

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, February 27, 1975

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

## MINISTERS' ABSENCE

The SPEAKER: I inform the House that, because of the absence on Ministerial duty of the Minister of Labour and Industry, any questions that would normally be asked of him may be directed to the Premier. Also, questions that would normally be directed to the Minister of Transport should be asked of the Minister of Works, and the Minister of Development and Mines will reply to any questions that would normally be asked of the Minister of Environment and Conservation.

## QUESTION

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

## BAROSSA VALLEY WATER SUPPLY

In reply to Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (February 20).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Barossa Valley water supply is obtained from the Warren reservoir and the Murray River through the Swan Reach to Stockwell main. The quality of water supplied from the Murray River varies considerably, depending on river flow conditions. The Barossa Valley water supply is monitored regularly by the Water and Water Pollution Control Laboratories of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, to ensure that these waters meet acceptable public health standards. This supply is continuously chlorinated to ensure the maintenance of a high bacteriological quality in the water distributed to consumers.

The department is now involved in the design and construction of a water treatment scheme for metropolitan Adelaide that is programmed for completion by 1984. Water treatment for northern towns, supplied from the Morgan-Whyalla mains, is planned as an extension of the present programme. The complex distribution system of the Morgan-Whyalla mains can be augmented with water from both the Warren and Swan Reach to Stockwell systems. An examination of the water quality of the Warren and Swan Reach to Stockwell systems will be incorporated in the intended investigation of the Morgan-Whyalla system.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION: MONARTO

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Dr. EASTICK: In this House yesterday the Premier, in replying to a question asked by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, asked a question about the policy of the Opposition towards the establishment of Monarto. His specific question was as follows: "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?" I replied, "Until it is reassessed, yes." The Premier then said, "I am grateful to the Leader for telling us he now opposes Monarto." Mr. Speaker, this was a deliberate misinterpretation by the Premier of my reply. Therefore, so that there can be no further deliberate distortion—

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Gunn: You can give it, but you can't take it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: My point of order is that the Leader may make a personal explanation, but he may not debate matters during a personal explanation he is making in this House. He may state facts or explain his own position, but he may not debate the position.

The SPEAKER: Order! I uphold that point of order. It has always been the practice and procedure of this House that, when any honourable member seeks leave of the House to make a personal explanation, he shall do so on the literal interpretation of the request he makes: it shall be a personal explanation as it affects that honourable member as an individual. It is not a matter of making policy speeches or engaging in debate: it is a matter concerning the individual member and his special interest in the matter. An honourable member may make a personal explanation as an individual. I uphold the point of order.

Dr. EASTICK: I assure you, Sir, that I have a very personal interest in the matter. As I have indicated from the factual statements in the *Hansard* record, I was misinterpreted. I said that this was a deliberate misinterpretation by the Premier of my answer. Therefore, so that there can be no further deliberate distortion—

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: On a point of order!

Dr. EASTICK: —of the Opposition's attitude—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the Leader may not say, I submit, that I have deliberately misrepresented him.

Dr. Eastick: Well, you have.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Gunn: You want to gag the Parliament now.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The position is that the Leader, in a personal explanation, may put his own position. As you have ruled, Mr. Speaker, he may not debate the matter. He may state the facts.

Mr. Gunn: He has.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There is no question at all of deliberate misrepresentation. The Leader may quote what was said by him and what was said in reply.

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order! What happened in Canberra this morning will not happen in this Parliament. It is up to me to maintain order, and I will do that. Once again, the honourable Premier has raised a point of order, and once again I uphold that point of order, and I will uphold similar points of order raised by any honourable member in this Chamber. I have pointed out that the honourable Leader sought leave of the House to make a personal explanation. A personal explanation must be according to the literal interpretation of what is meant by those words. It must be a personal explanation concerning only that honourable member as an individual. It must not be a matter of debate; it must not be a matter of insinuations about what has happened; it is a matter of personal explanation. Unless the honourable Leader keeps his explanation along those lines, I will have to rule him out of order as not confining himself to the terms of Standing Orders.

Dr. EASTICK: This is of real interest to me as a person. I make the point so that there can be no further

deliberate distortion by the Government of the Opposition's attitude towards—

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable Leader continues along those lines, I will not permit him to continue.

Dr. Eastick: Well, what about throwing me out?

The SPEAKER: I warn the honourable Leader that he has already infringed the Standing Orders, and he knows that as well as I do.

Dr. Eastick: That I'm being gagged.

The SPEAKER: I name the honourable Leader of the Opposition.

Dr. Eastick: Gagged!

Mr. Gunn: You're political gangsters.

Mr. Dean Brown: It's no better than Canberra.

Dr. Eastick: Absolutely gagged!

The SPEAKER: Order! I have named the honourable Leader of the Opposition for wilfully disobeying the authority of the Chair.

Mr. Gunn: He had a proper right to do it. Why don't you run and tell the Speaker? That's all you're fit for.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In the absence of any move by the Leader to make an explanation, it is my duty as Leader of the House to move:

That the Leader be suspended from the sittings of this House for this day.

Mr. Gunn: He wasn't given the opportunity—

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

Mr. Gunn: He wasn't.

The SPEAKER: Order! Is the motion seconded?

Mr. CRIMES: Yes, Sir.

*Members interjecting.*

The SPEAKER: Order! There is a motion before this House. The honourable Leader of the Opposition must leave the House whilst the matter is being considered.

*Mr. Millhouse having risen.*

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham knows full well that, on the motion now under consideration, there can be no amendment or debate.

*Dr. Eastick having left the Chamber.*

The SPEAKER: The honourable Premier has moved, and the motion has been seconded, that the Leader of the Opposition be suspended for the remainder of the sittings today.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (20)—Messrs. Max Brown and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Crimes, Duncan, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, and Wright.

Noes (16)—Messrs. Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe (teller), Goldsworthy, Gunn, McAnaney, Millhouse, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. McRae, Virgo, and Wells.  
Noes—Messrs. Evans, Mathwin, and Nankivell.

Majority of 4 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg) moved:

That this House no longer has confidence in the Speaker.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I second the motion.

The SPEAKER: Will you put the motion in writing?

Mr. Coumbe: Yes, we will put it in writing.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Bragg has moved:

That this House no longer has confidence in the Speaker. That motion has been seconded. The honourable member for Bragg.

Dr. TONKIN: Mr. Speaker, I am very upset and disappointed that I should ever have to move this motion in the House. I think that, quite apart from anything else, it has become more and more apparent that the Opposition in this place is not receiving the protection which it deserves and to which it is entitled by virtue of being the Opposition in a democratic House, or an allegedly democratic one, anyway.

The Leader of the Opposition, having been aggrieved and misrepresented by the Premier's statement during yesterday's sitting, was taking the only course open to him to explain his personal situation, and his personal situation was that he was being misrepresented on a matter of much moment and the subject of much debate in the community. Because of the Premier's attitude, the Leader was being misrepresented further in the community. The Premier could not take it and took a point of order and, when he took a point of order, you, Sir, were bemused by his argument and upheld that point of order. It was obvious that the Leader was not debating the issue: he was simply reading from the record of debate from yesterday, and if he is not able to explain himself by reading the details of the circumstances which led up to his misrepresentation he is virtually being gagged in this House. The Leader having tried three times to do this, I do not blame him for feeling frustrated enough to make the remark he made, and I submit he made that remark under the most intense provocation. I believe, Sir, that as Speaker your rulings in this House have been fair. I think you have a great sense of responsibility towards your job, but I believe there is far too much tendency on the part of the front bench to advise you, and that advice comes persistently and constantly.

Mr. Mathwin: Especially from the Premier.

Dr. TONKIN: Yes, and I think other members will have something to say about this. We have all experienced it. I will not say you have always taken that advice but I will say on this occasion that I believe you have done so and, because you have done so, I for one can no longer have confidence in you. I know the Premier is doing the best he can to get over this one now; he will pull any trick in the book that he can. Sir, I do not like seeing you used as a tool in the hands of the Government.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I am disappointed that I should have to speak in such a debate. I should have hoped, Mr. Speaker, that when you made your decision you would remember what happened yesterday when the Premier threw out a challenge by asking a question when answering a question. The Premier at that time was contravening Standing Orders. A point was made by way of interjection to you, Sir, and you said it was all right; you allowed the Premier to go on, and the Premier was given some latitude, because he was Leader of the Government. He asked a direct question of the Leader of the Opposition. It has always been the practice in this House, or at least it has in the past, that the Leaders of each side (the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition) receive a little latitude where

Standing Orders prevail. Today, because of the touchy issue, and because the Premier knew in his own mind that there would be an answer to his challenge and that the only way the Leader of the Opposition could answer it was by making a personal explanation, he set out to stop the Leader.

I support the motion, because, Mr. Speaker, I believe that yesterday you had the opportunity to stop the Premier from asking a question when, in fact, he was answering a question. You did not do that, and you could have at least allowed the Leader of the Opposition a little latitude in answering the Premier's allegation. That is all it was: it was a personal allegation as well as an allegation against the Party on this side of the House. Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed, because I have had your co-operation and there has been no bitching between us, but I think you forgot today, when making your decision, that you gave the Premier latitude yesterday, and you have failed to give the Leader of the Opposition even a semblance of that latitude. That is why I object to the decision you made today. I believe that, as Speaker, you have mainly conducted yourself fairly in the past. You must remember the circumstances that have created the situation that has arisen today. I believe that, in making your assessment, you have forgotten those circumstances, and that is where the injustice lies.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): The Opposition knows perfectly well that it has no ground whatever for disputing the probity of your conduct and rulings, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You've done enough damage for today.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The circumstances that gave rise to this matter were as follows: the Leader asked the leave of this House to make a personal explanation. In the course of that explanation, two points of order were taken by me—

Mr. Goldsworthy: Denying him a fair go.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: —that he was going beyond a personal explanation.

