

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, September 11, 1975

The SPEAKER (Hon. E. Connelly) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

PETITION: ELECTORAL SYSTEM

Dr. TONKIN presented a petition signed by 1 206 citizens of South Australia praying that the House would support legislation to introduce an electoral system for South Australia that ensured that a Party that gained Government must have gained at least 50 per cent of the votes and that every elector in South Australia had access to equal and effective representation.

Petition received.

PETITION: BEVERAGE CONTAINERS

Mr. WELLS presented a petition signed by 48 employees of J. Gadsden Proprietary Limited praying that the House would not pass the proposed beverage container legislation and would seek alternative methods to combat litter.

Petition received.

PETITION: STAMP DUTY

Dr. TONKIN presented a petition signed by 1 457 citizens of South Australia praying that the House would immediately move to alleviate the housing crisis now confronting many thousands of South Australians by supporting a rebate of State stamp duty initially to a maximum of \$300 on the purchase of a first house.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

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

LOANS TO PRODUCERS

In reply to Dr. EASTICK (August 26).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In reply to the honourable member's question concerning whether assistance has been given to organisations as a result of devaluations or alterations in tariffs under the Loans to Producers Act, the State Bank advises that none of the loans granted to co-operative societies under the Loans to Producers Act has resulted from difficulties associated with devaluation or an alteration in tariffs. The bank has no record of a co-operative society having been refused assistance under the Act on either of the grounds mentioned, but, if the honourable member has a particular case in mind, I will make further inquiries.

MURRAY LAND

In reply to Mr. WARDLE (August 28).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: In accordance with the provisions of the Monarto Development Commission Act (section 5 (4) (a)), all land and property purchased by the Monarto Development Commission is held "for and on behalf of the Crown". In my reply to a Question on Notice on August 26, I said the land purchased in the Sturt reserve area was acquired by the commission to assist in preserving environmental and recreation areas along the banks of the Murray River, which the State Planning Authority had recommended for preservation as a public reservation. The land in question will provide a future recreation area on the Murray River for the citizens of Monarto as well as the people of Murray Bridge, and will assist in controlling the impact

on the river of future population growth in the region. I understand that the communication between the Crown Law Department and the District Council of Mobjilong was to determine the amount of rates outstanding on leases and properties in the area being acquired to enable the usual adjustments to be made when finalising settlements.

METROPOLITAN DRAINAGE

In reply to Mr. CUMBE (August 26).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The scheme is expected to be fully operational in 1975 with the construction of drain No. 1 in Stonehouse Avenue, Camden Park. The drain is about 70 per cent constructed. There will be minor tidying works to be done, including the disposal of land surplus to requirements, and it is hoped that these will be finalised during the current financial year.

COOPER CREEK FERRY

In reply to Mr. ALLEN (August 13).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The ferry was first placed in the Cooper Creek on the Birdsville track in late February, 1974. It was removed on March 18, 1974, owing to the floodwaters rising above the safe level of operation of the ferry. It was refloated on July 12, 1974, when floodwaters had dropped to a suitable level, and it remained in operation until the Birdsville track was reopened on January, 8, 1975. The following animals and vehicles were ferried across the Cooper Creek during the above periods: 1 135 vehicles; 525 cattle; 50 horses; and 298 sheep.

FESTIVAL OF ARTS

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Premier say what steps he is taking to ensure that plans for the excellent and comprehensive programmes of local and international artists, to be presented at the Adelaide Festival of Arts next March, will continue unchanged, in view of doubts being expressed that Commonwealth funds may not be forthcoming, and would he support a public appeal to make up this difference? All members will agree that the Adelaide Festival of Arts has become an international event, whose high standards are acclaimed by leading figures in the world of the arts. These standards must be maintained, and nothing should be allowed to reflect on Adelaide and South Australia as a whole. If the next festival fails or falls in standard because of a lack of funds, it will be difficult to gain the confidence of artists who may be approached in the future. As far as possible, admission charges should not be raised but should be kept at a reasonable level that the average working man can afford, particularly in these times of extreme economic difficulty. The Government appears to bear a heavy responsibility to ensure that the forthcoming festival fulfils the same high standards that have characterised previous festivals.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I can assure the Leader that the forthcoming festival will fulfil the high standards set by previous festivals. In fact, I think it will be by far the most internationally acclaimed festival programme yet. The standard of programme prepared for the forthcoming festival is, I believe, of quite remarkable value. Last evening I discussed the festival programme with the Director, and I am aware that several international artists who are going to take part in the festival and who have seen the programme have said that they know of no other festival in the world that could provide the same sort of internationally acclaimed programme. The festival programme will proceed. I share the Leader's concern that the Artistic Director

of the festival has had to point out publicly (as he did yesterday) that decisions of the Australia Council on this matter have not been received, and this has embarrassed the festival organisation.

The problem seems to be that the Australia Council insists on looking at each sector of the festival programme through a separate board dealing with that kind of activity in the community rather than giving what is a necessary vote of confidence in a festival that is Australia's regional festival (there is no other festival in this country to compare with it) and giving the festival board a lump sum that it is perfectly competent to administer. I am concerned that that decision has been reached. However, I believe that the matter will be resolved and that the festival will receive substantial funds from the Australia Council. The festival board is proceeding on the basis of its existing moral commitment to the artists with whom it has negotiated. I am sure it will be possible for us to cover the costs of the festival but, if there is a short-fall from the Australia Council, I believe South Australians, knowing the kind of festival that is proposed for 1976, will support the festival, as they have done previously, to enable us to cover the basic costs involved.

VALE PARK KINDERGARTEN

Mr. SLATER: Will the Minister of Education obtain information on progress being made in connection with a kindergarten for Vale Park and whether it is likely to be available for use at the beginning of the 1976 school year?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Yes.

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: In view of the decision by workers at Rainsfords Metal Products Proprietary Limited to continue their strike for at least another week, will the Premier intervene to help bring the matter to a speedy and satisfactory conclusion for all parties concerned? The strike by about 200 workers at Rainsfords plant has now reached the stage where the jobs of about 4 500 employees of Chrysler Australia Limited have been thrown into jeopardy. Chrysler has made a laudable attempt to keep the men employed over the past week by continuing to produce vehicles and stockpiling them (I understand even stockpiling them on a sports ground adjacent to the Chrysler factory). I now understand the company is running out of space in which to store these unfinished vehicles. Unemployment is high, and we are faced with greater unemployment, especially with the next batch of school leavers. Will the Premier therefore take action to try to resolve this strike?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: This dispute comes within the jurisdiction of the Commonwealth commission and court and, indeed, the Commonwealth Commissioner has held hearings in relation to the matter. Naturally enough, my Government is concerned about the matter, and the Minister of Labour and Industry will be in touch with the parties in the dispute. So far, the parties have not sought my assistance in the matter, but naturally enough, since we are concerned as to the total problems that will arise in regard to South Australia, we will be keeping in touch to see whether we can do anything to assist in the matter. I point out that it is not possible for us to take over the duties of a Commonwealth Conciliation Commissioner.

Mr. Nankivell: What a pity.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We have had some success in other matters previously.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You took your time to get going in the Port Adelaide dispute.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must ask all honourable members to refrain from asking another question. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: So far from taking my time to get going on the Port Adelaide dispute, I was involved in that matter and in endeavours to conciliate it over a considerable period before the final announcements were made by me, and that was in conjunction with the Deputy President of the Commonwealth Industrial Court. That sort of statement by the Deputy Leader is nonsense. I have outlined to the honourable member the situation facing the Government in this matter, but perhaps I can now ask him in return (as this is what Liberal Governments constantly did to the Opposition, when we were in Opposition) to use his good offices on the employers' side to help settle the dispute.

ENFIELD HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. WELLS: Will the Minister of Education have his department review a recent decision to defer the provision of a sports hall, drama and music complex at Enfield High School? Members of the school council and parents and friends of the students have worked assiduously for years to gain sufficient funds to make possible the provision of such a complex. To a large extent I was involved in arranging and forwarding the necessary application. On November 21, 1973, the council Secretary and Headmaster received the following information;

It can now be affirmed that the Enfield High School building has been included in the 1975-76 tender-call programme.

The people concerned and I were naturally delighted to hear this, but information has now been received that the project will be further deferred and will not now be included in the 1975-76 programme. They are all highly incensed, as I am, and I believe that the matter should be reviewed. Will the Minister give it his sympathetic consideration?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I thank the honourable member for the question, and I congratulate him on the passion he has displayed in the interests of his constituents. I will undertake to re-examine rather than review the matter, because I am not in a position to give a complete commitment on reviewing it. However, in undertaking this commitment to at least re-examine the figures to see what can be done, I take the opportunity of reminding the House again that, with the breakdown as between the States by the Schools Commission of the funds that are available from Commonwealth sources for this coming 12 months, the capital area is the one that has particularly suffered. In this situation it is obvious that priority has to be given, first, to basic teaching units as opposed to those additional (although undoubtedly necessary) facilities such as halls, resource centres, libraries and so on. Secondly of course, priority is given to the provision of schools in new areas where these schools are needed, as opposed to replacement programmes in existing schools, however necessary these replacement programmes may seem to be. The position simply arises from the difficulties we have with capital funds. In this context, I found it almost hilarious less than 24 hours ago to hear the member for Davenport suggesting that Federal and State Ministers had "lined the pockets of their departments" at the expense (I assume he

was saying) of the instrumentalities. If any member wants to take up that contention, I simply direct his attention to our situation regarding capital funds for schools and many other projects that are dear to the hearts of my colleagues. However, I am willing to re-examine the matter.

MAIN ROAD NO. 34

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister of Transport obtain for me and for the Waikerie District Council a report from the Highways Department on the proposals it has for completing Main Road No. 34, which is the Loxton-Nuriootpa road? About three years ago, when the Wunkar silo was closed, evidence was given for the department by its then Assistant Commissioner (Mr. Flint) that this section of road between Wunkar and Swan Reach, part of which involves the council, would be reconstructed and resealed, with the sealing being completed by the end of the 1975 financial year. On this undertaking, the local people agreed to the closure of the silo. However, we now find ourselves at this juncture with 13.5 kilometres of that road incomplete. This incomplete section is in the middle of the road; the sealing of the road does not even extend from Maggea to the New Well and Waikerie Road turn-off, which many of the transport drivers use to take them back on to the Sturt Highway. This matter is of great concern to the council. Although there may be reasons why the department has been unable to complete the work during the time in which the money was then available, I ask the Minister to give me an up-to-date report on what is intended and to use his good offices, if necessary with his colleague in Canberra, to have a reasonable priority established for this small section of road so that it may be completed.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall be pleased to obtain the information for the honourable member, but it appears that what he is highlighting is the false premise on which the people acted when they agreed to the closure of the railway line, and that emphasises the real need of rail services to the rural communities of this State.

WHYALLA JETTY

Mr. MAX BROWN: Can the Minister for the Environment give me information about the proposal put by the Whyalla City Council to the Coast Protection Board regarding the widening of the last 24 metres of the proposed fishing jetty at Whyalla? The Minister is no doubt aware that I am keenly interested in fishing. I know that the board has been involved in this project; I understand that it granted \$14 500 towards the intended project, about half of the actual cost. I believe that consideration was to be given to the suggestion, I think by the council, that, if the seaward end of the jetty could be widened to this extent, the jetty would become, first, a more rigid structure and, secondly, would give greater recreational value. I understand that the application was made to the board. Can the Minister say whether approval was granted?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I am well aware of the honourable member's interest in fishing. Indeed, I understand that, to ensure the conservation of the species, he makes it his business never to catch any fish. True, the application was to the Coast Protection Board to widen the last 24 metres of the fishing jetty. I am pleased to be able to tell the honourable member that the board, having viewed the application sympathetically, recommended that an additional \$6 000 be spent on the

project. It was only in the last day or two that I approved the board's recommendation. So, the total work on the project will involve a grant from the board of \$20 000. This will enable the council, through its contractor (which, I understand, is the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited), to undertake the additional work on the outer end of the jetty. As the honourable member pointed out, this will provide an important amenity for the recreational activities of visitors to the area.

STATE FINANCE

Mr. BECKER: Can the Treasurer say what efforts are being made to expedite completion of financial arrangements with the Australian Government for the transfer of the State's non-metropolitan railways? In the first months of this financial year the State Revenue Account deficit was \$21 600 000. Payments exceeded receipts for August by \$6 400 000. This was mainly due to water rate equalisation, which delayed the issuing of accounts for water rates. Accounts that would normally be paid in August or September will not now be paid until September or October. Further, Medibank payments from the Commonwealth Government for August will not be made until September; in other words, the Australian Government cannot make these payments in the same month that the expense is incurred. The adjustment resulting from the railways transfer arrangements has not been made to date, and the State is still financing railways losses. The Australian Government has agreed to take over \$130 000 000 of the State public debt, but the State is having to meet full interest and sinking fund charges until the agreement is ratified. The largest amount concerned would probably relate to the railways transfer adjustment. Can the Treasurer say what is being done to expedite this matter and to ease the Revenue Account situation? Can the Australian Government meet the payment of these funds without undue delay?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I expect so. They will be paid as soon as the railways legislation is passed by the Senate.

PAY-ROLL TAX

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Treasurer say whether the Government is now willing to accept the Liberal Movement's policy as embodied in the motion carried yesterday in this House without dissent—that the exemption from pay-roll tax be increased to \$48 000 a year? I seek leave to explain the question, but I had better wait until the Treasurer is free.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Explain yourself or I'll call "Question" on you!

The SPEAKER: Question has been called. The honourable Treasurer.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. As I did not have any chance to explain my question and as the Treasurer was talking to the Clerk while I asked my question, could the call of "Question" be withdrawn so that I could give a brief explanation?

The SPEAKER: That would be up to the Minister who called "Question".

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: If he is willing to make it brief, I am prepared to withdraw my call.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am much obliged to the Minister for withdrawing his call. There is no need for me to canvass what happened in this place yesterday when the motion was carried. I understand that the Treasurer has

since said that, because this is a matter for consultation with other States, we must act in concert with them; nothing is to be done here. Since he said that, the Victorian Premier (Mr. Hamer) has introduced his Budget, and he made the straight-out promise to double the exemption from pay-roll tax. Having this morning been in communication with his office, I desire briefly to quote a couple of sentences from his Budget speech delivered yesterday, as follows:

Small businesses have been hard hit by inflation and have difficulty in finding the funds to carry on at all much less expand or develop. Further, with increases in wage rates many small businesses previously exempt from pay-roll tax have become liable for tax. In order to help them against inflation, it is proposed therefore to double the present exemption and to provide for a tapering off of the new exemption as pay-rolls increase.

In all fairness, I should quote the next sentence:

Because of the need for uniformity in pay-roll tax legislation in all States, consultations are in course on the manner of application—

not on the principle—

of the proposed new exemption provision. Details will be available when the necessary legislation is introduced.

It is perfectly obvious from that announcement made last night that Victoria proposes to double the exemption from pay-roll tax: we intend it should go to \$48 000, which is just a little more than doubling it. The Victorian Premier's explanation cuts the ground from under the feet of the Treasurer and the only argument he had against accepting what was a resolution passed without dissent in this place.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Commenting on the honourable member's resolution, I said that the figure he had in it was close to the figure concerning which there had been negotiations between the State Governments. In fact, South Australia has indicated its being prepared to increase the exemption level to double the present exemption level. What are being discussed at the moment, however, are certain corollaries about the incidence of tax at the higher level of pay roll, because some Liberal Governments in Australia in fact, while giving this exemption, want to increase the total revenue.

Mr. Chapman: Speak for yourself!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I did not put that proposition forward; it was put forward by the New South Wales Government, and an alternative was put forward by the Victorian Government; but both of them would have increased the total revenue from pay-roll tax.

Mr. Chapman: The point is that the question has been put to you.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have told the honourable member and suggest that he listen to what I am saying. This Government has indicated to the other State Governments that it is prepared to take the exemption level to double the present exemption level. We are discussing with them at present what the corollaries will be at the higher levels of pay roll. We have indicated that certain of the propositions they have put forward we would be willing to consent to.

