HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, August 4, 1977

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

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the Bill.

MOUNT GAMBIER STATE SAWMILL MODERNISATION

The SPEAKER laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on Mount Gambier State Sawmill Modernisation.

Ordered that report be printed.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: UNIVERSITY ELECTION

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: On August 3, 1977, in another place, the Hon. N. K. Foster asked a series of questions relating to alleged bogus voting in recent University of Adelaide Student Association elections. In particular, Mr. Foster asked me to investigate these allegations. It is not generally the policy of this Government to interfere in university matters where those matters are of an internal nature, and, having carefully considered the matters which have been brought to my attention concerning the recent University of Adelaide Student Association elections, I am of the view that none of those matters provides grounds for the Government altering its general policy in this particular instance.

I have spoken to the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Adelaide and he has advised me that the university is conducting an internal inquiry into the allegations, and that he will be making a public statement in a day or so, setting out the course of action which the university proposes to take in this matter and indicating the nature of such action. In view of this undertaking, the Government is satisfied that the university is exercising its responsibilities in a proper fashion and that there is no need for the Government to intervene. This matter was also raised in another place by the Hon. J. E. Dunford who sought answers to the following specific questions:

1. Were some ballot-papers for the elections obtained by false pretences by person or persons unknown?
2. Were those ballot-papers subsequently used for the purpose of making bogus votes in the elections?
3. Were some of those bogus votes handed to a polling official by a candidate endorsed by the Liberal Club of the Adelaide University?
4. Were the bogus votes all for endorsed Liberal Club candidates?
5. Is it true that a member of the State Council for the Liberal Party is implicated in the affair?
6. What action has the Vice-Chancellor of Adelaide University taken in relation to this matter?
7. Does the Attorney agree that students are entitled to know how, and by whom, attempts have been made to rig their elections?
8. Has the criminal law of South Australia been broken by the culprits in this episode?

Needless to say, in light of the Government's policy, which I have outlined, I do not propose to carry out the necessary investigations to enable me to answer those questions, as I believe that the university will deal with the matter satisfactorily at an internal level. Nor do I believe that it would be proper for me to speculate as to the inferences raised by the honourable member's questions as the answers to those questions are now the subject of the internal investigation at the university.

QUESTIONS

BUILDING COSTS

Mr. TONKIN: In view of the June, 1977, figures issued by the Australian Institute of Quantity Surveyors covering the current Australian construction costs, will the Premier now face facts and accept that South Australia has significantly higher construction costs than have other States, so that he and his Government can stop pretending that no problem exists and get on with the job of identifying which of its actions have destroyed our previous low-cost advantage? The Commonwealth Bureau of Statistics figures, showing that at $209 a square metre Adelaide had the highest actual building costs of any mainland State, were quoted in the House and elsewhere recently. They were not accepted by the Premier or by the Minister in charge of housing who used Commonwealth Savings Bank figures on building costs of an average range of housing to reject them. The figures from the Institute of Quantity Surveyors confirm the Commonwealth Bureau figures. Examples of relative costs are as follows: to excavate surface trenches not exceeding two metres in depth, in New South Wales, $13·50; in Queensland, $11·50; in Victoria, $15·55; in Western Australia, $8·30; and in South Australia, $25. A concrete paving slab cost per cubic metre is $37·30 in New South Wales; $30·10 in Queensland; $35 in Victoria; $29·20 in Western Australia; and $42 in South Australia. For concrete walls, the cost in South Australia is $77·50, compared with the next highest figure of $63·47 in Western Australia.

The cost of bricklaying per 1 000 bricks is $330 in New South Wales and $360 in South Australia. The costs in South Australia for block laying, and floor carcassing are also higher. Laying a hardwood floor costs $14·60 a square metre in New South Wales. Western Australia is the only State that has a higher figure than South Australia, at $18·21, with South Australia at $17. Of 844 items of construction, the cost in South Australia is the highest of the five States in 419 cases. People involved in building either as constructors or purchasers accept that high costs exist in South Australia, and that we are thereby being disadvantaged. Considerable concern is being expressed that the Premier has refused to face facts and accept that the problem exists. Until the fact that a problem exists is accepted, there can be no prospect of the problem's being solved.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have not seen the figures to which the Leader refers. I prefer, on previous experience of the Leader's figures, not to accept them until I have examined them. My information is that the Housing Industry Association has recently published figures on equivalent houses that confirm what this Government has said previously.

PRE-SCHOOL EDUCATION

Mr. WELLS: Can the Minister of Education give any information he has on what the Commonwealth Government intends to do in its forthcoming Budget in relation to funding for the pre-school and ancillary services? I was disturbed by a report on page 3 of the *Advertiser* of July 30 that commented on the authorised Budget leak from Senator Guilfoyle to the effect that $39 000 000 would be provided, as it was provided last year, for these services.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I do have some information on this matter because Senator Guilfoyle wrote to me on June 29 indicating that this sum would be the allocation to the States. I replied to the Senator expressing my concern about the drift of Commonwealth support for pre-school and ancillary services, and I thought it best not to say anything publicly until the Senator had a chance to reply and perhaps indicate a slight change of heart on the part of her Government in the light of the persuasive argument I put to her in that letter. There has been no reply. I also saw the statement in the *Advertiser,* and I assume we can therefore say that what all State Ministers have been told is now firm Commonwealth policy, and will be in the forthcoming Commonwealth Budget.