Mr. Venning: That's what you thought.

The SPEAKER: Order! This is a no-confidence motion in me as Speaker, and I will maintain decorum until this matter is determined.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In each of those cases, the Leader commented on the matters that occurred in this House yesterday. He went beyond the position that was endeavoured to be argued by the member for Bragg of reading what happened in the House yesterday, and accused me in the House of deliberate misrepresentation. I took the objection that this was not part of a proper personal explanation.

Mr. Goldsworthy: It was the reason for it, you donkey!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Goldsworthy: That was the whole exercise, you nit!

The SPEAKER: Order! If honourable members continue to disregard Standing Orders they will also be dealt with. As I have said already, this is a serious motion of no confidence in the Presiding Officer of this House, and this debate will be conducted as a debate on an important motion should be conducted.

Mr. Chapman: It's being conducted by one person.

The SPEAKER: I warn the honourable member for Alexandra. Only one member will speak at a time. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: You, Sir, upheld each of my points of order. There was no motion of dissension from your ruling on either point of order, as would have been required if members had disagreed to your ruling. The Standing Orders are clear: if there is any dissension from your ruling, it must be moved immediately. That was not done in either case. However, the Leader then accused you of gagging him, inviting you to throw him out. Upon his persisting in defiance of the Chair, you named him. Those are the facts. What you did was to act completely in accordance with the Standing Orders.

Mr. Mathwin: Your understanding of them!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Dean Brown: Rubbish!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Standing Orders of this House allow for points of order to be taken, and members opposite, including the member for Davenport, are prone to take them. I have no less right than any other member to take them.

Mr. Mathwin: You should have no more right.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I agree with that, and I should have no less right.

Mr. Venning: You run the House, not the Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! If there is another remark such as that from the honourable member for Rocky River, I will warn him. Until this motion is carried, I am still the Speaker, and I will continue to run the House in accordance with Standing Orders. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If honourable members choose to look at the records of the House, they will find that I take few points of order indeed, fewer by far than those taken by members opposite. I took points of order in accordance with Standing Orders, and I was upheld by you, Mr. Speaker. There was no dissension whatever moved from your ruling. The Leader then defied you twice, and was named in accordance with Standing Orders. I then sat and waited for him to make an explanation.

Mr. Coumbe: I tried twice to rise to my feet.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I sat here for some time.

Mr. Coumbe: The Speaker couldn't see me.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I sat here for some time, before anyone moved at all, waiting for the Leader to make an explanation, and he made none.

Mr. Coumbe: I tried to move that he be given the opportunity to do so.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I waited for the Leader to act in accordance with Standing Orders and make an explanation if he chose to do so; that was his right.

Mr. Goldsworthy: He wasn't given the option.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: He was given the option. I sat and waited until it was obvious that no-one would rise. It was at that stage that I rose and moved that, in the absence of the Leader's making any explanation to the House, it was my duty as Leader of the House to move for his suspension in accordance with your ruling, Mr. Speaker. I had no alternative whatever but to move in that way. That is the position. You, Sir, have acted in accordance with Standing Orders, so there is no basis whatever for the motion of the member for Bragg.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I want to divide this matter into two separate categories, following what the Premier has said in a weak and infantile way in trying to justify his actions. I have a copy of what the Leader was saying. He contended that what the Premier said yesterday was a deliberate misinterpretation of what the Leader had said. The Leader went on to say that it was his right to correct that misrepresentation. It was at that point that the Premier took the points of order that you, Mr. Speaker, upheld. Surely it is the right of any member on either side, if he believes he is being misrepresented, to rise and make a statement of the type made by the Leader. When the Leader sought leave of the House to explain, this was given unanimously. Then, the Premier, in a fit of pique, took two points of order to stop the Leader, who was exercising the fundamental right of any member to make an explanation. Standing Order 171 provides:

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

Mr. Speaker, apparently you did not see me, but twice I tried to rise to my feet, intending to move that the Leader be given the opportunity to be heard in apology. If you read the Standing Order, it says that a member "shall have the right to be heard in explanation or apology". That right was not given to the Leader on this occasion, yet it is set out in Standing Orders in black and white. Even had I not wished to move such a motion, you, Mr. Speaker, as Presiding Officer in the Chamber, could have had the obligation under that Standing Order, which says a member shall have the right to be heard in explanation. I emphasise that the word used is "shall" and not "may"; it is mandatory. By the way you, Sir, put the motion, you denied the Leader the opportunity to give an explanation or an apology if he so desired. I submit that what I have said is fundamental, and you have erred in that way. Therefore, I support the vote of no confidence in you as Speaker.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I do not support this motion with any great relish, for I frankly believe that you, Sir, make few mistakes in presiding over this House. However, on this occasion I believe you have erred seriously in several ways. All past experience in this House since I have been a member has indicated that, when a member believes he has been misrepresented, his redress is to have recourse to a personal explanation, which is precisely what the Leader of the Opposition tried to have. The Leader, in seeking to launch into his personal explanation, indicated that he believed he had been misrepresented by the Premier. This was the basis of the personal explanation. Frankly, I do not know of any other way in which a member can put the record straight if he believes he has been misrepresented in the House. Past experience would show that when the member for Adelaide called me a liar my recourse was to make a personal explanation. I believe you erred, Sir, in supporting and upholding, in the first instance, the point of order the Premier took to the Leader's statement that he believed he had been deliberately misrepresented by the Premier. How on earth the Premier can suggest that that is debating a topic, I do not know. Standing Order 137 covers the situation, and provides:

By leave of the House a member may explain matters of a personal nature . . .

What more personal matter could be raised in the House than that involving a member who believes he has been misrepresented? That is the matter the Leader raised. Standing Order 137 continues:

. . . although there be no question before the House; but such matters may not be debated.

The Leader was not debating the question; he was giving his reasons for rising to make a personal explanation. His reason for doing so was that he had been misrepresented by the Premier. At that stage, the Premier rose and took objection to the fact that the Leader was stating that he had been misrepresented. That is the flimsiest ground on which to take objection, Mr. Speaker. I believe you erred in supporting that point of order. Time and time again in this place members make personal explanations because they believe they have been misrepresented.

The other point on which it can be charged that you erred relates to the point raised by the Premier that no explanation or apology was given. I do not believe that the opportunity was afforded to make an explanation, and I consider that the Deputy Leader has validly raised this point. Since I have been a member in this place I have noticed that when members on this side of the House are named (and this has happened on at least two occasions I can remember) they have been invited to make an explanation. On the occasion I was suspended, I was offered the opportunity to give an explanation, which I gave, and I know that that happened when the member for Heysen was suspended. However, I believe that no such opportunity was given by the Chair for the Leader to make an explanation. It is with some reluctance and regret, therefore, that I believe we have no other recourse at this stage than to support this motion of no confidence in you, Sir.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I wish to remind the House that the motion that is before the House is a vote of no confidence in you, Mr. Speaker, and in your actions in this place in connection with the personal explanation sought to be made, and made in part, by the Leader of the Opposition. I think that is the way we should look at it. We should forget the heat that has been generated by the subject of the personal explanation, because the vote of no confidence is in you, Sir, not the Government, the Premier, or the Leader of the Opposition. Let me reiterate what has happened. The Leader of the Opposition rose in his place and asked leave to make a personal explanation, which is customary, and that leave was granted. As the Leader proceeded to make his personal explanation, the Premier (and I must say that I supported him) believed that the Leader went beyond what Standing Orders provide as regards making a personal explanation.

Mr. Dean Brown: What about when the Premier—

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will follow the matter through logically before the member for Davenport gets too excited. At that time, the Premier took a point of order and objected to the line the Leader was following in making his personal explanation. We are quite clear that that is what happened up to that stage. The Premier said he believed the Leader had gone beyond the normal ambit that is allowed in making a personal explanation. You, Sir, upheld the Premier's point of order. It amazes me to hear the member for Kavel, the previous speaker, say that he disagrees to your ruling. Standing Order 164 provides:

If any objection is taken to the ruling or decision of the Speaker, such objection must be taken at once and not otherwise;

In other words, one cannot talk of lost opportunities. If the honourable member disagreed to that ruling, the opportunity was there for him or any other member of the House to take objection immediately under Standing Order 164, which continues:

and having been stated in writing, motion shall be made, which, if seconded, shall be proposed to the House.

I cannot recall any member of this House acting under that Standing Order. If any member opposite can say that I am wrong, let him say it now. That was when the opportunity existed to disagree to your ruling, but members opposite did not.

Mr. Goldsworthy: We're taking the opportunity now.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Leader of the Opposition then proceeded with his personal explanation in exactly the same way as he had been proceeding before you, Sir, cautioned him and before you ruled on the Premier's point of order. Naturally, the Premier took the same point of order, which you again upheld. Again, no member on the Opposition benches saw fit to take objection under Standing Order 164—not one of them. The point of order having been upheld for the second time, the Leader of the Opposition who, at that time was evidently feeling frustrated about the whole matter, said, "I am being gagged."

Mr. Gunn: And he was, too.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: That is a matter of opinion. I am going through what happened, because a vote of no confidence in the Speaker has been moved and Opposition members are saying that the Speaker gagged the Leader.

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Speaker upheld the point of order and not one of you objected to it. Who objected to the point of order? Not you—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: —not you, and not you. In fact, no-one did.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Goldsworthy: Why don't you sit down?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: And then you agreed with the Leader of the Opposition saying he had been gagged. If you thought he was being gagged you could have taken objection to the point of order, but you did not.

Mr. MATHWIN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I draw your attention to the fact that, when we are debating a matter, we are supposed to debate it through the Chair and not use the term "you".