Mr. Chapman: But not to increase the rate of tax.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must bring to the attention of all the honourable members that, when an honourable Minister is answering a question, by Standing Orders an honourable member is not allowed to ask another question. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The present position is exactly as I have stated it. I do not know how many times I have to say it to honourable members: we are

prepared to introduce, during this session, a provision in relation to pay-roll tax doubling the present exemption level on the basis of an agreed and uniform provision by all the States.

Mr. Venning: Why don't you take the lead?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The reason I do not take the lead is that it is essential for the benefit of this State as well of all States that the incidence of pay-roll tax throughout this community be uniform. Pay-roll tax has proceeded upon a uniform agreement basis since the States took it over. We have indicated to the other States our being willing to agree to some of the propositions put forward in the alternative by them.

Mr. Chapman: Does your proposition—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have not put forward a proposition at all.

Mr. Venning: What about land tax?

The SPEAKER: Order! I will not warn honourable members again. Certain honourable members on my left are consistently asking further questions. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have answered the question.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARIES

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Minister of Local Government say whether it is the intention of the Government to bring in legislation this session to give effect to the findings of the third report of the Royal Commission into Local Government Areas, in particular the recommendations regarding compulsory boundary changes in local government? The Minister will be well aware of public feeling regarding this matter, and he will remember the many public meetings held on the subject. He will also recall that he has had his fingers burnt on numerous occasions when he has delved and potted in local government against the wishes of the public. This has been a great embarrassment to certain members of this place; it has put some of his colleagues in the hot seat, as I recall, and as the Minister does, too.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The member for Glenelg reminds me of some of the facts, but conveniently overlooks others. I remind him that this House unanimously (and that included the member for Glenelg) supported the view of the Select Committee that the implementation of the report of the Royal Commission was absolutely essential. The honourable member voted on that only about three months ago in this House. However, the report of the Royal Commission is at present in the hands of Cabinet. It is being studied, and in due course a determination will be made. The honourable member, together with other honourable members, will then be advised.

WATER STORAGE

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Minister of Works say whether any further assessment has taken place of the water-carrying capacities of reservoirs in this State and, as a result of such assessment, whether it is intended to take any corrective measures at any of the storages? The Minister will recall that, last year, following an unfortunate incident involving the Warren reservoir, it was found necessary to blast away portion of the spillway of that storage. Subsequently, I sought from the Minister information regarding storage capacities and the ability of the various storages and reservoirs in South Australia to hold water safely. It was indicated that a continuing assessment was taking place

and that at least in the case of the Baroota reservoir and one other corrective action was required. Are any further details available regarding this important matter, and what action is being taken within the department to correct any faults that have been determined?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will obtain a detailed report for the honourable member.

ROAD TRAFFIC

Mr. RUSSACK: In the light of the article appearing on page 1 of today's *Advertiser* and another appearing on page 5 of *Ego* 8 (a publication from The Levels campus of the South Australian Institute of Technology) what action does the Minister of Transport intend to take to deal with dangerous traffic congestion occurring at the intersection of Warrendi Road and Main North Road at peak traffic periods? The report in this morning's *Advertiser* states:

Replying to the student's criticism that the Warrendi Road intersection was a "death trap", Mr. Virgo said statistics since 1972 showed there had been 17 accidents, with one injury, at the intersection.

Because of that number of accidents over that period, there is a potential danger of serious accidents occurring in future. In the report in *Ego* 8, the spokesman refers to correspondence from the administration to the department and other authorities, and concludes by stating:

In fact, in the last four years there have been approximately 30 letters sent back and forth. After all this very proper, very correct, movement through the official channels, what is the net result? I'll tell you—nothing!

Therefore, I ask the Minister, in view of the evidence, what action he intends to take.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I can appreciate the approach that the member for Gouger is taking in his attempts to consolidate himself as a shadow Minister, but I think he would be better served if he got some facts instead of relying on fiction when he raised this sort of question.

Mr. Russack: I quoted your statement.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: That, unfortunately, is not typical of the honourable member. Normally, he is honest, and he suggests now that all that he has put forward is my statement. He knows that that is not true.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Minister has reflected on the character of the member for Gouger. He has implied that what the honourable member said was quite dishonest, and therefore he has implied that the honourable member was dishonest. I ask the Minister to withdraw that reflection on the honourable member.

The SPEAKER: Order! Perhaps the honourable Minister would care to rephrase the statement.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I said that this was not typical of the honourable member's normal honest approach, and the member for Davenport is asking me to withdraw that and to say that normally the member for Gouger is dishonest. I will not withdraw that sort of implication merely for the member for Davenport, who can keep his nose out of this matter and let me give the member for Gouger the reply that that honourable member has sought.

Mr. Goldsworthy: How about doing—

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition can keep out of it, too.

The SPEAKER: I must ask the honourable Minister to answer the question.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The plain fact is that, if the member for Gouger had sought the information by simply looking in *Hansard* to find the numerous times that this

matter had been raised by other honourable members who were concerned about the problem, and if he had considered the information that I gave to the media last evening (and I think the coverage on television last evening was reasonable), he would find that, of the 17 accidents to which he has referred and which he has said showed that there was a potential danger for the future, the traffic experts who advised me stated that, in their opinion, at the most only three of those accidents would have been prevented if traffic signals had been installed. Therefore, the potential danger to which the honourable member has referred is the impatience of those persons who use the intersection.

Mr. Coumbe: Have you ever tried to drive out there?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: When honourable members have finished interjecting, I will go further. A traffic study was undertaken in the area under the guidance of Mr. Steele, a lecturer from the campus, and this showed clearly that severe congestion was occurring on Monday evenings for about a quarter of an hour. If we consider the number of weeks for which the campus is operating (that is, the length of the academic year), I think we have about 30 evenings on which congestion will delay people for a period of time.

Mr. Dean Brown: Do—

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will keep ignoring the member for Davenport, because he does not even know the area. The study undertaken by the students at the institute showed that, instead of racing out at the close of lectures at 4 p.m. or 5 p.m., as some students were doing, if they delayed their departure for about a quarter of an hour there would be no delays of more than three minutes in getting out of the campus. That was the finding of the students themselves.

Mr. Venning: Oh!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The member for Rocky River may say "Oh!", because suddenly the whole case collapses. If the traffic signals were installed, as at least the member for Gouger would know (although some of his colleagues might not), the delays for people trying to make a right-hand turn could well be of more than three minutes duration. This situation has been under surveillance for a period extending back to the time before this Government came to office. It goes back to the time of the Steele Hall Government. I know that the member for Gouger was not in this House then, but he was in the Parliament.

Mr. Russack: No.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I apologise to the honourable member.

Mr. Russack: I've been a member for five years today.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I wish the honourable member a happy birthday. I doubt that he will have another five years here, because by the end of that time the people of the District of Gouger will have awakened.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister must answer the question.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Three proposals have been put forward. The first is that traffic signals should be installed, and I have indicated that problem there. Also I think the honourable member understands what the term "warrant for traffic signals" implies, and I think he understands the priority list that is compiled. As I said last evening, traffic signals for that area are currently No. 188 on the priority list. If the honourable member is willing to tell me what other areas he would have deleted from the list so that this intersection can be moved up, and to say what schools should be deprived of the protection by way

of traffic signals that is being called for, he may do so. I am sure that the mothers of the children at schools, even in his own district, do not hold the same view as he does. The second point is the suggestion that the speed limit should be reduced from 80 kilometres an hour to 60 km/h. The plain facts are that the enforcing authorities do not support a law that is not self enforcing, and they do not believe that the average motorist will observe a speed limit of 60 km/h. The third proposition is the construction of what is shown on the map as Cross Keys Road. I believe that is the answer but the Salisbury council, which has the ownership, control, care and responsibility in relation to that road, has stated that it is not willing to spend ratepayers' money constructing a road that basically will serve only The Levels campus. I agree with that point of view and, accordingly, I believe that the work ought to be funded from the institute itself.

LUCINDALE AREA SCHOOL

Mr. RODDA: Will the Minister of Education say whether the new building at Lucindale Area School, which has been talked about for some years, is included in his plans for school buildings? I have had numerous discussions with the former Minister on this matter, and in some terms there was general agreement that a six-unit complex should be provided. Of course, priorities have taken that off. Lucindale and Kingston (to be fair about it) are two areas in this part of the South-East in which learning facilities have not been upgraded. This is something of which members are not losing sight, and I should be pleased if the Minister could tell the House, if not now before the end of the session, when this new building is likely to be constructed at Lucindale.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I shall be pleased to give that indication well before this session has been completed. Members will be aware that I said some time ago that I was undertaking a review of the building programme in conjunction with the Deputy Premier, and the broad outlines of that review have now been completed. The implications of it for the project to which the honourable member has referred have not been finalised but, as soon as they have been, I will let the honourable member know.

LAND PURCHASES

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Will the Attorney-General consider immediately the feasibility of requiring an additional declaration on form 4, regulation 44 of the Land and Business Agents Act, so that the knowledge of major filling more than one metre deep on a block of land must be declared by the vendor and/or land agent? A Mr. and Mrs. Fradd, of Beaumont, recently purchased a block of land in Burnside for \$15 000. Several days after signing the contract, Mr. Fradd initiated a series of soil tests by a consultant. After several delays and after the final settlement of the transaction, Mr. Fradd discovered that the block of land had up to 4.5 m (about 15ft.) of filling, including rotting vegetation, old concrete and scrap metal, on it. The Fradds have been advised that the land is unsuitable for the construction of a house unless suitable special pile foundations are first constructed, and these would cost an additional \$7 000. A legal opinion obtained from a barrister indicates that Mr. and Mrs. Fradd do not have a claim against the vendor or agent or against the soil consultant or the architect. Will the Premier consider this alteration to form 4, in the interests of protecting some of the buyers of land in this State?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, I will consider it.

MONARTO LAND

Mr. WARDLE: Will the Special Minister of State for Monarto and Redcliff say whether the Government intends to purchase all remaining land within the designated site of Monarto during this financial year? The Minister will be well aware that about six or seven properties still remain, one of which is a fairly large property. I wonder whether the Government intends to proceed with those acquisitions and to finalise them this financial year.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: That is my understanding although, as the honourable member would realise, there is some disputation regarding one matter. It may be that the legal procedures will result in the matter not coming to finality this year.

Dr. Eastick: Have you got enough money in kitty?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Yes, there is no problem about that. I will check the matter in detail to ensure that I provide a completely accurate answer for the honourable member. My recollection is that the large property to which he has referred involves litigation and that the matter may not, therefore, come to finality this financial year.

REGIONAL ABATTOIRS

Mr. WOTTON: Will the Deputy Premier, representing the Minister of Agriculture, say what is the Government's policy regarding the establishment of regional abattoirs in this State? In recent months, inquiries have been received by a council in my district from people who are anxious to establish bulk meat-killing facilities and selling points within the district. The council's health inspector has advised inquirers of the regulations that are applicable and of the other requirements that would be imposed by the State Planning Authority and the Engineering and Water Supply Department if they were to establish in the water catchment zone. The council has advised these people that, before investing money in this type of project, some assurance should be obtained from the Agriculture Department regarding the possibility of establishing regional abattoirs throughout the State and, in particular, any direct proposals for the Adelaide Hills area. Inquiries to the Agriculture Department have indicated that it does not know what is likely to be done or even whether any firm policy has been decided by the Government. This makes it extremely difficult for councils to advise their ratepayers and inquirers with accuracy or confidence. I ask the Minister to inform the House of the Government's policy on this matter.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to take up this matter with the Minister of Agriculture and obtain a report for the honourable member. I think he is probably confusing the meat industry legislation, which will be introduced, I believe, during this session, with the establishment by the Government of regional abattoirs.

Mr. Wotton: No, it has nothing to do with that. It is quite separate.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Well, there is nothing at present to prevent anyone in this State from establishing an abattoir if the regulations are complied with. As the honourable member has suggested, there is nothing to stop them.

Mr. Wotton: No, except that they go into competition with the others.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: What does the honourable member expect? Does he expect to get the sort of information that someone else may set up there? I do

not know. As far as I know, the Government does not intend to establish regional killing works throughout the State.

Mr. Wotton: It does not—not beyond Gepps Cross?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No, it does not, and, so far as I am aware, it never has. The Government has its central killing works at Gepps Cross and Port Lincoln and, as far as I know, it is not interested in involving itself in any other works throughout the State. If the honourable member is concerned about that, I do not think he has any problems. Certainly, the meat industry legislation may have some bearing on what he is talking about, because these people would want to know the sort of provisions that are likely to be included in that legislation prior to establishing a works anywhere. If that is the case, I can merely advise the honourable member to await the introduction of that legislation to see how it affects them. However, I will obtain a report from my colleague and let the honourable member have it as soon as I can.

MEDIBANK

Mr. GUNN: Is the Premier aware that the Medibank scheme is causing long delays for people who apply for reimbursement of doctor's fees? As he was one of the prime supporters of this proposal, I inform the Premier that it has been brought to my attention that people have had to wait at least five weeks, and doctors a considerable time, before receiving their reimbursements. It seems that this scheme is suffering from bureaucratic stagnation and is running into all the problems that the Opposition foreshadowed when it was mooted. It would seem to be one of the Labor Party's greatest disasters if it is permitted to continue. I ask the Premier to have the matter investigated.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member will give me specific details of the cases to which he has referred, I will have them investigated.

DISABLED SOLDIERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. EVANS: Can the Premier say whether financial assistance will be given by the State Government to the Totally and Permanently Disabled Soldiers Association of Australia (South Australian Branch)? The Secretary of that association lives in my district and has contacted me and, I believe, the member for Adelaide (who I believe has been invited to inspect the association's premises, which he may have already done) about the matter. In a letter to me dated April 23, 1975, the Secretary stated:

Our operating expenses are gleaned from donations from local organisations and members and, believe me, we face a bleak future. In fact, we may have to face closure.

In a subsequent letter he states that, in a reply from the Chief Secretary to the Hon. Mr. DeGaris on February 27, 1975, the Chief Secretary stated, in part:

In addition, aged persons' homes receive generous assistance for both capital and operating costs from the Australian Government.

In his letter Mr. Brady referred to that part of the Chief Secretary's reply, and said:

Unfortunately, this is incorrect. This association receives no financial assistance from either the State Government or Federal Government. We rely on donations from local bodies and members for our income, and I can assure you that we face a very bleak future. When one considers assistance given to other State branches of the Totally and Permanently Disabled Soldiers Association of Australia, as is shown on the attached list received from the Western Australian Branch, some consternation and disappointment is experienced.

As an example of the help given to the Western Australian branch, I refer to the list to which Mr. Brady referred. The State Government donates \$1 000, but that sum will be increased to at least \$1 500 a year; the Lotteries Commission donates \$1 500; the Anzac Day Trust Fund donates between \$2 000 and \$4 000 a year; Red Cross donates \$600 a year; members' donations (and these come only from members) vary up to \$2 000; donations from doctors, dentists and business houses are large; and city and shire councils (although they do not all donate a sum each year) donate at least once every two years between \$2 and \$25. I ask that this matter be considered, as this is a group in our society that is disadvantaged. This association is asking for help, but not much help. I believe the member for Adelaide is fully aware of the details of this matter, and I ask the Treasurer whether he will make funds available for this association, because its air-conditioning unit is antiquated and does not operate and its buildings need to be repainted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will discuss the matter with the Chief Secretary and let the honourable member have a reply.

