establish a committee to consider some problems associated with determining gross vehicle weight or gross combination weight. True, the g.v.w. and g.c.w. differ from State to State, depending on the extent and terms of legislation in those States. For instance, in one Eastern State (I am not sure whether it is Victoria or New South Wales) the legislation contains a 20 per cent tolerance, but the manufacturer does not accept that his vehicle is capable of a 20 per cent tolerance and still be within safe limits, so he reduces the g.c.w. or g.v.w. to compensate for the laxity in that legislation. In respect of that aspect, therefore, they vary from place to place, but principally on the basis of the manufacturer's decision, because he does not accept the tolerance provided by the Parliament of that State.

RAILWAY TAKE-OVER

Mr. ALLEN: Can the Minister of Transport say whether the Commonwealth Government will be taking over all country rail services at the beginning of the next financial year? I visited Peterborough on Monday, and it seems, from the opinion of many people in that town, that this is to happen, and it is causing concern to local people.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Apparently, the honourable member has taken notice of a rumour circulating in Peterborough, because I was speaking to the Director-General of Transport a short time ago and he told me that, when he visited Peterborough last evening to attend a meeting, he was asked the same question. He replied, "That's news to me," and I can only endorse that reply.

BRUKUNGA CREEK

Mr. WARDLE: Has the Minister of Development and Mines anything to report about investigations that I believe have been carried out regarding contaminants in Brukunga Creek, which flows into Bremer River? I understand that some hydrological surveys have been made but whether they have been made by the State Government or by the Commonwealth Government I am not sure. However, some investigations have been made concerning acids that are present in run-off waters, and I should be pleased to receive any information that the Minister has on this matter.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Investigations have been made by Australian Mineral Development Laboratories operating in concert with the Mines Department. Recent studies have been directed towards confirming, or otherwise, the strategy that was suggested some time ago to hold back water by dams, as this would be the best short-term solution of the problem. As I understand it, it would be a short-term answer. In fairness to the honourable member, however, it would be better if I obtained a considered reply for him because it is some time since I considered this matter in detail.

SHEARERS ACCOMMODATION BILL

The Hon. D. H. McKEE (Minister of Labour and Industry) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to make provision for the proper accommodation of shearers; to repeal the Shearers Accommodation Act, 1922-1967; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: 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

The minimum standards of shearers' accommodation have not been reviewed since 1967. Changes in conditions since then and improvements in the standards required by law in other States indicate the need for the determination of new standards that are now appropriate. The legislation which is currently in operation was first passed in 1922 and has been the subject of five subsequent amendments. Although it is not a long Act, it has become quite unwieldy with some of the amendments virtually as long as the original Act itself. To compound the problem, we have a situation where some of the conditions of accommodation are set out in detail in the Act while others are contained in regulations. There is no logical reason for this and the net effect of all these factors is to make the

present Shearers Accommodation Act cumbersome and difficult to follow: in fact it resembles a patchwork quilt because of the many amendments.

Since April, 1972, a full-time inspector of shearer's accommodation has been employed to make regular inspections of sheep stations throughout the State. With the appointment of the first full-time inspector a systematic programme of inspections has been undertaken. This has revealed the necessity for there to be a complete revision of the requirements laid down by the legislation. Clearly the details of the type of accommodation required are more appropriate for prescription by regulation, so this new Act has been drafted as an enabling Act that authorises the prescription of details of accommodation to be made by regulation. I hope that the regulations will provide both station owners and managers with a clear idea of the amenities which will be required of them in the future.

Clauses 1 to 5 are formal. Clause 6 limits the applicability of this Bill to situations where there is no alternative accommodation available and where four or more shearers are accommodated at the same time. In certain circumstances, the Minister is empowered to dispense with the requirements of the legislation. Clause 7 deals with the appointment of inspectors which include certain members of the Police Force. Clause 8 refers to the inspection of buildings used for accommodation and includes a penalty for obstructing an inspector. Clause 9 sets out the inspector's obligation to give notice to the manager or owner of any property that the accommodation provided is unsatisfactory, and he can require that this be rectified within 12 months. Any such notice must be specific so as to leave the employer with no doubt as to his obligation. Clause 10 requires that offences under the Act be dealt with by magistrates or justices of the peace. Clause 11 empowers the making of regulations under the proposed Act. They are broadly expressed and all the substantive requirements of amenities and accommodation will be made under this clause.

Mr. CHAPMAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

RUNDLE STREET MALL BILL

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

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 25. Page 2558.)

Mr. CUMBE (Torrens): Last evening I indicated clearly that I supported the Bill to the Select Committee stage, because I firmly believe that a mall in the Rundle Street area of the city of Adelaide is desirable. I say that advisedly after considering the many reports available on this subject. The following reports are available for members to study: Rundle Street Pedestrian Mall Investigation Stages I, II and III; Rundle Street Mall Evaluation of Pavement Materials and Associated Services; the Addendum to Stage III Report of the Pedestrian Mall Study; and Parliamentary Paper No. 88 printed on September 18, 1973, on Traffic Aspects of the Mall. Those reports contain information pertinent to the study of this subject.

Discussions have been held between the Adelaide City Council and the Government since 1973, and a steering committee was set up comprising representatives of the Government, the Adelaide City Council, and Rundle Street traders. I use the word "traders" in its broadest sense because other ratepayers such as banks, cinemas and

hoteliers, as well as members of the Rundle Street Traders Association, are located in Rundle Street. So, wherever the term "trader" appears in the Bill it refers to traders generally.

After the idea was canvassed, it was necessary for investigations into the financing of the mall to be conducted, and the steering committee investigated the desirability of a mall. The steering committee and the council accepted the principle of a mall, as did members of the Retail Traders Association, provided that certain criteria were met. Investigations were then made as to the layout and design of the mall, and various reports were made available by town planners, architects, Pak Poy and Associates, and John A. Woodburn on the type of paving material to be used in the mall. It is clear that the concept of a mall, in the absence of footpaths, is one of open space. Members may have seen some of the types of paving material on trial in Rundle Street, near the bus stop outside the Myer Emporium. The tests have been made to evaluate the materials and to see how they will stand up to the impact of traffic and deposits of oil and rubbish. Much investigatory work was carried out. Experts D. & R. S. Carlson state on page 3 of the addendum to the Stage III investigation of the Rundle Street mall:

Perhaps the most interesting phenomenon in the continuing effort to revitalise the central city is the creation of pedestrian shopping areas in places where there had once been vehicular thoroughfares. Most planners stress that a pedestrian mall can work only as one element in an otherwise carefully conceived and integrated web of improvements. The improvement of traffic movement and storage is one of utmost importance—access and parking are essential to downtown's vitality, regardless of whether or not there is a pedestrian mall. In no case will a mall work without upgrading these factors; experience has shown parking is equally as important as access and improved traffic patterns. Malls which have the best records of economic success have generally been reinforced by better-than-adequate off-street parking, often built before the mall itself was open for business.

I believe that the Adelaide City Council is happy to go along with that general premise. When the question of finance was first raised it was proposed that the funding be split three ways: that is, between Adelaide City Council, the State Government, and the Commonwealth Government. However, the Commonwealth Government decided not to contribute, so it was suggested that the ratepayers in the area should contribute the other one-third.

I point out that the area concerned, as shown in the schedule to the Bill, not only includes Rundle Street but also extends back to North Terrace and Grenfell Street and takes in the side streets. Therefore, we have a problem that has arisen from the original concept. I understand that the retail traders have expressed willingness to co-operate in this whole concept, provided that certain other matters are resolved. They have stated clearly (and I consider that this is a fact of life) that, if a mall is to be successful, it must be successful in the market place. The quotation I have read shows that.

A mall is a place where people can move around freely and shop, without vehicles running up and down. Provided that business is attracted to the shops, the ratepayers would be pleased with the concept of a mall, but arrangements will have to be made for vehicles to deliver until 10 a.m., or some such time, and also for transport to service adjacent areas.

I understand that one concern being expressed (and some of these matters will be discussed tomorrow at the meeting in the Adelaide Town Hall) is that the ratepayers (and I

use that term widely) will be expected to contribute to the payment of both the principal and the interest. That raises an important matter that the Select Committee must consider seriously. We are considering a Bill that contains financial provisions, whereas there is no agreement now, as far as I can find out, at least between the council and the ratepayers of the area, about the amount of contribution that the parties will make. It seems that the retailers would want to contribute to the interest only. On the other hand, the council wants ratepayers to contribute to both the principal and the interest.

Those matters, in a nutshell, are the difficulties facing us at present. The Bill provides that additional rates up to 5c in \$1 can be levied on the ratepayers in the designated area. At present the council rate is 19c in \$1, which I understand is one of the highest council rates in Australia, and the council is facing severe financial difficulties, as I think the Minister would be the first to acknowledge. This was shown last year, when the Government introduced at least two Bills to relieve the council of some of its financial burden. For the life of me, I do not understand why the Adelaide City Council, of all the capital city councils, missed out in the most recent grants made by the Grants Commission. That seems inexplicable and I hope that, as a result of the commission's new recommendations, the council will receive a grant to relieve it of some of its obligations.

Clauses 8 and 13, which are interlocked, provide that the Adelaide City Council and the ratepayers will make available \$600 000 and that the Government will make available \$300 000. The Minister has stated in his second reading explanation that the total amount contemplated is \$900 000 but, frankly, after reading some reports by experts on this matter, I do not think for a moment that \$900 000 will be sufficient to cover the cost of the work involved. The clauses to which I have referred seem rather rigid, limiting the Government's contribution to \$300 000, whereas I should have preferred that the Government's contribution be one-third. The Government may have its reasons for making the provision that it has made, but I ask the Minister what will be the position if the \$900 000 is exceeded. As the Bill is worded, the council and the ratepayers would have to find the additional amount, and I would prefer that this provision be more flexible.

The other aspect that the traders have put forward is that they would like more representation on the Rundle Street Mall Committee. The Government, the council and the ratepayers are to have equal representation on the committee and, after all, the ratepayers will be paying the additional amount of up to 5c in \$1. One can imagine the amount of rates that these people will have to pay, because the present rate is 19c in \$1, as I have said. Let us not run away with the idea that all the ratepayers in Rundle Street conduct big emporiums: they do not. In City Cross, which is covered in this project, there are many small shops that sell artifacts, foodstuffs, and other items, and many of them have their rentals based on the rates paid by the owner. In other cases, including the case of offices, the tenant pays rates and taxes in addition to the rental that he pays based on floor area.

These are difficulties that the traders will have to face. The mall must be made to work, be operated correctly, and be constructed properly. I have examined the explanations about the alteration of sewers and about the work that the South Australian Gas Company, the Electricity Trust, the Australian Post Office, the Fire Brigades Board, and other authorities will have to do, and I know some of the problems there. The Government intends that the main

sewer will not be completely renewed but will have new connections made to it and some joints attached to it. The fact that the whole sewer will not have to be pulled up and replaced will result in a saving in the total cost, and a similar saving will be achieved by using an alternative type of paving. I personally like the brick-type of paving, but another type, expected to have a life of 40 years, has been recommended. Whatever type of paving is selected, I certainly hope a South Australian product is used.

I turn now to the matter of ingress and egress. I am a little doubtful whether sufficient spaces have been allocated in the recommended plan for taxi stands. Many people who shop in Rundle Street, particularly elderly people or women with children in pushers, use taxis. Perhaps more taxi spaces will be necessary. From the public transport system illustration in Parliamentary Paper No. 88, it seems that the Tramways Trust bus service, instead of running east and west along Rundle Street, will be diverted. The west-east service will travel along Grenfell Street from Light Square, returning to Rundle Street through Hindmarsh Square at Foys building. The east-west service will turn out of Rundle Street at Foys building, proceeding along North Terrace towards the Newmarket Hotel.

Therefore, people travelling by bus will go along either of those routes. That complete diversion of the bus service immediately poses a problem regarding the position of Hindley Street traders. Will they complain that shoppers who travel by bus will be diverted away from Hindley Street? I do not suggest for a moment that the bus could turn at the King William, Hindley, and Rundle Streets intersection, as that would create too great a hazard. The position of Hindley Street traders must be considered soon. If Rundle Street is a success as a mall, it may be that traders in Hindley Street will want that street turned into a mall. These are some of the problems that must be solved.

The financial aspects related to this Bill are not satisfactory, and other matters need consideration. In his explanation, the Minister spoke about providing the Foys building site as the location for a new parking station; he explained the financial arrangements involved in moving Government employees from that building. It is foreseen that the City Council will build a new parking station on the Foys building site. As far as I can ascertain, the capital cost of constructing that edifice will be about \$4 500 000. I certainly do not expect that station to pay for itself for several years. The council will be further committed in its loan works because of the building on this site.

I support the proposal that a car park be placed on the site. Unless parking facilities are made available, I do not think the whole scheme will be viable. As well as the existing car parks and the car park to be situated at the rear of Parliament House later, we must have another parking station such as that suggested for the Foys building site. It is interesting to note that the proposed parking station on that site is not recommended in the City of Adelaide Development Plan. Much attention will have to be given to the problem created by traffic entering and leaving the parking station. We have already seen the chaos caused in North Terrace and, to some extent, in Hindley Street, at the entrance to the Miller Anderson car park, when vehicles are trying to enter and leave parking stations during busy traffic periods.

I wish to give members some idea of the incidence of the proposed 5c rate involved. We must remember that not all ratepayers have agreed to the proposal. This rate represents about a 27 per cent increase for these people, and that is fairly solid. We should also consider the

financial aspect of maintaining the mall. In addition, who will look after it outside shopping hours? Will this be the responsibility of the council and the ratepayers or of the council alone and the Government? I should like to see the mall used outside shopping hours, especially at weekends, for functions such as those associated with the Festival of Arts. Such functions could take place throughout the year. Perhaps the Premier could recite there instead of at the zoo. If the mall is to be used outside trading hours, the question arises regarding the provision of emergency services, such as the fire brigade, ambulance services, the police, and so on.

We must remember that the recommendation is that delivery vehicles should enter the mall no later than 10 a.m. or possibly after 6 p.m. to remove refuse or deliver materials for the next day's trading. These are some of the main points that readily come to mind. I emphasise that the original concept was that the State Government, the Commonwealth Government, and the council would contribute to the cost of the scheme. As the Commonwealth Government has declined to participate, the ratepayers in the area have been called on to contribute. Therefore, the mall must be a success as a market place, otherwise it is no good having it. What will the Government do about the underground railway? I believe that in future this scheme, which I hope comes to fruition before long, could have a bearing on the project.

One point of disputation that has not been settled is the uncertainty about the repayment of principal and interest with regard to the council and ratepayers. That problem must be solved. The council, the traders, and the steering committee as a whole believe that there are several fundamentals regarding the mall. The report based on the various studies carried out states that it is considered that Rundle Street should be a full mall, provided that the mall is properly planned and designed, that increased short-term parking spaces are provided, that public transport frequency is improved, and that specific traffic management monitoring and control is undertaken in the surrounding street system. There has been newspaper comment about certain aspects connected with the mall. The consultants state clearly that temporary malls are seldom converted into permanent malls. In this case, we are establishing a mall from the outset. The report of the consultants states:

Where any of the essential elements to a successful mall have been eliminated or unduly delayed, the mall has been likely to fail. The particular elements referred to were: delay in providing car parking; lack of co-operation among retailers; poor design features; and vehicle access made difficult through congestion on parallel streets.

These matters are important. I have covered the philosophy of the question and have pointed out some of the difficulties that the Select Committee will have to resolve. Those difficulties include the difference in the sum to be contributed as between ratepayers and the other two parties to the agreement. The Bill indicates that the Government is providing fairly rigid statements regarding its commitment. Another difficulty relates to the \$4 500 000 to be spent by the Adelaide City Council on the capital works for the proposed parking station on the site of Foys building. As the Bill is going to a Select Committee, I believe I have covered this area sufficiently. However, if it were not going to a Select Committee I would be suggesting several amendments, which I will not do at this stage because it would be improper. I have pleasure in supporting the Bill to the extent that it be referred to a Select Committee.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I support the concept of the Bill and its reference to a Select Committee. If necessary, I

will consider whether I should appear before the Select Committee if I am allowed to do so. In the first pamphlet I issued in my district, one of my stated intentions was that I should like to see at least the section of Rundle Street between King William Street and Pulteney Street made into a mall. I am pleased that we are now one stage nearer that project. However, some aspects of this measure worry me. I do not accept that the mall will not work unless it involves flash paving and a gradiose scheme generally. I believe that the people of this State should realise that money could be wasted on this project for no real benefit. To pave the mall with bricks on edge would be a wicked waste of money. I strongly believe that if the mall is to work it will work without much money being spent on the pavement.