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. At the time the Deputy Premier was using the term I tried to call him to order twice. Honourable members are to be referred to as members of their respective districts, and the word "you" should not be used. The honourable Minister of Works.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I apologise, Sir, although if required I could certainly have named every Opposition member by his district. Not one of them took objection. They now have the temerity to agree with the Leader's statement that he was gagged. If they believed he was being gagged, they had the opportunity at that stage to take the objection that was open to them under Standing Order 164: not one of them chose to do that. Following the Leader of the Opposition saying he had been gagged and the hullabaloo that followed, the Leader then challenged the

Speaker. What did he say? I do not believe I need remind the House of what he said, because he said it loud and clear: "Throw me out."

Mr. Coumbe: That was about his only choice.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I know the Leader was under stress; I know the situation was emotional; but he actually challenged the Speaker to throw him out.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You wanted to gag him, and you did.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I think I have covered that point sufficiently. If the member for Kavel was worried about it (and this amazed me) he could have taken a point of order under that Standing Order. Either he does not understand Standing Orders, or he did not want to at that stage. It is no good members opposite talking to me or to anyone else about the Leader's being gagged if they were not willing to stand up at the time when the opportunity was available.

Mr. Goldsworthy: It's available now.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Deputy Premier.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It is not available now, because we are dealing not with an objection to a ruling that you gave, Mr. Speaker, but with a motion of no confidence in you.

Mr. Goldsworthy: As a result of the ruling.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: That is not so. The ruling was correct. You had your opportunity before that. The Leader, having challenged the Speaker to throw him out, could expect no treatment other than what he got. He was named and, having been named—

Mr. Goldsworthy: He wasn't given the opportunity to make an explanation.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not know whether he was stunned or whether every other Opposition member was, but he was given ample opportunity under Standing Order 171 to make an explanation if he so desired.

Mr. Coumbe: Did the Speaker give him the opportunity?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: There was no need for the Speaker to do that.

The SPEAKER: Order! A vote of no confidence in a Presiding Officer is a serious matter. I am taking it in that vein, and the debate on such an important matter as this should be taken in that way. Any honourable member who defies Standing Orders will suffer the consequences, and I warn all honourable members that from now on any honourable member who defies the authority of the Chair while I am still Speaker will be named in accordance with Standing Orders.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: There was ample opportunity for the Leader of the Opposition to rise in his place and make the explanation he was entitled to make, if he so desired, under Standing Order 171. The Premier deliberately sat still to give him that opportunity. Nowhere in this Standing Order is there a requirement that the Speaker call on the person so named.

Mr. Coumbe: He has the right to.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: So has the member so named the right to stand in his place to draw the Speaker's attention to his standing and to seek to make the explanation that he can make under that Standing Order. That was not done and no-one alongside the Leader of the Opposition or at the back of him tried to make him aware of it or assist him in the matter. The Leader of the Opposition did not do anything, so what else could

we expect either the Premier or the Speaker to assume? We assumed (I think correctly in this case) that he had no desire to make an explanation. In other words, he evidently wanted to be chucked out. That left the Premier no alternative under Standing Orders but to move as he did.

Mr. Mathwin: What about—

The SPEAKER: I warn the honourable member for Glenelg.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: You can sit there and twist in your seats if you like, but they are the facts, and they have been stated clearly. I have not embellished them in any way. I repeat that, if there was a disagreement with your ruling on the Premier's point of order, there were two opportunities for Opposition members to take objection, but they did not do that. Members opposite cannot sit here now and say that they have no confidence in you, Mr. Speaker, because they did not test your ruling or even try to do that, yet they have moved a vote of no confidence in you because they disagree with that ruling. That is the situation, and that is the motion before the House. Members opposite did not try when the opportunity was there. Too late, Sir, they have decided that they should get you this way, and I ask the House to treat this motion as it deserves to be treated, forgetting the politics and the emotional issues that led up to the matter and treating the matter seriously as a vote of no confidence in you. Any serious-minded member could not possibly vote for the motion.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): I support the motion and the arguments that have been advanced by members on this side, but I will also give an additional reason. Before doing that, I will reply to the Deputy Premier's attack. First, the Leader questioned the decision of the Speaker. It was the Leader who stood and said, "Look, I am making a personal explanation under Standing Orders, particularly Standing Order 137." I think, as you would agree, that there was no doubt that the Leader of the Opposition was carefully making a personal explanation about what went on yesterday in this Chamber.

There is a series of reasons why this motion has been moved, but the main reason why I am supporting it is that I believe that you, Sir, have suffered undue harassment and pressure, and have reacted to that pressure, from the Government front bench. I believe that the Premier took a point of order and put excess pressure on you, as Speaker, to uphold that point of order. I say that because I believe that, if we take the Standing Orders in the commonsense way in which they have been used in this House for so long and if we take the way in which personal explanations have been made, we see that there was no point of order whatever. We saw that the Premier did influence you to uphold that point of order, and quite wrongly did so. I saw a similar case in this Chamber last evening, when the Premier turned to the Deputy Speaker and said, "For goodness sake, shut them up and name them," and immediately the Presiding Officer got to his feet and warned the member for Glenelg.

The SPEAKER: Order! I rule that remark out of order. The motion before the Chair is one of no confidence in the Speaker. The honourable member for Davenport now is making a claim about something that happened previously, and he should have raised that matter then, not now. That remark is ruled out and is not to be the subject of further debate.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I will not comment further on that, but I will comment on the point that later in the

evening the Minister of Education put similar pressure on the person then in the Chair, and I believe that you, Sir, were in the Chair.

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out again that the honourable member for Davenport is speaking to a motion of no confidence in me, as Speaker of this House, not in any other person. If the honourable member objected to what was taking place at some other time, he had the opportunity to raise an objection. However, in accordance with Standing Orders, he cannot do so in the debate on this motion.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I will not continue with that matter, but you were in the Chair at the time, and I have been using this merely as evidence that you were pressured and influenced in the strongest possible way by members of the Government front bench. I believe that they are the people who decide what the interpretation of Standing Orders should be in this Chamber. We have all seen the Premier turn and comment to the Speaker (he did it in a speech today) and it sickens me to see the Premier trying to dictate to the Speaker.

It is for this reason that I no longer have any confidence in the Chair. How can I ever have confidence in the Chair when the person in that Chair has been irresponsible regarding the duty that this House has given him? How can I have confidence in the Chair when the Chair is influenced by the Premier of the State?

Regarding the detail covered by the Deputy Premier, the Leader of the Opposition had no chance whatever to stand and make an explanation or apologise for his actions. The moment the Speaker sat down (in fact, I was watching) he looked at the Premier and the Premier rose in his place. The Leader of the Opposition had no opportunity whatever to make a personal explanation. I think all members here saw that, the moment the Leader sat down, the Premier rose. There were plenty of witnesses to that. It is for this reason that I must support the motion on this most important and serious matter, but I do so wanting to ensure that we have democracy in this House from now on, and that Opposition members get the same treatment as members on the Government benches get.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I, too, support the motion of no confidence in you. I understand it to be a very wide motion. No reasons have been incorporated in the motion to justify it: it is merely a blanket motion of no confidence in you, as Speaker. Up to now the debate has been confined to the incident this afternoon. I understand that, because it is a blanket motion of no confidence in you, there are no requirements under Standing Orders for the debate to be so confined, and I intend to give, as my reasons for supporting this motion, other examples in respect of which I believe you deserve to forfeit the confidence of this House.

First, in dealing with the matter this afternoon, I believe the honourable member for Bragg, if I may say so, was too charitable in the way he moved this motion. For some time I have been considering giving notice of a similar motion because of your increasing partiality as the time during which you have occupied this position has increased. I say deliberately that you have become increasingly partial against those of us who sit in this corner (that is, the member for Goyder and me). I will give examples of that attitude, but I shall deal with this afternoon's incident first. At first, when it started with the attempt by the Leader of the Opposition to make a personal explanation, I thought it might have been a situation engineered deliberately to have him named and suspended, but, as things have

developed, I am not certain that this is the case, because of the way in which members—

Mr. Coumbe: You know damn well it's not the case.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know damn well that it is not the case, but I had my suspicions about it. However, the way in which members of the Liberal Party have behaved leads me to think it probably was not a contrived situation, otherwise they would have been better prepared for the debate. Certainly, I am glad to have the chance to support the motion. I deliberately did not get up to move dissension from your rulings that were given after the Premier had taken the points of order.

Let me now turn to the wider issues to which I have referred, and they are matters that you know of, of course. First, I have found that, as time has gone on, my call during Question Time has become later and later. Your practice when you were first elected Speaker (and I may say that I welcomed your election after the problems that we had experienced with your predecessor), and during your first session as Speaker, seemed to be that the then member for Goyder, now Senator Steele Hall, always received a very early call during Question Time. Normally, I received a call only two or three questions on the Opposition side after him. However, as time has gone on, I have noticed that now my colleague the member for Goyder (and I do not begrudge him this, as he is my colleague) often receives the call before I do, and I receive the later calls. That has been going on, and I cite it as being deliberate.

Mr. Chapman: You aren't always here. It's not a bad idea to be here when Question Time begins.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Normally, I am present during Question Time, or I would not seek the call. Another matter to which I refer is the difficulty that the member for Goyder and I have had in taking part in debates, and I suspect that the squeeze will be on for all of us when the recently amended Standing Orders come into effect next week. Indeed, the squeeze will be harder on the member for Goyder and me than it will be on other members. I have told you, both in words and by letter, that the member for Goyder and I do not accept the Opposition Whip, the member for Fisher. From time to time I have had extreme difficulty in getting on to the list of speakers and knowing just when I will be called. Perhaps this debate is exceptional but, when I went up to you after the motion had been moved and while the member for Bragg was still speaking, I asked to be put on the list, and you told me that you would not have a list for this debate and that it would be catch as catch can.