PRIORITY ROADS

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Minister of Transport get for me a report on the operation of the priority road system since it was introduced? I wholeheartedly supported the introduction of priority roads, a system that, undoubtedly, has many advantages. However, I have had drawn to my attention (and I have observed personally) a disadvantage of the system, namely, that motorists seeking access from minor roads to marked priority roads, because of the build-up of traffic during peak hours, find it almost impossible to get on to the priority road. Has the Minister's department carried out a study on this aspect to see whether there is any way of overcoming this disadvantage? In addition, can the Minister say whether it is intended that the priority road system will be extended to the city of Adelaide, especially North Adelaide?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not think it would be fair to say that a study has been carried out on the effects of the priority road system, but the department is certainly keeping a close watch on the effects of making various roads priority roads. When sufficient time has elapsed, I have no doubt that a more comprehensive report could be obtained, but I doubt whether a report at this stage would be meaningful. All that can be said is that the introduction of the priority road system has measured up entirely to expectations. It is true that some road users are disadvantaged as a result of the system, but equally it is true that probably many more road users are getting an advantage from the system. All in all, I do not doubt that the general road user has benefited tremendously from the scheme. It all boils down to the fact that motorists will have to go through an interim period of changing motoring habits. The member for Torrens, like me, has been accustomed for many years to driving in a certain fashion; the priority road system now requires us to change our driving habits. Generally speaking, none of us is too keen on change, and we are a little reluctant to accept it. I believe the message is now getting through to most road users that they cannot continue old driving habits on priority roads. Motorists are finding their way from suburban streets to traffic-controlled intersections to join the traffic flow rather than trying to break into the traffic flow past a "stop" sign or "give way" sign. Regarding an extension of the system to the city of Adelaide, more especially North Adelaide, I

cannot say other than that it is not foreseen in the near future, because the department is first converting those roads that are clearways into priority roads. No doubt the honourable member has heard the suggestion that Melbourne Street be a clearway, and I wholeheartedly support that view; however, I know that some traders in that street are not all that pleased about the idea. Traders on other roads were not too pleased initially but have since realised the benefits of the system. If there is any information I can get to supplement what I have said about North Adelaide, I will bring it down for the honourable member.

PARK FINANCE

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the—The honourable member for Alexandra.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Not having had the call, Mr. Speaker, can I ask a question and get a reply?

The SPEAKER: I gave the honourable member the opportunity, but he did not take that opportunity, and I thought he did not wish to ask a question.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister for the Environment.

The SPEAKER: Order! Does the honourable member wish to proceed with his question?

Mr. CHAPMAN: Thank you, Sir. Will the Minister for the Environment say what Commonwealth financial assistance is expected to be given to South Australia this year to purchase parks and conservation areas? Also, can he say whether the property of Stuart Peter Florence at Deep Creek (sections 76, 79, 80, 210, 211 and 212, hundred of Waitpinga) is included in the list and, if it is, can the Minister say what sum the department intends paying for that land and when the sale will be made? Mr. Florence has now been waiting for a reply from the department since representations were made on his behalf on April 19, 1974. Having many times met and discussed with Mr. Florence his problem, I believe he is well on the way to becoming a broken man financially and morally (if not mentally) over the whole episode. He has been treated disgracefully by the Government and the department regarding this land acquisition. I am sure the Minister is aware of the condition of this man following this long, drawn out and unreasonable episode.

Dr. Eastick: He's not in isolation.

Mr. CHAPMAN: True, but he happens to be a constituent of mine and this valuable property has been completely closed up by the Government's policy as outlined in the Outer Metropolitan Area Development Plan. The draft which was proposed included a segment of intention to acquire the majority of Mr. Florence's land early in 1974. I refer to the frustrations which followed the joint statement of the current Minister for the Environment and the Commonwealth Minister for Urban and Regional Development (Mr. Uren) on April 19, 1974, when they said that money would be available for the purchase of the land in question. A whole series of events has transpired since then, and it is high time that we obtained a general answer on the subject, and I am anxious to obtain a specific answer on this particular matter.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I can tell the honourable member that the Government will be proceeding to purchase this piece of land. However, I am somewhat staggered at the explanation that the honourable member gave and the suggestion that this man had been harshly treated. This is far from the truth. I inform all honourable

members, including the member for Light, who seemed to suggest, by way of interjection, that there were other people in this category, that the practice of the Government in relation to the purchase of national parks is one where the Government goes to a considerable amount of trouble to assist landowners whose land is to be purchased. This is done in a way which provides for more than simply going along and telling people that their land is required and immediately issuing a notice of intention to purchase. As a first step we approach the landowner and attempt to negotiate a price with him which will meet the satisfaction of the landowner and at the same time meet the Government's requirements to ensure the proper expenditure of public money by the Land Board, which is involved in the valuation of properties.

In this case, negotiations were commenced and undertaken with the landowner concerned, who wanted an amount considerably greater than the valuation made by the Land Board. As a result of this, negotiations finally collapsed and the Government took the next step, which is normal and which would be expected, of issuing a notice of intention to acquire the property. That was done about a month or two ago and the matter is proceeding along those lines. I do not know what the honourable member is complaining about regarding such persons and suggesting that they are being hard done by. This landowner has not been hard done by and has been treated with the utmost courtesy in the proper way to comply with the requirements which the Government must meet in these matters.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (MINISTRY)

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Constitution Act, 1934, as amended. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill, which in the usual form for a measure of this nature, provides for an increase in the number of Ministers from 11 to 12. Its only operative clause, clause 2, provides for this increase at paragraph (a) and the effect of paragraph (b) of the clause is to continue to ensure that at least three Ministers are members of the Legislative Council.

Dr. TONKIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (CITY PLAN)

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Planning and Development Act, 1966, as amended. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its purpose is to extend the life of the City of Adelaide Development Committee by a further six months from June 30, 1976. Honourable members will be aware that this is the second extension of the term of this committee, which was essentially intended as a temporary measure until permanent legislative arrangements were made for the control of development within the city of Adelaide. Honourable members will also be aware that a plan for the development of the city has been prepared by consultants to the council of the city of Adelaide. The Government

understands that the council has approved this plan and, in fact, it was placed on public exhibition on August 14, of this year. The purpose of placing the plan on exhibition was to facilitate public comment on it. The council has allowed a period of three months expiring on November 14 for such comment, and undoubtedly after that date it will need some time to consider the comments received and possibly modify the plan in the light of those comments.

Present indications suggest that the council will be in a position to submit the plan, as finally settled, to the Government before Christmas, but this will depend on the nature and extent of the submissions received by the council from the public. Since the plan, which will form the basis for the development of the city for the indeterminate future, impacts a great deal of the physical activities of the Government, some further time will be necessary for the Government to determine its attitude to the plan in its final form. Here I would indicate that for some time past the Government has had the evolving plan under continuous review as an aid in formulating its attitude.

From the foregoing, it is clear that, until the plan is settled, it is impossible for the Government to present to Parliament settled proposals for the legislative framework within which the plan will operate. At present various alternative proposals as to appropriate legislation are under consideration. At this stage, it is clear that, while proper regard must be made to the unique circumstances of the city of Adelaide, the effect of planning for the city must be viewed in the context of the whole State. Clause 2, which is the only operative clause, extends the life of the City of Adelaide Development Committee by six months, until December 31, 1976, since within that period it is likely that legislation to give effect to the plan will be placed before the House.

Mr. COUMBE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL (OPTIONAL PREFERENCES)

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Electoral Act, 1929-1973. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is in the same form as a measure that failed to become law in the last session of the last Parliament, and proposes the adoption of a voting procedure for the House of Assembly elections that may be referred to as "optional preference voting". Honourable members are no doubt aware that, following the enactment of the Constitution and Electoral Acts Amendment Act, 1973, this system of voting applies in Legislative Council elections. In summary, the system provides that while an elector is enjoined to mark his "preferences" on his ballot paper his ballot paper will not be informal if only one preference is marked on it.

In addition, the Bill provides that the procedure for making a vote by declaration where the elector's name does not appear on the certified list of electors for the polling place shall apply to Legislative Council electors in addition to House of Assembly electors. This change is now desirable in view of the fact that for practical purposes the same list of electors now applies to both House of Assembly and Legislative Council electors. I seek leave to have the formal explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF CLAUSES

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 110a of the principal Act by applying this section to electors claiming to vote at a Legislative Council election whose names do not appear on the certified list of electors for that polling place, but who make a declaration in the prescribed form before the presiding officer at the polling place. This section at present only applies to House of Assembly electors. This clause also amends section 110a to remove the possibility of an elector being disfranchised due to his ignorance of his correct subdivision when enrolling.

Clause 3 amends section 123 of the principal Act by providing that in an election for a district for which one candidate only is required, for example, a House of Assembly by-election, the absence of an indication of preferences other than a first preference will not render the ballot-paper informal. Clause 4 amends section 125 of the principal Act which is the provision dealing with the scrutiny. The effect of this amendment is to ensure that, even if a substantial proportion of the votes do not indicate a "preference" other than a first preference, a result of the election can be obtained. The need for the amendment proposed will of course only arise when the scrutiny "goes to preferences". In summary, if only two candidates remain unexcluded at that time, the candidate with the greater number of votes will be elected.

Dr. TONKIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (GIFT DUTY AND STAMP DUTIES) BILL

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

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Gift Duty Act, 1968-1973, and the Stamp Duties Act, 1923-1975. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The object of this Bill is to put into effect my Government's decision to grant, for a period of one year, generous reductions of the stamp duty and gift duty normally payable on transfers, where a person transfers a joint interest in his matrimonial house to his spouse. The succession duty advantages that flow from the joint ownership of a matrimonial house are considerable and, if my Government's plans for a new scale of succession duty rebates come to fruition, it will be even more advantageous for a couple to own their house jointly. It is obvious that many people who do not presently own their house jointly could not afford the considerable cost of stamp and gift duties imposed on transfers and so are put at a considerable disadvantage in planning their estates. It is my Government's intention to facilitate such transfers by reducing the duties payable thereon. The proposed concessions are primarily directed at matrimonial houses of a gross value not exceeding \$40 000. However, concessions will be available on a reduced scale for houses exceeding that value, and the formulae provided by the Bill also take into account amounts outstanding on mortgage.

Furthermore, it is proposed that a person who transfers an interest in his house to his *de facto* spouse will be entitled to claim the benefit of the concessions provided by this Bill. This demonstrates yet again my Government's desire to eradicate, where reasonably possible, discrimination on

the ground of marital status. If one takes a realistic look at our society, it becomes apparent that a considerable number of people are, and ought to be regarded as, spouses for all practical purposes, despite the absence of a marriage certificate. There are a few restrictions envisaged by the Bill: the concessions may be claimed only once during the relevant period, and the house in question must be the principal permanent house in which the donor and his spouse are living together as husband and wife at the time that the gift is made.

I seek leave to have the formal explanation of the clauses incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading them.
Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF CLAUSES

Part I of the Bill contains formal provisions. The Bill is deemed to have come into operation on July 14, 1975. Part II amends the Gift Duty Act. Clause 4 is formal. Clause 5 repeals section 11 of the principal Act which already provides some concession of duty on the transfer of a joint interest in a matrimonial house. New section 11 re-enacts in a more understandable form the present provision of the principal Act that relates to duty under \$5. It is made clear that a gift exempted under this section may become dutiable when aggregated with other relevant gifts. New section 11a re-enacts in subsection (1), in an amplified form, the existing provision of the principal Act that provides a concession of duty in relation to certain matrimonial house transfers. Subsection (2) provides for the temporary concession of duty that will be available only during the period of one year commencing on July 14, 1975. A donor can claim the benefit of either subsection (1) or subsection (2), whichever is to his best advantage. Under subsection (2), where the gross value of the house does not exceed \$40 000, no gift duty will be payable on a transfer of a half interest in the house. Where the house is valued at more than \$40 000 and is not subject to a mortgage, the value of the gift is reduced by \$20 000. Where the house exceeds \$40 000 in value and is subject to a mortgage, the value of the gift is to be determined with reference to a formula that takes into account a proportionate amount of the outstanding mortgage debt. (I will give an example of the working of this formula when I have completed the explanation of the clauses of this Bill.)

The effect of paragraph (b) is that the rate of duty payable on such a gift is the rate which would normally apply (that is, the actual value of the gift is taken into account for determining the rate applicable). Paragraph (c) provides, however, that only the dutiable value of such a gift need be taken into account when determining the rate of duty applicable to other gifts made within the period of 18 months before or after that gift. Subsection (3) sets out the circumstances in which a donor may claim the benefit of subsection (2). It should be noted that a person who owned a house jointly with his spouse on July 14, 1975, will not be able to claim the benefit of this provision. Subsection (4) limits a donor to only one claim for a gift duty concession on the transfer of a joint interest in a matrimonial house. Subsection (5) supplies some necessary definitions. It is to be noted that the concessions of duty provided in this section may be claimed only with respect to a house and the area of land on which it is situated that does not exceed 0.2 ha. Subsection (6) gives the Com-

missioner the discretion to decide whether two persons who are not married are living together as husband and wife. It is the Commissioner's intention to accept as sufficient evidence a statutory declaration that the two persons concerned are living together as husband and wife on a permanent and *bona fide* domestic basis. Subsection (7) enables the Commissioner to admit certain cash transactions as gifts that may attract the concessions provided by this section.

Part III amends the Stamp Duties Act. Clause 6 is formal. Clause 7 provides a similar scheme for the temporary reduction of stamp duties payable on a transfer of a joint interest in a matrimonial house by way of gift. Where the gross value of the house does not exceed \$40 000, no duty is payable. Where the gross value exceeds \$40 000 and there is no mortgage, the duty normally payable is to be reduced by the sum of \$360, which is the stamp duty payable on the sum of \$20 000. Where the gross value exceeds \$40 000 and there is a mortgage over the property, the duty normally payable is reduced by a proportion of the sum of \$360 determined by reference to a formula that takes into account the amount outstanding under the mortgage. (An example of the working of this formula will also be given.) The subsequent new subsections conform to the provisions relating to gift duty that I have already explained. I now give three examples of the way in which both concessions of duty are calculated where the gross value of the house exceeds \$40 000 and there is a mortgage over the property. They are as follows:

EXAMPLES

EXAMPLE I

	\$
Gross value of matrimonial house	45 000
Mortgage debt	9 000
Equity	36 000
Value of property conveyed	\$18 000
Stamp Duty—	
Duty payable on \$18 000 is \$300	
Reduction in duty:	
$20\,000 - (20\,000 \times \frac{9\,000}{45\,000})$	
$r = \$300 \left(\frac{18\,000}{20\,000 - 4\,000} \right)$	
$= 300 \left(\frac{18\,000}{16\,000} \right)$	
$= \frac{300 \times 18\,000}{16\,000}$	
$= \$266.66$	
Amount of stamp duty payable \$300 — \$266.66 =	
\$33.34	
Gift Duty—	
Dutiable value of gift:	
$v = (22\,500 - 20\,000) - \left(\frac{45\,000 - 40\,000}{90\,000} \right) 9\,000$	
$= 2\,500 - 500$	
$= \$2\,000$	
Value of gift \$18 000 ∴ rate of duty is 4.8 per cent	
Duty payable by donor \$2 000 × 4.8 per cent = \$96	

EXAMPLE II

	\$
Gross value of matrimonial house	60 000
Mortgage debt	10 000
Equity	\$50 000
Value of property conveyed	\$25 000

Stamp Duty—

Duty payable on \$25 000 is \$510

Reduction in duty:

$$r = \$510 \left(\frac{20\,000 - (20\,000 \times \frac{10\,000}{60\,000})}{25\,000} \right)$$

$$= 510 \left(\frac{20\,000 - 3\,333.34}{25\,000} \right)$$

$$= \frac{510 \times 16\,666.66}{25\,000}$$

$$= \$340$$

Amount of stamp duty payable \$510 — \$340 = \$170

Gift Duty—

Dutiable value of gift:

$$v = (30\,000 - 20\,000) - \left(\frac{60\,000 - 40\,000}{120\,000} \right) 10\,000$$

$$= 10\,000 - 1\,666.67$$

$$= \$8\,333.33$$

Value of gift = \$25 000 ∴ rate of duty is 5.5 per cent

Duty payable by donor \$8 333.33 × 5.5 per cent = \$458.33

EXAMPLE III

Gross value of matrimonial house	\$ 60 000
Mortgage debt	50 000
Equity	<u>\$10 000</u>
Value of property conveyed	\$5 000
Gift duty under provisions of section 11a (1)—	
Dutiable value under section 11a (1) (a) (i) is	
\$4 000, for which no duty is payable.	
Gift duty under section 11a (2)—	
Dutiable value of gift	
$v = (30\,000 - 20\,000) - \left(\frac{60\,000 - 40\,000}{120\,000} \right) 5\,000$	
$= 10\,000 - 8\,333.33$	
$= \$1\,666.67$	
Value of gift is \$5 000 ∴ rate of duty is 3.1 per cent.	
Duty payable would be \$1 666.67 × 3.1 = \$51.66.	
In this case the donor should claim the benefit of	
section 11a (1).	