This is most disturbing. My own officers suggest that it will mean probably a cutback of 17 per cent (not just the 13 per cent mentioned by the *Advertiser*) to this State in money for pre-school and ancillary services. This is because not only is it merely a block grant without any indexation factor built into it, but in addition it would appear, on the allocations to the States, that in particular South Australia and New South Wales have been discriminated against in favour of Victoria. Certainly the cutback in the allocation to Victoria is less than is the case for New South Wales and South Australia. The following figures show the way in which Commonwealth and State support for pre-school education has moved over the past three years, and indicate the increased share of the burden that the State is now being asked to carry. For the financial year 1975-76, the Commonwealth contribution to this area was $4 429 375, 66 per cent of the total of $6 734 388, which was contributed from Commonwealth and State sources. The Commonwealth contributed 66 per cent and the State contributed 34 per cent. In the 1976-77 year the Commonwealth contribution went up slightly to 70 per cent, and the State's contribution was 30 per cent. The estimated 1977-78 cut-up of the cake (and this is what I want to impress on members) expressed at June, 1977, prices, is that the Commonwealth contribution will be $5 719 000, 53 per cent, and the State's contribution will be $5 017 000, 47 per cent; so, in 12 months the Commonwealth contribution has moved from 70 per cent down to 53 per cent necessitating the State's contribution increasing 17 per cent from 30 per cent to 47 per cent. That really is an unacceptable situation. It is part of a general pattern of the Commonwealth's shrugging off responsibilities that people see as part of its responsibilities. There is not much that we can do about it in the short term: we will cop it. It will be in the Commonwealth Budget, but I would be derelict in my duty if I did not express extreme concern and disgust at the trend of Commonwealth funding for pre-school education.

WATER CHARGES

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Does the Minister of Works still believe there will be further steep rises in the water charges in South Australia in the next few years? The Minister said in 1973 that it was unlikely that water rates would rise to pay for filtration in Adelaide's northern and central suburbs. Two years ago, in 1975, the Minister predicted that there would be sharp rises in water and sewerage rates in order to pay for capital works. Commonwealth funds have been made available to assist with filtration works undertaken thus far, yet we find that Adelaide has the dearest water of all capital cities at present. I quote figures: in Melbourne, the cost of water is 12·75c a kilolitre for consumption and excess; in Sydney, 16·5c a kilolitre for consumption and excess; in Perth, 12·73c a kilolitre usage and 15·81c a kilolitre excess if paid by the end of November; in Adelaide, water costs 19c a kilolitre for consumption and excess; in Hobart and Brisbane the water supply is not metered, but it would seem that Hobart has the cheapest water. Does the Minister still believe that there will be even further steep rises in water charges in South Australia, as we are obviously the pace-setting State in relation to these charges at present.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Deputy Leader has used figures as his Leader does. In fact, if he examined the whole question of the systems of rating in the various cities, he would find that his statement is not correct. I hope the Deputy Leader heard me straight: the statement he made about Adelaide having the highest priced water in Australia is not correct.

Mr. Venning: Does that include—

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member knows as well as I do that that is not the only factor in the payment for the overall rate.

Mr. Tonkin: That is the charge for water?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: That is the charge for a kilolitre of water.

Mr. Tonkin: And is this the highest charge in Australia?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I must remind all honourable members that the Minister must be given an opportunity to reply to the question, and supplementary questions by way of interjection deprive other members of the opportunity to ask questions.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Leader had a sheepish look on his face when he made that statement, because he knows he is being dishonest. I am pleased that the Deputy Leader has asked this question, because I am concerned about what may happen to the price of water in South Australia in the next few years: I will tell him why. The Deputy Leader would be aware, as is every other member that, in 1975, the State Government decided to embark on a programme of filtering the metropolitan water supply of Adelaide. The State Government made that decision in the knowledge that the then Federal Government (the Whitlam Government) had entered into an agreement giving us an undertaking that it would fund this programme to the tune of about $100 000 000 to be spread over 10 years, and the funding would be on the basis of a 30 per cent grant and a 70 per cent long-term loan. Recently, we have been told that, instead of getting the $20 000 000 for which we asked in 1977-78 and 1978-79, it had been cut almost in half to $10 300 000, which has been made available over that period by the Federal Government, but we have had no indication about the future beyond that date.

The Premier has written to the Prime Minister seeking clarification of that point. We have sent telexes since, seeking a reply to the letter sent that sought clarification about whether the funding would continue beyond 1978-79, but we have had no reply. Only this morning, I have been

involved in preparing a further letter that will go from the Premier to the Prime Minister pointing out the great difficulties that face South Australia because of its geographical location in relation to the Murray River (we are at the bottom end of the system) and because of our climatic conditions.

It is not difficult to examine them. We have heard the Leader and other members of his Party ask questions on this matter. Indeed, the Leader asked a Question on Notice recently about the filtration of the supply in northern towns. I have just received a report that I have not yet read, but the summary of the report states that the cost of filtering northern towns effectively would be $48 000 000. A secondary scheme, which was suggested but which would not completely do the job, would cost $32 000 000, and it would cost a further $150 000 000 for complete filtration in metropolitan Adelaide. As members may have seen in this morning's *Advertiser*, we will be involved in considerable expenditure, possibly up to $200 000 000, in connection with the control of salinity on the Murray River within South Australia's borders, and a further $22 000 000 to be spent to reticulate Bolivar effluent. These are some of the problems which are peculiar to South Australia, which are beyond the resources of the South Australian Government, and for which we should be seeking Federal funds.

However, instead of getting any encouragement from the Federal Government to go ahead with the schemes, we are getting a breaking of the agreement. The Federal Government has a moral obligation in this matter, because of an agreement entered into by a previous Government for the filtration of Adelaide's water supply. No member can deny that that is a necessary event, and it has been forcibly pointed out to the Commonwealth Government in great detail. The Federal Government has been told that, not only does the South Australian Government have a responsibility to look after the health and welfare of the people of South Australia, but so, too, does the Commonwealth: we are not a foreign country.

The Deputy Leader wants to know whether there will be sharp increases in the cost of water: I appeal to him, to his Leader, and to other members of his Party to get solidly behind the Government, in the same way in which I have appealed to every South Australian Federal member of Parliament (Liberal, Labor, or whatever) to back the South Australian Government in getting the kind of funds we need to complete this programme, not only at a lower cost to the people of South Australia but also as quickly as possible. Although I would appreciate his support, it is not forthcoming at present. I shall be pleased to accept the assistance that he or his colleagues can give to impress on his colleagues in the Federal Government that we need this kind of money to get on with the job. The reply to the honourable member's question is that it depends to a large extent on what his colleagues in the Federal Parliament are willing to do for this State in the serious financial situation in which we find ourselves, and the sort of financial assistance we need to get on with these necessary projects. This will have a large bearing on whether or not sharp increases will occur in the price of water in South Australia.