May I now refer to two specific incidents, last November, of what I believe were unsatisfactory actions on your part. They were so unsatisfactory that I took the course of writing a series of letters to you about them, because I wanted to ensure that I had not misunderstood what you had done and I wanted to give you the chance, if you wished to take it, of explaining in writing or by conversation the actions which you had taken and about which I had complained. I have a copy of the letter I wrote to you, dated November 25, a couple of days before my suspension, about which I complained bitterly. I appreciated the support I received from members on this side, because I believed that I was very badly and unjustly treated. The letter states:

Dear Mr. Speaker, I write on behalf of the member for Goyder and myself to seek clarification of your practice in relation to the giving of the call to members during debate in the House. I do this because of two incidents

last week which seem to show that you are not now following the long-standing practice which has been followed, at least since I became a member of the House, of always giving the call to a member who has taken the adjournment of a debate and of calling members in the order of speakers arranged beforehand with the Whips.

The Notice Paper for Tuesday, November 19, showed that David Boundy had taken the adjournment of the debate on a motion of the Attorney-General. This was Order of the Day No. 2. Unfortunately, David had met with quite a serious accident on the preceding Saturday and was not in the House last Tuesday. I had expected you to call the member for Goyder when that Order of the Day was reached and, in his absence and on my standing, you would call on me in his stead. This, as I understand it, has been the practice in the past when a member who has the adjournment is not present. Instead, you did not call the member for Goyder, but immediately called the member for Gouger. Keith Russack was obviously prepared to speak, from which I deduced that he had been warned beforehand (I assume by his Whip after discussion with you) that he would be called. This alteration in the arrangements which I would have expected from previous practice was made without any mention to me by anyone, or even any inquiry as to whether David Boundy would be present to speak. That was the first incident, and I now refer to the second one, because the letter continues:

Late on Wednesday afternoon I discussed with you whether I would speak in the second reading debate on the Business Franchise (Petroleum) Bill.

Members will recall that that debate was hard fought and quite long on a matter of great importance and controversy. My letter continues:

After some conversation between us, and an interval of time while you worked out the order of speakers, you put my name on the list to speak after the member for Bragg.

Just after the House adjourned at 6 p.m. for dinner I looked at the list to estimate what time it was likely I would be called. Accordingly I returned to the House about 8.30 p.m. while the member for Chaffey, who preceded (I think immediately) the member for Bragg in order of speakers on your list, was speaking. The member for Bragg then got the call. I looked at the Speaker's list and found I had been moved down a little way and was about the third speaker down the list at that stage. Although I was a bit surprised at the change in the arrangements I made no comment about it. I may say however that I had been more surprised to be told when I came into the Chamber at 8.30 p.m. that I had already been called although I could not possibly have been reached on the list which you had prepared before 6 p.m. By reference to *Hansard* I saw that you in fact called me immediately after the member for Hanson who was speaking at the dinner adjournment and went on after dinner. This was some three speakers before my place on the list and at a time when of course I was not in the Chamber. Later I approached the Deputy Speaker and found that yet another list had been prepared, apparently by Stanley Evans, the Liberal Party Whip (who as you know does not whip for David Boundy or me), in which I had been further dropped down the list of speakers. It was then that at Allan Burdon's request I came and spoke to you in your room. You returned to the Chamber and revised the list to give me the next call on the Opposition side.

I had relied on the arrangement which I had made with you at an early stage in that debate before dinner. I have always been able to do so in the past and know of no reason why I should not on this occasion.

Of course, if either the Labor Party or the Liberal Party want to vary their speakers then David Boundy and I can make no complaint about that but I do suggest that his and my priority of speaking, if already arranged with you, should not be affected by any change made by the other Parties.

I have set out the facts of these two incidents at length to make the reason for this letter quite clear. Summed up it is that in the past I have always relied on the fact that a member taking the adjournment of a debate will be first called when that debate comes on again and that any arrangement which I have made with you as to our places in the order of speakers in the debate will be kept.



If you would like to discuss these matters with me please let me know. Otherwise I should much appreciate hearing from you that, despite these two incidents, you do not propose to change the long-standing practice to which I have referred.

As the other parties are involved in the matter I have sent copies to Gil Langley, Stanley Evans and Peter Blacker. That was the letter I wrote to you on November 25. I had an acknowledgment from the Liberal Party Whip, but it was not until November 28 that I received from you a letter in which you said:

Dear Sir, I acknowledge receipt of your letter dated 25 instant relative to House of Assembly procedures. On Tuesday, November 19, 1974, I was informed that owing to a serious accident, Mr. D. Boundy, member for Goyder, would not be in the House and, mistakenly, I believed that other arrangements had been made.

The long-standing practice and procedure in the House of Assembly has been that the Whips by agreement and consent have arranged the order of speakers for a debate, but if this procedure cannot be fulfilled in the future, discretion of the Speaker in accordance with Standing Orders will prevail. I expect to receive co-operation in this respect.

There is not one word about the second incident in explanation, or to say that I was wrong or that you would like to talk to me about it and put me right. One can only assume from that that you had to acknowledge the accuracy of what I had set out at some length. I then wrote to you on December 4 about this matter, as follows:

Dear Mr. Speaker, Thank you for your letter of November 28 in answer to mine of November 25. With regard to the first incident, I can only conclude from what you write that you allowed yourself to be misled by the Liberal Party Whip. I do suggest, therefore, that in future you should call me (or David Boundy) up to speak to you to check on anything which the Liberal Party Whip says affecting Liberal Movement members. As you know he does not whip for us and therefore is not entitled to speak on our behalf.

You do not specifically refer to what I wrote about the second incident to explain why you called on me earlier than I had arranged with you. I can only reiterate that I am whipping on behalf of David Boundy and myself and that I hope indeed to be able to rely on arrangements made with you concerning our places in the order of speaking in debate. As I have referred to the Liberal Party Whip in this letter I shall send a copy of it to Stanley Evans.

And I did so. I have never had an answer from you to that letter. It is, I believe, absolutely fundamental for the fair working of this place that all of us, whether we be members of a small Party or even independent members, or whether we be members of one of the numerically larger Parties, should be able to rely on your word. However, those incidents to which I have referred at some length show that we cannot rely on your word. You had the opportunity in writing to explain what you had done and you did not take it, so I can only conclude from that that you have to admit the wrong you did to me on that occasion.

There is only one other thing I would mention in supporting this motion. It is always members on this side who are dealt with harshly. Until a member in the first session pointed out that you had never even warned a member of the Government side no member on the Government side—

Mr. Wright: That's not true.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes it is.

Mr. Wright: The member for Florey was warned.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That was after, and very soon after I may say, the comment was made by an Opposition member. You know (indeed, everyone connected with Parliament knows) that there is at least as much disorder (and I use the word in its technical sense) from the Govern-

ment side as there is from this side. Since that time you have occasionally warned Government members for the first time (I do not know what first, second and third warnings mean; you have worked that out for yourself and you have never explained), but you have never taken it any further than that despite the most persistent interjections, sometimes from the front bench but not always. Only members on this side of the Chamber have been dealt with harshly by you, and that, too, is an obvious sign of your partiality.

I regret to have had to say these things, but I believe this is the proper opportunity to say them and I hope that my saying them will clear the air. Of course, you will survive this motion of no confidence because the Government has the numbers and will not make the mistake which was apparently made in Canberra this morning and which resulted in the resignation of the Commonwealth Speaker. I hope that, despite the formal outcome of this motion, we will have what we should have and what we have in theory: that is, complete impartiality on your part towards all members. Whether you like us personally or not, whether you approve of our politics or not, it is your duty, Mr. Speaker, to protect members' rights in this place. It is because you have not been carrying out that duty that I support the motion.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): I do not think that an attack such as that made by the member for Mitcham should go unanswered. The honourable member has the best record of defying the Speaker's rulings of anyone in the history of my membership of this Parliament. Every time a ruling is made that does not suit the member for Mitcham, he takes no notice of it whatsoever and persists in his defiance of the authority of the Chair until the Speaker's patience is finally pushed to the extreme, and the honourable member gets named. Of course, the honourable member has the best record of being suspended from the service of this House of any member in my experience, for that very reason—when he is named, he never apologises. Never in the history of debates in this Parliament that I have listened to, when the member for Mitcham has been pulled up by the Chair, has he admitted that he was in the wrong, nor has he apologised. Of course, the honourable member seeks equal status with that of the Leader of the Opposition, but his so-called Party is not even recognised within the House.

So far as this House is concerned, the member for Mitcham is a back-bencher, an Independent, as is the member for Goyder. That is the start and finish of it; the House in its traditions has never given any status to a Party of two, whether it be an independent Labor group or, as in this case, an independent Liberal group. That means that the member for Mitcham has equal rights with those of every other back-bencher.

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: In the frequency with which the member for Mitcham asks questions and in the frequency with which he takes part in debates, he is treated with more than justice by you, Mr. Speaker, in comparison with any other back-bencher. There has been no occasion when the honourable member has ever been prevented from speaking, unless it has been by his own absence from this House. The honourable member is more dilatory in his attendance in this House than is any other member. On occasions when the honourable member can be present, he is absent more frequently than is anyone else. I have never heard such an extraordinary recital as that which we heard a little while ago, about the honourable



member's letter to you, Mr. Speaker, in relation to the so-called second incident. The honourable member, by choice, was absent from this House when it was sitting and he happened to get the call while he was absent; when he came back he found he had been pushed down the list, and he got the call later as a consequence. That is supposed to be a case for lack of confidence in you, Mr. Speaker.

I suggest that the member for Mitcham has demonstrated to every member of this House and to members of the public who are listening or who will later read *Hansard* that his footling and piffing arguments are absolutely without substance and are figments of his own imagination, because he believes that he should have the same status and ought to be treated in the same way as the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Millhouse: Why do you think—

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member had his chance to speak, and I listened to him. I suggest that he pay the same courtesy to me.