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY secured the adjournment of the debate.

BOATING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Marine) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Boating Act, 1974. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It makes an amendment to section 11 of the Boating Act, 1974. The amendment is necessary to clarify the application of the provisions of the principal Act requiring registration of motor boats to certain offshore pleasure yachts. Section 11 of the Act provides *inter alia* that any motor boat which is required to be registered and to bear an identification mark under the provisions of any other Act or law is exempt from the provisions of the Boating Act relating to registration. The question has arisen as to whether certain offshore pleasure vessels are required to be registered under the Boating Act, as they are already registered, or required to be registered, under the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894, of the United Kingdom. Vessels involved are those pleasure yachts which are either over 15 tons burden or which, if they are under that tonnage, are not used solely within the rivers and coastal waters of the State: such vessels are required to be registered under the Merchant Shipping Act, and thus at

present are exempt from the registration provisions of the Boating Act.

However, there are no specific sanctions for failure to register a vessel under the Merchant Shipping Act. Of course, at common law, a person who commits a breach of a Statute for which no specific penalty is provided may be guilty of a misdemeanour, but this sanction is unlikely to be invoked. Consequently, an avenue is open for boat-owners to disregard the requirements of the Merchant Shipping Act, while at the same time enjoying exemptions from the requirements of the Boating Act. This amendment is designed to remove that possibility of evading registration.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 reserves the Act for the signification of Her Majesty's pleasure and provides that it will come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 amends section 11 of the principal Act to provide that any motor boat is subject to the requirements of the registration provisions whether or not it is required to be registered under any other Act and whether or not it is in fact registered under any other Act unless the boat is exempted by proclamation.

Mr. CHAPMAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

BEVERAGE CONTAINER BILL

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister for the Environment) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for the paying of refunds on certain containers; to prohibit the sale of certain containers; for matters incidental thereto and for other purposes. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

As this measure is similar to a measure that passed the House of Assembly during the previous Parliament, I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

This measure provides for the payment of refunds on certain containers. There is no question that cans create very considerable litter problems in this State, and the enactment into law of this measure will, in the view of the Government, go some way towards solving this problem.

Clauses 1 to 3 are formal. Clause 4 sets out the definitions necessary for the purpose of the measure and the attention of members is particularly drawn to the definition of "beverage". Clause 5 provides for the declaration of a day to be "the appointed day" for the purposes of this Act. It is on and from the day so appointed that the regulatory provision of this measure will come into effect. Necessarily the fixing of this day will require consultation with industry. Clause 6 provides for the marking of containers, as defined, with a statement showing the refund amount payable in relation to the particular container. Subclause (2) of this clause provides for the simple proof of the approved manner and form of marking the container. Clause 7 deals with glass containers. This clause provides that any retailer who sells containers carrying a particular brand or trade description to identify its contents must accept delivery of empty containers carrying that brand or trade description. The retailer must also pay to the deliverer the appropriate refund amount. Under this provision the retailer is not obliged to accept any unclean containers.

Part IV comprising clauses 8 to 12 deals with containers other than glass containers. Hence the retailer as such is not required to play any part in the collection process. Clause 8 merely makes clear the application of the Part which is to containers other than glass containers. Clause 9 provides for the establishment of collection depots in relation to containers of a particular type or class. In relation to each such collection depot a collection area is delineated. Subclauses (2) and (3) are formal and self-explanatory. Clause 10 prohibits the sale of beverages in containers, as defined for the purposes of this Part, other than from places or premises that lie within a collection area established for the collection of containers of the kind sold. Subclause (2) of this clause is an evidentiary provision.

Clause 11 enjoins a retailer, whose place of business or premises lies within a collection area established for the collection of containers of a kind he sells, to exhibit an appropriate sign showing the location of the appropriate collection depots. Subclause (2) of this clause is again an appropriate evidentiary provision. Clause 12 is, it is suggested, reasonably self-explanatory and sets out the obligations of the person in charge of a collection depot.

As was mentioned above, while the retailer, as such, is not required to handle empty containers as defined in clause 8, there is nothing in this Part that prevents a retailer, if he considers that it is in his economic interests to do so, from establishing a collection centre at or near his premises. It is entirely up to him. Clause 13 in express terms prohibits the sale of beverage contained in a ring-pull container on or after June 30, 1976. Clause 14 is a fairly standard provision dealing with offences by bodies corporate. Clause 15 is an evidentiary provision. Clause 16 is formal. Clause 17 provides an appropriate regulation-making power.

Mr. MATHWIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

PRE-MIXED CONCRETE CARTERS BILL

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

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour and Industry) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to regulate and control the cartage of pre-mixed concrete; to control the number and distribution of pre-mixed concrete trucks operating within the metropolitan area and to provide for matters incidental thereto. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

The object of this Bill is to provide a system of licensing in respect of the operators of pre-mixed concrete trucks within the metropolitan area of Adelaide. As members no doubt recall, the pre-mixed concrete industry suffered from acute industrial troubles during the first half of 1974, arising mainly from the fact that the number of trucks in operation was increasing to an extent not justified by the needs of the building industry. The so-called "little man" (that is, the man who owned and drove his own truck) found himself being virtually squeezed out of

the industry. This, and other difficulties within the industry, culminated in a crisis that brought the carting of pre-mixed concrete to a complete halt in May, 1974. The repercussions on the building industry as a whole were considerable.

Representatives of the various factions involved (that is, the concrete manufacturers, the employed drivers and the owner-drivers) approached me at that time, seeking some solution to the impasse and to the various problems involved in maintaining viability in the industry. I had many discussions with representatives of both parties, both alone and together, and the dispute was settled when substantial agreement was reached that the most appropriate solution would be to regulate and control, by way of licensing legislation, the number and distribution of pre-mixed concrete trucks operating within the metropolitan area. On the basis of these terms of settlement, the industry swung back into action without delay.

This Bill seeks to put into effect the agreement reached in settling the dispute. The Transport Workers Union and Concrete Manufacturers Association have reached substantial agreement on the provisions of the Bill, and I wish to congratulate them all on the conciliatory manner in which they have conducted all discussions in the matter. I feel confident that the Bill now presents no insurmountable problems and I have no hesitation in commending it to members as a measure that is vital to the continued smooth running of the pre-mixed concrete industry.

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 are formal. Clause 4 provides the necessary definitions, which are self-explanatory. Clause 5 establishes the Pre-mixed Concrete Carters Licensing Board. The board will have three members, one coming from the Concrete Manufacturers Association, one from the Transport Workers Union and one, the Chairman, nominated by the Minister. A member may hold office for three years and is eligible for re-appointment. Clause 6 empowers the Governor to appoint deputies to any member of the board. Clause 7 provides for the removal of a member of the board from office and the filling of vacancies. Clause 8 entitles board members to certain allowances and expenses. Clause 9 preserves the validity of certain acts of the board. Clause 10 provides for the manner in which the business of the board is to be conducted. Clause 11 provides for the appointment of a secretary of the board. Clause 12 provides the board with the necessary powers in relation to any proceedings (that is, inquiries, applications, etc.) before the board. Clause 13 requires the board to furnish any party to proceedings before the board with its reasons for making any decision or order. Clause 14 provides for the appointment of inspectors. Clause 15 provides inspectors with the necessary powers of inspection and investigation. An inspector must produce his certificate of appointment when requested, and may exercise his powers at any reasonable time.

Clause 16 provides for the fixing of the appointed day, which will be some months after the Act is brought into operation. All existing truck operators will therefore have ample time in which to obtain the necessary licences. Clause 17 provides that a person is guilty of an offence if he operates a pre-mixed concrete truck within the metropolitan area, otherwise than in pursuance of a licence. (It should be pointed out at this stage that the word "operator" is not intended to include a person who is simply employed on wages to drive a truck that is owned by a company or some other person). Clause 18 provides for the granting of licences by the board. All

existing operators (that is, persons who were operating trucks as at July 1, 1974) will be granted licences by the board without any consideration by the board as to the needs of the industry. In the case of any other applicant, the board will have regard to the needs of the industry and this applies whether the applicant is applying for a licence in respect of a truck previously licensed under this Act, or in respect of a truck that has never been the subject of a licence. Clause 19 requires the board to give an applicant opportunity to make representations to the board before it may refuse his application. The board is given the power to specify a time before which a rejected applicant may not reapply without the prior approval of the board.

Clause 20 empowers the board to impose conditions upon the holding of a licence. Subclause (2) specifically empowers the board to "tie" the so-called owner/drivers to certain concrete manufacturers. This means that the big companies will each be apportioned a certain number of independent truck operators. Subclause (4) empowers the board to revoke or vary any condition of a licence that has become oppressive, etc. Clauses 21 and 22 provide for the application for, and form of, licences. A licensee may apply to have his licence varied if he wishes to replace a licensed truck with a new one.

Clause 23 provides that a licence is not transferable. Any purported transfer would therefore be null and void and the purported transferee would be unlicensed and guilty of an offence under clause 17 of the Bill. Thus trafficking in licenses will be prevented. Clause 24 deals with the renewal of licenses, all of which will expire annually on the anniversary of the appointed day. Clause 25 empowers the board to inquire into the conduct of any licensee. An inquiry can be set in motion by the Minister or the permanent head of the department, or by the board itself. A licensee the subject of an inquiry must be given the chance to make representations. The board may either cancel a licence as a result of such an inquiry, or suspend the licence for a specified period of time.

Clause 26 gives any party to proceedings before the board a right of appeal to the Minister. The Minister may himself determine such an appeal, or appoint some other competent person for that purpose. There is no right of appeal against the outcome of such an appeal. Clause 27 contains the standard provisions relating to the annual presentation of reports to the Minister and to Parliament. Clause 28 provides for certain evidentiary matters. Clause 29 gives the board and other specified persons the usual immunity from legal action in respect of acts done in good faith. Clause 30 creates an offence where any person in authority improperly uses or divulges information gathered in the course of his duties. Clause 31 is the standard appropriation provision. Clause 32 provides for the disposal of prosecutions in a summary manner. Clause 33 extends liability for offences by a body corporate to the directors of that body, with the usual defence. Clause 34 provides for the making of regulations for the purposes of the Bill.

Mr. DEAN BROWN secured the adjournment of the debate.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

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

In Committee.

(Continued from September 10. Page 701.)

Schedule.

State Governor's Establishment, \$169 000.

Mr. MATHWIN: Under the line "Aides-de-Camp, Clerical, Domestic and General Staff", the actual payments last year were \$120 399, and the proposed payments this year are \$117 411. Can the Treasurer explain why this reduction has taken place?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): In August, an Australian aide-de-camp was appointed in lieu of an English one. The payment for his services will be reimbursed to the Australian Government from the contingencies line. An alteration in the method of payment because of an alteration in the source of the employment, accounts for the difference.

Dr. EASTICK: Last year no provision was made for an expense allowance for the Lieutenant-Governor but an allowance was, in fact, provided, and I do not quarrel with the provision of such an allowance. I appreciate the tremendous amount of valuable work that Mr. Walter Crocker undertakes. Further, I realise that other forms of assistance are provided; for example, the provision of a motor vehicle for official occasions. Nevertheless, the allocation seems insignificant in comparison with the contribution made by Mr. Crocker. Can the Treasurer provide further information about this matter?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The amount provided is small, but it is the sum that was suggested from the Governor's office; it was readily acceded to. I will investigate the question of a further honorarium for the Lieutenant-Governor.

Mr. BECKER: Can the Treasurer say when the Governor's term of office is due to expire? Further, where will be the future site of Government House? Has any further progress been made in providing a country residence for the Governor?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is not constitutional custom to discuss future terms of office of Governors in the House, and I do not intend to discuss that matter now. It is not intended to resite Government House. The honourable member will be aware that, when the Hayward family bequeathed the Carisbrooke property to the Government, one of the original purposes was to provide a residence for the Governor. However, an investigation of that property showed that there would be many problems in establishing Government House there. It would have involved a considerable building programme, which it was not thought economic to undertake. The Governor and his staff believed that it would not be possible to carry on effectively the Governor's duties from Carisbrooke. Consequently, it was decided that one of the alternative uses for which the wills provided would be undertaken; that is, the property will become part of the Art Gallery property, and work has already commenced in establishing a sculpture garden in the grounds of Carisbrooke. It is intended eventually to house there not only the valuable collection of art which is already there and which has been bequeathed to the people of South Australia but also some special collections in due season. So, it is intended to retain Government House at its present site, and it is not intended to make any changes in the use of the property.

As the honourable member will know, the Governor has a large country residence at Victor Harbor. The Governor took the view that, when he got away to the country, he really liked to be with Lady Oliphant by himself. Naturally, when one wants to get away from official duties, one

also wants to get away from all the trappings of officialdom. The Victor Harbor property is too large a property for them to use in that way. Consequently, it was suggested that a small house be built that would be suitable for such an activity by the Governor. We commenced negotiations on that basis, but the Governor has since told us that he does not want to proceed with the proposals. So, nothing further has been done on that matter.

Line passed.

Premier, \$2 884 000.

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): Regarding the item "Policy Division, administrative, Committee Secretariat, Economic Intelligence Unit, publicity and clerical staff", there has been a considerable increase from actual payments last year of \$721 748 to an allocation this year of \$831 200. Further, there is a considerable discrepancy in terminal leave payments between actual payments last year of \$36 323 and an allocation last year of \$7 135. Can the Treasurer explain these variations? The item "Arts Development Officer and clerical staff", for which \$56 500 is provided, was previously provided under "Office of Premier". So, we must take this item into account when we are considering the already considerable increases in allocations for items under the heading "Office of Premier".

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There is provision for Ministerial staff, 10; and for administration and Cabinet, 23. The administration and Cabinet provisions were taken over from the Chief Secretary's Department. Further, there is provision for the Policy Division, 14; Economic Intelligence Unit, 5; Committee Secretariat, 12; and publicity, 20. This is the publicity branch that was previously in the Tourist Bureau; it is not Ministerial publicity. It was necessary for us to investigate the old Publicity Branch of the Tourist Bureau, which was supposed to undertake general publicity for the Government in South Australia. A number of our publications did not meet the standards of publications in other States, and also publicity activity in various departments was fragmented, and there was no uniformity of policy in setting priorities for expenditure in publicity. It was decided, after a lengthy investigation by the Public Service Board, that publicity activity in the preparation of publications, setting priorities and the like should be centred in one organisation, and that should be the Publicity Branch, which was taken from the Tourist Bureau and put directly into the Premier's Department.

Advertisements have been inserted and applications are now under consideration for the head of the Publicity Branch. The Senior Journalist has been appointed, and it is expected that the standard of our publications will rapidly improve to equal those of other States. If the honourable member had been to Western Australia and seen the standard of its publications compared with ours, he would have realised the need to upgrade what we are providing in South Australia. The proposed new appointments during this year on that line total six.

In the Arts Development Branch there have so far been three officers and a clerical assistant. It is proposed to provide one more officer and a clerical assistant in addition this year. The work of the Arts Development Branch is so heavy that, in fact, the Director has reported to me repeatedly that the officers are being grossly overworked and that it is necessary to provide additional staff. This was investigated by the Public Service Board, and agreed to. I point out that these appointments have been provided after manpower budgeting by the Public Service Board and a specific target set in relation to the work involved.