EAST-WEST INVESTMENTS

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Can the Attorney-General provide me with any information on East-West Investments Proprietary Limited, of West Perth? Constituents of mine have been letter-boxed with a leaflet which states, in part:

Money makes money! ! ! Be a capitalist! ! Beat inflation! The man from East-West Investments, in association with W.A. Pines Pty. Ltd., has the answer for that second income from tree farming.

I can recall that questions have been asked, especially by the member for Whyalla, in relation to W.A. Pines Proprietary Limited. If my memory serves me accurately, the report provided at that time suggested that people who were approached to "get rich quick" by the man from East-West Investments may not be making a sound investment. To warn my constituents as quickly as possible if that is the position, I ask the Attorney-General whether he knows anything of either of the companies associated with this leaflet.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The honourable member is correct in saying that this matter was raised some time in the previous session by the member for Whyalla, who had had the matter raised with him. I undertook at that time to investigate the activities of certain of these firms. The department has been making investigations since that time, although I have not as yet received a report. I should like to bring two matters to the attention of the public. First, whether it be in relation to shares in pine forests or any other activity in which people are trying to sell goods from door to door, if the firm concerned operates in another State and does not operate in South Australia as a business, people should be warned to be most cautious of doing business with such organisations. I make that comment generally, rather than specifically about this matter. Secondly, as to the specific matter of shares in pine forests, it must be said that not all firms involved in this business are in any way open to doubt as to their propriety. Some of the firms involved in selling pine shares are most reputable. I would not want to see the situation in which my comments today were in any way taken as a reflection on all the organisations that conduct the business of selling shares in pine forests. However, those firms that operate from other States, in the manner to which the honourable member has referred, in my experience and the experience of the department are often not firms of a reputable character, and people of this State would be well advised to avoid dealing with firms operating from box numbers or from interstate addresses, and would be well advised, if they wished to purchase shares of this nature, to do business with firms operating in South Australia and which have had a long tradition and history of proper business dealings in this State.

BUILDING COSTS

Mr. EVANS: Does the Premier accept that the South Australian legislation for workmen's compensation, builders licensing, and long service leave for casual employees in the building industry has caused an increase in the cost of construction in South Australia?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Inevitably, cost increases have occurred in those areas, but the figures that I have seen to date do not lead me to the conclusion that those costs in South Australia exceed costs applying in other States. The recent figures that I saw for workmen's compensation claims and payments certainly do not support any such contention.

Mr. LANGLEY: Can the Minister for Planning inform the House of the combined cost of land and building a house in this State compared to other States? Members opposite have tended to give the cost of building a house but not the combined cost of land and the building of that

house. Naturally, there are different types of house construction, such as asbestos, brick veneer, and solid brick in this State and other States. Surely a combination of land and house cost is what people consider when making the biggest outlay of their life.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: All honourable members would be aware, despite what Opposition members occasionally say in public, that the cost of land for urban development in South Australia is significantly cheaper than in other mainland States. This lower cost has a significant impact on the final cost of house and land in the ultimate purchase. I should not like the honourable member's question to carry with it any implication that the lower land costs offset higher house costs, because that is not the case. It is certainly true that, in Adelaide especially, the proportion of brick and brick veneer houses built is much higher than in Melbourne, Sydney or Brisbane. In Adelaide it is almost impossible to get approval to build an asbestos or timber house in the metropolitan area. Where such approvals can be obtained, the houses are difficult to sell. There is a traditional prejudice in South Australia against timber housing that carries over into asbestos housing as well. For comparable house costs Adelaide compares favourably with the Eastern States for brick and brick veneer dwellings.

True, in Melbourne and to a lesser extent in Sydney, but to a larger extent in Brisbane, a much higher proportion of weatherboard houses are built. Those houses are cheaper than brick and brick veneeer houses, as they are cheaper in South Australia for similar construction. It would not be proper to compare the average cost of housing in Adelaide with the cost of housing in other capital cities, but it is necessary to compare the cost for like forms of housing. In this connection I have checked carefully the latest tender prices received by the South Australian Housing Trust for various forms of housing both in the metropolitan and country areas of the State. The trust can now have brick veneer houses built for extremely low prices, but that price does not take into account the full cost of fencing and the provision of other outside services in which the trust engages. For houses let by the trust to tender to private builders the price in the range $16 000, $17 000, and $18 000 is indeed common.

Another factor that operated in the housing industry, especially in 1976 (a year in which the building industry in South Australia was at full stretch when about 15 000 houses were completed), was that profit margins were increased significantly by some builders. The price to the purchaser went up as a consequence. It is worth remembering that in all sections of the building industry, probably more so than in any other industry, profit margins are very sensitive to overall conditions. Profit margins fluctuate substantially depending on the general conditions in the industry at one time or another. For example, at present and for the last two or three years, in Sydney profit margins have been compressed significantly because of the highly difficult state of the building industry in New South Wales. Profit margins in the building industry this year have declined significantly.

Any person calling tenders for housing or for larger buildings will experience quite a different tender climate now, compared to the South Australian situation as it was over a year ago. In contract after contract, the experience now is that the tender prices are coming in well below estimate, whereas last year the tendency, if anything, was for the reverse to be the case. This proves that there are three forms of figures: lies, damned lies, and statistics. Members opposite tend to spend their time less with the third category. They are not so much interested in the facts as they should be.

McNALLY TRAINING CENTRE

Mr. MATHWIN: Has the Minister of Community Welfare decided to close Assessment 2 in the high security block at McNally Training Centre? If he has, will he assure the House that there will be no overcrowding of the dormitories, and in no circumstances will the residents of Assessment 2 be placed in the first offenders unit? The Minister will be well aware that overcrowding of dormitories could well bring about a situation that existed at the time of the riots and serious disturbances at McNally in 1975 and 1976. He will realise that at the time there were first offenders placed in the same area as recidivists.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I make clear that I was not necessarily well aware of any such facts as put forward by the member. I do not need him to put any words or imputations in my mouth at all. I am quite capable of putting forward the things of which I am aware and those of which I am unaware. The reply to the first part of his question is "No". He asked me had I made a decision yet, and I have not. The reply to the second part of his question is, that I will consider it.