Mr. Millhouse: That's a hard question to answer.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I did not hear it.

Mr. Millhouse: Then I'll repeat it. Why do you think—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Millhouse: —the Speaker—

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

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member has just demonstrated his defiance of any authority that you, Mr. Speaker, attempt to exercise from the Chair. The demonstration that we have just seen, with the member for Mitcham continuing his interjection while you were on your feet, is typical of his behaviour in this House over a long period. The honourable member is a member of the legal profession, and he claims to be an upholder of law and order. He has never cared one tinker's cuss for law and order in this Chamber—not on one occasion. Yet he has the gall to get up and say that he has no confidence in the Chair. Most of the members of this House have no confidence in the amount of sense, decency, tolerance and willingness to obey the traditions and rules of this House that the member for Mitcham displays: the lack of confidence is in the honourable member, and that lack of confidence resulting from his absolutely intolerable behaviour over a long period is shared by the vast majority of members on this side and on the Opposition side.

For the sake of the Opposition, I am sorry that Opposition members have had to put up with the support of the member for Mitcham. Whatever case they had, which was very little, was not helped by the honourable member's intervention. I apologise that their case has been so weakened by the piffing and footling speech we had to listen to. Regarding the general situation, it seems to me that a tradition is building up in this House among certain members that, if they are called upon to take certain action and to apologise, they refuse to do so: they stand on their proverbial dignity. The situation always applies in this Chamber that, if a member apologises for something he has done, no further action follows. That is a general procedure. I have been called on to apologise on occasions, and I have done so. I have not liked doing so, but I have done so, and that has been the end of the matter.

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: When I have been required to apologise by the Chair, I have done so. The position with respect to personal explanations ought to be put clearly on the record. Standing Order 137 provides:

By leave of the House, a member may explain matters of a personal nature although there be no question before the House; but such matters may not be debated.

The words "but such matters may not be debated" are critical. In other words, the right to make a personal explanation is a right to explain some matter in which one has been involved personally. It does not extend to a right to convert that explanation into any form of debate whatsoever. That has been the long-standing situation in this House, and all members are aware of it. If a member is called on by the Speaker to stick to Standing Orders, the member should stick to those Standing Orders or move to disagree to the Speaker's ruling. It is simply not good enough for the time of this House to be wasted week in week out by people refusing to obey the authority of the Chair when it is exercised by the person required to implement that authority. By our actions as members we have made your job, Mr. Speaker, far more difficult than it has ever been in the past. I say "our actions": I do not excuse myself entirely from criticism on that matter.

Mr. Dean Brown: You are the worst in the House.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will leave others to judge that, not the honourable member. I suggest that the time has been reached in connection with debates in this Chamber when matters are no longer assisted by the behaviour of members in not paying attention to the Chair. That comment applies to all members. It is time that all members in the House obeyed Standing Orders. If the Chair makes a ruling, the ruling should be accepted with good grace and, if there is disagreement with the ruling, the appropriate motion should be moved. If we do not mend our ways in this matter, we could become one of the most disorderly Parliaments in the history of South Australia or Australia.

On many occasions business of concern to the people of the State is interrupted or upset as a result of the attitude of individual members in defying the authority of the Chair and continuing to interject when they have been asked to cease, continuing to speak when you, Mr. Speaker, are on your feet, refusing to accept your ruling, and proceeding to do the very thing to which you have taken objection. If we continue in this way, we shall make this Parliament a much worse place.

Mr. Goldsworthy: The change in Standing Orders will do that.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I suggest that this motion should be thrown out, as it is not the appropriate motion to have been moved on this occasion. As the Deputy Premier explained, if Opposition members had been aware of the Standing Orders they would have moved the appropriate disagreement motion at the time it was required to be moved, and the present motion would not have been necessary. Then we would not have had to put up with the dreadful and pitiful garbage we listened to from the member for Mitcham.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): It does not give me any pleasure to take part in this debate. However, as an Opposition member and a person who believes in a fair go for every section of the community, I believe I should make my protest about the treatment received by the Leader this

afternoon. What had happened was a clear case of the Leader's being misquoted deliberately by the Premier, who was trying to save his own worthless political neck. When the Leader tried to put the record straight so that the people of South Australia would be correctly informed, the Premier tried to gag him. The Premier cannot take criticism. He wants to gag not only the public but also the Parliament. One can only come to the conclusion that he wants to turn this democratic House into Dunstan's den, so that only he and the Labor Party can be heard; other members do not count.

What sort of a state of affairs is that! We would be failing in our obligation as a democratic Party if we sat idly by and let that situation occur. Let us examine what happened today. At the first opportunity, the Leader rose quite properly in order to explain how he had been misquoted. On two occasions points of order were taken, and he was stopped, and on the third occasion, when he rightly objected, he was named by you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Goldsworthy: He was not warned.

Mr. GUNN: No, he was named. On other occasions when members have been named (and I received this treatment on one occasion), they have been given the opportunity by the Speaker to withdraw or explain their remarks. Since I have been a member, mine has been the only explanation that has been accepted. However, the Leader was not given that right, and it is a fundamental right which should be afforded to every member and which should be supported by all members who believe in a fair go.

Mr. Langley: Your mob doesn't.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GUNN: I will let the member for Unley make his own speech in this debate, if he is capable of doing so. He rarely speaks in debates in this Chamber.

The SPEAKER: Order! The motion is one of no confidence in the Speaker.

Mr. GUNN: We have heard some interesting speeches in defence of the course of action taken by you, Mr. Speaker. I can only say that I was amazed at what the Minister of Education said. If one member in this House has consistently flouted your rulings, Mr. Speaker, and has been a law unto himself, it has been the Minister of Education. He has refused to obey your rulings, and has continued to speak when you have been on your feet or the Chairman has been on his feet. He has failed to follow the traditions of the House, and he has got away with it. Yet when members on this side have stepped across the line only slightly they have been brought to heel.

During the last Parliament, there appeared to be two sets of Standing Orders used by the previous Speaker: one for Government members and the other for Opposition members. I am pleased to say that you, Sir, have not adopted that attitude. However, I believe that the Premier and his Ministers have had far too much influence on the conduct of the House. It has been traditional for the Speaker to protect not only the rights of Government members but also those of Opposition members, this tradition having been handed down from the House of Commons. A tradition of that House that should be adopted here is that the Speaker, once he is elected, steps aside from his Party political obligations. Our tradition has been that the Speaker must always be impartial.

I do not believe that the Leader today received an impartial hearing when he tried to correct the public record. In view of the decision made, one has to support

this motion of no confidence in you, Mr. Speaker. The Premier must accept responsibility for the fact that this motion has had to be moved. He drew the battle lines. The Deputy Premier shares equal blame, for he supported the course of action adopted. Opposition members had no alternative but to protest in the strongest way open to them: a motion of no confidence is a serious course of action to follow. However, as the Premier behaved shabbily in gagging the Leader and preventing the public from being given the truth, he brought on himself the course of action we have taken. I strongly support the motion.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE (Minister of Labour and Industry) moved:

That the question be now put.

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order! Is the motion seconded?

Mr. PAYNE: I second the motion.

The House divided on the Hon. D. H. McKee's motion:

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

Noes (16)—Messrs. Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe (teller), Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse, Rodda, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Broomhill, McRae, Virgo, and Wells. Noes—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Nankivell, and Russack.

Majority of 5 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

The House divided on Dr. Tonkin's motion:

Ayes (16)—Messrs. Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse, Rodda, Tonkin (teller), Venning, and Wardle.

Noes (21)—Messrs. 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, and Wright.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Nankivell, and Russack. Noes—Messrs. Broomhill, McRae, Virgo, and Wells.

Majority of 5 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

#### PUBLIC SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL (CONSOLIDATION)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

#### KINDERGARTEN UNION BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

#### FAIR CREDIT REPORTS BILL

A message was received from the Legislative Council agreeing to a conference to be held in the Legislative Council conference room on Thursday, March 6, 1975, at 10 a.m.

#### WHEAT DELIVERY QUOTAS ACT AMENDMENT BILL (COMMITTEE)

Second reading.

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

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

It amends the Wheat Delivery Quotas Act, 1969, as amended, in one particular. Briefly, it provides for a reorganisation of the Wheat Delivery Quotas Advisory Committee, which at present consists of 11 members representing the interests set out in section 7 of the principal Act as at present in operation. After discussions with the interested parties it is felt that at this time the size of the committee could be considerably reduced, and accordingly this measure provides that should this Bill be enacted into law the advisory committee will consist of three members: a chairman appointed by the Governor on the nomination of the appropriate farmers' organisation (the United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia Incorporated) and two persons appointed by the Governor.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends section 5 of the principal Act by making an amendment consequential on the change in composition of the committee. Clause 4 amends section 7 of the principal Act and effects the reconstitution referred to above. Clause 5 amends section 10 of the principal Act by reducing the size of the quorum in view of the reduced size of the committee. Clause 6 repeals section 11 of the principal Act which is no longer appropriate. Clause 7 makes certain consequential amendments to section 12 of the principal Act arising from the fact that the Chairman is now appointed and not elected by members of the committee.

Mr. VENNING secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### INDUSTRIAL ORGANISATION (BUILDING GRANTS) BILL

Adjourned debate on motion of the Hon. D. A. Dunstan:

That the report be noted.

(Continued from February 26. Page 2603.)

Mr. DUNCAN (Elizabeth): I support the motion. I was most interested to hear the many comments that were made by members opposite yesterday, because it seems that they have decided as a Party to turn this matter into a complete and utter political football.

Mr. Goldsworthy: All kicking the one way.

Mr. DUNCAN: That is an interesting comment. It is one of the few occasions when we have seen the Opposition kicking the one way. Generally, members opposite are going in different directions. No doubt the reason for their kicking in the one direction in this matter relates to what was said yesterday by a member on this side when he said that the Opposition had received clear instructions from their masters in another place and from the Adelaide Club. However, that matter has been well canvassed, so I will not continue with it today.