Dr. TONKIN: I am well aware of the valuable work that can be done by the Arts Development Branch and its officers; that is well worth while, but what money was actually spent last year, under that line, which was not then a separate line and which this year is?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not have that information but will get it for the Leader.

Mr. MATHWIN: I see that for the Development Division actual payments last year were \$248 753 and that has been increased this year to \$323 672—an increase of almost \$75 000. Can the Treasurer say whether that is because of an enlargement of staff in the division, or is the increase due to equipment needed?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The number of staff positions in this division is of a strength certified by the Public Service Board, the number being 29, but some positions have been vacant during 1974-75. It is proposed to appoint two additional staff during 1975-76 to fill positions already created but vacant during 1974-75. In other words, it had been certified by the Public Service Board that during 1974-75 positions were necessary to provide the service that the division is supposed to provide to the public; but the honourable member will recall that at the beginning of this year I put freezes on filling positions in the Public Service for a period and then relaxed that situation only to a minor extent. It is now possible within the terms of this Budget to fill those positions, and it is desirable that they be filled to give a service to industry in South Australia commensurate with the standards of service that honourable members themselves seek. The number of employees in these positions in South Australia compared to those under Governments in neighbouring States is very small.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Treasurer tell me what the duties and salaries of officers of the Policy Division and Economic Intelligence Unit are and obtain a list of the officers involved?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will get that information.

Mr. EVANS: Can the Treasurer give us an idea of how far behind the Planning Appeal Board is with appeals and whether Judge Ward will be back operating with the Planning Appeal Board to try to make up the long leeway that now exists? I believe Judge Ward is working on another project and there is a big backlog of appeals, which is costing individuals much money and interest on finance while waiting to have their appeals heard. Often, it ties up many contracts subject to sales of property. Is any move being made to speed up the processes in this area?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: A number of amendments were made to the Planning and Development Act last year designed to speed the procedure before the Planning Appeal Board and making provision for single-member hearings by the board in some cases. In the long term, the way to cure this situation will be a considerable revision of the Planning and Development Act itself. Part of the problem facing the Planning Appeal Board at the moment is the nature of decisions made, in the first instance, either by local government or by the State Planning Authority, which lead to the appeal process. Part of the problem we have been facing is that, because of that, the Planning Appeal Board has in itself tended to become a planning authority rather than an appeal authority. We have been working for some time on a complete revision of the Planning and

Development Act designed to cope with these problems, because I do not expect we shall get finality on this matter to introduce a measure before the second half of next year. In the meantime, we have been doing everything we can to speed up procedures before the Planning Appeal Board, and that is what the amendments were designed to do. I cannot tell the honourable member now, but I imagine Judge Ward would be returning to work on the Planning Appeal Board now, but I will make inquiries.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I refer to the Unit for Industrial Democracy. Unfortunately, the Treasurer was not here last night to hear a speech I delivered on this matter, but I hope he has read it. This matter comes under his portfolio. Can the Treasurer state the reasons for the change in the name of that unit? Is it because of a change of policy at State level? What conflict is there between the policy of the Treasurer, the policy of the Australian Labor Party, and that of Mr. L. J. Prowse on the introduction of legislation? What staff is employed by this unit?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The reason for the change of name was that it seemed to the Government that "industrial democracy" was very much better descriptive of what we were about than "quality of work life". This Government believes in democracy and believes that democracy is not confined to participation in governmental or local governmental elections, but involves participation in all the decisions affecting one's life. The Government's legislation has set out to increase participation in government, including the long fight to have the people of this State included in participation in this Parliament, against the wishes of the conservatives of the State.

Mr. Millhouse: You did not do that on your own.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We are always glad of a little help. The question as to the Australian Labor Party's policy does not seem to be a question calling for an answer in Committee proceedings on the Budget. The reasons for the policy are set out within it and are quite clear. Many companies have expressed interest, involvement and concern in, as well as support for, proposals of this nature; indeed, I came to this Parliament today from a meeting with senior executives of one such company.

Mr. Millhouse: What company?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They do not wish me to say. Four officers are employed in the department as public servants, and its head officer (Mr. L. J. Prowse) is on contract.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: In reply to a question several weeks ago the Treasurer said that no organisations or companies had expressed concern about the policy of the A.L.P. on this matter, but I have two copies of letters sent to him which, in very strong terms, express dissatisfaction with that policy. The Treasurer should rethink his policy on industrial democracy. I do not disagree with the concept, but I disagree with the policy he is intending to implement.

Mr. COUMBE: The Treasurer has explained why this department has been renamed. I want to know why it has been taken from the Minister of Labour and Industry. It would seem logical that that Minister should have it, just as the Labour Minister administers it in another State. The Treasurer either has no confidence in his Minister or wishes to pursue the matter personally, together with the many other facets of his large department.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is for neither of those reasons, because the Government and I regard it as a major part of the development of Government policy in South Australia. I have been largely the architect of the Government's policy in this matter. I was the author of the document that was put before the Labor Party conference. I put it to the committee and the committee agreed with it, but I had written it. It is an area in which I believe it necessary for me, as Leader of the Government, to take a particular interest. It is something that I set up that is central to the Government's policy. I believe that it is necessary for the administration of the State. When we took office in 1970, I took all the development portfolios under my wing for a time to set an overall policy, and that policy was set.

Mr. Mathwin: You didn't get a very good start to it after you came back from Sweden, because if you had realised the time that it took to get this in Sweden you wouldn't have threatened it under compulsion.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member does not know what he is talking about in this matter and I suggest that he allow me to reply to the question asked by the member for Torrens. The reason was in no way a lack of confidence in any Minister; the reason was that this matter was central to Government policy and that, therefore, I should take particular administrative control.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I agree with the idea of industrial democracy, but that is an inexact phrase that means different things to different people. I suggest to the Treasurer that the problem about all this is that, if he goes as far as he suggests with the proposal in the paper, of which he has been boasting, he will frighten industry away from South Australia. A reaction that I received to the proposal was that, if anything like this came in, in South Australia, the people concerned would transfer their entire undertaking to another State.

Mr. Keneally: Which company was that? You were demanding information.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, and I did not get it, and the honourable member will not get this information, for the same reason. The photostat of the paper that I have is headed "Achieving industrial democracy—extracts of proposals adopted at South Australian A.L.P. convention—June, 1975", and commences with the words "Access to information". The preamble states:

Disclosure of information in the following areas is of major concern to trade unions.

They are the ones that will get the information, not the workers. The subheadings under which information is to be given to trade unions are:

- (i) Manpower and remuneration questions;
- (ii) Control questions;
- (iii) Development, production, and investment questions;
- (iv) Cost, pricing and profit questions;

The information listed under item (iv) is:

Cost and pricing structures; breakdown by plant or product where applicable; turnover; financing of development.

If every company is to be subject to publicity through the trade unions for those things (and one can expect that the information will get to competitors, if there are any left), it will make business and commerce quite impossible. Under the A.L.P. proposals, there will be no secrets; the trade unions will get the whole lot. That is objectionable enough, but shareholders' representation on the board will be reduced to one-third. The remainder of the board is to come from the workers

in the organisation and the experts in company management appointed by the Government. Doubtless, those appointed by the Government will be public servants of the right persuasion, and the arrangement means nationalisation of industry in this State, because the representatives of the public appointed by the Government will have a decisive voice. I do not believe what the Treasurer has said about this, and I challenge him to name any private establishments in South Australia that will accept the scheme. We go on to find that within any commercial or industrial undertaking there are to be joint workshop committees, employee councils, and joint management councils.

Although the idea of worker participation is a good one and must be pursued (it is a development in democracy, however that term might be defined, throughout the world), I do not believe it will lead to anything but disaster for South Australian industry at a time when it has been put, by Labor Governments in this State, at a serious disadvantage compared to its competitors in other States. Perhaps I can put it in another way that is, perhaps, more accurate: the advantages which industry had in the past and which were carefully built up by Liberal and Country League Governments have disappeared since Labor assumed office. One can argue whether that is good or bad. Although Government members may say that that it is good, I do not think it is good. Although I do not say that everything that has been done is bad, if industry is to survive in this State it must have some special advantages to attract and keep it here. I believe it has lost many of these, and these proposals, which are, apparently at the Treasurer's behest, Australian Labor Party policy (and that policy is binding on the Government), will spell disaster.

Dr. TONKIN: The Treasurer suggested earlier that I should ask him later about terminal leave payments. I now do so.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The increase for 1974-75 was because of the voluntary retirement of Mr. Bray and the retirement, on account of invalidity, of Mr. H. James. The provision for 1975-76 provides for the retirement of one officer and the resignation of another officer.

Mr. RODDA: I notice there is an increase of about \$22 000 in the allocation for inspectors and clerical staff of the Builders Licensing Board. Having had discussions with the board throughout the year, it is obvious that its inspectorial staff should be increased to enable it to function in the interests of the building industry in this State. Is it contemplated that the board's staff will be increased?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The board had five inspectors and nine clerical staff at the beginning of last year, and there was an increase of one inspector and one clerical officer in 1974-75. It is intended to appoint an additional clerical officer in 1975-76, but none beyond the last one that has been appointed.

Dr. TONKIN: I echo the sentiments expressed by the members for Davenport and Mitcham about the Unit for Industrial Democracy. I refer particularly to the Development Division and the lines that show marked and significant sums that do not allow in any way for the natural inflationary trends that are apparent in almost every other department. I refer particularly to the allocation of \$20 500 for fees and displays, as opposed to \$18 700 proposed last year and \$13 763 actually spent. I refer also to operating expenses, for which about \$38 000 has

been proposed, compared to \$36 000 spent last year, and to payments to consultants, which are running at about the same figure but which make no allowance for inflationary trends so that, in real terms, it will be a considerably smaller allocation. I refer also to publicity of information for industrial promotion. Although \$60 000 was proposed to be spent last year, only \$37 259 was spent, and only \$36 000 is proposed this year. That is a significant reduction in actual money terms.

This reflects a regression of this department, which is to be deplored. This is occurring at a time when additional efforts should be made not just to attract new industry here (I do not think we have Buckley's chance of doing that under present economic conditions) but also to keep industries here. The days when we used to see tremendous development in this State (I refer to the establishment of General Motors-Holden's, Chrysler Australia Limited, and many other factories and developments in the 1960's) have gone. I cannot recall one major new industrial development that has occurred in South Australia in the last 3½ or four years.

Mr. Millhouse: They wanted to have Redcliff.

Dr. TONKIN: The Government has had some pie in the sky ideas. Various projects have been floated but have got no further than that. There has certainly been an expansion of industry, but those expansions have occurred largely where the concerns have already had such a capital investment in this State that they could not afford not to expand in order to remain a viable concern, and that type of expansion is ceasing. One has merely to look at the list of major building projects undertaken in the last year to see that the Government has been reduced to listing such projects as building additions at the Home for Incurables, and the Nurses Memorial Centre, work on which was completed recently. Not only is industrial development at an all-time low, but also it is apparent that the Government is making no effort to stimulate or maintain industry in this State. It is no wonder that industry is taking the obvious course: when it can no longer afford to operate here, it will cut its losses and move to other States.

Reasons are given why industry should move to other States. It is said that industry should move to the centre of its distributing point, but that is not good enough, because South Australia should be the distributing point, as it was once. It has also been stated that industry should move nearer to its markets. That may be so but, as more industry leaves South Australia, our population and markets will decline and unemployment will increase. I should like to hear the Treasurer justify this small allocation. It is indeed poor, especially when considered in conjunction with the recent closure of the Industrial Research Institute. Obviously, the Government is not concerned about what happens to small businesses, family concerns and industry generally; it is doing little to help them. I should have thought, before South Australia degenerated into an arts and crafts State, relying on home crafts and industries, the Treasurer would do something more about it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know whether there is any point in my replying to that bit of persiflage.

Mr. Millhouse: I don't think there's anything you can say.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Oh yes, there is plenty I can say. All the Leader did was get up and huff and puff.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: And contradict himself.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is so. If the Leader wants to talk about major developments that have occurred during the term of office of this Government—

Dr. Tonkin: I didn't say that: I said "In the last 3½ or four years".

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader said there have not been any, but there was, for instance, the establishment by Levi Strauss, the factory that was built for Mitchell's and the A.N.I. drop forge.

Mr. Nankivell: That was a pie in the sky effort; we wouldn't give it to them.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I know members opposite would not do so, but we set it up. We also attracted the Fletcher Jones factory, which was not only established with the assistance of the South Australian Government but also immediately asked for a three-fold expansion. That is the sort of development the Leader says does not occur in South Australia. Of course it does. In addition, the Government has established several oversea initiatives that were not undertaken by Liberal Governments for which South Australian industry has paid tribute to the South Australian Labor Government.

Mr. Millhouse: Which industries?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Only the other day Mr. Shearer expressed his gratitude to me for the assistance we have given to him regarding his contracts with Libya. It was the South Australian Government that provided dry-land farming and agricultural development in Libya that led to the visit here about two weeks ago of a delegation from Algeria. Iran, Pakistan, Algeria and Morocco have requested the same sort of undertaking, thus opening up a demand for this sort of equipment. This sort of encouragement of industry goes on continually. The South Australian Government has the best of relations with industry.

Mr. Millhouse: Industry doesn't seem to think so.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No doubt the honourable member talks to different people from those I talk to. I can say only that I have received extensive support from industry in South Australia. I am sure Adelaide Brighton Cement Limited would indicate to the Opposition that it has been grateful for assistance from this Government. It is simply not true that this Government has not acted to assist industry or acted in consultation with it, because the Government does so constantly. The honourable member condemns the Government for showing no interest in small industry because we are altering the basis of our industrial research. In fact, the Industrial Research Institute was set up by a Labor Government; it was entirely a Labor Government initiative and was condemned by the Opposition.

Mr. Nankivell: We were right.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Now the honourable member is saying that we should not have set up that institute anyway.

Mr. Nankivell: I didn't say that.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member cannot have his cake and eat it, too. Industrial development activities are continuing in South Australia. The level of publicity and advice the State Government has given to industry that it has helped establish can be maintained, and I am being, in present circumstances, reasonably economical. Services offered by the Development Division will allow the Government to provide services to industry far beyond what was provided by Liberal Governments in South Australia. When did a South Australian Liberal Government ever institute an appearance before the Tariff Board (now known as the Industries Assistance Commission) on behalf of industry of this State—never. South Australia was

the first State Government to do this. When did the Liberal Government make representations of the kind that led to the acceptance of the 85 per cent local content plan and the provision of small car manufacture in Australia on behalf of the motor industry? The Government did that with the support of industry.

Mr. Coumbe: But the industry wasn't in trouble then.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member knows perfectly well that at the time of the I.A.C. report the Australian motor vehicle industry was in grave trouble, as was every other motor vehicle industry producing country in the world.

Mr. Millhouse: Don, would you say something about workmen's compensation?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Treasurer is to be referred to by his correct title.

Mr. Millhouse: Sorry, will the Treasurer say something about workmen's compensation?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, because that is not the line being discussed.

Dr. TONKIN: Apart from saying that he is exercising economy in a field in which he should not be exercising economy, the Treasurer has not replied to the question, but has dodged around and reverted to history; he has talked about past Liberal Governments and what they did. It is results that matter; it is factories that have been erected that matter; and it is job opportunity that matters. Words are cheap! The Treasurer should not have talked about representations made before this commission or that board, because it makes no difference. What is needed is real, hard, palpable assistance to establish factories. At least that is the proud record of L.C.L. Governments in this State. The Treasurer has still not said what new major industry has been established in South Australia in the past 3½ years. I do not believe he can. He may justify his assistance to industry in this State, but I certainly do not believe that industry thinks much of what he has done. I do not believe, as I said the other day, that he is the businessmen's friend.

We are disappointed about the sums that have been made available, because they represent a real cut in activities. Although the Treasurer says he is proud of his activities in this field, such as publicity, information for industrial promotion, and the establishment of oversea centres, he is not really being honest or meaningful about it. In this present inflationary situation he is making economies and cutting back funds available for this sort of activity, and this is the wrong time for such action. Unless we can stimulate the industrial and private sector of this State the economy has little chance of returning soon to normal.