The area of the mall can be blocked off to traffic, its main benefit being to give freedom of movement without interference from motor vehicles as people walk from shop to shop and from one side of the shopping area to the other. Public transport should be kept out of the area, because even in South Australia buses are noisy, although I do not blame anyone for that noise, because they are large vehicles and require much power to propel them, thus creating noise pollution. One of the purposes for creating a mall is to remove pollution in the area that is created by motor vehicle fumes and noise.

It has been stated that there is a need for craftsmen such as cobblers, metal workers and people who create different forms of craft and art, and provision could be made for them without great expense. It would not make much difference to their work if they were situated on a concrete, brick or diamond pavement (the latter, of course, they could chisel up and use in their craft work if they were that way inclined). For people to suggest that the intention of creating such a mall is to encourage people to shop in the city area is bad. We should not deliberately encourage more people to move into the city of Adelaide. Indeed, we should not encourage people to use their own vehicles to come into the area. Reasonable public transport is available from most suburbs. Unfortunately, it is not yet completely satisfactory in my district, but the Minister has assured me that his department is working on an improved system for the area. That action is appreciated, because the sooner there is an improvement in the area the better it will be for the people living there. The Adelaide railway station, which will serve the area of the mall, is not far away from it, and the Minister has seen fit to provide a free bus service to take people in the direction of the proposed mall.

Why do we set out to encourage motorists to drive into the area? There is no way in the world that I can see that more people can be encouraged into the vicinity of the mall without creating greater traffic congestion. As soon as streets are closed off to the mall, more motor vehicles will be pushed into other nearby streets, thus increasing traffic congestion and pollution. The member for Torrens referred to how money for this project would be spent. If we do not undertake a grandiose scheme, the sum of \$900 000 to implement the project will not be needed. I believe the mall can be provided simply and cheaply. Bearing in mind that most people do not believe it necessary to go to extremes in providing this facility, I hope that we can keep the sum below that proposed.

I do not believe that, because such a scheme is started off as an experiment, it is certain to fail. If that is the case, what we are really saying is that only the people of today (the Government and those who support it on this issue) have some initiative to see that the project is begun.

If we start off on an experimental basis with the mall to see how it works, I am sure that future generations will have the initiative to make it succeed. To suggest that the people of today are the only people who could make such a scheme work (if it is to start off as a full development) is utterly ridiculous. I strongly support the creation of a mall and will do so until such time as someone proves that such a project is unsatisfactory. The only way that that can be proved is to put it into operation, and the correct way to do that is to implement a sensible, conservative programme on which, if successful, more money could be spent later. I do not agree to going ahead with the project on a grandiose scale, because it might not be successful, anyway. I fully support the project and hope that common sense will prevail.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I enthusiastically support the Bill. Until I was fortunate enough to undertake a study tour about 18 months ago, I knew little about shopping malls. One of the most attractive features of many European and American cities is their malls. I have visited Sydney, where traffic is excluded from Martin Place, and I believe it is to be excluded from other parts of Sydney, including George Street. Malls in countries overseas have unique characteristics: many are in narrow lanes that are quaint and hardly suitable for traffic, and Rundle Street, by comparison, would be a large, wide mall. Sacramento, in the United States of America, has a modern mall containing many fountains, and the only vehicle allowed in the area is a small tram used to convey shoppers from one end of the mall to the other.

The outstanding feature of a delightful mall in Lucerne, Switzerland, is the colourful flags hanging in front of each shop. I believe that the Rundle Street mall will be an asset to the city of Adelaide when the project is developed. The initial expense was more than that provided for in the Bill, but it does not seem to be necessary to provide for rear access to the buildings as shown in the original plan. I cannot see much sense in the paving experiments undertaken in Rundle Street, and no doubt an inexpensive method of developing the surface of the mall will be found. Last year when the mall was being discussed, I referred to an article from the *London Illustrated News*. Headed "New Deal for Pedestrians", an article, in tracing in some detail the development of shopping malls in Britain, stated:

Until the late 1960's efforts to take the traffic out of places where people shopped or strolled or wished to linger for pleasure seemed dogged by delay and obstruction. A few shopping precincts had been created in the centres of new towns or blitzed cities—Coventry was a pioneer—but other cities, like Bristol, were prevented from doing so by the threat of boycott by developers and traders. The high street had traditionally been both market-place and thoroughfare.

It seems that malls in England were not developed without some opposition, which we have had also in this State. In relation to the access to the mall, the article also stated:

Others have judged that provision of rear access to all premises would be, in terms of costs, delay and difficulty, frankly not worth the candle. Of these, certainly the most impressive is the Leeds paved zone— $\frac{1}{4}$ mile of existing shopping streets, originally much congested by through and stopping traffic, now transformed into a civilised and attractive environment for the shopper. London Street, Norwich, did not provide rear servicing to all premises; goods were carried or trolleyed to shops. Leeds went one stage further. The streets were paved over from wall to wall and private cars excluded under powers obtained in the 1966 Leeds Corporation Act. But lorries and other delivery vehicles were allowed in initially at all times.

These conditions are contemplated for the Rundle Street mall, and I am enthusiastic about providing such a shopping mall. It should develop a character of its own, but that

will depend on the ingenuity of those responsible for its design. From my experience the mall will have much to offer for the enjoyment of people shopping in that part of the city of Adelaide. I enjoyed poking around in malls in London, and I am sure I will do the same when the mall is established in Adelaide. I support the Bill.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I support the proposal, which has generally been accepted throughout the community. Members have given examples of similar facilities overseas, and I recall some very attractive shopping malls, particularly one in Kassel in Germany that I saw when I visited Dr. Möler of arteriosclerotic fame. The mall in that city had been built from scratch when the city was rebuilt after the Second World War. We have examples of this situation in South Australia: the Elizabeth town centre and other major shopping centres show how people can shop without worrying about motor vehicles, and are a contribution to our quality of life. I have no doubt this proposal will be satisfactory, but I see no need to progress with the scheme with any degree of haste. I believe it could be spread over a period of several years, provided that traffic was prohibited from entering each end of the street. It is not simply a matter of placing chains across these entrances or of placing tubs here and there. We should beautify the area, but not all at once.

Concerning the special paving experiments, I believe that a road surface designed for heavy traffic in Rundle Street, including Tramways Trust buses, should be able to take the heavy pedestrian traffic that is likely to use it for the next few years. I see no reason at all why money should be spent rapidly on replacing that surface with any brickwork or any other design of paving material, no matter how aesthetically desirable it may be ultimately. When I looked at the sample bricks set into Rundle Street, I was reminded of the old wooden blocks with which the streets of the city were originally surfaced and it seemed to me that we were taking a step backwards in time so far as Rundle Street is concerned, but I do not think that is such a bad thing. The problems of finance have been dealt with by the member for Torrens, and I believe they can be solved or to some extent ameliorated by spreading out the project. I think the burden on the council and ratepayers could be spread out and lessened by this means.

One of the reasons given nearly two years ago for establishing a mall was the high level of air pollution through carbon monoxide and other toxic gases, and I believe nothing has happened to reduce that degree of contamination and pollution. For that reason, I think efforts to keep cars out of that densely populated area of the city are good. However, I find it a conflict of ideas to close off the main street in the centre of Adelaide in order to provide better shopping conditions and to keep the motor vehicles out of that area but to provide in the Bill for the building of a parking station at one end of the proposed mall. If an additional parking station is required in Adelaide (and I believe there is some doubt about this) I do not think that is the best place to put it. I would rather see it sited perhaps nearer East Terrace on the site of the East End Market. There is no reason at all why the plan cannot be modified to provide parking facilities in that area.

There is no reason why such a proposal would interfere with any other function the area might serve, and I believe it should be considered seriously. I hope that, if the mall is successfully established and we do have a parking station (I hope further away than Foys building), the Minister of Transport will provide a Bee-line bus

service in addition to the one already so successfully operating, the route of that service to circle around the area of the mall and to take as its main points of contact the numerous parking stations nearby. This will help people and encourage them to use the parking stations, making it a pleasure for them to keep their cars out of the city proper. I think that that idea, together with the establishment of a mall, will serve a useful purpose. Undoubtedly there will be initial problems such as the problem associated with traffic coming from Hindley Street, but I think that will look after itself, because anyone travelling east in Hindley Street knows that, if a motorist in front of him in the left-hand lane at the King William Street intersection wants to turn left, he may as well be patient because he will have to remain there for at least one cycle of the lights; he cannot get across the intersection straight away. That is another reason why we should alter the intersection so as to close Rundle Street to traffic. I do not think that is a big problem, and I think that if this scheme is successful it could also apply to Hindley Street. I am attracted to the idea, I support it strongly, and I hope it will have the success I believe it deserves.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I join my colleagues in supporting the Bill. I think the member for Kavel remembers during our peregrinations in London that I asked a distinguished looking gentleman whether he could show us the way to the Mall, and he said, "Go down two blocks and turn left, and she is a very good business woman"! The member for Torrens has obviously researched the problems associated with the mall. I give the Minister credit for bringing the proposal forward. For a long time Rundle Street has been acclaimed and recognised as a shopping centre by people not only in the Commonwealth of Australia but also in other parts of the world.

Mr. Coumbe: It is one of the most densely populated areas in Australia.

Mr. RODDA: I am indebted to the Deputy Leader. Rundle Street footpaths, although wide, are crowded with shoppers, and the pushing and shoving that occurs does not enhance it as a desirable shopping centre. When the area becomes a mall, shoppers will be more attracted to Rundle Street. I am sure the proposal will be supported by the Rundle Street traders, although some misgivings have been expressed about its financial aspects. Although the member for Fisher said it was a bad thing to encourage more shoppers into Rundle Street, I believe that many people will still shop in the suburban shopping centres, but a new atmosphere will develop in Adelaide with the advent of the Rundle Street mall. I should like to see this mall developed along similar lines to those of the festival theatre complex, which is of such a high standard.

Much has been said about traffic congestion, and I believe that closing off Rundle Street is a golden opportunity to introduce one-way traffic, improving the traffic flow. This problem will exercise the minds of people such as Dr. Scrafton, who is charged with responsibilities involving the movement of traffic. Traffic will not lessen, and the time has surely arrived when, part and parcel with the progress visualised under this Bill, we should examine introducing one-way traffic in our main streets. This must be done. Visitors and our own people will be able to shop in the mall in a relaxed atmosphere. Like the Deputy Leader, I hope that the underground rail commuter will have ready access to the mall. The whole project can be described as a massive development, and I am sure that the Select Committee will consider all aspects of the concept.

Mrs. BYRNE (Tea Tree Gully): I support this proposal. Much is being said about getting people back into the city, and the development of Rundle Street as a mall will do this. Many people now shop at large multi-purpose complexes in the suburbs, one reason being that these complexes are near where they live and it is more convenient to shop there. However, they must come to the city at times, and then probably they would shop in Rundle Street if it was more convenient for them to do so, whereas at present it is uncomfortable and overcrowded. Shoppers do not want to be hustled and bustled as they walk down Rundle Street. Further, the mall would benefit mothers with young children and with pushers. The street should become an open space, as at present children are trampled on and such conditions, cause mothers to lose patience with the children. This is all because of the discomfort and overcrowding. It is essential that there be adequate seating in the mall, not only for elderly people—

Mr. Coumbe: For young couples?

Mrs. BYRNE: Yes, for young couples and other people who will be able to eat their lunch near where they work. At present traffic is congested and it is hazardous to cross the road other than at traffic lights, because of the risk of being run over. Many people later wish that they had not been so impatient and had gone to the traffic lights, but they take the risk at the time because they are shopping during their lunch period and are in a hurry.

Because this mall will increase the number of people who shop in Rundle Street, it will be necessary to establish a child-care centre there so that mothers can leave children there while they shop. Doubtless, mothers who work as shop assistants could leave their children there. I trust that adequate toilet facilities will be provided for both sexes (and I am speaking mainly for women in this matter) in appropriate places. At present this is not the case. I have heard reference during the debate to advantages and disadvantages, but I am of the opinion that the advantages far outweigh the disadvantages and that the proposal will have the support of most people in South Australia. When it is provided, the mall will be a big tourist attraction.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I must support the Bill to the Select Committee stage but, beyond that, the thought of a shopping mall in Rundle Street does not turn me on one little bit. Candidly, I could not care less, and the mall will not make me do more shopping there. I think the Minister may have been aware of this when he introduced the Bill. In his explanation he states:

The Adelaide City Council then commissioned consultant studies to look at the financial viability of a mall, the degree of public acceptance and the design concept. The resulting reports were accepted by the council in June, 1974, and in general these studies suggested that the mall would boost trade significantly by increasing store turnover, and also demonstrated overwhelming acceptance by the public of the concept of a mall.

I interjected "Not me." The mall will not be an incentive to me to shop in Rundle Street, when I can shop comfortably and adequately in the suburb in which I live. Are we being asked to support this legislation because the Rundle Street traders are having difficulty in attracting people to shop there? If we are, that is a selfish attitude. Why bring people back to the city to browse and stroll around in the most highly intensified retailing area in any capital city in Australia? The area is not well catered for by public transport. In fact, public transport in Adelaide is so bad that buses terminate at Victoria Square and we provide a link with the railway station on North Terrace by way of the free Bee-line buses. Every day we see those

buses turning from North Terrace into King William Street against the red light, and that shows how well the lights are phased!

Everyone is becoming emotional over having a mall, as though it was the most fantastic thing that has ever happened to South Australia. Candidly, I do not think it will do a thing. If there is normal growth and increase in the value of properties in the city area in the next 50 years, we will need a larger trading area, and I am speaking of commercial trading, not only retail trading. Economics show that to be so. We are being asked to prop up what I consider to be a fading and declining retail centre. Why have John Martins, Myers, Woolworths, and Coles undertaken such tremendous programmes of development, establishing stores throughout the metropolitan area? Why are they building large shopping complexes in the suburbs? The reason is that they could not attract people from the suburbs to the city to buy their wares. Representatives of John Martins and Myers will say that they undertook these programmes as a matter of simple economics and that this has been a sound investment.

To keep their turnover at the same level and to improve their business they had to build shopping complexes in the suburbs. They will continue to do this as the metropolitan sprawl continues. By establishing a mall in Rundle Street, we will simply brighten up a retail strip between King William Street and Pulteney Street for the sake of a few large retail outlets. I am surprised that the Government has fallen for this trap. I have heard no argument that will convince me that this is a good move. I am sure that, considering the economic situation of this State and country, we cannot justify the expenditure outlined in the Bill. It is all very well for my colleagues to say that it is not good enough simply to chain off this section of Rundle Street and leave it at that. I believe that, for the next year or 18 months, we could block off this section of Rundle Street and give the mall a trial to see whether people respond to it. That should be done before we outlay considerable expense on paving, and before we do irreparable damage to the area.

Public transport will have to be rerouted out of this section. I have sufficient confidence in the Director-General of Transport to know that he will solve, to some degree, the traffic problems involved, although this will not be a simple task. Many white-collar workers in this area will be inconvenienced. They will no longer be able to walk out of their office and step on to a bus in Rundle Street; they will have to walk to North Terrace or Grenfell Street. I point out that Grenfell Street is already becoming clogged up with public transport. Our public transport system is unsatisfactory. I am pleased to see in the newspaper that the Tramways Trust is having a long, hard look at improving public transport services for the year 2000. It is interesting to see that many of the suggestions made by members on this side are being investigated; these will be found to be the best means of improving the public transport system.

Much has been said about the Bee-line bus service. Let us face the fact that this service is designed simply to entice people to go from the railway station to Moores. There is a huge gap in our public transport system caused by the termination of some services at Victoria Square. All we would have to do is to extend services to North Terrace or the Adelaide Oval and we could cut out the Bee-line service, saving a few thousand dollars. That is logical, but the Minister has never been interested in logic; he is more of an ignoramus than anything else.

I believe that the Bill has been rushed before the House; Rundle Street traders and the City Council are still to have talks. I think it is unwise for Parliament to decide on this matter now. Although I will support the referral of the Bill to a Select Committee, I shall be interested to see the report of that committee. There will need to be good evidence put forward to convince me that the expense involved in this scheme is warranted. Much promotional work would need to be done to convince me to shop in Rundle Street more often than I do now, a visit to the city shops every three or four months. I support local shopping. I would rather shop at, say, Glenelg than spend time trying to park and then travelling some distance to city shops.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What about Jetty Road as a mall?

Mr. BECKER: I have said before that I am against that. However, I do not object to making Moseley Square a piazza. The problem is always concerned with parking. The Minister is on record as saying time and time again that there will be no more parking stations in the city of Adelaide. The public transport system of the State, including railways and bus services, costs \$45 000 000 a year. I cannot say that I could do much better than that, as public transport must be subsidised. However, I do not think our Party would spend \$45 000 000. Despite this expenditure, the Minister supports the building of a multi-storey car parking station on the south-east corner of Rundle and Pulteney Streets. I understand that the cost of this building is estimated at \$6 000 000. The trouble is that the public has no faith in our public transport system; we must still cater for private motorists.