Although the history of the building of the Trades Hall on South Terrace has received some airing in this place, it has not received the sort of attention that it should have received. The Leader of the Opposition and the member for Kavel made clear that their knowledge of the sorts of activity pursued by the trade union movement in an attempt to raise money for the running of Trades Hall was limited.

I will now refer to some of the matters raised by those members, because they clearly show that the Trades Hall Managing Committee is in difficulties now, not because of a lack of effort (because that committee has done a magnificent job to raise the necessary money) but principally because the economic climate has changed and because estimates of the economic viability of the Trades Hall were not entirely correct. I want to refer especially to Senator Bishop, who undertook the primary and major work of raising funds that were necessary to build the Trades Hall.

Senator Bishop is now the Australian Postmaster-General. He made a magnificent effort and spent thousands of hours of his valuable time in attempting to raise the necessary funds.

Senator Bishop virtually door-knocked and approached personally every employer in South Australia in an attempt to raise the necessary funds. How can the Leader say that no significant appeal was made to the public of South Australia when that sort of effort has gone into raising funds for the Trades Hall? It is a pity that the Leader is not in the House this afternoon to answer that question, because it seems to me to show clearly the sort of irresponsible comment that was being made yesterday. Apart from all the major employers in South Australia being approached for donations, a letter campaign was undertaken appealing to thousands of people throughout South Australia in an attempt to raise money for the hall. A personal letter was sent under the Premier's hand as Leader of the Labor movement in South Australia. This campaign did not prove sufficiently successful to raise the necessary funds for the hall; however, it was successful in that the final sum raised from all sources was \$190 000. Unfortunately, however, that sum was insufficient to cover the necessary capital and interest costs faced by Trades Hall.

Every effort possible has been made to ask the public of South Australia to donate to this cause. That the appeal has not been sufficiently successful is not a reflection of the work put into the appeal by the trade union movement in this State. The record clearly shows that a cause such as this, although it is worthy, has to compete with many other causes. The appeal for the necessary funds has been unsuccessful for that reason. In speaking to this Bill yesterday the Leader of the Opposition said that Mr. Doyle, the accountant on the Trades Hall Managing Committee, had said to him that when the hall was opened it was not a financially viable project. The Leader made that statement yesterday with the clear intent of leading the House into believing that the entire Trades Hall project had never been viable; that is not the case.

What Mr. Doyle really said was that the Trades Hall was not economically viable three years after the original viability studies were undertaken. Surely that does not relate to the time the project was conceived or when the original viability studies were carried out. Since the Trades Hall has been open, many attempts have been made to raise funds to assist in paying off the capital and interest charges as they have fallen due at certain times. Last year, for example, a car raffle was organised after a car had been donated to Trades Hall for the purpose of raising money, and that raffle raised several thousand dollars.

Members must be aware that sums such as \$45 000 a year (which is the deficit faced by the Trades Hall Managing Committee) cannot be raised by raffles of that type. Certainly that sort of fund-raising attempt can be made to assist the financial plight of the organisation, but it will not solve the plight of Trades Hall. Many people within the trade union movement, including people in this House, make regular donations to Trades Hall by way of deductions from their bank accounts. However, the Trades Hall, in an attempt to bolster its funds, has increased its rentals to a level whereby they are higher than other comparable economic rentals in that area of the city.

Mr. Arnold: Is there any vacant space in the hall?

Mr. DUNCAN: No. Not only is there no vacant office space in the hall: several unions are sharing offices because of the difficulty in obtaining space in the hall. I will refer

to this matter later, because the economic situation regarding rents is important. Trades Hall council affiliation fees have been increased significantly to the stage where they are equal to the affiliation fees charged in any other Australian State; this has also been done in an attempt to bolster the Trades Hall's finances. Opposition members may not appreciate that only about one-third of the members of trade unions in South Australia are members of unions that have offices in Trades Hall. To talk about levying the entire 100 000 or more members of the trade union movement in South Australia for the benefit of the hall is unrealistic, because members of unions that do not have offices in the hall are, understandably, not altogether enthusiastic about making a large donation towards the cost of Trades Hall. However, they are willing to use the hall's excellent facilities in the way of meeting and conference rooms. It would be difficult to levy the entire trade union movement, many of whose members belong to unions that do not have their offices in the hall.

Mr. Chapman: How do you justify calling on all the taxpayers?

Mr. DUNCAN: I will reach that matter later. I will now list some of the large unions that do not have offices situated in the hall: the Amalgamated Metalworkers Union, Australian Workers Union, Federated Ironworkers Association of Australia, Australian Postal Workers Union, Miscellaneous Workers Union, and the Australasian Society of Engineers, all of which use the hall's facilities regularly, every time they have a stop-work meeting, etc. That is the centre of trade union activity in South Australia. The affiliation fees of the Trades and Labor Council have been raised to a high level. This has been an effective levy on each and every member of the trade union movement in South Australia in an attempt also to bolster the Trades Hall's finances. However, again, this has not been a solution to the problem; it has raised significant funds, but nowhere near the sum needed to cover the deficit.

Successful attempts have been made to increase the use of the hall's facilities by means of implementing better management policies and greater advertising of its facilities. Many more unions, which are now using the hall's meeting facilities, have managed to enter into long-term contracts for using those facilities on certain nights of the week, and the managing committee has been successful in attracting conferences to the hall. All these activities have assisted in bolstering the hall's finances. However, we are talking about an enormous sum (\$40 000 a year over and above the managing committee's present income). This sum needs to be found each year to meet the interest and principal repayment commitments.

I will refer now to a matter that has been raised by an Opposition speaker. The hall is now four storeys high. The original intention was to build a Trades Hall of four storeys, pay that building off, and then add another three storeys to the existing building, which has been built to take those additional storeys, so that most of the trade union movement in South Australia could be accommodated in the one building. However, the building of such a large complex at the time was beyond the foreseen financial resources of the trade union movement. So, it was decided to build the hall in two stages. Unfortunately, the first stage has been financially bogged down, with the effect that many unions that would like to move into the hall are unable to do so at present because of insufficient space. Several unions, rather than be away from the hall, are sharing offices with other unions. In reply to the member for Chaffey, I point out that there is no office space in

Trades Hall that is not let out at the high rentals applying to office space available there generally.

Mr. Nankivell: How much space is occupied by the A.L.P.?

Mr. DUNCAN: Only a small amount (I think no more than about 37 m<sup>2</sup>). The member for Alexandra raised the furphy of why people in South Australia as a whole should contribute by means of taxation to assist the Trades Hall and the trade union movement. I really believe that he asked the question rhetorically, because I do not believe that even he doubts the worth of the trade union movement to the people of the State.

Mr. Chapman: Don't place too much confidence on that remark.

Mr. DUNCAN: I believe that even he is surely not so rigidly fixed in the seventeenth century as to believe that the trade union movement has not been of great worth to the people of the State.

*Members interjecting:*

Mr. DUNCAN: The member for Alexandra may refute my comments but, when one examines his record, it clearly shows him as the spiritual descendant of rack landlords, child exploiters and slave traders that he is. Members can clearly see that the kinds of reactionary idea he has put forward indicate his spiritual heritage. No doubt most Opposition members appreciate that the trade union movement is, and has been, of great worth to the people of this State. It is only through the efforts of the movement that the spiritual ancestors of the member for Alexandra (the child exploiters and slave traders) no longer hold sway in society, nor are they able to exploit in the way they did prior to this century and to the birth of the trade union movement.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You've got your geography wrong: he comes from Kangaroo Island, not from the Nile.

Mr. DUNCAN: Regardless of whence he came, I have no doubt about his spiritual ancestry: he is well in the camp of the slave traders. As the member for Kavel pointed out, almost uniquely for the first time the Opposition is kicking in the same direction, and I suggest its intention is that, if a trade union or trade unionists are put before the Opposition, it will kick them down.

Mr. Becker: What about private enterprise?

Mr. DUNCAN: I am not talking about private enterprise. The Opposition is doing this simply to kick the trade union movement. All members opposite know in their hearts that the trade union movement has done a great job for the people of South Australia and that it certainly has a job to do in the future. The Opposition's point of view has certainly undergone a change in this debate, and no doubt that change has occurred because of the realisation that this was a great way of getting at the trade union movement. There is no doubt that Opposition members see this very much in terms of a class struggle and a chance to kick the trade union movement in the teeth. The Opposition members appointed to the Select Committee have been given a real insight into the affairs of South Australia's trade union movement, as well as its financial plight. Yesterday, the Treasurer laid the cards on the table: he told the House of the real position relating to Trades Hall and, if members opposite vote against this Bill, they will have the blood and the demise of the trade union movement on their hands, about which many of them will be delighted.

Mr. Chapman: That's blackmail.

Mr. DUNCAN: Let us not talk about blackmail. I think that is what members opposite are engaging in.

*Members interjecting:*

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DUNCAN: Let us look at the Opposition's record in this matter. Almost gloatingly and gleefully, the Leader issued a press release stating that he had donated the magnificent sum of \$10 to the Trades Hall. However, I, and indeed all Government members, have put in much more than that. This was a belated donation by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Mathwin: How much have you put in?

Mr. DUNCAN: Every Government member has donated more than \$100. This illustrates clearly that Government members are honest in their approach to the matter. I cannot help thinking that the \$10 donated by the Leader in this gloating fashion was really conscience money. That money was donated, and Opposition members thought, "Here is \$10. That will ease our conscience in relation to the disgusting approach that we will have to take on this matter when it is debated in Parliament." That is the sort of attitude that the Leader adopted on behalf of the Opposition. If I had had anything to do with the matter, I would have sent the \$10 back, because it was a slight on all trade unions and trade unionists in South Australia. I believe the donation was made in that frame of mind. Possibly, the Leader was hoping that it would be returned to him so that he could gloatingly say, "They don't want the money."