HOUSING

Mr. SLATER: Can the Minister for Planning say what the situation is regarding the demand for housing in the private building sector in South Australia, and whether the number of houses on the market exceeds the demand because of the inability of prospective purchasers to obtain finance for housing brought about by the monetary policies of the Federal Government?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The present situation is not 100 per cent clear. The last figures I had some weeks ago for the South Australian Gas Company, which is the most reliable source of the stock of unsold houses, suggested that the number of unsold houses had stabilised. Normally, the number of unsold houses at any one time in Adelaide is about 800. When one considers that that is about one month's supply, it would be a reasonable stock of unsold houses to have on hand. The Gas Company's figures show that the number of houses that have been connected to a gas main but not sold had increased towards the end of last year to about 1 400, and remained static at that figure through to May this year. As a result of actions taken by the State Government, there was a definite stimulus to the building industry, and a significant increase in the number of Savings Bank loans took place in June. That increase will have continued into the month of July. Further, the additional money made available to the State Bank has enabled that bank to increase its rate of lending by 20 per cent over the past two months. Honourable members will be aware that the concession with respect to stamp duty could not be expected to have an immediate impact, because it would take time for people to organise themselves to get the necessary documentation through in order to take advantage of that concession. I am hopeful that we may see in the next month or two some improvement in the overall situation.

However, the indications we have had from the Federal Government about the funding to be made available under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement for 1977-78

is that the funds will be the same as the funds available for 1976-77, which were the same as the funds made available for 1975-76, which were the same as the funds made available for 1974-75, over a period when building costs increased throughout South Australia by about 50 per cent. The Federal Government is not satisfied with penalising the younger generation through making it more difficult in the employment sphere and deliberately creating unemployment in its search to reduce real wages. It is not satisfied with a situation where young people in our community have been out of work now for over a year. It is also determined in its blind adherence to archaic and outdated economic and monetary policies to create a situation where the younger generation is being penalised in the most damaging way in its need to buy a new house. There has never been greater discrimination against the younger generation in our community than exists now, as applied by the Federal Government, and it is an absolute disgrace. Every bit of inflation which goes on at the present time—

Mr. TONKIN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I refer to Standing Order 125, which provides:

In answering any such question, a member shall not debate the matter to which the same refers.

I ask that you take that into consideration in considering the Minister's long diatribe against the Federal Government.

The SPEAKER: I think I have pointed out to the House before that it is not within my power to control what the Minister says when he is debating the—when he is—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not think there is any need for this type of behaviour. I do not think it enhances the conduct of this House, either. I think I have made clear that I can only appeal to Ministers to keep their answers brief. I have no power under the Standing Orders to control them to any time, and I think the honourable Leader knows that quite well.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am glad the Leader is embarrassed by the situation. It is about time that the Leader and some of his colleagues started sticking up for South Australia rather than blindly supporting the rotten policies of the Federal Government. There has never been a situation where younger families have been under greater difficulty in purchasing their own house than what applies at the present time. The Federal Government is not giving any effective support to the removal of the difficulties of that situation, and the Leader in his turn—

Mr. EVANS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. In the circumstances, would you support a move by the Opposition to have power in the Standing Orders to stop Ministers debating the answer?

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Standing Order 125 states:

In answering any such question, a member shall not debate the matter to which the same refers.

A ruling has been given in the past week or two that members of the Opposition do not answer questions, anyway, so it is perfectly obvious that the only sensible interpretation of that Standing Order is that, when members are answering questions (and in 99·9 per cent of cases that would be Ministers), the question shall not be debated, so I ask that you rule that the Minister is debating the question.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is placing a wrong interpretation on the Standing Order. There are rare times when a member can answer a question, but that does not refer to a Minister. The honourable Minister of Mines and Energy.

Mr. TONKIN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. May I ask whether to be a Minister of the Crown in this Parliament one has to be a member of the Parliament?

The SPEAKER: I think that is a ridiculous question. The honourable Minister of Mines and Energy.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! If Opposition members wish to misuse Question Time, that is up to them. The honourable member for Davenport.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Mr. Speaker, it is quite clear that Standing Order 125 refers to—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will be seated. I warn the honourable member that he will not debate the issue. If he has a point of order, he will stipulate it, and then he will sit down.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. My point of order is that Standing Order 125 quite clearly refers to all members of this Chamber. It states—and I read it again:

In answering any such question, a member shall not debate the matter to which the same refers.

It is quite clear that it refers to all members.

The SPEAKER: I cannot uphold that point of order. I can only appeal to Ministers to keep their replies as brief as possible.

Mr. TONKIN: In that case, Mr. Speaker, I intend to move disagreement to your ruling.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: When do you intend to move it?

Mr. TONKIN: Now. I move:

That the Speaker's ruling be disagreed to.

The SPEAKER: The honourable Leader of the Opposition has moved to disagree to the ruling of the Speaker because it asserts that Standing Order 125, applying to all honourable members, does not apply to Ministers, and implies that Ministers are not members of the House. That is certainly not what I said.

Mr. TONKIN: With great respect, I disagree, because that is exactly what, in my opinion, the ruling implied, and that is why I moved disagreement to it. This whole situation has been brewing up for the entire session of this Parliament, during the two weeks and three sitting days we have had. We have not had full Question Time because of other motions, but that is the Opposition's prerogative to choose. When we have had Question Time, the Ministers' replies have been prolix, prolonged, loquacious, and deliberately designed to inhibit the Opposition's rights to make full use of Question Time. Not only that, but our opportunities to question have been inhibited by the ruling which provides that questions may be asked (and I am certainly prepared to read one, two, and three) relating to any Bill, motion, or other public matter connected with the business of the House put to the Ministers of the Crown and to other members. That, again, assumes that they are other members, so that Ministers of the Crown, under the Standing Orders, are members. We are bound, as you well know, by a ruling that, in Opposition, we may not comment or debate a question when it is asked, but must stick entirely to the facts.