It is a person's democratic right to use his motor vehicle when he wants to. Probably we are spoilt in this respect, and that is another issue that must be considered. The Government is handing over the Foy's building site to the council on favourable terms. In his second reading explanation, the Minister states:

Clause 28 provides for the transfer to the council of an appropriate car park site. Members will be aware that the "Rundle Street traders", to use a generic term, set great store by the provision of adequate car parking facilities to support the establishment of a mall. In earnest of its desire to meet the felt needs of the traders, the Government intends to make available the site, known as the Foy and Gibson site, on extended terms and at no interest, representing a concession in money terms of the order of \$250 000. That is a fairly generous arrangement; I remind members that no interest will be payable. Again, the taxpayers will subsidise the whole operation, including subsidising the car parking station fairly heavily, and I do not support that. In considering the history of Foy's building, I refer to McLellan's *Adelaide's Early Inns and Taverns*. By looking at the history of the site, we can get some idea of what people will think when this beautiful old building is demolished. The building was erected in about 1909 and was then known as the palatial Grand Central Hotel.

It is interesting to recall that on July 13, 1920, the late Duke of Windsor, who was then the Prince of Wales, attended a brilliant State dinner at this hotel. In 1927, the Grand Central Hotel was absorbed by the business of Foy and Gibson. In December, 1849, John Hornabrook applied for a licence for a two-storey building on this site. In 1839, the South Australian Company had erected a house that was occupied for some years by the Misses Bathgate, two ladies who arrived in the *Orleana* in January, 1839, and who at once set up a fashionable boarding house. It was also the site of a hotel, and it has been used for other purposes, too. It would be a pity to see the whole

of Foy's building demolished. We often hear the Premier and his colleagues saying that we should preserve certain buildings because they are part of our heritage.

The sum of \$40 000 is to be paid for a consultants' report, so it is the consultants' duty to their employers to come up with the answer to make this project work. The consultants must say whether the parking station is to be erected in the best possible location available. If people are to visit the area for the purpose of buying goods I am sure they will not wish to walk too far. As far as I can ascertain, the habits of city people suggest that a walk from Foy's building would be too far. In using that building I believe we are taking one step forward and two steps back.

I therefore hope that the Select Committee will be given considerable time to investigate this whole issue thoroughly. Whoever is on the committee will, I hope, not be guided by the pressure put on them to report in a few weeks. If it is necessary I hope that the committee will sit for some time and will consider all facets of the establishment of the mall. If necessary, members of the committee should look at malls that have been built in Western Australia and in Martin Place, Sydney. I believe there can be no comparison between the malls that have been built in Western Australia and New South Wales and the one to be built in Rundle Street.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Perhaps members of the committee could look at malls in oversea countries.

Mr. BECKER: I should not think that the committee could justify going any further than to Western Australia or the Eastern States. We have heard many statements about what happens in other countries, but the conditions applying in those countries are different from those that will apply here. The Minister, in his second reading explanation, has stated that the proposed mall will increase trade in Rundle Street. I challenge that statement, however, because I do not know how lunch-time strollers (office workers) will spend any more money than they spend already. The same could be said about the rest of the community in the present economic climate, which I cannot see improving for the next 12 months or so. The Minister has also stated that the mall will make a more attractive place for shoppers and city workers and that it will boost tourism in this State. That suggests that people will come to the mall from Cairns, Broome, and Hobart to visit the Adelaide mall. Like hell they will! If they are going to come to Adelaide they will come to see what is happening at the festival theatre. I assure the Minister and other members that no-one will come to Adelaide to see the Rundle Street mall.

Mr. WARDLE (Murray): I must confess that my ideas and those of the speaker who has just resumed his seat differ greatly, but I guess that is what comes from being members of a free enterprise Party. I suppose that the most difficult problem to be solved in making Rundle Street a complete mall is its physical shape: it is just too long, so wide, and so consistently weak for a given length. It is unfortunate that shop frontages are aligned as they are and that the situation cannot be altered. If we were to erect a new mall I am sure that the shop frontages would differ, but some shops have been there now for over 100 years. Be that as it may, I still believe that much can be done in changing Rundle Street to a mall.

I support the Bill because I believe tourists who come here will go away and say to people in their State, "When you go to Adelaide, whatever else you see, whatever

else you do, don't miss going to the Rundle Street mall." That is the sort of appeal I believe the mall will have for people. The previous speaker referred to the thousands of people who travel on the Bee-line buses from Adelaide railway station to Moores in Victoria Square but, although I shop frequently at Moores, I do not see the sort of crowd in Moores, that I see getting on and off Bee-line buses. Therefore, I believe some of those people get off between the railway station and Moores. One of the big issues (and I understand it to have been accepted by the Rundle Street traders) is that people will be able to shop in peace and quiet and in an area where the air is much less polluted than it is at present. The mall will be comfortable and convenient, and people will not face the dangers created by motor vehicles. From the health viewpoint the atmosphere will be fresher and cleaner.

I do not wish to recite the names of malls I walked through, admired, and shopped in when I was overseas recently. Every new town that has been built in the last 15 or 20 years has not built its city centre or main shopping centre in the form in which Rundle Street was built. All new towns are providing mall-type environs from which vehicular traffic is excluded. Although the shape of Rundle Street will not be an inspiration to the design of the mall at least many decisions to be made will be inspiring. One of the first acts I should like to see is the pavement taken up and a suitable pavement laid in its place. I know that some people believe that such an action would waste a considerable sum and that it is not totally necessary; however, I believe it is terribly important. If we are to create a mall, let us spend the money to make something with which everyone will be satisfied.

There are some attractive pavements available, pavements that have been used as a basis for malls throughout the world. It would be a shame (and I really doubt whether this is the intention) to see the streets and footpaths remain as they are. There are many ways in which indoor and outdoor plants could be used to decorate and furnish the mall. I do not wish to go into all the aspects that have been dealt with by other members, except to add my support for the Bill. Some Rundle Street traders have built shops in other areas of the State to encourage people to shop near their homes, but I believe there will always be people who will wish to shop in the city centre. It is therefore obvious to some city businessmen that to improve the area of Rundle Street outside their shops is just as important as improving their window displays. I therefore believe Rundle Street can be made into a delightful spot.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I support the Bill, which will be referred to a Select Committee. For many years I have believed that there should be a mall in Adelaide and that it is needed in Rundle Street. The malls I have seen in other parts of the world have proved beyond doubt to be most successful, and have provided shopping conditions in which shoppers can buy goods or just window shop without being surrounded by air pollution from heavy transport, buses, and motor cars. To be able to wander around those areas is a delight, and people are encouraged to shop there. Perhaps a mall will encourage people to shop in Adelaide but, as member for Glenelg, I hope that it will not be long before the Government helps to make Jetty Road, Glenelg, a mall. Such a facility would further encourage tourists, because in Glenelg we have far more to offer than has the centre of Adelaide. Successful malls have been constructed in Victoria and New South Wales.

The Premier has often suggested that, because of our delightful Mediterranean climate, we should have more leisurely drinking and eating in open-air facilities in the by-ways of this city, and we now have that chance if Rundle Street becomes a mall. We have a delightful climate in Australia, and I, more than any other member, appreciate it. This should not be a grandiose scheme initially: we should close off the area as suggested in the report given to the Minister in 1973, and should place large trees in tubs. However, the beautification scheme should be a reasonable one, and not too expensive in the first stage. We should not spend huge sums on putting bricks on edge along the surface of Rundle Street at this stage, but we should provide something reasonable. The festival hall, originally conceived by a Liberal Government in this State, is an excellent example of costing, particularly when compared to the Opera House in Sydney, because our complex is as good as any. I heard Alf Garnett on radio this morning, and he supports my opinion. On page 13 of the report to the Minister on the traffic and transport aspects of converting Rundle Street to a pedestrian mall, a recommendation states:

The rerouting of bus services shown in exhibit 1 is the best of several alternatives investigated, but has some disadvantages because of a reduction in service, protection, and facilities to some people destined for Rundle Street and Hindley Street, and some adverse effect on general traffic movement.

I do not believe that general traffic movements are important: according to the plan submitted, traffic could travel along North Terrace and Grenfell Street. Another recommendation provides that goods service could be provided in any case, so that the worry of providing such services for businesses in Rundle Street need not concern anyone. A further recommendation suggests that taxi-cab services could be satisfactorily maintained, provided that Gawler Place remained open to traffic. However, cruising taxi-cabs in Gawler Place should not be allowed, and this provision should be well policed. The recommendations contained in this report should be considered by the Select Committee at the appropriate time. It is also recommended that access to all parts of the mall must be available at all times to emergency vehicles, and no-one could argue with that provision.

I am concerned, like other members, about the suggested parking station on the site of Foys building. The provision of this facility may create a problem, and further investigation should be made because this facility is an important aspect of the success of this venture. I hope the Minister will consider this question seriously. I agree with the Bill in principle and believe that it should be referred to a Select Committee, mainly because of the great success of malls in other parts of the world. We have waited too long for it now, and I hope that we do not have to wait much longer.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Local Government): I thank Opposition members for their support of this legislation, and also thank the member for Hanson for his opposition to it. I was surprised at some of his comments, and regret that he is not now present so that he could hear my replies. I cannot believe that anyone could be so naive or dense as not to be impressed with what has been said and seen by so many other people. I hope that, when a chance comes for Opposition Parties to select a member to travel around the world in accordance with Government policy, the member for Hanson may be forgiven for having opposed the Leader and allowed to make this tour. Then I am sure that he will return with the same opinions that have been expressed

by other members who have seen malls in other parts of the world. The honourable member is obviously lacking a great deal in his education. How he can justify opposing the establishment of a mall at the bottom end of Jetty Road in Moseley Square, Glenelg, I do not know. I hope he can resolve his difficulties with the Glenelg council.

The member for Torrens states that there is disagreement over the repayment of principal and interest. True, the traders expressed the view that the ratepayers in the area as defined in the Bill should be concerned only with the repayment of interest. The Adelaide City Council at a properly constituted meeting carried a motion that those ratepayers affected would be responsible for the repayment of the interest and the principal. For that reason it is included in the Bill. Whatever disagreement may or may not exist is between the traders and the Adelaide City Council: it is not the business of either the Government or the Parliament.

The member for Torrens suggested that the \$900 000 referred to in the Bill was probably insufficient, yet other members have expressed the view that it is probably more than is required and there should not be an elaborate installation. This matter having been discussed between the Adelaide City Council and the Government, I have told the council that whatever decisions are taken in relation to the expenditure will obviously be honoured by the Government and, if the Government is part of a decision to involve the expenditure of more than \$900 000, it would obviously be duty bound to introduce an amendment to the legislation to cover that situation. The City Council knows that and I believe that it is more than satisfied with the assurance it has been given.

The point was made, I think by the member for Bragg, that the mall was a good idea but that there was no hurry and that we should not hasten with it. It was said that we ought to install the mall but that we should do it over a period of two or three years. However, that is the attitude that South Australia was saddled with prior to 1965, and that was why we were known as the backward State of the Commonwealth. We always had plenty of time to do these things but we never got around to doing them! For goodness sake, in this day and age let us get on with it. I believe we have wasted too much time on the idea. I would like it to have operated by Christmas, 1973, but it did not. I hoped for 1974, but it was not ready. I am determined, however, that it will be operating for Christmas, 1975.

Bill read a second time and referred to a Select Committee consisting of Messrs. Coumbe, Crimes, Mathwin, Wright, and Virgo; the committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to adjourn from place to place; the committee to report on March 13.

WHEAT DELIVERY QUOTAS ACT AMENDMENT BILL (COMMITTEE)

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

FAIR CREDIT REPORTS BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's message intimating that it insisted on its amendments to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

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

That the House of Assembly insist on its disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments Nos. 1 to 13.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): When the Bill was before the Committee previously, I did not realise that the Attorney-General, by his attitude, had reversed a

decision taken by his Government in another place. Will the Attorney maintain his previously expressed attitude, and will he tell the Committee why the Government has changed its mind so that the House of Assembly managers appointed to a conference will know what case they will have to argue? Members need to know these details so that they can understand better the matter with which they are dealing.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I explained the reasons for disagreement when this matter was last before the Committee: for the reasons I enumerated, the Legislative Council's amendments, taken as a whole, are not acceptable to the Government. I therefore ask the Committee to insist on its disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments.

Dr. EASTICK: I briefly make the point that the Attorney-General seems to have misunderstood my question. Why are the Legislative Council's amendments, which were supported by the Government in another place, not now acceptable to the Government?

The Hon. L. J. KING: If the Leader reads them as a whole, he will see why.

Motion carried.

A message was sent to the Legislative Council requesting a conference at which the House of Assembly would be represented by Messrs. Dean Brown, Keneally, King, Payne, and Tonkin.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (CITY PLAN)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 19. Page 2445.)

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): Although I support the Bill, I will in due course move an amendment to it. All members accept the statement, in the Minister's second reading explanation, that the Bill is important for South Australia's future and particularly for the future of the Adelaide area. All members who have had access to the report on the redevelopment of Adelaide have been impressed by the details contained in it, even though they may not have been so impressed by some of its recommendations, particularly the recommendation relating to the concept of a registered place. The Government realised that a time limit should be placed on the operation of the Bill, because it was clearly indicated that the whole development of the Adelaide area could remain static for an indeterminate time. As a result, the date of June 30, 1975, was included in the original Act, action having to be taken by then, and the matter having to be referred back to the House for further consideration if additional time was necessary. The imposition of this time limit has caused sufficient action to be taken for the report to be brought down.

Many people in the community, particularly those associated with this matter, wanted to delay the presentation of the report, thereby allowing more time to be given to the investigation. I believe a similar situation arises now: if we were to extend the period further, perhaps all the appeals (and I understand there are more than 700 of them) against the provisions of the report would go into limbo. There would be no desire to get on with the job of hearing those appeals and of making sure that the future development of the Adelaide scene was allowed to progress as quickly as possible.

It may be said that the Bill simply extends the date from June 30, 1975, to June 30, 1976. However, I believe that period is too long and that it will take away the initiative required to get on with the job. While June 30, 1976, may appear a practical date, it is unlikely that

Parliament will sit during the autumn of 1976 because of the normal triennial election programme. If the Government considered that an extension to June 30, 1976, was too short, legislation could be introduced in October or November of this year to amend the legislation further. In Committee, I intend to move that the date should be amended to December 31, 1975, to urge all those associated with these activities to get on with the job and to come to grips with the problems involved. Then it would be possible to come back to Parliament during October or November for an extension to June 30, 1976, if required.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: What damage will it do to let the Bill go through as it is drafted?

Dr. EASTICK: If the Minister had been listening, he would have heard my contention that a fixed time is an important issue in urging people to get on with the job and to make the decisions necessary for the development to proceed. Anyone associated with building or general development is aware of problems associated with building activities in Adelaide in the past two years. The activities of the committee caused an advanced building programme on the Adelaide Children's Hospital to be stood over while a complete reassessment was made of the method of improving the hospital's facilities. While the end result may be advantageous, a depression has been caused in development. So that development can proceed, a quick decision is essential. In supporting the Bill, I look forward to the assistance of the Government in amending the Bill as I have foreshadowed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Expiry of this Part."

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

To strike out all words after "amended" and insert "by striking out the passage 'thirtieth day of June, 1975' and inserting in lieu thereof the passage 'thirty-first day of December, 1975'".

My amendment shortens by six months the period provided in the Bill. If an additional period is needed a Bill must be brought before Parliament during the latter part of this year. My amendment is an endeavour to ensure that there is a spur to getting on with an important job so that the development of Adelaide can continue. I seek the support of all members for my amendment.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): While I appreciate that the amendment is designed to put pressure on people to do something, this issue is far too important for hurried decisions to be made or for people to be unduly pressured to take action. That is why the Government stipulated the period set out in the Bill, and it would not be in the best interests of the scheme as a whole to shorten the period. Although I do not entirely disagree with the reasoning behind the amendment, the Government believes that the period stipulated in the Bill is a desirable period; it does not put undue pressure on people, so we cannot be criticised for forcing the issue, but at the same time we want all necessary time to be taken in the most important deliberations involved. Although it would be possible, as the Leader said, to introduce further legislation in October, I do not think that would be necessary, and I think we should accept the situation outlined in the Bill.

Mr. CUMBE: In supporting what the Leader has said, I regret the Minister's reaction. Part of the work involved in this plan is in my district. I am conversant with the City of Adelaide Development Plan proposals, which have

caused comment in my district in relation to some of the more prominent buildings as well as some houses occupied by private people. It must be cleaned up sooner or later, and we must bear in mind the attitude and responsibilities of local government. Although this involves an interim committee set up for a special purpose, ultimately we have to come back to local government. The City of Adelaide Development Plan will eventually come before Parliament, although probably not in its present form. It will be a matter for lengthy discussion. The amendment has virtue, and the Government will be able to take suitable action in the next session of Parliament if the need should arise.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (19)—Messrs. Allen, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick (teller), Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

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

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Arnold and Mathwin. Noes—Messrs. McRae and Wells.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negated; clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ART GALLERY ACT AMENDMENT BILL (BOARD)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 19. Page 2445.)