Mr. Goldsworthy: Make up your mind! What do you want: do you want money, or don't you?

Mr. Crimes: We accepted it.

Mr. DUNCAN: Members opposite know that the sum of money required is far greater than the measly \$10 donated by the Leader. Although I have not much more time to contribute to the debate, I should like to make one or two clear statements for the benefit of Opposition members. The member for Alexandra has already shown his colours: he does not believe in the trade union movement or consider that it has in the past done a great job for the people of South Australia.

Mr. Chapman: You speak for yourself!

Mr. DUNCAN: The honourable member said that by way of interjection. I challenge members opposite to put their bloody colours to the masthead to illustrate their attitude in this respect. I think most Opposition members would repudiate the attitude taken by the member for Alexandra, because most of them are more reasonable than that. I appeal to their sense of reasoning, because they know the problems facing Trades Hall. As the Treasurer said yesterday, unless this loan is made there is a real chance that Trades Hall will go into liquidation. I appeal to the reasonable members opposite not to listen to the classic seventeenth century approach taken by the member for Alexandra in this matter. I appeal to them and ask them, for the good of the trade union movement in South Australia and, indeed, for South Australian society generally, to support the Bill.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): In speaking to the motion, I remind members that the crux of the matter is contained in proposed new clause 4, which is set out in paragraph 6 of the Select Committee's report. It provides:

(1) Subject to this section, the Treasurer may advance to the corporation by way of loan the sum of two hundred thousand dollars for the purposes of assisting the corporation in meeting its financial liabilities arising from the construction of the Trades Hall.

(2) The corporation shall repay the said amount of two hundred thousand dollars to the Treasurer by forty equal annual instalments of five thousand dollars, the first such instalment being due and payable on the thirtieth day of June, 1985.

That is the basis of many of the objections that have been made and, indeed, it would be my objection to the matter. I do not disagree with Trades Hall being given a loan at a reasonable repayment rate. However, I cannot see why, when comparing Trades Hall with other organisations in the community, it should not have to make its first repayment instalment until 1985. I cannot agree with that. Not having been there before, I took the opportunity early this week to visit Trades Hall. I was pleased to see Mr. Shannon there and to inspect the establishment. Although there is a fair amount of waste space in certain areas, generally speaking it is a fine building. Had more accommodation been provided to enable the trade unions to obtain more rent from lessees, the venture could have been more viable. I did not know when I visited Trades Hall what type of report the Select Committee was going to make; nor did I know what had transpired before the Select Committee.

Although yesterday, the earliest opportunity I had, I read the proceedings and submissions made to the Select Committee, unfortunately I do not have with me the notes that I made. However, I do recall some matters that attracted my attention. The evidence shows that to January, 1974, the amount of money raised was \$136 982.80 from levies, \$8 673.30 from donations, and \$58 105 from donations by employers. That contribution by employers is generous, as I do not think any member would dispute. I am always pleased to do my share, within my means. These contributions show that, if a fund was organised in a proper way, much money would be received. The fund-raising effort should not be half-hearted.

Mr. Crimes: If we get the \$200 000, we may be able to do that, but we cannot afford it now.

Mr. MATHWIN: Surely \$200 000 would not be required to lodge an appeal in the State. It was interesting to read Mr. Giles's evidence to the committee that he had sent a letter to the Treasurer. When he was asked whether other members of the committee had had the opportunity to peruse the letter, the reply was "Yes". However, when asked whether he would be willing to have the letter tabled so that the other members of the committee could see it, he said that he would rather not do that, because he would not like the matter to become a big issue.

Mr. Coumbe: Are you suggesting that some members of the committee were aware of the letter and some were not?

Mr. Payne: I hope not, because the point at issue was whether the letter was sent to the committee, or to the Treasurer in a private capacity. You go back over it.

Mr. MATHWIN: The transcript of Mr. Giles's evidence, at page 45, is as follows:

Some members of the committee have not had the opportunity to read your letter?—Yes.

Would you be happy for it to be tabled before the committee?—I would prefer that it not be tabled. The letter was from one individual to another individual, and it did not approximate the bulk of opinion of my colleagues on the management committee.

Mr. Payne: I am not disputing the second matter, but I think the connotation you are putting is not the one that was put at the time. I did not see any such letter.

Mr. MATHWIN: I am not trying to stir up dirty water, and it could be my fault that I had little time to

read the evidence. However, Mr. Giles did refuse to answer a question asked by the member for Eyre, and other members who have spoken in the debate have canvassed that. Let us not forget that the Labor Party rules provide that every trade union member should pay to the Party an affiliation fee of 40c a year, and this could bring in much money in a year. The Labor Party has its headquarters in the Trades Hall and it could use that as a propaganda base if it wanted to do so. I am not suggesting that the Labor Party does use it in that way, but would it be wrong to suggest that that Party ought to subscribe to the funds?

Mr. Crimes: We cannot pay the necessary staff now, for want of financial resources.

Mr. MATHWIN: We have heard about the large amounts of money that some Commonwealth-registered unions have. I am not referring to State unions here. As the law stands, we can peruse the balance sheets of unions registered with the Commonwealth court but, unfortunately, we cannot do that in regard to State unions. The Labor Party could well contribute thousands of dollars to this project. I suppose we grasp at any straw in this situation.

Mr. Shannon's submission was well prepared and contained much detail, but one thinks of what other way to raise money is available. The richest people in the world at present are the oil barons and the Arabs, and perhaps we ought to ask the P.L.O. whether it is willing to come into this proposal. Those people are coming into ventures throughout the world, particularly in tourism, and they do not know what to do with their money. The member for Elizabeth dealt severely with my colleague from Kangaroo Island. He said that the member for Alexandra was one of the child exploiters, one of the hard men in the world, who was quite willing to grind the working man into the ground.

Mr. Crimes: No, he said he was a spiritual descendant of those people.

Mr. MATHWIN: I do not think the member for Elizabeth did anything at all to help the cause in his outburst, because he then turned his anger on every member on this side, saying that we were always kicking the unions, that we hated them, and that at every opportunity we took full advantage of the circumstances to kick them. The member for Elizabeth would know that that is not correct. Looking back through history, we see that the people who have helped the trade unions more than any other people have been the right-of-centre Parties. Our trade union history comes from England, because we have followed the system adopted there; therefore, we must go back to the early records in the United Kingdom.

On every occasion, it has not been the leftist Parties in Parliament that have assisted the trade unions, but the right-of-centre Parties; in the United Kingdom, that is the Conservative Party. It was the Conservative Party that repealed the anti-combination laws and established the right to combine and to form trade unions. The right-of-centre Parties allowed men to combine to form trade unions. It was the Conservative Party in 1959 which established the right to peaceful picketing, a right that has been expounded here by trade union leaders who, in some cases, have broken the law in this regard. Again, the right to strike, another great step in trade union history, was finally established by the Conservative Employers and Workmen's Act in 1875. Here again, the member for Elizabeth, a learned man, who should know the history of trade unions inside out, should know how well the right-of-centre Parties have supported trade unions throughout history.

A vote of thanks was passed by the Trade Union Council at its congress in Glasgow in 1875 to the Conservative Home Secretary at that time. We need go no further for proof. It was the Conservatives who, in 1802, legislated for limited hours of work for children in textile factories. I can go through the history of trade unionism and show the assistance it has been given by thinkers of my political following, by people right of centre, not particularly by people on the left. The statement by the member for Elizabeth did nothing to help the situation; he got into members on my side of politics for their rough treatment of trade unions.

As a past member of a trade union, I have great sympathy for that movement. It is imperative that it should continue; it will always be needed. Certainly, the need is not as great as it used to be because of the actions that have gone on with trade unions and because of the fine and sympathetic understanding they have had from people like me and members on my side of the House, who have been sympathetic and receptive to the needs of trade unionists, allowing their activities to be liberalised (a fine word) in the manner in which the right-of-centre Parties have helped them. I could give many more instances. You, Sir, are well versed in trade union history and you would know that I am not stretching the truth and that what I have told the House is quite correct. Some assistance must be given to these people, but in no circumstances can I support the report as it has come from the Select Committee; therefore, I will vote against it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I oppose this motion because I will oppose this Bill at every stage. I have, however, what I regard as some cogent reasons for my opposition to it. I desire to refer to the report of the Select Committee, which we are debating. I refer first of all to paragraph 3, which states, in the latter part:

In his evidence—

and I believe it is quite wrong for a Select Committee to attempt to hide behind a public servant's opinion—

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.

The next paragraph also canvasses the views of the Under Treasurer. When we look at the evidence of the Select Committee, we find that Mr. Carey, the Under Treasurer, was asked only four questions. He could have been there only a few minutes. Certainly, his evidence does not bear out this paragraph of the report. Obviously, he had been invited or directed by the Government to work out a number of propositions by which the Trades Hall could be assisted, because the Treasurer, who was Chairman of the committee, started off this way:

Following the last meeting I asked you to consider various alternatives of coping with the difficulties of the Trades Hall and to set out cost advantages and disadvantages. Have you prepared that material?

The answer was "Yes", and then apparently it was presented. Question 134, asked by the Chairman, was as follows:

The committee is looking for some means to ensure that the Trades Hall remains a viable proposition on the basis that it makes its best efforts to meet commitments but that they must be written down to be able to do so?

The answer from Mr. Carey canvasses what is called alternative No. 6, and continues in this way:

Whether the committee pays half the amount or all of it should be within its power by that time.

That is the question of repayments under alternative No. 6. The next is a sentence I shall quote to show that the Select

Committee majority (a Government majority) is hiding quite wrongly in every way behind the Under Treasurer, who said:

It is a question of how far you believe the Government should make concessions.