Mr. MATHWIN: I understood from the Treasurer's reply concerning staff employed in the Development Division that the increased allocation of \$75 000 related to the salaries to be paid to two new officers in that division. If that is so, they will receive more than a judge. What will these two officers do, and what salaries will they receive?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Some staff members were engaged last year, and the department had to meet their wages for only part of the year.

Mr. GUNN: The sum of \$50 000 is proposed for oversea visits by the Premier and his officers. What oversea visits will he make this year, what will be the purpose of those visits, and whom will he be taking with him?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: At present the only place I plan to visit is Penang. Whether I will be required to go anywhere else, I do not know. I have been asked by the Libyan Government to have discussions with it, but no decision has been made about that.

Dr. TONKIN: What is the position regarding interpreter services in public hospitals, courts, and similar situations? Much difficulty is experienced in helping people with a poor command of English, and unless qualified interpreters are used it is often embarrassing for those concerned to have interpreting work done by hospital staff. How far has the project to provide skilled interpreter services proceeded in South Australia? Will the Treasurer comment on the submission of the South Australian Council of Social Service on interpreter services?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Positions for two senior interpreters were created by the Public Service Board, and the first position was filled this morning. I expect the other position to be filled within about a fortnight. This will lead to a general interpreter service for the Public Service, although these officers will be working specifically in the courts. I have had discussions with S.A.C.O.S.S., but it is difficult for us to provide in the Public Service a full range of full-time interpreters to cover every Government service. The Public Service Board investigated this matter and listed in all departments officers who are bi-lingual or multi-lingual so that there was information available in departments about officers who were readily available to provide interpreter services. However, that will not meet the situation the Leader has referred to. In the Public Service in future recruitment we will see whether, especially in the social services field, we can engage recruits who, as a qualification, are already bi-lingual. This would help us cover the matter to which the Leader has referred. However, this is not something that we can accomplish in the short term. I can say that we have commenced work on it, and I appreciate the work undertaken at the S.A.C.O.S.S. seminar. A proposition was set up to run a full interpreter service, but the council admits that this was an ideal situation which it cannot conceive, given the necessary priorities of Government expenditure, could be met in anything like the short term.

Mr. VENNING: What members' fees are to be paid from the \$9 000 allocated to the Builders Licensing Board?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is for the sitting fees of the board. The Chairman and the four members are paid on a sessional basis and, given the number of expected sittings, that is the figure.

Mr. RUSSACK: Regarding the Builders Licensing Board, the sum allocated for inspectors and clerical staff is \$119 200. First, does that sum include the normal increase, or has the number of inspectors increased? Secondly, when a licensee seeks to renew his licence, is it now the practice of the board to interview the applicant to ensure that he is a person capable of holding that licence? Thirdly, have any conclusive results been obtained by the panel established to investigate the success of an electrolysis cure of salt damp?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: From memory, there is an interim report on salt damp which does not give anyone much joy about dealing with it. I will try to get that report for the honourable member. Concerning staff numbers, an additional inspector and clerical officer were appointed towards the end of the last financial year, and an additional clerical officer will be appointed this year.

We are looking at the impact of three additional salaries over the full year which, together with the escalation in wages, account for the extra amount. Regarding the board's procedure, I am not aware that it has a policy of calling people before it regarding renewals of licences, but I will obtain a statement from the Chairman of the board for the honourable member.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Although many allocations have been reduced, the sum allocated for the overseas visit of the Premier and officers has been increased enormously from \$30 000 last year (\$19 582 was actually spent) to \$50 000. The Treasurer has merely said that he is going to Penang and that he may go to Libya. Why is there this enormous increase in this vote? Of course, it is not only the Treasurer but also his officers who can travel under this line. Is that part of the greater attention to administration about which we have heard so much in the last 36 hours? I am not satisfied about this increase, as I do not believe that the State gets much value out of these junkets of the Treasurer and his Ministers. I do not want to give offence to my friends in the Liberal Party, but the previous Leader of the Opposition undertook a trip which cost the State about \$15 000 and was then sacked within a few weeks.

Mr. Venning: Would you accept one?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have never had an overseas trip on the Government in 20 years, and it would depend on whether I thought it would be of any value to the State afterwards. I am not satisfied with the way in which money is thrown about for this purpose, and I complain bitterly about the \$50 000 that has been set aside for this line. The item "Overseas visits of Minister, Minister's wife (where approved) and officers" is under the heading of Development Division. I do not know which Minister it is who is to get with his wife, where approved, \$20 000 for overseas visits. Can the Treasurer say who that Minister is? I have been looking diligently at *Hansard* to see who that Minister may be, and I think I am right in saying that it is the Minister who has announced his retirement. I think he is the Minister of Development.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: No.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Then I do not know who it is. The sum of \$50 000 is appropriated for the Treasurer to visit the south of France, and \$20 000 is for some other Minister, if it is not the Treasurer, to go overseas. This is an extravagance, I believe it is a waste of money, and I ask the Treasurer whether he can justify these items.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not intend to answer—

Mr. Millhouse: You can't.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not intend to answer the abuse the honourable member levelled at me, namely, the suggestion that for me to go overseas was just an expensive holiday in the south of France at public expense.

Mr. Millhouse: Of course it is.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is a denigration not only of the honourable member but of the House. The degree to which I have been involved in overseas trips in relation to the work of this State is very much less than that of the Premiers of Liberal-governed Australian States.

Mr. Coumbe: Less than for the Prime Minister.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is less than for Sir Robert Askin and Sir Henry Bolte, and very much less than for Sir David Brand. Apparently South Australia, in involving itself in development, is not even to work in proportion.

Mr. Mathwin: You came back with a worker participation plan, but you don't put it in operation.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I gained much from investigating worker participation, and I consider that was important to the State. As to the honourable member's accepting a trip at any time, many members would subscribe enthusiastically to the State's supporting him with a one-way ticket.

Mr. Millhouse: Who is being abusive now?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The \$50 000 line includes provision for officers. We now have joint companies and many developments now proceeding jointly with Malaysia and Penang and, in consequence, a number of visits of officers is necessary to attend board meetings and to further the work of the establishment of joint undertakings in the area. Mr. Bakewell is in Kaula Lumpur now; prior to that, Mr. Kowalick and Mr. Sullivan both had to make trips in the course of joint planning work. The provision is to cover work of this kind and any visits to the offices of the trade agents that we have established in Asia. The provision for an oversea visit by the Minister of Development is a necessary provision in relation to the development portfolio.

Mr. Millhouse: Who is he?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: At present, the Minister of Planning and Development, but some changes in portfolios are likely soon. Unless there is a sudden change in my marital status, which I do not expect, the line does not refer to me.

Dr. EASTICK: I refer to the provision for the Agent-General in England. I appreciate that the Government has seen fit to provide better housing for the Agent-General, and I appreciate that he is responsible from time to time for investigating possible industrial developments for the State. Last April, he travelled on the Continent for that purpose. Can the Treasurer say what resulted from the travel the Agent-General undertook on the Government's behalf and whether it was possible for the Minister of Development, who subsequently travelled in that area about the same time, to formalise any agreements for further industrial development from the Italian area to South Australia.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Two companies undertook negotiations as a result of the Agent-General's visit. Their executives have visited South Australia, and they are in the course of negotiating with the department to establish here.

Dr. Eastick: What area of interest?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: One is in some form of boating manufacture, I think, and the other in the specialist craft field of silver and glassware. There is also a further indication of interest with regard to specialist tiling.

Mr. MATHWIN: I refer to the item "Payment to consultants for services", under the heading "Office of the board".

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Keneally): Order! I point out that, as the honourable member is discussing an item under the Public Service Board Department, I suggest that he ask his question again when we reach that part of the Estimates.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN moved:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 5 p.m.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (22)—Messrs. Abbott, Broomhill, Max Brown, Corcoran, Duncan, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, Langley, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (22)—Messrs. Allen, Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Bown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Millhouse, Nankivell, Russack, Tonkin (teller), Vandepeer, Venning, Wardle, and Wotton.

Pair—Aye—Mrs. Byrne. No—Mr. Rodda.

The SPEAKER: There being an equality of votes, I give my casting vote in favour of the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN moved:

That consideration in Committee of the Bill be now resumed.

Motion carried.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Premier say whether the Builders Licensing Board pays it way?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: From memory, I believe it does.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Can you find out for sure?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Yes.

Mr. BECKER: A circular is issued to the media listing the names of Ministers, their telephone numbers, press secretaries and research assistants. The most recent circular omitted the name of Miss Koh, who was previously listed as a research assistant. Can the Premier say whether the title of her office has been changed, or give the reason for the omission?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Miss Koh is a research assistant, as she always has been. I do not know why there has been a change in the list.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Am I correct in thinking that the document "The Working Environment Committee, Report and Recommendations" is the Premier's doing? Did he write it? Is it his policy and, if it is, is it therefore the policy of his Government that such a programme as is outlined here is to be implemented?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have made clear that it is the policy of the Government, which is undertaking a number of experiments in the public sector in line with that policy. We have stressed (and it is stressed in the policy document) that in this area we must move cautiously and pragmatically, because it is difficult to draw general rules from the fact that, in the present economic organisation in Australia, the modes of administration in organisations differ markedly, and it is not easy to plan for administration until one can see an organisational chart. Therefore, we have to go along slowly. During this three-year period we propose to proceed in the public sector on the basis of that policy. In fact, the Housing Trust is being reorganised now on the basis of that policy. I expect that policy to be implemented in the Housing Trust during the next few months, and we expect that other Government undertakings will also be implementing the policy.

The unit is working on models for all Government undertakings in South Australia. Experience in the public sector undertakings will be of use to the private sector and to the many companies that have inquired and sought the assistance of the unit in writing programmes at various stages of development in participation programmes. As we

learn lessons from our experience in that area, we expect we shall be able to draw general conclusions, but it is the policy of the Government that we should proceed by example in the public sector and by assistance in the private sector on a voluntary basis, and we expect that in three years time we shall have sufficient experience to be able to draw some general conclusions.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Treasurer explain the allocation for the visit of an officer to South Australia, under the heading "Agent-General in England"?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: An officer from the Agent-General's office returns to South Australia periodically; that has been the case for some time.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Is it part of his conditions of employment?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is a visit aimed at seeing to it that senior officers in the Agent-General's office have the opportunity of knowing what it is they are representing in London, what is happening here. It is common for the Agent-General, during the term of his office, to make a visit to South Australia: it happened to Mr. Milne and to Mr. White. It is normal for a senior officer in the Agent-General's office to make a visit back to South Australia. I expect that an officer will visit South Australia this year.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: As regards the Government's industrial democracy policy, in reply to a question I asked about whether any official complaints had been received, the Treasurer said, as reported in *Hansard*, "No official representations have been made to me." I will now reveal to the Committee a letter sent to the Treasurer on June 11, 1975, by the General Manager of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry (Mr. C. W. Branson). As the Treasurer claims he has not even seen this correspondence, it would be fitting if I read it to him now so that he can see what letters to him contain. The letter states:

My dear Premier,

LABOR PLAN FOR WORKERS

An article appeared in the *Advertiser* newspaper of May 27, 1975, which purported to set out details of a report by an 11-member "Working Environment Committee", which we believe included yourself. We understand that this report is to be submitted to the State A.L.P. conference in Adelaide from June 13 to 16. Should this conference adopt the proposals, we understand that they will become A.L.P. policy for implementation by Labor Governments. While we have been unable to obtain a copy of the report, the details published in the press caused this organisation to give earnest consideration to the items raised therein. The Industrial Matters Committee on June 4, 1975, considered the press report.

Employers today are finding the situation so difficult that any further impositions will cause some of them to give up trying to retain the liquidity necessary to continue in business. There are South Australian based companies that currently are seeking a take-over bid, while others are undertaking feasibility studies into the development of any new production capacity to other States. The range and severity of change involved in some of the matters reported, as included in the proposals, will make, from the point of view of most managements, Adelaide and South Australia a less attractive place in which to consider setting up their operations. Our Industrial Matters Committee directed that a letter in the strongest terms be forwarded to you. Even those managers who find Adelaide a good place in which to live and to bring up a family can be adversely affected by decisions of others to extend their production facilities elsewhere or to quit. Those that wish to remain in South Australia are, therefore, seriously concerned about the impact that any proposed changes might have on the viability of their businesses. I am directed to request you to use your influence in the interests of South Australia to have the matter withdrawn from the agenda or at least to have consideration of the proposals deferred.

Yours sincerely,
(Signed) C. W. BRANSON,
General Manager.

The second letter is from the President of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry (Mr. John Bashford). No doubt it was written because no acknowledgement of the letter sent by Mr. Branson on June 11, 1975, had been received. Mr. Branson, I understand, was overseas when the second letter was sent. It was dated August 15, 1975, and states:

Dear Premier,

WORKING ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. C. W. Branson, General Manager of the Chamber, wrote to you on June 11, 1975, on the above subject and whilst it is appreciated the report and recommendations were adopted at the State A.L.P. conference in Adelaide on June 13-16, the Chamber is very concerned on the possible effects of the policy if implemented on commerce and industry in South Australia. The views expressed in our previous letter are still valid and the purpose of this letter is to again urge you and your Government to have second thoughts on this subject as we sincerely believe that any legislation enacted as a result of the report would have a marked effect on the business community, its future, its employment possibilities and the economy of the State. Your comments would be appreciated.

Yours sincerely,
(Signed) John Bashford
President.

I understand that no reply has been received to that letter. The shabby treatment of Mr. Branson and Mr. Bashford indicates to some extent the regard in which the Treasurer holds industrial development. Will the Treasurer apologise for the failure to reply to those letters; will he apologise also for completely misleading this House in the answer to a question given in *Hansard*; and will he reassess his entire policy on industrial democracy?

Earlier this week the Treasurer decided to disband the Industrial Research Institute. The decision was taken by Cabinet, without the knowledge of the Chairman or the employees, who found out after the decision had been made. What has happened there is completely contrary to the policy laid down in this document. That shows the Treasurer's complete hypocrisy. He will force one set of standards on private enterprise but will not accept those standards himself. Will he accept that one-third of the number of people in Cabinet are to represent taxpayers and one-third to represent public servants, with one-third coming, if he likes, from A.L.P. Ministers in the State? The document states clearly that, once the legislation is introduced, employees will have a right to sit on the board of the shareholders, but it gives no right to the shareholders to sit on the employee council.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In so far as I can understand the questions asked in the honourable member's diatribe, the answers are "No".

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Treasurer has given no explanation for not having acknowledged the letters, let alone say whether he concedes that they represent the views of industry and commerce in this State. Earlier this afternoon he stated that industries in this State supported his idea of the one-third being on boards of industries, and so on, and now we have found that the organised body representing industry and commerce in this State has protested twice, apparently to no effect. I do not think the Treasurer should be allowed to go today without explaining that the protests were made despite what he has said this afternoon and without explaining the fact that he did not acknowledge them.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Is the Treasurer now claiming that he has not received this correspondence from the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, and has he misinformed this Committee of the facts? If he has misinformed the Committee, will he be man enough to apologise for that? I admit that he must receive much correspondence, but what I am concerned about is that,

when I have read these letters to the Committee, the Treasurer is not willing to acknowledge having received them or to apologise to the Committee.