Mr. RUSSACK (Gouger): I support the Bill, which does two main things. First, the name National Gallery at Adelaide will become the Art Gallery of South Australia and, secondly, new section 16 expands the powers of the board. Paragraphs (a) and (b) of new section 16 (1) contain provisions similar to those in the principal Act. New paragraphs (c), (d), (e), and (f) extend the board's duties. Those new paragraphs provide:

- (c) to assist in the promotion, organisation and supervision of art galleries and collections of art and any body or association established for the promotion of art within the State;
- (d) to advise the Minister and any organisation referred to in paragraph (c) of this subsection on matters of general policy relating to art galleries and collections of art;
- (e) to advise the Minister, local government authorities and any other authority or body on the provision, selection and maintenance of works of art for public places in the State; and
- (f) such other functions as may be necessary or incidental to the foregoing or as the Minister may from time to time specify.

New section 16 (2) gives the board such powers as are necessary for or incidental to the carrying out of its functions, and new section 16 (3) merely continues the duties that the board has had. We on this side of the House support the measure.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—"Powers and functions of the board."

Mr. RUSSACK: New section 16 provides:

- (1) The functions of the board are as follows
 - (c) to assist in the promotion, organisation and supervision of art galleries and collections of art and any body or association established for the promotion of art within the State.

Can the Minister say whether any such body or association will enjoy the same autonomy in the future as it has enjoyed in the past? Will the responsible Minister have any further authority, or is the provision mainly to assist in the promotion of art?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): Any such body or association may not be interfered with in any way. Paragraph (c) does not mean that the board can direct a body or an association. Any such body or association will still be autonomous if it is autonomous at present. If it requires assistance, such assistance will be forthcoming.

Mr. RUSSACK: New section 16 refers to "the Minister". Last year the definition of "Minister" was struck out. Am I correct in believing that the term "Minister" refers to the Premier?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The term means the Minister to whom the administration of the legislation is committed at any given time. Of course, that does not necessarily mean that it would be the same Minister all the time.

Mr. Russack: Which Minister is involved at present?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Premier.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

UNDERGROUND WATERS PRESERVATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 19. Page 2445.)

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): This short Bill affects the hundreds of Marcollat, Parsons and Glen Roy, often identified as the "Padthaway" area of the South-East. This part of the State is blessed with a wonderful amenity: potable water in vast quantities at depths of six metres. It is common to have discharges of 1.135 megalitres an hour at that depth. In this area water has been used for irrigation in great quantities. Two years ago the Government very properly issued a proclamation in an attempt to bring the area within the ambit of the principal Act. As the Minister says in his second reading explanation, the form of restriction on the use of underground water is to limit the draw-off. When an appropriate draft notice of restriction under section 17 of the principal Act was submitted to the Government's legal advisers, they indicated that it would be necessary also to direct the installation of meters to record the amount of water taken from wells.

Because this Bill is necessary, the Opposition has no quarrel with it. The Government believes that, because the restrictions are effective, the requirement that landholders install meters is unnecessary. Once the Bill is passed the draw-off will be limited to an amount not greater than the amount required to irrigate the area of crops irrigated in the 1972-73 season. Or, if it is so desired, the Minister still has the right to require the installation of a meter. The Minister may have to resort to this requirement in the future, but not in the immediate future. There have been considerable changes in land ownership in this part of the State. High prices have been paid for the land in the expectation that irrigation would be possible. Shallow bores, high yields and the nature of the terrain lend themselves to flood irrigation. As a result, much water has been wasted. It may be argued that the water that is flooded on to the land finds its way back to the aquifer, and therefore is not lost. If that argument is valid, why has the basin reached a critical level?

I have recently noticed that there is extended use in vineyards of the water winch, a controlled and efficient application of water. This poses the question: are we making the best use of the water available? I do not want to see wholesale restrictions on people using flood irrigation. I point out, however, that very efficient farmers who have recently moved into the area paid large sums for their land, and they are precluded from making any use of the wonderful amenities there. In this time of economic stress they could engage in cash cropping. The Bill gives the Minister necessary powers to control the use of water in the Padthaway area, and we have no argument about that. However, the question whether optimum use is being made of the draw-off water should be considered.

Only today, I had discussions with representatives of the District Affairs and Conservation Committee of Mundulla. That committee is interested in the announcement by Dr. Cass that money will be available from the Australian Government to assist water conservation in the States. These people want to utilise the water that runs off in the Mundulla area and, I understand, recharges the Padthaway Basin. With the help of funds from Dr. Cass, expert advice will be sought in preparing a case to present to the Minister relating to the clearing up of some run-away holes in the Mundulla area, thus diverting water into the Padthaway Basin that would normally find its way to the Coorong, with much loss through evaporation.

Under the Act, before anyone can let water go underground, there must be an examination by officers of the Mines Department in conjunction with officers of the water preservation committee, so that the potability of the underground basin is preserved. There is complete co-operation in these matters among landholders in the area. In view of the concern expressed by people who are not permitted to use underground water, I believe that its existing use should be examined to ensure that the optimum value is being obtained from it. As the Bill is straightforward, I have much pleasure in supporting it.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): The amendments included in the Bill will not merely enable the Minister to apply restrictions without using meters, if that is his wish, within the area of Padthaway, even though that is what the amendments are said to do. Under section 17 (2) (b), it was previously necessary for quota restrictions to be accompanied by the installation of meters; it was mandatory for the department to take both courses of action at once. Now, under the Bill, the department will be able to take either one course or both courses.

I wish to take this opportunity to point out some of the injustices that occur under a system in which people must declare the extent of their crop in any one year. There is no doubt, from my knowledge of the northern Adelaide Plains, that agriculturists who were honest and mainly good operators, since they used water correctly (and water is a valuable commodity in this State), ended up with the wrong end of the stick when quotas were issued. In many cases, those who were ruthless enough to gamble that the department would be unable to check them out and who put in a dishonest report on their crop for a year got away with it. I do not entirely blame departmental officers, because it was virtually impossible to check this out.

Another bad fault arose in this system. Good operators, who understood the benefit of using water at the right time and in proper quantities, limited their crop to the extent that they could look after it expertly. Other people who tended to be greedy gambled on growing more than they could look after efficiently and ended up with a poor quality product. Yet the latter operators used nearly the same

quantity of water a hectare as the better operators. If water is used for a longer period than necessary, the crop is half bogged. Then the crop is left for too long and no benefit results, with the crop being unsuccessful in quantity and quality. Perhaps we should conduct an inquiry through the Agriculture Department into how some operators in the irrigation field operate. This should apply particularly to operators in the northern Adelaide Plains, although the same position could apply at Padthaway. Honest producers have their problems. If the people of Padthaway find out what I have said, they may be tempted to be dishonest when they make their application; perhaps it is unwise for me to speak in this way. However, I hope they are not dishonest; I trust that they will see the need to be responsible.

Another problem arises in declaring a crop in a certain year. A producer may have reached the time of life when he wants to reduce his crop, intending to retire soon. He may have a son who is overseas studying or working. He may reduce the area of crop he plants while his son is away. However, when the son returns, there is difficulty in increasing the quota, yet that person may be able to operate with more expertise and make use of the water more responsibly than others who have larger quotas. Therefore, injustices occur and have occurred in the northern Adelaide Plains. What I am saying is not an attack on the department or the Minister. I know the Minister is aware of the problem that has occurred in the northern Adelaide Plains.

Some producers operate on 236 392 litres to 254 576 l a year, whereas others (who did not grow as much in the year for which they were asked to declare their crop size for each classification of crop) receive 318 220 l to 363 680 l a year. That makes honest men wonder whether it is worth being honest. If people at Padthaway play the game honestly there will be no discontent in their community. I hope that one day there can be a new reckoning in the northern Adelaide Plains, with an attempt being made to right the injustices that have unfortunately been allowed to occur. However, I know any solution is difficult to find. I will now refer to the South-East particularly. Under a State Liberal Government, the people in that area asked for drains to be constructed to drain their areas in order to be able to graze stock and make greater use of the flatter country. I believe that we are now paying the penalty for some of our actions in being too anxious to drain such large areas.

The member for Victoria made the point about directing more water back into the aquifers. That is something we must consider seriously, and we must carry out every possible investigation in that field. If it is possible for South Australia to redirect any good quality water into any form of storage for the future, we should do so. If nature has given us an underground water storage which has a greater capacity than that used by nature, even though usage by man may have had an effect on its holdings, we should act to have that reserve kept at the highest possible level. I see no wrong in the amendment the Minister has foreshadowed to amend the original 1969 Act.

I commend the Liberal Government of the day for taking the first step in this State to preserve our underground waters and to have some control over well drillers and those who employ them. Undoubtedly, at times some wells have been drilled unnecessarily; sometimes they have been drilled to a greater depth than was necessary and have actually taken away a reserve of water to a lower level. Fortunately, sometimes they have been sealed off and the supply saved, but at other times the supply has not been

saved. A Liberal Government implemented the original concept of control of underground waters, which is one of our greatest natural resources. I congratulate those Cabinet members who decided, in 1969, to take this action, because today we reap the benefit, as we will of the present Minister's action when the amendment has been carried. I support the Bill and look forward to a more honest return being lodged by primary producers in the South-East, with regard to acreage grown, than we received from a few people on the northern Adelaide Plains who exploited the situation for their own selfish ends.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): The department's operation at the Padthaway Basin is a holding one at this stage; hence, the flexibility I want included in the Act. When an accurate assessment over a longer term has been made, we will know how the basin has been functioning. The basin is probably at its optimum use now, but we are uncertain of how it is functioning. Proper use of the water concerns the Government just as much as it does the member for Fisher and the member for Victoria. After adequate investigation, we will probably be able to allow more development in that area. I think the member for Victoria knows how it has developed in the last decade, particularly. Regarding Dr. Cass's offer, we have applied to the Australian Government for funds. The honourable member is no doubt aware that the Water Resources Branch of the Engineering and Water Supply Department is well on the way to being established. The legislation to implement it will be introduced in the next session of Parliament, although I had hoped that I might be able to introduce it before the end of the present session. The staff has been built up and the State's water resources will be investigated properly and efficiently. It is a holding situation more than anything else and, with proper investigation, we should get the maximum use of this water and should be able to prevent what has happened on the northern Adelaide Plains from recurring.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Notices."

Mr. RODDA: Can the Minister say whether there has been an increase in the draw-off that will bring about the requirement which he can carry out administratively as a result of the introduction of the Bill, which refers to a specific area? Has there been usage that has caused the Government alarm during the past year?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): The assessment made by the department's hydrologists and engineers was such that they were afraid that, if we did not hold the situation as it was, it would lead to over-exploitation of the basin. In other words, although they were not certain (because they had not completed their investigations), they thought that it had reached its maximum use. It is a holding operation so that we can conserve the supply and take steps to ascertain the way in which the water is used, before allowing others to participate. I appreciate the feelings of people who may have moved into the area in the expectation of getting water and who may have seen it running down the road, as I have seen it.

Mr. RODDA: The Minister's reply causes me some alarm. I believe there have been decreases in water usage at times, because certain major landholders have sold their land and because others have been using the water winch. It seems that some of the original irrigators have been having a big suck at the lemon.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member knows that we introduced restrictions some time ago, and the requirements of the Act are that I would have to insist on meters if I proceeded. I am amending the Act to avoid that procedure and to enable investigations to be completed. According to the information I have received, we have reached a stage where the further use of water has to be stopped.

Clause passed.

Mr. CHAPMAN: How long does one have to stand on clause 2 to be seen by the Chair?

The CHAIRMAN: The question has been put. My attention was not drawn to the fact that the honourable member was standing, and I regret that.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

INDUSTRIAL ORGANISATION (BUILDING GRANTS) BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) brought up the report of the Select Committee recommending amendments, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Report received. Ordered that minutes of proceedings be printed.

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

That the report be noted.

The committee had several meetings for the purpose of taking evidence, and then discussed matters contained in the Bill. The evidence very clearly showed that the position in which the Trades Hall is now placed is that it will be quite impossible for it to meet the interest payments on its liabilities and still remain a viable operation. The evidence was also clear that when the Trades Hall had been built, and subsequently, efforts had been made to raise the necessary money and that levies had been struck on member unions. However, levies had a limited effect and, because of the nature of the registered rules of some unions (registered under our law), it was impossible for levies to be effected in the case of several unions.

Mr. Millhouse: All this was known at the time, though.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In fact, some unions, by their rules, specifically prohibit the imposition of levies. However, that does not mean that attempts have not been made to raise the necessary money to bridge the gap between the present expenditure to meet principal and interest on the Trades Hall and the income of the hall. Also, it was clear that, in letting Trades Hall facilities, rentals being charged were comparable with those obtained for comparable premises: perhaps they were greater than those charged for competitive premises elsewhere in the city.

Mr. Venning: Why?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In order to try to raise as much money as possible in income.

Mr. Millhouse: All this was known at the time you started the venture.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I did not start it, and I suggest that the honourable member listen to me.

Mr. Millhouse: You will have to talk pretty hard to convince me.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am sure I will never convince the honourable member. However, it is not a matter of convincing him. I suggest that, before he makes his usual stupid interjection, he should listen to a few facts.

Mr. Millhouse: You will convince precious few people in South Australia, and I think you know that.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I really do not intend to give material to the House and have this kind of constant interjection from the honourable member.

Mr. Millhouse: You invite it when you speak like that.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham will not take over the proceedings of the House. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The position in this matter is that the continuance of this project has caused problems because the project was faced with difficulties, particularly because of an escalation in interest payments.

Mr. Dean Brown: It wasn't poor planning?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, it was not. It was on the basis of the recommendations made by the architect at the time and a reasonable forecast as to the amount of money that would be raised to pay off the principal. A considerable sum was raised by trade unionists in South Australia.

Mr. Millhouse: It was an ordinary business venture.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It was considered that this was a reasonable project. The maintaining of a facility for the union movement in South Australia in order for it to have a common centre in which the activities of unions were carried on is necessary for the continuance of the union movement. If no assistance is given, the Trades Hall faces foreclosure and sale.

Mr. Venning: The same as anyone else.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, and because the position is serious the Trades Hall is asking for the kind of assistance that has been given to other comparable organisations in South Australia.

Mr. Millhouse: Rubbish!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Concerning the position of comparable organisations, I point out to honourable members that evidence was given to the Select Committee that the Chamber of Manufactures in South Australia had, over a considerable period at the end of last century and the beginning of this, received annual grants from the Government.

Dr. Eastick: For specific purposes.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In addition, the Chamber of Manufactures had also held exhibitions and was accommodated rent free in the Exhibition Building.

Mr. Millhouse: How long ago was that?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: At the beginning of this century and until the organisation acquired its premises in Pirie Street. In fact, it was able to build up the necessary finance and funds by being accommodated rent free and by being given Government grants that covered administration expenses.

Mr. Millhouse: Ha, ha!

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will get the chance to speak later in this debate if he so desires.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know whether I have to shout the whole time in order to make myself heard, or why this debate should not be carried on in some sort of order.

Mr. Venning: Why should you get preferential treatment?

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are not permitted.

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

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

That the debate be now adjourned.

The House divided on the motion:

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

Noes (19)—Messrs. Allen, Becker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick (teller), Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. McRae and Wells. Noes—Messrs. Arnold and Blacker.

Majority of 3 for the Ayes.

The SPEAKER: The motion therefore passes in the affirmative, the debate to be made an Order of the Day for—

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: On motion!

Motion thus carried.

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

That the debate be now resumed.

The House divided on the motion:

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

Noes (19)—Messrs. Allen, Becker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse (teller), Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. McRae and Wells. Noes—Messrs. Arnold and Blacker.

Majority of 4 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): The Treasurer started to outline the course of events since this House last met, but he did not tell the House that the report that has been received today was not reached unanimously. In fact, the member for Eyre and I not only did not support it: we did not support the report that was ready to be presented last Tuesday week. However, I will confine myself now to the report that is before us this evening. It suggests that the Government take a course of action different from that proposed in the original Bill. It seeks to make available to the trade union movement, through the Trades Hall Managing Committee, \$200 000, on terms set out in the various amendments in the report. That is not a view that the member for Eyre or I hold.

The Treasurer started to develop a line of approach indicating that the evidence taken by the Select Committee showed that the Trades Hall was in a difficult position. No-one denies that. In fact, all members of the Select Committee admitted that the evidence given by Mr. Shannon, Mr. Doyle, and Mr. Carey and his associate (the latter two persons having been requested to examine the affairs of the managing committee) showed that the committee was in a difficult position. That position was known by Mr. Doyle in 1972, when the Trades Hall was opened. That is evidenced by statements made to the Select Committee.