Although it is difficult indeed to avoid commenting on occasion, you, Sir, very properly in that case always call Opposition members' attention to that requirement. You infallibly do so and, in so doing, you prevent any form of comment. I am not arguing about that; that is your job. It is what the Standing Orders set down, and you apply

that. Now, I ask that you apply the Standing Orders equally to Government members and that in this regard you apply Standing Order 125, which provides:

In answering any such question, a member shall not debate the matter to which the same refers.

It is not a question of other members but of a member of this House and, if he happens to be a Minister, Chairman of a committee, or any other member, including you, as Speaker, that member of this House fundamentally is bound by Standing Order 125. I refer to Erskine May, Fourteenth Edition, page 341, relating to oral replies; it provides:

An answer should be confined to the points contained in the question, with such explanation only as renders the answer intelligible, though a certain latitude is permitted to the Ministers of the Crown.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. TONKIN: A certain latitude may well be granted to a Minister of the Crown, but before any member is a Minister of the Crown—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader of the Opposition must be given an opportunity to speak.

Mr. TONKIN: Before any Minister of the Crown can be such a Minister, he must be a member of this House. I submit that, although Erskine May is clear on this point (and I accept that a certain latitude may be given), Erskine May, as we have been told many times by you, Sir, and your successors is not the governing body of rules in this House over and above the set down Standing Orders. The Standing Orders are the orders which govern this House, and they take precedence of Erskine May and everything else. Erskine May can be used in the interpretation of them, if there is any need to interpret them, but this three-line Standing Order 125 is totally and absolutely clear in what it says. The Ministers on the Government benches have, during this session of Parliament, totally and absolutely contravened that Standing Order, to the detriment of the Opposition. I go further and say that it has been, as all honourable members in this House know, a deliberately contrived attempt and a tactic to keep the Opposition from making full use of Question Time.

Your duty, Sir (and I put this to you with great respect), as Speaker of this House, is to uphold the undoubted rights and privileges of the members of this place. Very soon, we will all be moving across to Government House to present the Address in Reply to His Excellency. You, Sir, on that occasion will be demanding, on behalf of members of this House, their undoubted rights and privileges, as you did when you were first elected Speaker. On behalf of members of this House you demanded those undoubted rights and privileges. Having demanded them, and having received an assurance from His Excellency, it is your duty to uphold them. I submit that you are not upholding the Standing Orders in relation to the answers being given by Ministers at this stage. You are giving more than a little latitude; you are totally ignoring the entire spirit of that Standing Order. For that reason, I must disagree to your ruling.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): That was a piece of fluster-buster. The Leader framed his disagreement to your ruling, Sir, around Standing Order 125, and he then had his attention drawn, during the course of his speech, to Standing Order 123. He endeavoured to distinguish that—not, if I may say so, very well.

Mr. Chapman: In your opinion.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am giving my opinion.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Well, speaking as one who has had to argue points of law previously, I do not think the honourable member would have done terribly well before a court on this one. Then he had handed to him, in the middle of his impassioned plea to the bench, an authority which he read out with great gusto to support himself, and found that he had gone wrong and had read out an authority which supported the contrary view. Then he argued against the very authority which he had just cited. It was not a very good performance. Our Standing Orders give effect to the practice of the House of Commons, which is set forth in Erskine May. The various Standing Orders have to be read together. Standing Order 123 states:

At the time of giving notices of motion, questions may be put to Ministers of the Crown relating to public affairs; and to other members, relating to any Bill, motion, or other public matter connected with the business of the House, in which such members may be concerned.

Standing Order 123 draws a distinction between questions to Ministers of the Crown and answers by them, and questions to other members. It is only members who are then referred to in Standing Order 125. The position in relation to Ministers is not covered by Standing Order 125.

Mr. Tonkin: You don't believe that's the business of this House.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is not a *sequitur*. The Leader has never been terribly strong with logic, and he is not very strong with law either, at the moment. In consequence, in replying to questions, which are referred to in the latter part of Standing Order 123, a member shall not debate the matter to which the same refers. These are quite restricted matters. Regarding Standing Order 123 and Ministers of the Crown replying to questions, those questions relate to public issues and, consequently, it has been the tradition of the House of Commons and of this House that Ministers may reply as is necessary in their view on those public issues. Consequently, Ministers cannot be confined as is done in Standing Order 125 in relation to questions asked of members other than Ministers. That is the perfectly plain meaning of the three Standing Orders read together and, in those circumstances, your ruling, Sir, is, with respect, perfectly correct.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (20)—Messrs. Allen, Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin (teller), Vandepeer, Venning, Wardle, and Wotton.

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

Pair—Aye—Mr. Coumbe. No—Mr. Jennings.

Majority of 2 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

The SPEAKER: The honourable Minister for Planning.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is a fact that the younger generation has to pay more of its income to meet mortgage payments of a house than did its parents or, indeed, its grandparents. That is disgraceful, and it has been brought about by the policies of the Federal Government and by its restrictive policies, particularly over the past eight or nine months. Unfortunately, the Leader of the Opposition supports those policies. As far as this

State is concerned I consider that it is a disgrace that policies that affect adversely so many young people in this State are supported publicly by the Leader of the Opposition and by the Liberal Party.