Mr. GUNN: Surely the Committee will not be treated with such contempt. The member for Davenport correctly put to the Treasurer a matter that requires a definite answer. He has properly read to the Committee a document, and surely someone is not telling the truth. The Committee ought to be told, and it ill behoves the Treasurer to act in such a blatant manner. There has been much discussion on this line, and members have read the Treasurer's documents, which would create havoc in and be a disaster for industry in this State. Despite this, the Treasurer will not answer a question that has been properly directed to him. He owes the people of this State a reply.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I know that the Treasurer wants to get this line through. He has been looking at the clock, and so on, but the only way in which he can get it through quickly is to give some sort of answer to the points which the member for Davenport made and which I made in supplement. I want to know whether he got those letters and, if he did not, what happened to them? They are of such importance that I cannot believe the letters would have gone to some official in the Premier's Department and then been lost. If they did go to the Treasurer, why did he not answer them, and why did he conceal from the Committee earlier this afternoon that this was the feeling of the chamber that represents commerce and industry in this State? I do not always agree with the chamber, and I certainly do not always agree with Mr. Branson. However, I do not believe it is proper for the Treasurer to congratulate himself, as he did in this Chamber, on his good relationship with the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, yet say nothing about this. Then, when the letters were read later, we found that they were not even acknowledged. This matter deserves a reply from the Treasurer and, if he does not give that reply, I intend to take certain action before the Committee gets off this line.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The position regarding Mr. Branson's letter is that I did receive it. However, I point out that it did not at that time apply to established Government policy, but referred specifically to what was clearly a misunderstanding of what that policy was. It did not refer specifically to the policies that the Government had adopted. I have no recollection of receiving Mr. Bashford's letter. In fact, it seems strange that it should not have been acknowledged if it was sent to my department, because it is the department's standard practice that, if a letter is not dealt with in full straight away, it is immediately at least acknowledged. I will therefore ascertain what has happened to it. It may well be that that letter has been held for the periodic consultations that take place between the Chairman and Secretary of the chamber and myself, for which they have asked and which I have readily granted.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: For the Committee's information, I will read the address to which the first letter, dated June 11, 1975, from Mr. Branson, and the second letter, dated August 15, 1975, from Mr. Bashford, were sent. It is as follows:

The Honourable D. A. Dunstan, Q.C., M.P.,
Premier of South Australia,
Premier's Department,
State Administration Centre,
Victoria Square,
Adelaide, S.A. 5000.

This clearly indicates that the letter must have been received by the Premier's Department. The Treasurer is now trying to squirm out of this matter by saying that the policy referred to in Mr. Branson's letter was not a policy adopted by the Australian Labor Party. The Treasurer knows full well that it was, in principle, the policy adopted by the A.L.P. State conference. He acknowledged it was in his reply on August 26, 1975, to a question I asked about the policy contained in the Working Environment Committee report and recommendations at the A.L.P. annual conference from June 13 to June 16. That policy was referred to in the newspaper cutting and in my question in *Hansard*.

The Treasurer's first reply to my question was "Yes, in principle". My original question was whether the material contained in the A.L.P. conference report was Government policy. The Premier cannot squirm out of this incident by claiming that Mr. Branson's letter did not refer to the same policy. Of course it did! One or two minor points in that policy might have been changed, but the fundamental principle was contained in the conference report, as outlined in the newspaper article and as covered by Mr. Branson in his letter. I believe the Treasurer is trying to squirm out of a situation that he has misrepresented to the Committee and his action is totally unsatisfactory.

Dr. TONKIN: I am appalled by the Treasurer's attitude to this matter. I would have thought that the member for Davenport has put a case that is clear both to the Treasurer and to the members of the Chamber. The Treasurer now has an opportunity to say he is sorry for misleading the Committee and that he inadvertently overlooked the letter because of pressure of work. Perhaps the Treasurer signed letters without noticing it. He has reason, like any other honourable member, to admit it was an honest mistake; instead, he will not admit it but sits and sulks and does himself little credit. It is a serious matter, as it has always been and will always be, for a Minister of the Crown to mislead a Parliament, whether in South Australia, Canberra, Westminster, or anywhere else the Westminster system operates. If the Treasurer refuses to acknowledge that he has misled the Committee, such action can only be considered wilful. I do not believe that is so; I cannot believe it is so. The Treasurer should at least reply to the member for Davenport and members of this Chamber so they know exactly what happened. If he has made a mistake he should admit it and be honest about it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have told the Committee what occurred in this matter. I certainly did not set out to mislead the Committee, and that is the position.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am fortified to hear that, but want to take it a step further. Now that the Treasurer's attention has been drawn to these letters I should like him to undertake that he will acknowledge them; indeed, reply to them in the next few days. I am certain he would agree that a letter dated June should not lie about for any longer than about three months. Will the Treasurer therefore give a considered reply to those letters?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The matter of worker participation and industrial democracy will be discussed by me with the officers of the chamber at periodic meetings.

Mr. Millhouse: When will that be?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I anticipate quite shortly.

Dr. TONKIN: I, too, am fortified by the Treasurer's answer, and I am pleased to hear that he will discuss the matter with officers of the chamber. I should like to point

out that the Treasurer could have saved much of this discussion if he had been open and honest right from the start, and given the answer he has finally given, which has been rung out of him. I make the point that the Treasurer should properly thank the member for Davenport for drawing his attention to his lapse in this matter. I believe that this is the action that any reasonable man should take.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Just before the matter closes, I should like to point out that the Treasurer has completely misled this Chamber, and I do not believe that he has crawled out of it by claiming that the letter was on another matter altogether. I have now found the place in *Hansard* where I asked the questions, and I believe it is worth reading those questions and the answers I received, because I think it shows that the Treasurer has, in fact, misled the Chamber; and whether it was a deliberate misleading of the Chamber, and therefore, he is a liar, or not, is a matter for his own conscience.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member will withdraw the word "liar".

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I will repeat, Mr. Chairman, the context in which I said it. I said, "As to whether or not it was a deliberate misrepresentation of the truth, in which case it was a lie, or not, is up to the Treasurer's conscience." I did not, in fact, say that he was a "liar".

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the honourable member to withdraw the word.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I withdraw the word "liar", but I still make the point as to whether or not it was deliberate misrepresentation of the facts is up to the Treasurer's own conscience to decide. The first question I asked was as follows:

Have the report and recommendations of the Working Environment Committee, which were presented to the 1975 Annual State Convention of the Australian Labor Party, been adopted as policy of the State Government and, if not, what parts are not Government policy?

The answer was as follows:

Yes, in principle.

Therefore, there were no parts, even in principle, which were not adopted. Mr. Branson has referred to that exact policy, and we can see that the Treasurer cannot climb out of this matter simply on the claim that he thought there was an entirely different matter reported in the newspaper to that adopted at the conference. The next question I asked was as follows:

Will the Government legislate to compel companies to have employee representatives on company boards and management councils and, if so, when will this legislation be introduced?

The Treasurer replied:

The report makes it clear that during the next three years the Government will provide for such representation within the public sector undertakings. From the experience so gained a decision will be taken with respect to legislation.

The third question was as follows:

Have any companies or organisations expressed concern to the Government relating to the recommendations proposed in this report?

Mr. Millhouse: What page is that?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: It is on page 436 of *Hansard*, of August 26, 1975. I will repeat that question because, if one examines the letter from Mr. Branson, one can see that it was referring to the newspaper report which related directly to the recommendations in the report that went before the A.L.P. conference. I asked:

Have any companies or organisations expressed concern to the Government relating to the recommendations proposed in this report?

The Treasurer's reply was:

No official representations have been made to me.

That is a complete and utter misrepresentation of the facts, as I have shown here this afternoon.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: One other matter flows from this and I am glad that the member for Davenport has brought it to our attention. This concerns the proposals of the Government as given in that answer, that the Government will provide during the next three years for such representation within the public sector undertakings. Can the Treasurer be more precise about the plans which, presumably, will be put into effect by this unit for industrial democracy and say what the immediate plans are within these public sector undertakings? I suppose that public sector undertakings are bodies such as the Electricity Trust, the State Bank, the Savings Bank, the Housing Trust, and Samcor. I take it that soon we will see some moves inspired by this unit within those organisations.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The first model for moves of this kind has been drawn up in respect of the Housing Trust. Discussions on the model for the trust have been proceeding for some months, and I expect that the initial arrangements will occur within the next two months. This will mean some changes in the trust's board. As the honourable member may have noticed, members of the trust whose appointments fell due have been appointed only for a short term to allow for changes to be made in the board as a result of these negotiations. The trust will be the first experiment of this kind, although there have been some experiments at Samcor during the past 2½ years.

Mr. Gunn: It's not been too successful.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It has not been too bad, and the operations at Samcor are vastly better now than they were under the old Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board. The position with regard to the Electricity Trust, the State Transport Authority, the State Bank and the State Government Insurance Commission is that the unit for industrial democracy, after the introduction of the model at the Housing Trust, will proceed with negotiations within those organisations for an appropriate model for them, using in the course of the drawing up of those models the lessons we gain from the Housing Trust's operations. It will take some further time for models to be prepared in respect of them and it will require much discussion, since in each case the administrative structure is different. Therefore, it is necessary to operate in a somewhat different way in each case, but I expect that during the next year models will be introduced for all of them.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: As this is an announcement of a considerable departure in the control of semi-government instrumentalities, can the Treasurer say just what the model is for the Housing Trust? I believe that there are about six member on the trust.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: There are seven or eight.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: They have all been appointed previously by the Government on an *ad hoc* basis as individuals who were likely to be able to make a useful contribution to the running of that organisation. What changes are we to get? Are we simply to see different people appointed? Are they to be drawn from the trust's employees? What is the model of which the Treasurer speaks? From what the Treasurer has said, it is obvious that firm decisions of policy have been made by the Government.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Final decisions have not been made. A number of models have been drawn and discussed. The model currently under discussion was a model originally drawn by the Chairman of the Housing Trust, and it was discussed with the Unit for Industrial Democracy. It is subject to discussion with the trust's employees before any final decision is made on it. When a final decision is made on the model, that decision will be publicly announced. However, I cannot announce the present proposals to the honourable member when they have not been discussed in detail with all the necessary employee groups in the trust.

Mr. GUNN: The Premier said earlier that the proposal now applied at Samcor.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I said that there had been some experiments at Samcor.

Mr. GUNN: Those experiments are quite different from the proposition that the member for Davenport has described. I understand that there is one employee representative on the Samcor board; that is very different from giving non-shareholders control over the whole operation.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. GUNN: The Samcor operation has left much to be desired.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Will the honourable member for Eyre resume his seat? When the Chairman calls "Order", it is right and proper for the honourable member who was speaking to sit down. He will be called again. How does the honourable member for Eyre link Samcor with the Premier's Department?

Mr. GUNN: In one of his replies, the Treasurer quoted Samcor as an example. I was simply explaining the situation in relation to the example he gave.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member is out of order.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The member for Eyre was simply pointing out the policy adopted by the Government in connection with a specific board. The Treasurer described how he was introducing industrial democracy in semi-government instrumentalities. The member for Eyre said that a different policy had been adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: The member for Eyre said it was only an example, and I cannot uphold the point of order. It is possible to make a passing remark on the matter.

Mr. GUNN: We do not want to have a real argument about the matter. Does the Treasurer envisage that the Government, in attempting to implement this policy, will adopt the principle now operating at Samcor for all semi-governmental instrumentalities where they intend to use the principles outlined?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The experiments at Samcor have been useful to us in developing the policy and the further models that we now have in view. I am not suggesting that what has happened at Samcor in the set-up of the board or in the provision of the consultative committees is exactly the model that will be followed elsewhere. In fact, I expect, in due season, some revision of the position at Samcor.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Housing Trust model require any change in the Act under which the trust is set up?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: At this stage of the proceedings, I doubt it.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Does the plan for the Housing Trust include a management council, as proposed within the policy, or does it include only the representation of the employees actually on the board?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It includes a management council. Clearly, an election from the shop floor to the board will not achieve effective worker participation. The whole history of worker participation experiments elsewhere shows that. What we have been concerned to see from experiments elsewhere is that there is an effective relationship between management and workers, that there is consultation in the workshop at the works level, and then at the board level.

Mr. Nankivell: That is all very well, but that is significantly different. There are many unions involved in one company.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I think the honourable member will see, when the models are published, that we have provided for that. The reason the policy states clearly that the trade unions must be worked through is the result of experiments elsewhere. If the honourable member has studied the Swedish experiments—

Mr. Nankivell: It does not work.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It does not work as well as we should like it to work, but it would have worked much less if the Swedes had not followed out what they had done—that the workshop committees and the representation are through trade unionists, and that is done specifically in a Swedish organisation and supported by the employers at Saab Skania, Volvo and the other plants, who have said clearly that, if a separate organisation not involving the trade unions is set up and then that organisation is used for representation of the workers to management, there will be a conflict between the trade union organisation and the worker participation organisation. The trade unions will see that organisation as a competing organisation and start to oppose it or pull it apart. That mistake was made in the original Samcor experiments and, as a result, caused us to look closely at the way in which we should proceed. I looked at oversea experience in this area on the holiday in Europe which I took and to which the honourable member has referred. It happened to be a hard-working holiday. That is why we have proceeded in this way. The honourable member will find that this experience has occurred in Germany, in Sweden and in Israel, and that it is a clear lesson from the experiments we made in the early proposals arising from the committee's reports published on the public and private sectors at Samcor.

Mr. Nankivell: How do you resolve demarcation disputes?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: When the honourable member sees the model for the Housing Trust he will see that this has been coped with, and we expect the model to work. I am unable to publish it, because it has not yet been fully discussed with the employees. Until it has been, and until agreement and conclusions have been reached, we will not publish it generally.

Mr. EVANS: I am worried that the Treasurer is prepared to experiment first in an area in which one of the most serious situations exists.

Mr. Millhouse: Parliament is not going to get any say in it, either.

Mr. EVANS: That is right. If there is an area in which we should walk away from experimentation in this type of administration, it is the Housing Trust. With a little

discipline in that organisation, with the setting of right priorities and rents to be charged, some of the problems can be overcome. If we take the experiment the Treasurer is moving towards in that organisation, are we trying to shirk the responsibility of rent fixation? There are few unions in Germany, and that is one reason why there is some chance of success there, but the Treasurer is picking on an industry with the greatest multiplicity of unions of any industry in the State, namely, the housing industry.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member is debating the question of the Housing Trust.

Mr. EVANS: The Treasurer has said it will be one of his first experiments with money being used in this area.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member can use an example, but he cannot debate the Housing Trust at this stage.

Mr. EVANS: Can the Treasurer give a guarantee that, in experimenting in this way with the Housing Trust, he will not create any greater adverse effect on the housing industry and the availability of housing in this State than exists already?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will give that guarantee, and I can assure the honourable member that, so far from not needing experiments in this area, the reason why the Housing Trust was chosen as the first area in which activity of this kind would be undertaken was that there was considerable request from the staff of the trust that they proceed on this basis.

Dr. EASTICK: I accept that this is a model which was initially determined by the Chairman, and that it has had some degree of discussion. What reception has the model had amongst those members of the organisation who have been given the opportunity to review the model and its implementation?

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member is out of order. He may pose an example, but he cannot debate the Housing Trust in any way.

Dr. EASTICK: I have not mentioned the organisation. I have simply said that a model has been indicated as being in existence in an organisation.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like the honourable member to refer to a line, if that is the case. I ask the honourable member what line he is speaking on.

Dr. EASTICK: I am referring to worker participation, or industrial democracy, which is the basis of all this discussion. I have been interested in what the Treasurer has said, and doubtless on another occasion much will be said about the Swedish experiment and its application to South Australia. The Treasurer has been correct in stating publicly that the Swedish system would not work in Australia because it is one not of industrial democracy but of industrial domination.

When one discusses industrial democracy with people in Sweden, Norway and West Germany, one finds that it is a matter of the complete domination of the employer group. The Treasurer has said that Saab Skania and Volvo accept the situation, but they have no alternative but to accept it. If they do not, the Parliament gives effect to what the worker groups want the employer group not having the opportunity to be heard. I repeat my earlier request that the Treasurer indicate the reception that this model has had in the Housing Trust.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The most serious aspect of this matter is that a model is to be adopted by the Housing Trust and that it will mean a restructuring of the trust. The matter will not be the subject of legislation, and

there will be no opportunity other than this one to find out in Parliament what that model is or to debate it at all. We should take this opportunity to debate what the Government intends to do with the Housing Trust. Obviously, the Government has made up its mind about what the proposals are, and Parliament should debate what we think of them. Otherwise, we will not have another chance. The Parliament will have adjourned, there will be no legislation, and the thing will be done by Executive act. The hour is getting late, and I ask that we defer this matter and perhaps report progress until we know what is the model. Is the Treasurer willing to do that?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, I am not. I ask that progress be reported and the Committee have leave to sit again.