Mr. Doyle, when he first became associated with the financial affairs of the Trades Hall Managing Committee, clearly indicated to the Select Committee (and he has continued to indicate it) that it was in deep financial difficulties, and it still is in those difficulties. Earlier the committee had not been able to meet its commitments, yet no evidence was given to the Select Committee that there had been any real effort to correct the situation that Mr. Doyle outlined. I do not walk away from the fact that, on evidence given, \$165 000 was made available by way of donation to the Trades Hall Managing Committee. I laud the fact that that amount was raised, but I repeat what I have said publicly, namely, that I consider that other public funds and employer funds would be available if only the organisation had continued its appeal for assistance.

In the evidence given to the committee, it was suggested that my public announcement and the \$10 that I had personally made available to Mr. Shannon, representing the Trades Hall Managing Committee, had not attracted any further donations. It had been a failure as an appeal. I stated before the Select Committee that what I did was not make an appeal on behalf of the Trades Hall Managing Committee but indicate to the committee that people in the community were willing to give money. As a result of the public announcement that I had sent a cheque to the committee, a pensioner lady from Victor Harbor sent a cheque for \$1 towards the appeal, indicating that she would have liked to make more money available but that her financial resources were limited.

Mr. Chapman: But they're very liberal people in that district!

Dr. EASTICK: They are well represented by a Liberal Party member, too. In a letter to the Editor of a newspaper, it was stated that a donation of \$5 had been made by a unionist from the Storemen and Packers Union. We will not go into the situation that has been reported to me, namely, that, as a result of his making that money available and announcing it publicly, means were sought to have him thrown out of the union. That is another matter, but that is the sort of tactic that was used.

Mr. Wright: Can you prove that?

Dr. EASTICK: If the honourable member can read the transcript—

Mr. Wright: It's an allegation without foundation, and you know it.

Dr. EASTICK: It is not an allegation without foundation. If the organisation showed a little self-help, many people in the community would be willing to make funds available. I do not suggest that they would suddenly make available \$1 000 000 to the Trades Hall, which is about the amount it needs to clean the slate completely, but there is money available for this organisation. If it had accepted the recommendations made by Mr. Doyle in 1972, it would have undertaken a series of promotions to obtain that assistance. It would not be in the position in which it is today. Probably today's debt would not be as great as it is, because the organisation would not have had to capitalise unpaid interest. There was an earlier occasion when it was not possible for the Trades Hall Managing Committee to meet its interest payment. There was a moratorium on the payment, but subsequently the unpaid interest became an addition to the capital. So, it is now in the position of paying interest on that higher capital; that is most unfortunate.

It was also quite evident that there was no true feasibility study of the operation. When an inquiry was made as to whether a feasibility study had been made, the reply was

negative. It is amazing that an organisation would undertake a building programme of this magnitude without procuring a proper feasibility study. Evidence was given that the organisation would have liked to increase the size of the building to make available additional office space for rental and to obtain the benefits therefrom by greater use of the available leisure facilities; however, the additional money, \$250 000, needed to build the extra floor was not available. Despite the greatest of goodwill and despite the genuine interest shown in the organisation, there was a lack of proper assessment. As a result, difficulties have arisen for the Trades Hall Managing Committee.

Much of the immediate problem is not related to the question of a feasibility study, nor is it related to the failure to provide for servicing the loan. This organisation, like many others and like people wanting to purchase houses, has been hit severely by the interest rates forced on the whole community by the Australian Government.

Mr. Evans: Many people have had to sell their houses.

Dr. EASTICK: Yes. The increase in interest rates will be a noose around people's necks for many years. Possibly some people will never be able to release themselves from the bonds associated with the crippling increase in interest rates. Many people will never be able to advance their ownership of their houses, because of the Government's failure to provide houses at a proper interest rate.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader knows that he is debating a certain Bill, and he must adhere to that Bill.

Dr. EASTICK: Thousands of South Australians in business and in voluntary organisations have found themselves in precisely the situation confronting the Trades Hall Managing Committee. Their problems relate directly to the size of their interest bill. It was one of the last straws on the camel's back. The member for Elizabeth drew a red herring across the trail when he said that the Chamber of Manufactures Incorporated, as it then was, received a series of payments and benefits involving occupation of premises without rental. Evidence presented to the Select Committee clearly shows that many projects undertaken by the chamber have benefited the public. The chamber has introduced into South Australia industries that were, and still are, beneficial to South Australia. It was a quid pro quo: if it received \$600, it spent \$600 in a series of projects beneficial to the State. Silkworm production is an example; further, the ligurian bee, a pure strain, was introduced on Kangaroo Island with the aid of sums made available through the chamber. These sums would probably amount to \$200 000 over a period.

The Select Committee also heard that Centennial Hall, property of the Royal Agricultural and Horticultural Society at Wayville, was built with the aid of funds made available by the Government on extremely favourable terms. Centennial Hall has benefited, and continues to benefit, the public, although it was implied that the only people who had benefited from the building of Centennial Hall were members of the rural community. Any person who has lived in South Australia for any significant period would have used the hall for charitable and educational purposes. Many of us would be able to say that we sat for our Intermediate and Leaving examinations there. Some could say that they sang in the 1 000-voice choir. The hall has been used, and is still used, by a large cross-section of the South Australian community. It was not made available for sectional use.

Dr. Tonkin: The festival hall comes into the same category.

Dr. EASTICK: Yes. Benefits will continue to accrue for many years from the festival hall. It was suggested in evidence before the Select Committee that, without this type of assistance, the Trades Hall could be sold up: the financial position was so grave that the building could cease to be the home of the trade union movement. I trust that will not come to pass, as that would be against the best interests of a balanced industrial understanding that we hope to see in this State for years to come.

However, I know from evidence received by the committee and from information given to members over a long time that many people in the trade union movement do not appreciate what is foreseen in this case, because it amounts to a hand-out. If it is not exactly a golden handshake, it is close to it. Several people believe that, if this sort of action were taken, it would lead to the destruction of the trade union movement, because it would be giving that movement something for nothing; it would take away the initiative and drive that the unions should have to correct their own financial affairs. Surely that must occur to many people at this time, when we see many members of the Trades Hall Managing Committee and affiliated organisations having money available to put into a radio station. At present, these people are applicants for a radio station licence in South Australia. It has been indicated that, if the licence is received, about 20 unions will make funds available. Although I cannot say how much each union would contribute, I have been informed that a considerable sum is involved.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: As a rule, you get bad advice.

Members interjecting:

Dr. EASTICK: The attitude of members opposite makes me believe that I am on the ball. If the sum available from each of the 20 unions were only \$1 000, it would be expected, at a time of dire financial difficulties in relation to the Trades Hall building, that these funds would be used to safeguard the home of the union rather than spent on the hustings, as it were, in setting up a radio station. Would not the sustentation fee that comes from some organisations to the Labor Party for political promotion purposes be better directed to saving the home of the unions? I believe funds are available to the unions if they care to marshal them. Some public funds would be available, as well as some money out of the pockets of members on this side, several of whom are willing to contribute.

Mr. Gunn: I'll give \$10.

Dr. EASTICK: At page 8, the *Unionist* of March, 1971, contains the following article headed "South Australian Trades Hall gets off ground":

A public appeal to employers for \$100 000 will be made to help cover the cost of building new trade union headquarters in Adelaide. Approval for a \$900 000 Commonwealth Bank loan late in January gave the go-ahead for work to commence in February with completion planned for December.

The new headquarters will comprise an office block of basement and four floors accommodating 28 unions, two legal firms, the Trades and Labor Council and the A.L.P. Four additional floors may be added later.

The basement is planned to include a club with bar and dining-room to accommodate 300 and a two-level car park will park 70 vehicles. At the rear of the office block an auditorium seating 500 people is planned, together with meeting rooms for 50, 100 and 300 people. These may be air-conditioned, if funds permit.

The existing Trades Hall has been sold to a private developer at an undisclosed price. The builder's estimate on the new building is \$850 000. T. & L.C. Secretary Mr. J. E. Shannon has overall responsibility for the project.

That article pinpoints the fact that a loan was obtained for a sum greater than the estimated cost of the building. That fact should be considered in connection with my earlier comments about feasibility. At the time that announcement was made, there were many unknowns in the future.

Before the Select Committee, Mr. Shannon and Mr. Doyle were most helpful, providing all the information for which they were asked. Indeed, subsequently they provided confidential information whose confidentiality I intend to maintain. The indication was that employers and several organisations rose to the occasion, with support amounting to about \$165 000 being available. However, the Treasurer, in the few remarks he made on this vital issue, spoke about the limited effect of levies. He said that it is not possible to raise as much as had been expected through levies on the trade union movement. In fact, sufficient evidence was presented before the committee to show that some levies raised may never have reached the fund for which they were raised. What percentage of the funds was finally paid in is also a matter of some conjecture.

I now refer to a document which was not presented before the committee but which a witness before the committee said was available. This shows that, in the case of the Storemen and Packers Union, sums made available for the Trades Hall were passed over to the Trades Hall Managing Committee. But we find that Mr. Petrie, the Federal Secretary of the union, when submitting the balance sheet as at June 30, 1973, presented with the document necessary to be placed before the court the following qualified auditors' report:

To the members of Federated Storemen and Packers Union of Australia (South Australian Branch):

We have examined the balance sheet of Federated Storemen and Packers Union (South Australian Branch) as at June 30, 1973, and the related statement of receipts and payments for the year then ended. Our examination included such tests of the accounting records and such other auditing procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances. We report that:

- (1) Proper books of account were not kept during the period July to December, 1972.
- (2) We were unable to satisfy ourselves that all receipts and payments of the union for the period July to December, 1972, have been correctly recorded.

Subject to these reservations, in our opinion:

The above balance sheet gives a true and fair view of the state of affairs of the Federated Storemen and Packers Union (South Australian Branch) as at June 30, 1973.

The accompanying statement of receipts and payments gives a true and fair view of the transactions of the union as recorded in the union's bank account for the year ended June 30, 1973.

In other words, that is a clear indication by the Federal Secretary that he could not vouch for the validity of all the transactions of that union during the preceding 12 months. I raise this point, because one must question whether all of the funds raised were correctly directed to the purpose for which they were raised, namely, Trades Hall on South Terrace.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: That's a dirty word.

Dr. EASTICK: It is not a dirty word, if I may reply to the Minister, who has interjected with such an inane comment. I have the highest regard for responsible members of the union hierarchy, but I have little regard for irresponsible members of that hierarchy, and there are some of them. I believe there are some with whom Government members would not care to associate, but I will not go into personalities. There should be a strong trade union movement with its own house, but I do not

believe that we would have such a strong movement if this kind of hand-out was made available to it. As I opposed the measure when it was before the House earlier, I oppose it now. I want, in advance of remarks by Government members who were also members of the Select Committee, to refer to another matter, because I think it proper that it should be appreciated and put in its true perspective. The member for Eyre and I made ourselves available for Select Committee meetings on the occasions they were called, and we indicated during the course of those discussions and examinations we undertook that we recognised that the Trades Hall was in difficulties and that it would need some kind of help.

We looked for ways and means whereby it could receive help, and we undertook to look at a series of alternative proposals for funding that were suggested by the Under Treasurer (Mr. Carey) at the direction and request not only of the committee but also of the Treasurer. Notwithstanding our belief that the hall was in need of help, and notwithstanding the merit, in the short term, and costs of the proposals contained in the amendments, it was my considered belief and that of the member for Eyre that the trade union movement would not benefit to any degree by our supporting such an action. If the Government intends to proceed with the Bill, it does so completely of its own volition and against the background knowledge that it is not a popular undertaking within the community or even the trade union movement. The Government undertakes this action with the knowledge that members of the committee, from both sides, made themselves available to consider the possibilities. I do not deny that an opportunity was provided and time made available for the work of that vital committee, but I will not accept a situation wherein my opposition to this measure can be turned against me politically or used to show me up. I told the committee Chairman only about 36 hours ago that I would not accept being told what I must believe, nor would I be compromised into a position by threats. I make my position clear.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Who threatened you?

Dr. EASTICK: If the Minister had been listening, he would have heard me refer to the committee Chairman (the Treasurer), with whom I used such terms as, "Don't be so bloody foolish to think that you could."

Mr. Wright: That's not true.

Mr. Gunn: It is so.

Dr. EASTICK: I want that point clearly understood on the floor of the House. I cannot, in any circumstances, accept the proposal contained in the report, which does not have my support nor, as he will undoubtedly indicate, the support of the member for Eyre.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I support what my Leader has said, and I am surprised that the member for Adelaide has waited until after both Opposition members of the Select Committee have spoken. I do not believe that he is game, because he realises that the Government does not have a logical case to put to the people of the State. I will make several facts clear from the outset: I have no personal dislike for the trade union movement.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: You could have fooled me.

Mr. GUNN: I do not want to see the trade union headquarters moved from the present premises. Judging by the attitude of the Minister of Labour and Industry, it appears that he considers that Opposition members would like to see the trade union movement destroyed.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: That's exactly right! Now you can sit down! You've satisfied me.

Mr. GUNN: That is completely untrue. Only a fool would try to bring about that situation and the Minister obviously fits into that category. At the hearings of the Select Committee it became evident to me that the Managing Committee of the Trades Hall had failed to make a proper assessment of the situation before building the hall. It would be clear to anyone who examined the evidence or the balance sheets, that the committee had failed to make a proper investigation. In July, 1969, the Trades and Labor Council applied to the Government but was refused assistance by the then Premier. Why? Obviously, when the Treasurer and Treasury officials examined the situation, it was obvious that this was not a viable proposition.

Mr. Payne: Did they say that in their reply?

Mr. GUNN: No, but details of a feasibility study were not made available to members of the Select Committee. I ask the member for Mitchell where is that study. What are its contents?

Mr. Payne: You are saying there was no feasibility study?

Mr. GUNN: No, I am not. I think that, if the member for Mitchell were honest, he would agree that the basis of the rejection by the then Government was that the proposition was not viable, and that no guarantee was given. In New South Wales a guarantee was given, and a similar arrangement was made in Western Australia, so that in those States there must have been a good financial history in relation to the Trades and Labor Council. Also, it is obvious that anyone who examined the documents would realise that the Trades and Labor Council was under-capitalised when it began this venture. I believe that some members of the trade union movement consider that the situation was not properly investigated, and some are dissatisfied with the managing committee. Mr. Giles (Secretary of the Plumbers and Gasfitters Union) was called before the committee and, under cross-examination, he refused to answer a certain question. I quote the following extract from page 48 of the evidence:

96. Mr. Gunn: Do you think the Management Committee of the Trades and Labor Council has been efficient in administration up to this time and do you think the venture was investigated properly before the Trades and Labor Council Management Committee committed itself to this large amount of money?—I would rather not answer that.

When I insisted, the member for Adelaide (Mr. Wright)—

Mr. Payne: Quite properly put you in your place!

Mr. GUNN: No, he did not. It was obvious that, as a person closely associated with the committee (indeed, I am not sure that he is not an ex-member of that committee), the honourable member was embarrassed. It was obvious, because of the refusal by Mr. Giles to answer, that the committee had mismanaged the affairs of the council, and he did not want to support a decision that had been made. That was the reason.

Mr. Wright: How do you know when I feel embarrassed?

Mr. GUNN: By your attitude at that time.

Mr. Wright: Read from the evidence the question I asked.

Mr. Payne: If you don't answer, you're guilty: that's his attitude.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GUNN: One could continue at great length about the evidence of Mr. Giles, because it was pointed out to him when he refused to answer that question what interpretation could be placed on his evidence.

Mr. Coumbe: Why didn't the Chairman insist on an answer?

Mr. GUNN: At that time the Treasurer (who was Chairman of the Select Committee) had to leave the meeting, and the committee was being chaired by the Leader of the Opposition. I believe he treated that witness fairly when he pointed out to Mr. Giles clearly what interpretation would be placed on his refusal to answer, and that is the only one that could be placed on that action. Whilst we are considering a gift of \$200 000 to the Trades Hall, we should know where the headquarters of the Labor Party are situated in this State. From details in the handbook of the Australian Labor Party, South Australian Branch, they are situated at South Terrace, in the building known as the Trades Hall. It is interesting to note that a Labor Government is to make a donation of \$200 000 to the same building in which it is housed.

Mr. Wright: They pay rent for it, and they are entitled to be a tenant, you goose!

Mr. GUNN: I ask the member for Adelaide whether he would like to repeat that interjection.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot solicit interjections.

Mr. GUNN: Although the Australian Labor Party is housed in this building, only 25 trade unions are housed in it out of the 68 unions operating in this State. I believe that the trade union movement is completely dissatisfied with its present administration, and that rank-and-file members have been let down and are not willing to support the Trades Hall because of shady deals that union representatives have made on their behalf: they have misled their members.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: They keep electing them.