He then continues, saying that the concessions are not as large as they seem on paper. Mr. Carey, properly, fairly, and squarely, in his evidence sets out that it is a matter of Government policy as to how far assistance is given to the Trades Hall, and it is completely and utterly wrong for the report, as it does in paragraphs 3 and 4, apparently to hide behind the opinion of a public servant. It is wrong by convention and it is wrong in fact when one takes the trouble to look at the evidence presented.

A good deal has been said in this debate, much of it, in my view, quite irrelevant to the matter under discussion. The fact is that, at a time when we are desperately short of money in this State, the Labor Party Government intends to give (and I use the word advisedly, for reasons to which I will refer soon) \$200 000 to its own political friends and supporters. There is no justification whatever for this, except that of political influence and friendship. The Trades and Labor Council has made a bad business deal, and there is no justification why it should receive assistance any more than any other body should receive assistance from the Government: indeed, the less, because of the political connection between it and the present Government. Not only is this action immoral but also it looks immoral.

Having said that, and I believe that is all there is to say about the principle of the thing, I turn to the amendments recommended in this report to be made to the Bill. They are a complete sham. If one bothers to read them into the Bill, that becomes obvious. What do they purport to do? They purport to change the word "grant" to the word "loan", so that we are to make (or in theory we are to make) a loan to Trades Hall, Adelaide Incorporated. It is a sham for this reason: an alteration is recommended to the long title to the Bill and one to the short title, but no alterations to clauses 2 and 3.

Clause 3 is significant, because that is the interpretation clause and defines "the corporation" as meaning "The Trades Hall, Adelaide Incorporated, an association deemed to be incorporated under the Associations Incorporation Act, 1956, as amended", and defines "Trades Hall" as meaning "the building known as Trades Hall situated on South Terrace, Adelaide". Also, a "prescribed organisation" means "any organisation that directly or indirectly represents the interests of employers as such". No alterations are recommended to clause 3, but clause 4 is to be deleted and replaced by a new clause. In the original Bill clause 4 gives the Treasurer, on such terms and conditions as he sees fit, the authority to make a grant to the corporation, but that clause is to be replaced by a new clause, the marginal note of which states "Loan to Corporation" and provides:

(1) Subject to this section, the Treasurer may advance to the corporation by way of loan the sum of two hundred thousand dollars for the purposes of assisting the corporation in meeting its financial liabilities arising from the construction of the Trades Hall.

I point out that there is no suggestion that this loan is to be on any particular terms or conditions; there is no provision for the payment of any interest on the loan; and no provision for the taking of any security for the loan. What sort of a loan is that? It is interest free and without any security. What if there is a default of payments or repayments? Repayments are covered in the recommended new subclause (2), which provides:

The corporation shall repay the said amount of two hundred thousand dollars to the Treasurer by forty equal annual instalments of five thousand dollars, the first such instalment being due and payable on the thirtieth day of June, 1985.

What if the first instalment, or any subsequent instalment, is not paid? What redress has the State of South Australia or the Treasurer? Nothing at all! The member for Hanson was a bank officer by occupation, and I wonder whether he would have the authority of his bank to make a loan on such terms. I wonder whether any lending institution in Australia or anywhere else in the world would be willing to make a loan on those terms. The thing is utterly ludicrous. We call it a loan, but do not ask for interest or take any security, and we are giving it to the friends and the landlords of the Government Party. The so-called amendments are a complete whitewash and sham.

Now let us consider the amendments to clause 5, which is a much less significant clause. It deals with what was included in a pathetic attempt to show some fairness in providing for the Treasurer to make grants to what are called "any organisation that directly or indirectly represents the interests of employers as such"; that is, employer organisations. If the recommendation is agreed to, clause 5 (1) would provide:

Subject to subsection (2) of this section the Treasurer may on an application in a form approved of by him by a prescribed organisation and on such terms and conditions as nearly as possible the same as the terms and conditions provided for in section 4 of this Act, advance by way of loan to that organisation an amount for the purpose of assisting that organisation . . .

However, there are no terms or conditions set out in clause 4 and, therefore, clause 5 (1) means nothing. As I understand it, this report is presented by a bare majority of members of the Select Committee: in fact, they are Government amendments only. During the earlier debate I chided members on this side and told them that, in my opinion, they should not take part in the business of the Select Committee and should not offer themselves as members. I still believe that suggestion to be correct, but that is what led to my suspension at the end of the sittings just before Christmas. I believe that what has happened at the Select Committee has amply justified my advice to members of the Liberal Party, that they should have nothing whatever to do with the committee. They were out-voted by Government members in a quite cynical way but, by their presence on the committee, they have helped the Government by giving some apparent respectability to these so-called amendments.

I have analysed them briefly to show that they mean nothing, that it is a sham, and that the Bill, as amended, is quite as objectionable as it was originally. It is no more and no less than a cynical attempt to give a political favour (\$200 000) to the body that supports the present Government and the body that is the landlord of the Government Party, the Australian Labor Party. I think it is bad in every way. I hope this motion will be defeated, and I will do my best to see that it is.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): I oppose the suggestions in the report of the Select Committee and I oppose the Bill, too. Many people are in more trouble through high interest rates than is the Trades Hall Managing Committee. Later tonight, I will be contacting a young couple who have a mortgage over their house; if they cannot make the necessary payment, they will have to pay 20 per cent interest. How can I, as the representative of that young couple, agree to use the taxpayers' money, or even Loan money, for the Trades Hall Managing Committee? The land tax of a dairy farmer in my district has increased



from \$180 to \$2 300. In those circumstances, how can I support a gift to the Trades Hall Managing Committee? I cannot do it.

I will support anything that helps the sick and the aged, but I will never vote to assist able-bodied people who should be able to look after themselves. Trade union officials criticise private enterprise, but private enterprise can build a building in Adelaide and make a profit on it. Why do trade union officials want special treatment when they have failed to manage their affairs properly? I am a great supporter of young people. They are a better generation than my generation, and better than the generation before. The member for Elizabeth said, "We appealed to people for money, but they would not give us enough. We will therefore compel the people to pay for the Trades Hall." The honourable member's attitude is: if we cannot get the money through voluntary means, we will compel people, who are working long hours, to pay it. I know a young chap on a farm who is working 90 hours a week, and he is paying 12 per cent interest on his loan, yet the Trades Hall Managing Committee wants a free-of-interest loan!

I have a vested interest in the Trades Hall: I do not want the brick I purchased to be sold. I regret that the people whom I trusted have come here with this pitiful talk. How can members support giving away the taxpayers' money to support this project? The trade union movement has performed excellently in many ways, but let us consider how many people are out of work as a result of the actions of some trade union secretaries. One secretary tried to put an industry out of business in my town, and I am glad to see that the trade unionists have kicked him out of his secretaryship.

Mr. Max Brown: You are now giving the real reason why you oppose the Bill.

Mr. McANANEY: No. I have consistently said that I do not believe in assisting able-bodied people. In the most recent *Monday Conference* programme, Dr. Cairns showed a great command of the English language but he did not have any knowledge of accountancy or economics. I believe that the Trades Hall Managing Committee has got into trouble as a result of the economic policies of the Commonwealth Government. I know young people who in the last 18 months have been trying to get a Housing Trust house, but it takes 15 months to get such a house built.

Mr. Payne: How long did it take to build your new house?

Mr. McANANEY: I am paying 10 per cent on a mortgage on it.

Mr. Payne: You didn't make very good financial arrangements, did you?

Mr. McANANEY: You know that the Commonwealth Government taxes people so that it can make money available at 5 per cent to certain groups; you know, too, that others have to pay at least 10 per cent.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Crimes): Order! The honourable member for Heysen will address the Chair.

Mr. McANANEY: You know, Sir, the great respect I have for you. We entirely disagree on our politics, but you are a very kindly old gentleman. I have made clear where I stand. I voted against the motion for a Select Committee because I believed that, if the Trades Hall Managing Committee had had a viable economic proposition, it could have borrowed the money elsewhere. Apparently it has borrowed the money elsewhere, but it cannot service the loan. If other people cannot service a loan, where do they go? They go to the wall! Big companies would not have gone out of business if it had not been for the Commonwealth Government's financial policies.

Mr. Max Brown: Do you believe in helping big business?

Mr. McANANEY: I would do away with much of the spoon-feeding of secondary industries. Then every section of the community, in fair competition, could decide what to produce. The only obligation on the Government is to ensure a balanced economy, with the demand for goods equalling the capacity to produce. Then it can be left to competition to work things out. By that, I am not talking about a *laissez faire* system, a national credit scheme, or anything else. Provided the Government ensures a balanced economy, the natural forces in the economy will work things out. Large staffs are not necessary. The Minister in charge of housing now has a large staff, yet fewer houses are being built than was the case before. Healthy competition can bring about a thriving community.

Mr. Payne: What about the United States, where 10 000 000 people are out of work?

Mr. McANANEY: As usual, the honourable member is astray. I think I have made my point clear. I do not believe in helping people who are able to help themselves. There is no reason why the Trades Hall organisation cannot get itself out of its difficulty. I previously contributed a brick to the cause and was sneered at for doing so. I am willing to do this, despite the fact that I have to pay 10 per cent on the money I use. I have lived on an overdraft all my life.

Mr. Max Brown: You told me you were good at business.

Mr. McANANEY: If a person has any ability at all in this way, he services the loan by paying the interest on the money he borrows; he makes his money work. If a person cannot do that, he must work for someone else. No logical reason has been put forward by members opposite (although they have had plenty of opportunity to do so) why this loan should be made. I strongly oppose what is recommended. Only 100 unions use the Trades Hall building. What has happened as regards this building should have been foreseen some time ago. Office space should have been balanced with conference rooms, and so on. I strongly oppose the Bill.

Mr. OLSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 5 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, March 4, at 2 p.m.