Mr. Millhouse: All right. We'll come back to it later. Progress reported.

The SPEAKER: That the Committee have leave to sit again—

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: On motion.

The SPEAKER: For the question say "Aye", against say "No". I think the "Ayes" have it.

Dr. Tonkin: Divide!

The SPEAKER: Ring the bells.

While the division bells were ringing:

Dr. TONKIN: Mr. Speaker, in view of certain news that has been communicated to me finally by the Treasurer, I seek leave to withdraw my call for a division.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN moved:

That the sitting of the House be extended beyond 6 p.m. to allow consideration in Committee of the Premier's Department line in the Appropriation Bill to be completed.

Motion carried.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: PRESS REPORT

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour and Industry): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I refer to a report on page 3 of today's *Advertiser* headlined "Embarrassing Government defeat—Millhouse", in which the member for Mitcham is reported to have made statements concerning the passing of a motion in the House yesterday on pay-roll tax. The honourable member's comments were completely inaccurate, as I was most certainly not sleeping and, secondly, I did know what to do, as I have demonstrated many times in this House. It would have been clear to the member for Mitcham that this was the case. Further, I was in the House to secure the adjournment of the secret ballots Bill, and at the time was studying some papers from my department in relation to shopping hours.

Mr. Chapman: What is this—a departmental explanation?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I wish you'd drop dead.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister of Labour and Industry must withdraw that statement.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I will withdraw it, Sir: I hope he does not live a very long life.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. It is not often—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. CHAPMAN: —that I object to personal remarks. However, I do not believe the Minister has satisfactorily withdrawn, or fairly attempted to withdraw, the intent of his remark. I also call on you, Sir, to ask the Minister to withdraw his second remark.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister has withdrawn the remark. The honourable Minister of Labour and Industry.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Further, I was in the House—

Mr. CHAPMAN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I am sorry that it is late, but I point out that the Minister withdrew his remark and then virtually said the same thing again.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have made a ruling, and that ruling stands. The honourable Minister of Labour and Industry.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Further, I was in the House to secure the adjournment of the secret ballots Bill and was studying some papers from my department in relation to shopping hours. I was doing this to honour an undertaking I had given earlier to the member for Mitcham that I would speak on his shopping hours Bill later that afternoon; in other words, to do him a favour.

Mr. Millhouse: Like fun! You had a fortnight to—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: It is extraordinary—

Mr. Millhouse: "Do me a favour," he says.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Millhouse: It's your damned job; that's what you're paid for.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister has been given leave to make a statement. The honourable Minister of Labour and Industry.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: In other words, to do him a favour. It is extraordinary that he should attack me in these circumstances. I will certainly be wary, "certainly", Mr. Speaker, of making any arrangement with this man in future.

The SPEAKER: Order! With the "honourable member".

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I am pleased to accept—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister will refer to the honourable member as "honourable member".

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The member for Mitcham, then, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to accept any legitimate political comment, but not untruthful accusations.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am indebted to you, Sir, and to the House for the opportunity to make a personal explanation. As the Minister was speaking my conscience was rather pricked because I had used the word "sleeping", so I intended to get up and say that I used the term in its metaphorical sense. In fact, the Minister was not doing the job for which he is on the front bench, which is to watch the progress of the House. To say he was "sleeping" was a bit wide.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Untrue—completely untrue!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It was only literally untrue. The result was disastrous for the Minister as it was for the Government. I was going to apologise for using a loose term that may have caused him any pain, but the Minister

went on to say things that were utterly offensive to me, as they would be to any honourable member, during the course of his personal explanation. The Minister had had a fortnight to reply to the Bill on shopping hours which I introduced. When it was called on yesterday the Minister suddenly, without giving me prior notice, hopped up and tried to adjourn the matter and, in fact, adjourned the debate. Later in the day he complained about my bad temper because he had done that to me. The Minister now has the gall to say that he missed the situation altogether when I moved my motion on the pay-roll tax measure because he was doing me a favour so that he could reply to the shopping hours debate later in the day! That shows the grossest incompetence and I am glad I used that word about him outside the House.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Later:

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

That consideration in Committee of the Bill be now resumed.

Motion carried.

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Treasurer now give me the reply which I was earlier denied in relation to the responsiveness of Housing Trust employees regarding the model which has been directed to their attention? I seek further information in this matter.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Where I have been involved in discussions, to this date it has not been discussed at workshop level. The people involved have raised a number of queries about the working of the model. More than that I cannot say at this stage.

Dr. Eastick: Only queries?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They cannot give a final expression of opinion until they are clear that the model is going to work along the lines that they believe it should work. The particular area of query relates to the consultative council, the management council, and how far it will replace the work of the present trust administrative committee. That has been a subject of discussion. I cannot tell the honourable member more than that at this stage. So far as the queries of the member for Mitcham are concerned, when the conclusions have been reached about the employees and board members who are involved in these discussions, as well as trust officers (Mr. Ramsay is involved in the discussion to a considerable degree), the model will be published. Certainly, it would not be helpful to the discussions at this stage for us to publish the present model, which is either the fourth or fifth model that has been drawn in relation to his exercise.

The member for Mitcham says there is some horrendous executive act going to take place here in relation to administration. I point out to the honourable member that, where there are Public Service departments or where there are administrative arrangements to be made with the consent of the board and the involvement of the Minister in semi-governmental authorities, they do take place by Executive action. They normally do, and I point out to the honourable member that, when he took office in the Attorney-General's Department, he made a number of administrative changes without legislation or debate in this House. That is part of the Executive duty of Government, and we intend to continue with it.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The Treasurer has muffed and distorted the truth for the second time in this Chamber this afternoon. Earlier he explained in reply to an interjection by the member for Mallee why representation of employees had to be through the trade union movement.

He said that this was the case in Sweden and, I think, West Germany. Now I wonder why the State paid \$50 000 for the Treasurer's overseas travels last year. I refer to an article in the *Australian Quarterly*, volume 46, December, 1974, written by the Consul for Social and Commercial Affairs in Australia. This article, which is more recent than the Treasurer's trip, points out that representation of employees does not come through the trade union movement in West Germany. Therefore, the Treasurer's entire argument has no skerrick of truth whatever in its application to West Germany. Indeed, West Germany is one country which has much experience in industrial democracy over, at least, the last 25 to 30 years. Page 70 of the *Australian Quarterly* states:

Most workers' council members are trade unionists, but not necessarily so. They are elected as representatives of the employees and not as representatives of the union.

For this reason, I ask the Treasurer to correct his statement and to readjust the industrial democracy policy so that representation does not need to come through the trade union movement. The Treasurer is now, through this new industrial democracy policy, trying to insist that there must be compulsory unionism in this State, and that is the reason why this representation must come through this means, otherwise the person is a complete nonentity unless a member of the trade union. He would no longer have any say even in electing the representatives to the management council or for the board. I make that request to him, and I think he owes the Committee another apology for completely distorting the truth and again misleading this Chamber.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know what has got into the honourable member. He is getting very wound up this evening.

Dr. Tonkin: Too loud to good effect, I think.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the Leader thinks that that is so, it is perhaps a commentary on his own judgment. Overwhelmingly in West German the membership of the councils is through trade unions, and it is done through trade unionists and with the co-operation of the trade union organisation. The organisation of the whole co-determination law came through the Trade Unions' Federation of Dusseldorf. True, the trade union structure in Germany is rather different from our own but there is the closest involvement of the trade unions with the consultative councils.

Mr. Dean Brown: That's different from what you said earlier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member says that as far as the co-determination law is concerned there is no provision in it that the worker elected must be a member of a trade union, that is right, but the fact that he is in practice is also right, and that is what has to happen. The whole structure in Sweden is certainly on the basis of the trade unions. If the honourable member would like to take up a count of the people who are involved in the co-determination policy as worker representatives on supervisory boards and companies and count up the membership of trade unions, he will find that the number who are not members of trade unions is negligible.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am still perturbed about the Government's intention with regard to the Housing Trust and it is obvious to me now that the Treasurer is unwilling to explain what recommendations the unit for industrial democracy has made with regard to the trust's structure. He has been given at least six opportunities to say what

those recommendations are, and he has ducked the question each time. Once when charged one might say that he did not understand or that he had forgotten but, more than that, I am not willing to go; yet we have had it half a dozen times. We now know that the Treasurer regards this as an administrative act, and that is the sort of thing he is going to concentrate on now; we are to be excluded. I will concede that perhaps by some stretch of the imagination it would do some mischief if the model were disclosed too soon if it has not been agreed by everyone. I want an undertaking from the Treasurer that, before this is put into effect, there will be an opportunity in this place to debate the principles. It is one thing to say that I made some trifling changes in the Attorney-General's Department when I became Attorney-General (God knows they were needed after his tenure!) but it is another thing to suggest that these matters of fundamental principle (the complete alteration of the structure of a Government instrumentality to be used as a model for the whole of industry) should not be debated here; that is what the Treasurer is saying, and it is entirely wrong. If the Treasurer is not willing to give the undertaking I have sought, it will be necessary for me to take some action on this line.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not intend to give the honourable member an undertaking that Parliament will debate these arrangements before any action is taken to put them into effect. What I have said to the honourable member is that I expect that the arrangements will be concluded within the next two months. They will be published as soon as they have been decided upon. If Parliament is sitting at that time, of course the honourable member will find some opportunity to debate them.

Dr. TONKIN: Does the Treasurer think that Opposition members are so foolish that they could accept a statement like that—if Parliament happens to be sitting! Of course Parliament will not be sitting, because the Treasurer has told us it will not be. What is the Treasurer trying to do? This is a most unsatisfactory state of affairs. Either he does not know what the arrangements will be or he is not willing to tell members; whichever the alternative, he is not willing to let members debate the issue. It is futile to carry on in this vein. I was perfectly happy to withdraw my call for a division previously on the understanding that we would be able to finish this line, but finishing this line means that this House should get some reasonable information. If the Treasurer has not got that information, he should get it. Unless we get that undertaking, I intend to move that progress be reported. The Treasurer's action totally negates any agreement we may have made across the Chamber.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have said that the position is that a number of models have been drawn over a period of months. Discussions are proceeding, and it would not be proper for me to publish the current proposals, which are due for discussion at all levels of the trust, until those discussions have taken place. When they have taken place, the proposals will be published. The longest period I can see is a period of two months, but I hope they will be completed before that. It would be most inconvenient for the Government if they were not completed before that, because the current tenure of members of the trust board runs out on October 18. We expect that the trust will reach conclusions, and I will then be able to make a statement in this place. I will do that but I will not interfere with the arrangements now being made for proper consultation for what is quite clearly

a political debate by honourable members opposite, who are opposed to the whole policy, to try to do something about that publicly. These arrangements will take place with proper consultation at all levels of the trust. When conclusions and agreements have been reached within the trust, including agreements at all levels, the conclusions will be published. That is the proper process of participation. Honourable members will have the chance to comment on that.

Dr. TONKIN: Can we have just one statement without double talk and without talking around the subject and trying to obscure it: will the Treasurer or will he not undertake to give this Parliament an opportunity to debate the arrangements when they have been reported and finalised?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes; I will, certainly.

Dr. Tonkin: You will give an undertaking?

Mr. Millhouse: Let us pin him down on this.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I did not say before they were implemented; I said there will be an opportunity for the House to discuss the proposals and the model for the trust when it has been published.

Mr. Dean Brown: But not before it is implemented?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Not before it is implemented, no. I would have to undertake immediately a number of measures for implementation, and I will not hold that up for a debate to take place in this House. I shall be happy, however, to give honourable members full information about it. I certainly want full information for the public about what is taking place in the trust, because it will be necessary for the purpose of the Government's programme that information about the progress of the work within the Housing Trust on industrial democracy is channelled out to industry and organisations within the State. We have every intention of giving the fullest information on what occurs.

Dr. TONKIN: That is not a satisfactory answer. It is pointless and stupid of the Treasurer to imagine that presenting the facts to the House after they have been implemented will make the slightest difference. Once again, he is short-circuiting the true functions of Parliament.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You can move a motion if you have the numbers.

Dr. TONKIN: We are wasting our time here. I move: That progress be reported.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (21)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Millhouse, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin (teller), Vandepeer, Venning, Wardle, and Wotton.

Noes (21)—Messrs. Abbott, Broomhill, Max Brown, Connelly, Corcoran, Duncan, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Allison and Eastick. Noes—Mrs. Byrne and Mr. McRae.

The CHAIRMAN: There are 21 Ayes and 21 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I give my casting vote in favour of the Noes. The motion therefore passes in the negative.

Motion thus negatived.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: We have gone almost as far as we can on this. The Treasurer is not prepared to tell us what the model is. He makes excuses for that. He is

not prepared to give any undertaking that Parliament will be able to scrutinise the model before it is put into operation with the Housing Trust. He has been deliberately avoiding giving those undertakings but it is perfectly obvious, whatever he has said, that he is not prepared to do anything, that he is determined, for one reason or another (and I suspect because he realises the storm of protest that it would create), not to give us any information at all about this or to allow us to debate it, because the House will be up—

Mr. Evans: He wants us to approve the money.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, we have to approve the money. There is a line later on the Housing Trust. I protest most bitterly about this. It is a complete negation of Parliamentary control, a complete negation of the right of Parliament to debate, before they are put into operation, fundamental changes in administrative arrangements. For that reason, because it is the only thing I can do, I move:

That the line on the Unit for Industrial Democracy be reduced by \$100.

This is, of course, a motion of no confidence in the Government for what it is doing. It will probably be a vain protest, but it is the only thing I can do to express my extreme displeasure and to draw attention to what the Government proposes to do, and I move accordingly.

Dr. TONKIN: The member for Mitcham told me that he wished to speak on this matter, and I completely agree with what he has said. If he had not made this move, I would have done so on behalf of the Opposition. The situation is disgusting and appalling and it has been extremely difficult to persuade members on this side earlier that they should not take this action. I second the motion with pleasure. What the Government has done today culminates a week of absolute disregard for the people, Parliament, and the Parliamentary institution.

The Government's actions are despicable and show a lack of concern for a large proportion of the population. The Government will govern by administrative action, and now I have no doubt why Parliament is adjourning for eight months. The people deserve better than this arrogant, overriding, and dictatorial machine that sits opposite.

Mr. MATHWIN: I support the amendment mainly for the reasons given by the member for Mitcham and the Leader and also because of the Treasurer's statement that in Germany and Europe a person had to be a trade union member to be given a position on the board. The Premier would know, if he had spent the time in Germany and Sweden that he said he spent there, that the statement was not correct and that he was misleading the Committee. Parts of the arrangements in Western Europe are as follows:

Arrangements for employee or worker participation are required by law in many Western European countries. West Germany has developed 'participation' farther and faster than anyone else and now has statutory provision for employee directors on supervisory boards, in all limited companies employing more than 500.

The criterion is whether the organisation has 500 employees, not whether they are members of a union. The information continues:

This has developed from the German coal and steel experiment. In the coal and steel industries it has been a legal requirement since 1951 that employees should have the same number of seats as shareholders on the supervisory board. The provisions in the draft European Company Law are modelled upon German law.

The explanation does not state that members must be members of trade unions. In view of that and his obvious intention to mislead the Committee I support the amendment.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (21)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Millhouse (teller), Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Vandepeer, Venning, Wardle, and Wotton.

Noes (21)—Messrs. Abbott, Broomhill, Max Brown, Connelly, Corcoran, Duncan, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

The CHAIRMAN: There are 21 Ayes and 21 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I give my casting vote in favour of the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

Line passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

At 6.42 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, September 16, at 2 p.m.