Mr. GUNN: One could tell some interesting stories about that, too. I believe that, before this matter is continued in this House, the Trades and Labor Council should put its own house in order and ask the public of this State to support it. If an organisation comprising 68 unions with more than 200 000 members cannot raise funds from the public, there must be something wrong with it. It has the organisation and the manpower, and surely it has the knowledge of how to go to the public and solicit funds. If it cannot do this, it will never be solvent and able to operate the building efficiently or even to finance it. This would be a commonsense and logical solution. The Leader said earlier that he would be pleased to make a donation; I am sure that all Opposition members would be pleased to do the same thing, and I believe a large section of the public would also be willing to make donations.

Mr. Langley: What about the member for Mitcham? Could you guarantee that?

Mr. GUNN: I referred to members of my Party, and we are the official Opposition. I do not believe taxpayers in this State will tolerate a situation in which their funds are to be disbursed in this way, and there will be public disquiet. We have had a case put to the Select Committee to which the Treasurer has referred, and no doubt the members for Adelaide and Mitchell will go to great lengths to support this move. Mr. Shannon made a lengthy submission, which was an excellent history lesson because it took us back to 1890. However, we are dealing with matters as they are now, and what the Government of the day did then does not mean that this Parliament or Government should take a similar course. The next example given was that of the Royal Agricultural and

Horticultural Society of South Australia. However, that is not an industrial organisation: that organisation provides entertainment for the public.

Mr. Payne: Is that your only objection—that the Trades Hall is an industrial organisation?

Mr. GUNN: Anyone who looks at the situation logically, fairly and justly will clearly say that the taxpayers of South Australia should not have to foot the bill for inefficiency. In my electoral district I cannot justify this expenditure to the many people that have approached me.

Mr. Wright: I bet you could justify it for the United Farmers and Graziers.

Mr. GUNN: Many people have approached me and asked, "Are you going to support this? It cannot be justified." At the local council office I may be asked the question by a district clerk who has had to stand down many long-standing and loyal employees because the council has insufficient funds to continue their employment.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member knows that we are dealing with the adoption of the report.

Mr. GUNN: I was only making a comparison, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: There are no comparisons in the report.

Mr. GUNN: I will not labour that point any further. In examining this whole matter, I suggested to Mr. Shannon that, although the Trades and Labor Council was under-capitalised (and this point was not properly investigated), he approach his Commonwealth colleagues on this matter, because of the high rate of interest the council was forced to accept for this project. I suggested that the cause of this high rate of interest was the result of the action of the Australian Labor Party Commonwealth Government, which had been supported by the Trades and Labor Council. It was the Commonwealth Government the council had supported that had increased interest rates to 11 per cent.

I pointed out that the Commonwealth Government had disbursed funds in a willy-nilly fashion throughout the nation, often to far less deserving causes than this one. The Treasurer believed that such an approach would be unconstitutional. Why would such an approach by the council be unconstitutional? The Commonwealth Government may make grants to anyone it likes. That argument was a red herring drawn across the trail. Finally, I sincerely hope that the Trades and Labor Council puts its own house in order by going to its own members and to members of the public and by making a genuine effort to obtain its funds independent of Government help.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Why doesn't B.H.P. go to its own shareholders?

Mr. GUNN: It does, at times, and many companies in the private sector have to go to their shareholders. Why does the Minister not ask the member for Victoria about the situation applying at Naracoorte, where the local abattoir had to call on its members? Obviously the Minister does not understand anything. If the trade union movement acts on the two suggestions I have made—

The Hon. D. H. McKee: It's clear—

Mr. GUNN: It is obvious that the Minister is reflecting the same views as those of Mr. Shannon and Mr. Doyle. I do not believe they want to go to their members, because they are afraid that they will be rebuked for their inefficiency. There is a large body of opinion in the trade union movement that is dissatisfied with trade union administration. In recent times we have seen the example of

Mr. Cavanagh, and I am sure that we will soon see other examples. The Trades and Labor Council has found itself in the same position as that of many small firms and other South Australian industries as a result of the policies the council put forward and as a result of the policies it has supported. I suggest that the council take a hard look at itself and put its own house in order before it asks South Australian taxpayers to foot the bill for its mismanagement. I sincerely hope that the council will go to the public, because I am sure that if it does this in a reasonable manner it will be successful. As I have already said, I have nothing personal against the Trades Hall, and I have nothing personal against trade unions.

Members interjecting:

Mr. GUNN: Members opposite can laugh, but I believe that in any free society people are entitled to organise themselves in a union or an association. That is part of the democratic process. However, they have to show some responsibility, and the council would be showing its responsibility by putting its own house in order and by going to the public to seek additional funds. I support the remarks of my Leader and I oppose the adoption of the report.

Mr. WRIGHT (Adelaide): I support the adoption of the report. To put the member for Eyre properly in the picture, I point out that I did not wait deliberately for him to speak before me. That was his choice, not mine. True, I was waiting for a member on the Opposition benches to speak, but it was not the member for Eyre. In order to understand the problem properly (and this major problem confronts not only the trade union movement but the South Australian community generally), I refer to the history of this situation.

If I remember correctly, the member for Murray told the House today that Opposition members belonged to a free enterprise Party and that they could vote as they liked. Therefore, I throw out a challenge to members on the other side. This evening, as well as on many other occasions, they will vote *en bloc*. If members opposite are fair, study the evidence I will produce, and consider the historical background of the inception and continuation of the trade union movement in South Australia (and members opposite pretend to be fair-minded men), we may see a change of face, but I am doubtful about that as a result of my experience on the Select Committee. That experience led me to believe that Opposition members on the committee were being dominated by their Party or some other outside influence, and I intend to establish this more clearly later on.

It is important to understand what has happened in the development of the trade union movement in South Australia. In his submission Mr. Shannon told the committee that the movement was established in 1884. The wise leader realised at that time that the movement could not succeed until it was a strong, united body. They realised that success could not be achieved until they had a home of their own where they could domicile their affiliated organisations. The Trades and Labor Council commenced planning immediately to obtain and maintain a building where such provision could be made.

It must be remembered that in 1884 the union movement was not strong: it had only a small representation and it did not have much money. Action was therefore taken by the committee to find out what was the Government's approach on this matter. The committee approached the then Government for financial assistance, either through a cash grant or a land grant. The Government of the day refused to consider that request. However, some

assistance was made available by the Hon. G. C. Hawker, who in 1889 appreciated the position of the council and donated \$100. He told the council that he regretted that the Government could not help at that time. There was a further donation of \$1400 from a private person (Hon. R. C. Baker). In 1891, Mr. T. H. Brooker, M.P., expressed regret that the Government had rejected the motion to assist the Trades Hall Council. The point is that there were then people in the community who were willing to help the cause. However, the Government was not willing to help, and we know what sort of a Government was in Opposition then!

A compromise solution was put to the Trades and Labor Council executive by the Hon. C. C. Kingston. He suggested that the Government might consider supporting a dual enterprise, describing it as a "home of conciliation" or "Conciliation House". The Hon. Mr. Kingston wanted to put employer representative and employee representative organisations into the same building, but I congratulate the then Trades and Labor executive on not accepting that provision, because it would not have worked. It would not have been possible because, had it come off, it would have been a "lovey-dovey" arrangement.

There is no question about the relationship between employer and employee representative organisations: in most instances no relationship exists. It was therefore not possible even to examine that proposal, which was rejected unanimously by the then T.L.C. executive. This is the most important part of the history of that period, which necessitated my retracing it. I have now proved that the T.L.C., which has examined its own records, has never received an ounce of help from the Government since its inception, although it has received help from private people who saw a real need to assist it and, indeed, did so by making substantial cash payments to it.

I will now examine what happened in the period from 1874 to 1908. On the admission of Mr. Branson, who gave evidence to the Select Committee (he did not dispute this in any way, as can be seen from the minutes of evidence), the Chamber of Manufactures has received grants totalling \$21700. If that sort of money was related to present-day values, it would be worth about \$200 000. In this situation, the report that has been tabled does not recommend a grant or a gift of money, and it does not recommend that a permanent arrangement should be made. Indeed, the committee has recommended that a loan, to be repaid over 10 years, be made to the T.L.C. It is asking not for gifts but for help to enable it to survive over a certain period in its history during which its financial position is bad. However, in the past, with help being given to the forces opposite the trade union movement, the T.L.C. struggled on of its own volition without help and was able to open the old Trades Hall in Grote Street in 1896. I do not suppose Opposition members ever bothered to examine that building, which was like a rabbit warren. In fact, I do not know how people could occupy it, because it contained the worst possible accommodation in which people had to work. Indeed, it was a model befitting the 1896 era.

I do not think anyone would suggest that that standard of accommodation should be forced on any organisation, be it an employer or employee organisation, United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia Incorporated, or any other organisation that represents people. Such organisations and persons ought to be provided with the best available accommodation that their financial position permits.

In 1950, the Trades Hall examined the alternatives of purchasing a new property or renovating the old building. It was estimated that even to make the place reasonably livable would cost about \$20 000. The situation at Trades Hall was, then, an impossible one, as \$20 000 could not be spent on what could be described as an absolute wreck of a building. I think the organisation took the correct step. It had no option but to continue on its way and try to obtain more finance until it was able either to knock down the old Trades Hall or to sell it and move to a new site. Rightly or wrongly, that was their decision, and I think it was the correct one. Some persons say that the new Trades Hall should have been relocated on the old site. However, this involved demolishing the old building, and using temporary accommodation during construction of the new building.

The member for Eyre tried to condemn the committee. However, that committee only makes recommendations: it is not an autonomous body. Indeed, all its decisions are carried on to the full complement of delegates who represent all unions on the council. It is therefore no good for the member for Eyre to try to tell the House that there could be a vote of no confidence in the Trades Hall Trust Committee, because all its actions have been endorsed by the full meeting of delegates. When he appeared before the Select Committee, Mr. Shannon did a magnificent job explaining the difficulties being experienced by the Trades Hall. Indeed, he did such a magnificent job that I had no doubt then, and part way through the committee's proceedings, that the Opposition members on the Select Committee were sympathetic.

Mr. Payne: They have said as much, anyway.

Mr. WRIGHT: There is no question about that: they were sympathetic, and I will prove that. I do not want to labour this point by referring to the whole of the balance sheet presented to the Select Committee by Mr. Shannon. However, it is essential that Opposition members, in their free enterprise Party, examine in detail the exact situation in which the Trades and Labor Council finds itself. At best, the T.L.C. can continue to operate with an annual deficit of \$43 293. That is taking all things into consideration: I refer to its income from sustentation fees, trade union affiliates, hall hire, property rent, and all its other income. This was not disputed by anyone. Indeed, its accountant certified that these figures were correct, and this point has not been disputed by anyone associated with the committee, including the Under Treasurer. The problem is that every year the T.L.C. is going into debt by about \$43 000. Indeed, that figure could increase, especially with today's spiralling inflation and rising costs. Having no other way to raise money, the T.L.C.'s situation looks extremely black. Indeed, any honest man must admit that the situation could not be more black.

Mr. Chapman: The reds have turned black, have they?

Mr. WRIGHT: I was doing well until the member for Alexandra came in. I expect to do better now, because he will make stupid comments as he usually does, and I will be able to play off them. I refer to the transcript of the proceedings before the Select Committee at page 61, when Mr. Branson was giving evidence. I do this to corroborate the points I have made about the sympathetic understanding that I believed members of the Opposition were showing. Mr. Gunn was questioning Mr. Branson, and the following is an extract from the transcript:

Mr. GUNN: You said that your organisation opposed the grant. Is that correct?—That was the expression of opinion by the council.

Do you think your members were fully aware of the financial situation of the Trades and Labor Council Managing Committee?—No. In fact, I do not know that I am fully aware of it.

Your organisation would not like to see the council as it now exists disintegrate?—That is reasonable. We would not like to see it.

That question came not from the Government side but from the Opposition side, and Mr. Gunn asked it. In fact, it is more than a question: it is a statement of the view that he held at that stage.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: He's still holding it.

Mr. WRIGHT: No, he has changed. I think Mr. Branson's reply to the question was reasonable. Mr. Branson accepted such a situation, and at that stage I was willing to give credit to Mr. Gunn, who on instructions from outside or inside this place, from another place, or from somewhere else has completely changed his mind. I am not finished with Mr. Gunn yet, but there is no question but that he was sympathetic at that stage. He then asked Mr. Branson:

You consider that there are advantages to yourselves and the community in allowing these people to be housed under one roof so that they are more accessible to one another and to those who wish to see them?

One would think that that question, which was a supporting question, was asked by a Government member. Mr. Branson replied:

It is not a question of accessibility. We believe that a strong trade union movement is important in this day and age. One of the regrets we have from time to time is that the authority and responsibility of trade union leaders become less and less in some situations because of shop floor committees that behave like a rabble.

Mr. Gunn: You objected to that statement, didn't you?

Mr. WRIGHT: I will come to that. Mr. Branson also stated in his reply:

That does not help industrial relations, and we are interested in industrial relations.

He did not refute the question put by Mr. Gunn, who, as I have said, was extremely sympathetic at that stage. Again addressing Mr. Branson, Mr. Gunn asked:

If the legislation is passed, would you contemplate your organisation requesting funds to assist it?

Is that a question that someone opposing this loan would ask? Surely that question is being asked by a sympathetic person who wanted to do something about the matter.

Mr. Goldsworthy: That was the other part of the Bill, wasn't it—the part dealing with employers?

Mr. WRIGHT: I will deal with that matter soon. In reply to that question, Mr. Branson stated:

I should think there would be at least a body of opinion that would press for the chamber to receive its share of whatever help was available.

Mr. Branson was not saying that it was just not on. He was saying that, if funds were available for the employee organisations, they ought to be available for the employer organisations, and he was willing to accept the position. I refer now to my final point in relation to Mr. Branson's evidence. I asked him the following question:

If your organisation were in similar difficulties to the Trades Hall (and there is no doubt Trades Hall is in financial difficulty) and you found it impossible (you may not find it impossible, but assume for this question that you do) to raise further money from your members (as has been done) and the Government was willing to assist your organisation in some way, would your organisation accept that assistance?

Mr. Branson is the head of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry in this State. About 60 per cent of employer organisations in this State belong to the chamber. Mr. Branson replied:

Yes, for sure. Surely our history indicates that we are willing to accept Government assistance.

Surely I have shown that there has been a change of face by the Opposition members of the Select Committee. There has not been a change of face on my part.

Mr. Gunn: You ought to be the last one to talk about a change of face, because you've changed the proposal.

Mr. WRIGHT: It was not so much a change of face by the Leader of the Opposition, because he had not placed himself at such a disadvantage as had the member for Eyre. The member for Eyre made many references in his speech—

Mr. Venning: He made a good speech.

Mr. WRIGHT: That is a matter of opinion. The honourable member for Rocky River would not know a good speech from a bad one, so I do not see how he can judge. The member for Eyre tried to show that there was disputation in the Trades Hall Managing Committee and he also referred to evidence given by Mr. Giles. Mr. Giles was called at the behest of Opposition members, not of Government members. I do not know what the Opposition members expected to get from Mr. Giles, but from their point of view the whole matter fell flat, because he did not support them one iota. The rebuff came when I asked Mr. Giles the only question that I put to him.

He was peddling the possibility of raising money by levy, but Mr. Shannon had clearly explained that that was not possible. I think Mr. Shannon's words were that collecting the money was just not on, and he denied that there was any possibility of raising further funds by public subscription, because already assistance amounting to \$165 000 had been given, mainly from business people but also from other organisations. Mr. Shannon made that denial when the Leader of the Opposition asked him a question. Mr. Giles was brought before the committee for the specific purpose Opposition members had in mind of trying to get information to prove that there was some sort of split in the trade union organisation. I asked him the following question:

How much support have you received for your ideas from outside your own body?

Mr. Giles replied:

Very little. In fairness, I say that the consensus of the opinions that have been given to me amount to this: "Sure, your idea is great, but it is just not workable and we just cannot get that sort of money out of contributions." That is clear proof, spoken by the man whose original idea it was to try to gain support and at the same time (it was his right to do so) to suggest that the decision to request a Government grant was incorrect. Mr. Giles got no support; he indicated that to the Select Committee, and Mr. Shannon corroborated that story.

Finally, I want to give my idea of the conduct of Opposition members of the Select Committee. The Leader of the Opposition said he was not satisfied with the Bill in its present form. The Chairman said, "That is a reasonable proposition. Why don't we get the Under Treasurer (Mr. Carey) down and ask him whether he can come up with some alternatives?" That was a perfectly fair proposition. Mr. Carey came down with six propositions and, although they were not discussed at great length, they were certainly discussed. The Leader of the Opposition requested that he be given further time to examine them. Again, I had no objection to that, because it was a fair request.