O'NEILL WETSUITS PROPRIETARY LIMITED

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Will the Premier make public all records and agreements, and any other relevant documents, relating to the operation of O'Neill Wetsuits Proprietary Limited since December, 1976, and the formation and operation of Golden Breed Proprietary Limited? If the Premier is unwilling to do so, why is he afraid of the truth being revealed? My reason for asking for the release of all the information is the incorrect and incomplete information that has been given so far. As evidence, I give four specific examples. First, the Premier refused to reply to questions I have asked about the extension of Government loans and guarantees given to O'Neill Wetsuits Proprietary Limited. It seems now that a loan of $300 000 and a guarantee of $700 000 have been given for this purpose. Secondly, it was claimed by the Premier that the South Australian Government had stepped in to save 500 to 800 jobs. However, subsequent information revealed that the new company, Golden Breed Proprietary Limited, had employed only 155 former employees of the old company and that 184 of those former employees had lost their jobs completely. Thirdly, several unsecured creditors have expressed to me their absolute disgust at the manner in which the State Government has worked so closely with the oversea company, Richton International Incorporated, without safeguarding the interests of local businesses. Local creditors are owed, I understand, about $800 000 by the old company. Finally, the Government would not reveal its capital investment, loans and guarantees to the new operating company, Golden Breed Proprietary Limited. I understand that the Government has invested $250 000 in equity capital in the new company and has given a guarantee for a further $500 000 as trading credit. It is time that this Parliament was given the truth and the complete facts.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not have the full statement on this matter that I had in my bag when Parliament met, expecting the kind of outpouring that we have now had from the honourable member, because of his usual statements in the newspaper knocking any assistance given by this Government to any industry in this State. On the day of the next meeting of the House I will proceed to deal with the things that the honourable member has said. I will do it in detail, and I will deal with the member as his disgraceful conduct deserves. I will give a full reply on the day that the House next meets.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will give a full statement about this matter when the House next meets. At this stage I point out to the House and the member that he knows, although he will not put this in his statements to the public, that the Treasurer of this State is not in a position to proceed to make advances or give guarantees until there has been a recommendation on the matter by the Industries Development Committee of this Parliament, upon which a member of his Party in this House sits. It is a bi-party committee. His Party was a party to the recommendations which were made to me for the very actions the member condemns.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is the way in which the member behaves. It is obvious that he sets out to mislead the public constantly. I will deal with him when the House next meets.

At 3.12 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That Standing Order 44 be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting.

The purpose of this motion is to enable all necessary action on any Bills to be taken as required during the rest of the day's sitting that will allow the action necessary on Bills that may be returned by the Legislative Council, and may enable introduction of the Bills for which notice has been given for today.

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): The Deputy Premier kindly intimated to me that this move would be taken today. I understand that it is necessary to facilitate the business of the House while we have other business before it during the Address in Reply debate. This is an unusual occurrence, and the Government cannot expect the Opposition to acquiesce every time in this sort of move to suspend Standing Orders. We have just had some difference of opinion on the interpretation of Standing Orders. I suppose that one way to get over that difference of opinion, should it happen to disadvantage the working of the House in any way to one side or another, would be to move that that Standing Order be suspended. The purpose of a Standing Order is exactly what it states: to be a Standing Order to govern the business of the House. This time the Opposition will agree, because there is a matter of extreme urgency before Parliament: that is, the matter of the motor fuel Bill.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That's the only reason.

Mr. TONKIN: I am pleased to hear from the Premier that that is why the motion was introduced. We are fiddling far too much with Standing Orders of this Parliament and with normal practices. We have seen this with the introduction of Bills before the Address in Reply debate has been concluded. We will agree this time.

Motion carried.

COMMERCIAL AND PRIVATE AGENTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Commercial and Private Agents Act, 1972-1976. Read a first time.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

It seeks to overcome sundry minor difficulties that have arisen in the administration of the Act since its inception in 1972. Clarification of several definitions is sought by the Commercial and Private Agents Board, and it is also proposed that retail store security officers should be required to hold a licence under this Act. The Bill also seeks to provide that the Board may grant a provisional (that is, interim) licence to an applicant who is employed, or about to be employed, by a licensed agent. As the Act now stands, a security agent, for example, cannot employ a person as a security guard until that person's application has been considered by the board and processed. The Bill creates several new offences in order to clamp down on some undesirable practices.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the Act. Clause 3 amends various definitions. A person who repossesses goods subject to a "consumer" mortgage is included in the definition of "commercial agent". The obtaining of evidence for legal proceedings in relation to workmen's compensation or car accident injuries is included in the functions of a loss assessor. A loss assessor performing this function therefore need not take out an inquiry agent's licence. A person who supplies guard dogs is included in the definition of "security agent". A store security officer is defined. Clause 4 effects a consequential amendment in relation to store security officers.

Clause 5 requires persons acting as store security officers to hold licences under the Act. Paragraphs (*b*) and (*d*) of this clause delete some words that could lead to confusion with respect to a person who is licensed in one category and who is thereby permitted to perform functions that also may be performed by other categories of agents. Clause 6 provides that the board may grant provisional licences to certain applicants. Such a licence is initially effective for a period of six weeks, but this may be extended by the Registrar. A provisional licence may not be granted to an applicant for a commercial agent's licence. Clause 7 inserts a reference to "consumer" mortages in the section of the Act that deals with the obligation to report to the police the repossession of certain motor vehicles. Clause 8 repeals section 28 of the Act. New section 47a deals with the employment of unlicensed agents. Clause 9 corrects a drafting error.

Clause 10 enacts two new sections. An agent who employs an unlicensed agent, or a retail store that employs an unlicensed security officer, is guilty of an offence. A creditor who deliberately assumes a different name in order to lead a debtor to believe he is dealing with, for example, a collection agency, is guilty of an offence. A person who supplies a "pro-forma" document to another person so that the latter can pretend to be a commercial agent is guilty of an offence.

Clause 11 provides that offences shall be dealt with summarily. As the Act now stands, proceedings for offences have to be commenced within six months (by virtue of the Justices Act provisions) and this has meant that quite a few offences have had to go unprosecuted. By extending the time limit for prosecutions to two years, this Act will be brought into line with the provisions of the Land and Business Agents Act.

Mr. MATHWIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

INDUSTRIAL AND PROVIDENT SOCIETIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Industrial and Provident Societies Act, 1923, as amended. Read a first time.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: 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

This Bill, which is in a form identical to a measure passed by this House on March 5, 1975, and subsequently amended in another place and which finally lapsed on the prorogation of the session. It amends the principal Act, the Industrial and Provident Societies Act, 1923, as amended, and deals with the question of shareholding in societies, within the meaning of the principal Act, from two different points of view.