Throughout the meetings the Chairman treated the Leader with courtesy and fairness, and the Chairman granted the Leader's request. I have repeatedly referred to the fact that we were getting expressions of sympathy and support, particularly from the member for Eyre. I was therefore

led to believe, as were the other Government members on the Select Committee, that the Opposition was taking the alternatives away to examine them closely and come back with a recommendation on what it was willing to accept.

Dr. Eastick: Did the Opposition members say that?

Mr. WRIGHT: I did not say that the Opposition said it: I said that it was well understood. It was the proposition of the Opposition to look at alternatives; that surely would lead any rational man to believe that the Opposition was trying, in the light of the views it had expressed, to be fair and to find a solution to the problem. That is the view I formed. On that occasion the member for Eyre told me privately that he had some personal sympathy; he thought something ought to be done, because there was no doubt that the Trades Hall Managing Committee was in difficulty. The honourable member cannot deny that. What alternative view could Government members of the Select Committee hold, other than the view that there appeared to be some area of compromise?

The three Government members were amazed at the Opposition's attitude when we reconvened the meeting after 10 or 12 days. The Chairman said, "You have had an opportunity to discuss this. Are there any suggestions coming forward?" He opened the proceedings on that basis. The Leader of the Opposition, at whose request this was done, said, "I cannot support any of the propositions."

Mr. Duncan: Did they have a Caucus meeting in the meantime?

Mr. WRIGHT: I do not know. Further, I do not know whether they were directed by the Legislative Council or the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, but I am willing to say that they were directed. There is no question that directions came from somewhere. How could a man who is normally honest change his mind and be so bare-faced about a situation that he had provoked? He had wanted time to study the proposition. However, when the Chairman asked why he had changed his mind, he used the feeble excuse that the draft report was exactly the same as the Bill. Why would it not be? No decision had been made as to what the report would contain. The Secretary of the Select Committee, under instructions from no-one, prepared the draft report in that manner.

Mr. Payne: It was a starting point.

Mr. WRIGHT: Yes, something to work on. Whatever was discussed on that occasion could have resulted in a change. I now want to deal with the events leading to the change from the original draft report to the report now before members. It was my view (and I discussed it with no-one) that the report now before members was more opportune and more practicable, and that it had a better chance of being accepted by members opposite; further, it had some chance of having a clear passage through the Legislative Council, as compared to the proposal for continuing with the grant. It was proposed that the committee should reconvene and look at the proposition for a loan rather than a grant. The proposition that was brought back was the exact thing suggested by the Leader of the Opposition in the first place; this is the most misunderstood of all the things that occurred in the Select Committee.

Mr. CUMBE (Torrens): We have heard two Government speakers, and I have been waiting all this time to hear something of substance. Up to the present I have heard absolutely nothing from the Treasurer, who was cut off by the gong; that was not the first time, and it will not be the last time. We heard nothing from the member for Adelaide except a recitation of history and a tirade of

abuse. In the last few minutes of his speech, the member for Adelaide criticised the conduct of the two Opposition members of the Select Committee as regards their outlook and their decision.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Will you make a constructive suggestion?

Mr. COUMBE: I want to say something about this very important matter. The member for Adelaide criticised the Opposition members of the Select Committee for their attitude, but I believe that they took a very responsible attitude; indeed, they took the only acceptable attitude. The member for Adelaide then suggested that the Opposition members of the Select Committee had received instructions from Legislative Councillors, but that is a highly improper suggestion at any time. The Select Committee sat under Standing Orders of this House, and the suggestion is a very severe reflection.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Where do you get your directions from?

Mr. COUMBE: Having sat on many Select Committees, I can say that members of Select Committees come to their own decisions; at least, that is so as regards members of my Party. Of course, I cannot speak for Government members. I wish to refer to the debate on this Bill that took place on November 27 last year, before the Select Committee was appointed. I vividly recall the public outcry at that time, when the Government promoted this Bill to assist the Trades Hall Managing Committee. At that time, there was all sorts of talk about a scandal and about patronage. One has only to look at the newspapers of the time to see the public reaction. I suggest that a similar reaction will occur if this Bill is steamrolled through by weight of Government numbers.

Let us forget that the Trades Hall building houses trade unions and a political organisation and look at what is proposed as an ordinary proposition. I suggest that if such a proposal came before the Industries Development Committee it would not get past first base. Many organisations and industries in South Australia are crying out for this type of help. The member for Adelaide refuted certain things that had been said about the Trades Hall Managing Committee, dealing with the early difficulties it encountered. I was interested to hear what the member for Florey said when he spoke last November, for he is a member whom I respect and who I believe is respected by most trade unionists. He has held high office in the trade union movement in South Australia and, possibly, in Australia. Referring to the Trades Hall building, he said:

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.

What he is saying is that in the initial feasibility study (and I use that term advisedly) someone made a gross mistake in estimating the return to the managing committee, or else the estimation of rental income was too ambitious. Secondly, what the honourable member has said means that the facilities have not been supported by the trade unions, and this has been part of the trouble. My understanding from what I have heard is that, even if interest rates had not increased as they unfortunately have in the last year or so, the Trades Hall Managing Committee would have been in trouble anyway in meeting the interest commitments with which it was faced. This problem has been

compounded by the steep increase in interest rates that has been caused by the Commonwealth friends of our opponents opposite. When I spoke in this debate in November, I suggested a course of action that apparently has not been acceptable to the Select Committee. I suggested that a term loan could be made, with a moratorium on interest. Apparently that was not acceptable, because this evening we have heard of a grant or loan with no interest whatever, and that is quite different from my suggestion.

Why was the Select Committee reconvened? I understand that the Treasurer had a motion on the Notice Paper to have the matter dealt with last week, yet the committee was reconvened early this week. Although I have sat on numerous Select Committees, this is the first time I have heard of a Select Committee's being reconvened. Apparently the decision at that time was not acceptable. Reference has already been made to paragraph 3 of the committee's report. The Under Treasurer of the State was called to give evidence, as I believe was correct and proper. This paragraph states:

In his evidence the Under Treasurer supported the view that a reduction in the total commitment of the managing committee was necessary to assist the Trades Hall to remain a viable operation but also stated that it would be necessary for the managing committee to continue to raise funds from its own activities.

That last part is cogent and pertinent. As the Leader has already suggested, I believe that funds could possibly be raised from other sources. The Treasurer has said that certain unions, under their constitutions, would be prevented from making such donations out of their funds. However, I submit that there would be nothing wrong with taking the hat around. If \$100 000 were required to help the Trades Hall, this would mean only a couple of dollars from every union member, and plenty of other people in the community, including members on this side, would be willing to put money into the hat. I understand some members have indicated that they will do so.

The committee's report refers (and I do not know who wrote it) to the Royal Agricultural and Horticultural Society and the Centennial Hall. When he spoke in November, the member for Elizabeth referred to this. Certainly the member for Adelaide referred to it a few minutes ago. We all know that different circumstances applied in that case from those that apply in the case of the Trades Hall. Centennial Hall was to be used for exhibitions to promote trade, commerce, and industry in South Australia, and to promote employment. That had nothing to do with the industrial advocacy section of the Chamber of Manufactures, as it was then called. These are two separate cases, and I believe that paragraph 4 is superfluous in this regard. The connotation is extremely flimsy. It was unwise for the member for Elizabeth to build his case on that, as he tried to do, and on the assistance given earlier in this direction at the turn of the century, and to tie the two together, because no nexus exists.

The report states that the Treasurer will make a loan to the corporation, as it is called, that there shall be 40 equal payments of \$5 000, that there shall be a moratorium, and the first instalment made on June 30, 1985. It will be a long time before the loan is paid off, but that is by the way. The whole matter is wrong in principle. I am completely opposed to the Bill and I believe that most South Australians will be opposed to the proposition. I can just imagine the outcry and groundswell of resentment that will arise as a result of the Bill. I was interested in what the member for Adelaide had to say. He began by saying that he was going to issue a challenge for us to answer. He never issued the challenge, not because he ran out of time but

because he was so taken up with criticising members of the committee that he forgot to issue it. The motion and the Bill are wrong in principle and should be opposed to the full.

Mr. PAYNE (Mitchell): I support the motion. The Leader of the Opposition, to my way of thinking, has demonstrated either his insincerity or his perfidy.

Mr. Goldsworthy: What does "perfidy" mean?

Mr. PAYNE: The Parliamentary Library is still open and the honourable member is welcome to go there and look up the meaning of the word. First, despite evidence to the contrary, the Leader tried to show that no precedent exists for the matter we are now considering, namely, for money to be made available by grant or loan to an organisation such as the Trades Hall Managing Committee. The precedent has been clearly cited on earlier occasions, for example, by the member for Elizabeth. Some attempt has been made by Opposition members and by the Leader of the Opposition this evening to ridicule the information that has been brought forward. Mr. Branson, in giving evidence before the committee, went to some pains to try to show that the sums involved had been given for services rendered.

Dr. Eastick: That matter was referred to.

Mr. PAYNE: The Leader has an advantage over backbenchers: he has unlimited time, whereas I have only 30 minutes. Public money was paid to a certain organisation, but the Leader did not say that there was anything wrong with that; yet, somehow or other, it seemed to bother other Opposition speakers, who went to considerable lengths to try to justify the action. The balance sheet for the year 1882 shows that—

Mr. Coumbe: You're always living in the past.

Mr. PAYNE: The voters have shown who is living in the present, because we are occupying the Government benches. The balance sheet shows that in 1882 subscriptions from members (and this point has been hammered: why don't members subscribe more money) were £135. The Government subscribed £500. Rents and taxes raised about £73 and the sale of furniture raised £2 18s. The sum of £500 was a large amount in the total overall receipts of the organisation for that year. In 1893—

Mr. Becker: What were the rates and taxes then?

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

Mr. PAYNE: In 1893, the Government contributed £300. Subscriptions had fallen to £117 and sundry receipts were about £7 14s. In 1904, the Government was still contributing, but at the reduced rate of £200; subscriptions were about £123, and sundry receipts were £13. So, a considerable part of the overall activity was financed by the Government. We are not here to suggest that there was anything wrong with that, because no-one would suggest that it was not to the ultimate benefit of the citizens of the State. However, the Leader has tried to suggest that, when the Government of today intends to make available under the terms of the legislation and the report a sum of money to an industrial organisation important to society in this State (as Opposition members have admitted, even though they appeared to be speaking tongue in cheek when they said that they did not want to see the trade union movement cease to function from its present premises), it is a different thing when considering whether a grant or loan should be made.

The Deputy Leader had a more difficult task because he referred to the Bill relating to the Horticultural Society in 1935, and that was more difficult to get around if one

argues that public funds should not be made available, because that Bill made available the large sum of £50 000, of which £40 000 was interest free and repayable by 58 payments of £100 a year. If that was not a grant, I do not know what to call it. Also, the additional £10 000 drew interest at 3½ per cent only. That sort of thing is not wrong, because the people of the State benefited and are still benefiting from what was involved in the Government of the day advancing State funds to the society. The tenor of the Leader's comments was that if he could not prove any precedent, then it was bad planning and organising that caused the problems. Recently, the Leader did not have that opinion, and this leads one to believe that the member for Adelaide was correct when he said that the Leader had had one opinion for some time but it changed because of other factors or outside directions. I intend to quote extensively what the Leader said—

Dr. Eastick: Quote correctly.

Mr. PAYNE: At page 2335 of *Hansard* the Leader is reported as saying:

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 . . . and I do not believe that the problem is the result of a lack of planning.

That covers a wide range of aspects, and I assume that the Leader was satisfied with everything in November, but for some reason his opinion has been changed.

Dr. Eastick: By evidence submitted to the Select Committee.

Mr. PAYNE: That is what I hoped the Leader would say. In November he had an opinion, and now something that he heard during the committee's sittings has caused him to change his mind.

Dr. Eastick: You only have to refer to what Mr. Doyle said.

Mr. PAYNE: The Leader paid a tribute to Mr. Shannon and Mr. Doyle for the frank, open, and careful way they gave their evidence, the figures they presented, their willingness to answer all questions, and their prompt action in producing further evidence at short notice.

Dr. Eastick: What about the confidentiality?

Mr. PAYNE: No doubt people would be interested in the confidential sections of that evidence but, for my part, they will stay confidential. Apparently, the evidence of Mr. Shannon and Mr. Doyle did not cause the Leader to change his opinion. Another person who gave evidence was Mr. Carey, and I presume from what the Leader said that he was satisfied with that evidence. Mr. Giles was called as a result of a request by the member for Eyre, and the Chairman arranged for Mr. Giles to attend before the committee. I do not recall hearing the Leader criticise the evidence of Mr. Giles, so I assume that he was satisfied with it. The member for Eyre asked him many questions.

Mr. Gunn: One of which he refused to answer.

Mr. PAYNE: Mr. Giles had the right either to answer or not to answer. He was asked his opinion of the operations of the managing committee, and it was a leading question.

Mr. Gunn: That's not so. It was a fair question.

Mr. PAYNE: As all members of the committee observed, Mr. Giles does not lack intelligence and integrity, but, in my opinion, as he did not consider that he was competent to criticise the managing committee, he decided not to answer the question. We can all conjecture why he did not answer the question, but none of us know the full reasons. The Leader fairly pointed out to him that, if he

did not answer it, a connotation might be placed on the lack of response, and I am sure the Leader, as a Chairman, would not try to coerce a witness in any way. Therefore, presumably it was not Mr. Giles who caused the Leader to change his opinion. Mr. Branson gave evidence, and he would not have caused the Leader to change his mind. Mr. Branson's evidence was given frankly and freely, and I was impressed with his replies. There has been a snide suggestion this evening that the Trades Hall Managing Committee did not handle things properly and got into difficulties over the financing of the building.

I point out to members that Mr. Branson freely admitted that, in financing his own organisation's building, the Chamber of Commerce and Industry had recently encountered difficulty which had been overcome by a method on which I shall not elaborate. The difficulty was caused by altered circumstances in financial arrangements which had not been foreseen. Something happened and despite all its care, prudence and its feasibility study, that body also faced difficulties. It is such difficulties that we are faced with here. I had better return to my serial—

Mr. Becker: It's very boring.

Mr. PAYNE: The member for Hanson says it's boring, yet he has been listening for the last 28 minutes with rapt attention, and I can only assume that he finds it most interesting. There were only two other witnesses, one being Mr. Daugherty (Parliamentary Counsel), and I am sure the Leader would not suggest that he did something to change his mind, and Mr. Thompson, whose stay was short, as he contributed little to the matter we were considering. True, he may have had some interesting stories, but they were not germane to the matter in hand. Those were all the witnesses. It only leaves the members of the committee who could have changed the Leader's mind.

There has been no suggestion by the Leader that the behaviour of his own member on the committee, the member for Eyre, caused him to change his mind, and there has been no suggestion that I have detected that the behaviour of the Chairman, or the member for Adelaide or myself caused him to change his mind. Therefore, we come back to the point that was made earlier by the member for Adelaide: we have the case of the Leader holding an opinion, which was evident; he wanted to be helpful in this matter, and he appreciated the difficulties of the managing committee. The Leader is on public record as being in favour of the retention of the kind of system existing in South Australia where the trade union bodies are organised from Trades Hall, which helps industrial relations and harmony generally.

The Leader is in favour of all that and, on earlier occasions, as was demonstrated by the member for Adelaide, he appeared willing to consider the proposition. However, at the end of the deliberations and without further ado, the Leader said that he was not willing to support the proposal. What was the final excuse used by the Leader? It was that we had come in with a draft and that the draft was the same as the Bill with which we started. The Leader then got huffy and took his support away.

The Leader has probably been a member of as many Select Committees as I have, and he well knows that a draft is merely a draft. All honourable members who have sat on Select Committees know that a committee can commence with such a draft and can finish its meetings with perhaps only four words being the same as in the original draft and with a couple of hundred new words included, even with all members of the committee

arriving at a unanimous conclusion. Indeed, that would not be uncommon. That is a flimsy excuse, too. It is as clear to me as it is to most honourable members that the Leader's actions have been dictated by someone outside. Perhaps it might have been suggested to him that this was the course of action he should follow. Certainly, he followed it, because he indicated tonight that he is completely intransigent on this matter.

What are we considering? It is to make available to the Trades and Labor Council a sum of money that has been certified by the South Australian Under Treasurer as being a suitable amount to allow that council to continue to be viable. That is what this matter has come down to. We have expert opinion on this matter. That opinion was not a political opinion, because it was expert advice. The amount recommended needs to be made available, whether it is given or lent to that organisation, so that it can continue in existence on a sound footing and benefit every South Australian citizen. No honourable member can deny this. Many members opposite have indicated that they agree with this proposition, yet they will not move one small step towards trying to make it possible.

Mr. Keneally: Their public opinions differ from their private opinions.

Mr. PAYNE: True, their private opinions and their public opinions are two different things. Members opposite have one opinion for show and another opinion for real and, when it comes to the test, they must do what they are told and what has been suggested to them.