First, it proposes that the limitation of shareholding by any member of a society other than a member who is a registered society shall be increased from the present limit of $10 000 to such amount as is fixed by the rules of the particular society. A fixed limitation on the maximum amount of share capital that can be held in the society is necessary to ensure that the society remains a "co-operative company" within the meaning of the Income Tax Assessment Act of the Commonwealth so as to attract certain taxation advantages.

Secondly, the Bill deals with the question of the voting power of individual members of a society. Before 1966 there was no provision in the principal Act that the voting power of each member should be equal. Although, in fact, the vast majority of societies provided for such equality of voting power by limiting members to one vote. In 1966 an amendment was made to the principal Act to provide that, in future, all societies should provide in their rules for equality of voting rights but that societies existing before 1966 that did not have this "equality of voting" provision in their rules could maintain their position as at that time but not permit any member to increase his voting rights. At the same time power was given to the Minister to approve a variation from this principle where it appeared reasonable. In 1974 the amendment referred to above was substantialy re-enacted as a law revision measure. In the event that the 1966 amendment, as re-enacted in 1974, seems to have given rise to some inequities as between members of the societies affected by it, accordingly, clause 5 of this Bill attempts to deal with this matter. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 makes an amendment to section 2a of the principal Act that is consequential upon amendments proposed by subsequent clauses of the Bill. Clause 3 amends section 3 of the principal Act by providing a definition of "permissible amount", which can be recognised with the maximum shareholding that can be fixed by the rules of the society. Clause 4 amends section 5 of the principal Act that deals sufficiently with maximum shareholdings and substitutes the expression "permissible amount" for the figure "$10 000".

Clause 5 by inserting a new section 12a in the principal Act provides, in effect, that in the case of "prescribed societies", as defined, no member (other than a member that is a society itself) of a society shall be entitled to exercise voting rights in respect of any amount by which his shareholding exceeds $4 000. This will not prevent

such members increasing their rights in so far as their present shareholding is less than $4 000. Proposed subsection (3) of this new section makes it clear that the power of the Minister is preserved to approve a departure from this principle, should the particular circumstances of a society render this desirable. Clauses 6, 7 and 8 are consequential amendments.

Mr. DEAN BROWN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Electoral Act, 1929-1973. Read a first time.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: 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

This Bill, which is in the same form as a measure that failed to become law in the last session of the last Parliament by reason of the fact that it was negatived in another place on March 25, 1975, proposes the adoption of a voting procedure for the House of Assembly elections that may be referred to as "optional preference voting". 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.

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 applies only to House of Assembly electors. This clause also amends section 110a to remove the possibility of an elector disfranchised due to his ignorance of his correct subdivision when enrolling. Honourable members will be aware that a provision identical to this provision has already been enacted into law and its inclusion here is necessary so that this measure will be a Bill subject to section 41 of the Constitution Act.

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, that is, 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 does 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, arise only 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.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY secured the adjournment of the debate.

PRICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Prices Act, 1948-1976. Read a first time.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: 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

This Bill makes a number of disparate amendments to the principal Act, the Prices Act, 1948-1976. The Bill provides for the repeal of section 53 of the principal Act, so that annual amendment of the principal Act is not necessary for the continuation of the price control provisions. It expands the definition of "consumer" so that it includes a purchaser or a prospective purchaser of land otherwise than for the purpose of resale or letting or for the purpose of trading or carrying on a business. Purchase of a home is the major transaction entered into by most consumers and expansion of the definition of "consumer" to include such purchasers will enable the advisory and investigatory functions of the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs to apply to such transactions.

The Bill inserts a provision in the principal Act providing that it shall be an offence to personate an authorised officer. This proposal has been prompted by complaints including, for example, a complaint that a businessman had been required by a personator to produce stock and pricing records and a complaint that a trader had been directed by a personator to sell an item at a reduced price. The Bill extends the power of the Commissioner to assume the conduct of legal proceedings by or against a consumer by providing that the Commissioner may do so where the proceedings have already commenced.

The Bill removes the present restriction in the principal Act to the effect that, before the Commissioner may investigate any unlawful practice, he must first have received a complaint from a consumer. This restriction has tied the hands of the Commissioner to a certain extent, in that he has not been able to investigate practices or prosecute offences that have come to his attention indirectly from the complaint of a consumer or by other means. Finally, the Bill inserts certain evidentiary provisions in the principal Act.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 5 of the principal Act by inserting evidentiary provisions relating to appointment of authorised officers and delegation by the Minister. Clause 3 inserts a new section providing that it shall be an offence for a person to personate an authorised officer. Clause 4 amends section 18a of the principal Act by removing the restriction upon the powers of investigation of the Commissioner that he must first have received a complaint from a consumer. The clause amends that section by providing that the Commissioner may assume the conduct of legal proceedings on behalf of a consumer where the proceedings have already commenced. The

clause also inserts evidentiary provisions relating to the fulfilment of the conditions upon which the Commissioner may assume the conduct of legal proceedings on behalf of a consumer. Clause 5 repeals section 53 of the principal Act which provides that the price control provisions of the principal Act shall cease to have effect at the end of this year.

Mr. TONKIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (NARCOTIC AND PSYCHOTROPIC DRUGS AND JUSTICES) BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendment:

Page 2, lines 28 to 30 (clause 11)—Leave out all words in these lines after "amended" in line 28 and insert the following:

"—

(*a*) by striking out from subsection (1) the passage 'subsection (3) of';

(*b*) by striking out subsections (2) and (3) and inserting in lieu thereof the following subsections:

(2) Subsection (1) of this section does not apply in respect of an advertisement in a publication, circular or paper circulated only amongst legally qualified medical practitioners, registered dentists or veterinary surgeons.

(3) No person shall have in his possession any publication, circular or paper containing—

(*a*) advice as to the manner in which any prohibited plant may be cultivated;

or

(*b*) advice as to the manner in which any drug to which this Act applies may be manufactured, prepared or administered.

(4) A person who contravenes a provision of this section shall be guilty of a minor indictable offence.