Dr. Tonkin: Are you referring to members of the T.L.C.?

Mr. PAYNE: I am referring to honourable members opposite. This has been clearly demonstrated by the Leader and his cohort, the member for Eyre. We have seen a sudden change of face and a sudden change of heart without proper reason, without logic and without common sense. That could result from only one thing—pressure, outside advice and outside direction. Perhaps it resulted from discussion in the Adelaide Club. Call it what one will, that is what happened. If that is not the case then I feel even more badly about the matter, because it must be in the hearts of members opposite.

Members interjecting:

Mr. PAYNE: Is this what members opposite really think and feel about the trade union movement? Do they see a chance to do the movement harm? Now they have a wonderful chance to do harm to the South Australian trade union movement. Members opposite can mouth platitudes and go through the motions—

Members interjecting:

Mr. PAYNE: What are members opposite asked to do in respect of this matter? They are merely asked to agree to the proposition to lend (not give) to the Trades Hall management the sum of \$200 000, which will be repaid. The member for Torrens said that there will be no interest payments. There is much precedent where interest has not been paid, yet this scheme is to lend a sum of money so that the industrial future and welfare of over 100 000 South Australian workers can benefit. Yet the Opposition is not willing to go one yard to assist in that situation. This is clearly demonstrated by the behaviour we have seen tonight.

Dr. Tonkin: How many workers did you say?

Mr. PAYNE: Well over 100 000 workers, let alone their families.

Dr. Tonkin: Why don't they each put in a donation?

Mr. PAYNE: We have already heard that suggestion from the Leader.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask honourable members on both sides of the Chamber to refrain from interjecting, and allow the honourable member to make his speech.

Mr. PAYNE: The Leader was going to work wonders in this matter. He said, "I will put in \$10 myself. Why don't they get the money from the public?" However, when Mr. Shannon gave his evidence, I asked how much money the Leader's appeal had brought to the Trades Hall. He replied that the Leader had given \$10, for which the Trades Hall thanked him, another \$5 had been donated by one person, and another \$1 had been given by another person. Yet the Leader suggests that the appeal should continue on this basis. The Opposition's whole attitude on this matter is a hollow sham.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! If honourable members do not conduct themselves properly, I will have to take appropriate action. The honourable member for Mitchell.

Mr. PAYNE: Its whole attitude on this matter is a hollow sham.

Members interjecting:

Mr. Mathwin: How much did you put in?

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

Mr. PAYNE: In reply to the member who asks how much I put in, I have donated more than he has, and I intend to continue donating for as long as I can afford to do so. I believe I have explored the whole matter clearly. I have certainly concentrated on the Leader's effort. After all, that is only fair, as he must bear the responsibility in this matter: he is the Leader and he sets the pace. The member for Adelaide and I have shown just what he did. Fundamentally, he was not a bad sort of bloke at the beginning: he was reasonable and intended to examine the matter. He wanted to be helpful but then (and I can only assume this) he got an outside direction which meant the end of any hope concerning the Trades Hall Managing Committee.

Dr. Eastick: Wrong again!

Mr. PAYNE: The entire Opposition attitude on this matter is shameful, and I can only ask Opposition members to reconsider their decision and support the Bill.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): One can hardly take seriously the remarks made by the member for Mitchell. The whole thought behind his speech was that the Leader of the Opposition was quite a nice chap who was going along in the way in which the Select Committee was heading but who suddenly went bad on them because he had been got at. That is the sort of nonsense that led to the half-hour speech made by the member for Mitchell, who commenced by accusing the Leader of at least insincerity and, at worst, perfidy, which may be akin to heresy but which means treachery.

It is impossible to take seriously the piddling nonsense of the member for Mitchell. Is he some sort of second-rate, two-bob psychologist, referring as he did to inflexions in the Leader's voice which led him to the conclusion that the Leader earlier agreed with the argument? He spoke about a change of heart: although in the second reading debate the Leader said that he was convinced that the Trades Hall had managed its affairs competently, as a result of being a member of the Select Committee he had

done a complete about face. If anyone would be competent to judge what a back somersault is, it would be this Labor Government!

This is the charge: according to the amateur psychologist from Mitchell, the Leader is filled with treachery, as he ascertained from questions asked in the Select Committee hearings that the Trades Hall had made a mess of things since the start. I think this is a peripheral question, anyway. However, let us correct the record. I refer now to page 28 of the evidence taken by the Select Committee. Mr. J. H. Doyle (I think he was the Accountant), who was giving evidence with Mr. Shannon, was asked the following question by the Leader:

You mentioned that by the opening in 1972 you foresaw difficulties arising?

After answering "Yes", Mr. Doyle was asked:

And you indicated a way in which you could assist, and to your credit you have done so?

This is the treachery: the Leader said that the Trades Hall had managed its affairs competently but then, having asked some questions as a member of the Select Committee, he found that the Accountant did not think this was so. He is therefore accused of perfidy. The Leader continued:

Was sufficient action taken at the time when you identified that problem to offset the escalation of problems that are now much more patent?

Mr. Doyle then replied:

From the time of the opening of Trades Hall through to the present time I have attended practically every Trades Hall Managing Committee as a guest, and I can assure you that they have been fully aware of the position, because I have explained it at the time. They have endeavoured to take action.

Although the questioning continued for about another page, I will not read it because I want to deal with a few other matters. However, I find another part of the evidence interesting. The Leader asked Mr. Doyle the following question:

But other organisations, be they industrial, commercial or whatever, have found themselves in the same position and have had to suffer the same consequences?

Mr. Doyle replied:

What you are saying is that we are victims of the times?

After the Leader said, "I could go on to say that", Mr. Doyle replied:

If the interest rate was 3½ per cent less we would be viable—there is no question about that.

I understand the rate of interest paid by the Trades Hall is about 10½ per cent. It therefore needs a reduction in its interest rate of about 3½ per cent in order to be viable. Perhaps that would be a solution. Mr. Doyle does not seem enthusiastic in the earlier evidence to which I have referred. He said that they had "endeavoured" to take action, but that is a half-hearted response if we are to get into this area of giving meaning to what people have said by the inflexions in their voices, and so on, as Government members have sought to do in forming conclusions this evening.

Mr. Doyle did not seem to be enthusiastic about the efforts that the Trades Hall had made to bring about its own salvation. For his precedents, the member for Mitchell had to go a long way back to 1882. He seemed to elicit from the fact that the Chamber of Manufactures had gained \$1 000 from the Government an abiding, immutable principle that should impel Governments to hand over money when any organisation gets into trouble. I do not think, even in his more lucid moments, that the member for Mitchell would hope to sustain that argument.

... The fact is that the Trades Hall has got into difficulties because of initial unsound planning and because of continued difficulties which I believe can be laid largely at the feet of the financial policies of this Government's Commonwealth colleagues. Much press publicity has been given to this matter since it first hit the deck, but one matter sums up the situation well, and in this respect I refer to a letter which appeared in the *Advertiser* and which was written by Dr. A. J. Forbes, the member for Barker in the Commonwealth Parliament. We know very well that Government members do not especially like Dr. Forbes; he is a strong member of Parliament whose dislike for certain of the traits that are so apparent in the present Commonwealth Government has been voiced frequently. However, he has a reputation for clear thinking and basic political honesty. The letter states:

The Dunstan Government's grant of \$200 000 to the Trades Hall is a national scandal unequalled in my 18 years in politics. The Trades Hall is a victim of the most vicious credit squeeze and rate of inflation in living memory.

That is a fact. Even the member for Adelaide has said that, apart from bad management initially, inflation and interest rates have put the Trades Hall in its present position. The letter continues:

But so are hundreds of business firms and tens of thousands of individual Australians. The Dunstan Government and the inhabitants of the Trades Hall more than anybody else were responsible for advocating the return of the Whitlam Government in South Australia. And yet they alone are to be cushioned from the effects of the gross economic mismanagement of that Government.

That letter appeals to me as being an eminently sensible and honest summation. The letter refers to other people getting into difficulties, and if Government members peruse the press cuttings in the Parliamentary Library they will see that in Victoria about 1 000 companies went insolvent last year.

Mr. Duncan: That's not true. They didn't become insolvent.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The honourable member can get the cutting and correct me. The point is well taken that the difficulties of companies have increased immensely because of the activities of the present Government. Let the member for Elizabeth refute what I have said by giving facts. The member for Adelaide called me a liar in relation to a statement I had made involving Mr. Cameron and independent schools but, when I found the statement and was able to show that what I had said was accurate, the member for Adelaide did not have the grace to apologise.

Dr. Eastick: Did the Minister of Transport apologise the other day?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: They would not apologise. An industry in my district—

The SPEAKER: Order! Previously I have called the attention of honourable members to the fact that this is a debate on the motion that the report of the Select Committee be noted and, whilst inflation may be one of the reasons for the recommendation, that does not open the debate to one involving inflation and its effect on everyone in the State. I must call the honourable member back to the motion.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I was making the point that the Trades Hall was in precisely the same situation as are many other institutions in Australia, and I was giving an example of a firm that applied to the Government for the same sort of assistance as has been made available to industry in certain circumstances. In that case, which involved brickworks, a grant of about half the amount involved here would

have corrected the position, but the application was refused. The brickworks has since closed down, creating unemployment.

The Government is trying, as it does in other instances, to create a privileged class in the community. In this case, it is dealing with those in the Trades Hall. The member for Mitchell stated that the future of thousands of workers in this State would be in jeopardy if this money was not made available. However, I find that statement hard to credit. He also suggested that the Leader had launched an appeal on behalf of the Trades Hall, but that was arrant nonsense. The Leader stated that he was willing to make a contribution if the Trades Hall would do something, and he contributed \$10. It was utter nonsense for the member for Mitchell to try to make a cheap point about the Leader's appeal, because the Leader's appeal did not exist. If we take notice of Mr. Doyle, the efforts of Trades Hall, which initiated the appeal, have been only half-hearted anyway.

The speech made by the member for Adelaide was devoid of argument. He said that he would welcome a free vote by Opposition members but he thought that the Opposition probably would vote in a block. His conclusion was that, if all Opposition members voted against the proposal, they would have been instructed to do so. That is nonsense. The demerits of this case are so obvious that I should be extremely surprised if any Opposition member voted for it. The burden of the speeches made by the two Government members was that they thought they had the Leader in the bag but found out that they were mistaken.

What basis is that for a grant of \$200 000 to the Trades Hall? The member for Adelaide gave us an interesting history. He did not go back as far as the member for Mitchell did and he did not quote what happened in 1882, but he said that the Government had spent money in various ways. He also mentioned inflation, and every thinking Australian would know that inflation in this country escalated because of the actions of the friends and comrades in arms of this Government in Canberra.

Mr. Crimes: In West Germany, too.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The inflation rate in West Germany is 7 per cent.

The SPEAKER: Order! We are not dealing with inflation in West Germany.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not consider that all avenues have been explored. The member for Adelaide referred extensively to the member for Eyre and made much play of the statement by Mr. Branson that, if an offer was made to his organisation, it would accept the offer. I should have thought that Mr. Branson would be considered a fool to look a gift horse in the mouth. I do not see how anything is proved by Mr. Branson's admission that, if money was offered, he would take it. I listened to the references to the evidence of Mr. Giles, who apparently wrote a letter to the Treasurer, who was invited to table it by the member for Eyre. However, the Treasurer did not table it. So, there is vagueness surrounding the evidence of Mr. Giles, but he made some public statements to which I would like to refer. An article in the *Advertiser* of December 21, 1974, states:

The President of the Trades Hall Managing Committee (Mr. R. J. Giles) has declared his opposition to the Government's \$200 000 grant to the Trades Hall. News of Mr. Giles's stand leaked out over the past few days and has caused a stir in the trade union movement. The S.A. Government already has been criticised by business and political leaders and members of the public in recent weeks for making the \$200 000 grant from public funds.

Mr. Giles, who is also S.A. Secretary of the Plumbers and Gasfitters Union, recently wrote to the Premier (Mr. Dunstan) in a private capacity attacking the Government's decision. He admitted yesterday he had written to the Premier on the subject of the Trades Hall grant. But he would not make the letter available for perusal or publication. "The only comment I would make is that I am quite determined that at the next meeting of the Trades Hall Managing Committee on January 29 the issue will be pursued to finality," he said.

"My objective is to have the trade unions that undertook the project shoulder their responsibilities more realistically. That involves their taking some steps towards adequately capitalising the venture, which is seriously under-capitalised." That indicates a responsible attitude by Mr. Giles, who I understand is a left-winger. I think Mr. Giles has shown a refreshing spirit of independence and a sense of responsibility that is obviously not shown by the other members of the Trades Hall Managing Committee. Mr. Giles shows an inclination to see whether some other solution can be found. I do not know Mr. Giles, but I would say that that is a plus for him. The Treasurer said publicly that a grant was the only answer, and the Select Committee's report proposes what really amounts to a grant, although this proposal does not come from the two Opposition members on the Select Committee. It is proposed that the Trades Hall Managing Committee receive the \$200 000, with no repayments for 10 years; then, the moneys will be repaid at the rate of \$5 000 a year for 40 years. Of course, if the Government remains in power, it can allow the committee to delay repayments even further. In view of the rate of inflation and the fact that no interest is to be charged, the Government may as well give the committee a grant. The Government has made a token offer of a grant to some other organisations when no approach had been made by those organisations. The Trades Hall Managing Committee says that it has no alternative; I do not believe that, and neither does Mr. Giles, the Secretary of the Plumbers and Gasfitters Union. Is the union movement broke? Other evidence indicates that it is not. An article in the *Advertiser* of October 10, 1974, referring to a proposal by the Labor movement to apply for a radio station licence, states:

The State Secretary of the A.L.P. (Mr. G. T. Whitten) and the Secretary of the S.A. Trades and Labor Council (Mr. J. E. Shannon) said this in a joint statement yesterday. The Minister for the Media (Senator McClelland) said on July 17 that he had invited applications for a licence for Adelaide's fourth commercial radio station.

One does not get into that venture for peanuts. The article continues:

Messrs. Whitten and Shannon said a 10-member sub-committee, comprising representatives of both the A.L.P. and the T.L.C., had been appointed to make a study with the aim of applying for the licence.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What's this got to do with it?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: This article was published at a time of great financial stringency—at about the time when the Bill was introduced.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What has happened since?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not know. Let the Minister tell me!

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: The plan was investigated and rejected.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Maybe it was, but the union officials must have thought that there were real possibilities. It demonstrates that they thought that they could rustle up money to invest in the radio station. The article continues:

"We are certainly interested in gaining the new radio licence," they said. "We would not be doing our duty as representatives of the industrial and political labor movement if we did not apply." The Labor leaders emphasised the objective of a radio station licence was not simply to "promote Labor Party and union propaganda".

They hardly need to promote Labor Party and union propaganda, because the Government undertakes that task at public expense. The article continues:

If granted the licence, the station would have to be a viable commercial proposition, although it would provide direct communication for the trade union movement and the A.L.P. Already, in at least three States, the A.L.P. or Trades Hall councils control radio stations. These exist in Sydney, Melbourne, Brisbane and Newcastle. In Adelaide, the official A.L.P. publication, the *Herald*—

Mr. Crimes: What the article says is not correct.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The honourable member should take the matter up with the *Advertiser*. However, I shall omit the next part of the article; it concludes:

Unofficial estimates—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: No official application has been made, so you may as well give it away.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Obviously, it was thought that there was a chance of scraping up the money, because a 10-man committee was set up to consider the matter.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Has the Liberal Party applied?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I understand the Liberal Party, as such, did not apply. The article concludes:

Unofficial estimates are that the establishment cost of a station would be at least \$500 000.

I do not believe that every avenue has been exhausted by the Trades Hall Managing Committee to solve its financial problems. It has a responsive Government which is very amenable to suggestion from that quarter. This is the easy way out. What accommodation do young home owners have to make when their interest rates climb? They either find the money or get out. What accommodation do small businesses make when faced with a disastrous Commonwealth Labor Government such as the one we have at present? First, they must sack employees and, in the final resort, close their doors. What accommodation do these people have to make? I believe that the position of the Trades Hall is far better for it to be able to take realistic and sincere steps to overcome its financial difficulties than is the position of many of these other people.

If these many thousands of members to whom the member for Mitchell referred are in jeopardy and facing ruin if they cannot find the \$200 000, I believe that the first appeal should be made to them. If they are convinced, as the member for Mitchell is, that their very future depends on finding the money, I do not doubt that the money will be found. It is not the Leader's function to initiate an appeal, nor does he seek to do so. However, I repeat that certain Opposition members have made donations available and others will do so. The Trades Hall organisation should get off its backside and make a genuine attempt to pull itself out of its current difficulties. I do not support the recommendations contained in the report.

Mr. DUNCAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.22 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, February 27, at 2 p.m.