(5) The Minister may, by notice published in the *Gazette*, grant an exemption from all or any of the provisions of this section in respect of—

(*a*) any person or class of persons;

or

(*b*) any publication, circular or paper or any class of publications, circulars or papers."

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General): I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment be disagreed to.

My reasons for opposing the amendment are that at the present time in South Australia we have a Royal Commission looking into the whole question of drugs, and I do not think I have heard any member of the Opposition criticise the terms of reference of the Commission, which are as wide as we could possibly draft them. We wanted a full inquiry into this whole area and in the meantime we intended as a Government that the drug laws in South Australia, which generally speaking are adequate, should prevail more or less as a holding operation until the report from the Royal Commission was available to the Government so that we could, after the considerations of the Royal Commission had been taken into account, change the laws in accordance with the recommendations of the Royal Commission.

The amendment to the Narcotic and Psychotropic Drugs Act and the Justices Act was brought before the House by this Government as an urgent measure. I thank the Opposition in this House for the way it co-operated in recognising the urgency of that measure. The amendment was brought before the Parliament simply to ensure that the existing laws applicable to drugs could operate effectively. It was a machinery provision to correct an anomaly that had been brought to the notice of the Government by the Supreme Court. That was the sole intention of the legislation. As a Government, we are not convinced that the drug laws that apply in this State are entirely satisfactory. We believe that it may be that amendments are needed to the drug laws of the State, and maybe amendments are needed not only to the Narcotic and Psychotropic Drugs Act and the Justices Act but also the common law itself may need amending by Statute and the Criminal Law Consolidation Act may need amending, but these matters ought to be left until the Royal Commission has brought down its recommendations and the Government has had the benefit of the considerations the Royal Commission is giving to this subject. Apart from that, the whole question of drug misuse and abuse and the laws governing that subject in Australia have now been thrown into confusion by the proposals of the Federal Government that it should set up a Royal Commission. Until this whole matter has received further consideration, it is my belief and the belief of the Government that we should not take any precipitous action to change the fundamentals of the law as they are at the present time until these considerations have been sorted out. That is basically the reason for the Government's opposition to the amendment proposed by the Legislative Council.

We do not necessarily have any real objection to it as to its intention. I have plenty of objections to the way it has been phrased and worded, because I believe it is far too wide and that it opens a Pandora's box as to what sort of publication, circular or paper could in fact be printed and owned by a person. The Chief Secretary pointed out vividly in the other place some examples of the sort of matters that could conceivably come within the ambit of the proposed amendment. He referred to the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* which under an interpretation of this amendment could conceivably be a publication which it was an offence for a person to possess. That situation is untenable, and it is certainly not a situation which in law we as a Government would want to see applied in South Australia. I believe that the Opposition probably can now see that this amendment is too wide. I readily concede that the intention of it has some merit, but it is a matter that ought to be left until the Royal Commission into drugs has reported and the review which the Government has promised will take place then has been undertaken.

The member for Heysen sought from me an undertaking that as soon as the Royal Commission report was received the Government would, as a matter of urgency, review the drug laws. I gave him that undertaking, and that is on record. It is merely a matter of waiting for the Royal Commission's report until this review is undertaken. I ask members not to seek to tamper with the law as it is at present until we have the expert and considered advice of the Royal Commission to guide us.

Mr. WOTTON: I support the amendment. We have supported in the past and we will continue to support the State Royal Commission. We also will support the Federal Government inquiry. I believe, and I believe that all members will agree, that it would be foolish not to believe that delay could occur before any necessary action could be taken. We are committed to doing what we can to safeguard the public at the earliest possible moment. I believe we can do this by supporting this amendment. It has been suggested that the amendment would apply to

encyclopaedias and the like, but, although they may describe the extraction of opinion, they do not do so in such a way as to encourage it. I suggest that "encourage" is the key word concerning publications we seek to eliminate because that is their obvious prime purpose of publication. I have before me a copy of the publication *The Australian Seed*, which was brought to the notice of members in the other place. I think all I need to do is quote a few headings in this publication, such as, "The fine art of successful marihuana trafficking" and "The fine art of dope cooking". There is a provision that encyclopaedias and dictionaries are to be excluded, but, because we cannot afford to take any chances regarding the delay that may occur between now and the results of the full inquiry, I urge members to support this amendment.

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I support the amendment. I accept that a Royal Commission is about to meet concerning this whole problem and that much preliminary work has been done on the subject. This is the very situation I have been desperately afraid would develop with the appointment of a Royal Commission on drugs. The appointment of a Royal Commission was something with which no-one could possibly find fault, but there was always that danger, which was expressed many times, that because a Royal Commission was in existence looking into the problem nothing further need be done. One could have almost said that we did not really need to introduce this Bill to close any loophole, because there was a Royal Commission. Now, because an amendment has been moved in another place we are told that it was all right to bring in the Bill in the first place but there is no need to consider any amendment made in another place because there is a Royal Commission. I do not think that is a reasonable argument. It defeats the whole purpose of the Bill. While my colleague has very adequately dealt with the difficulties in relation to marihuana and the publicity given to it, I am particularly concerned about an article that I understand appeared in a similar publication called *Methadone Madness*, which tells how one can get a prescription for methadone by pretending to be a dependant who cannot get treatment.

These matters are of immediate importance, and if we do not take things as they arise we will be here this time next year saying that there are loopholes and problems, but we need not do anything about them because we have a Royal Commission sitting. We cannot afford to waste that time. I have said on many occasions that drug dependence is reaching, or has reached, epidemic proportions in this country and in this State. A Royal Commission will be of no value if it is allowed to go on and we do not have progress reports and commonsense action taken before any report on loopholes that crop up, and other urgent matters. In fact, that Royal Commission could prove to be a detrimental influence. It could have a contrary effect simply by inhibiting public awareness and public debate. I appreciate the Attorney-General's point of view, but I certainly cannot agree with it. If it was good enough to bring in a Bill to close a loophole it is good enough to ensure that that Bill adequately closes the loophole it was intended to close and any others that might arise during the debate.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I refer the member for Heysen to his comments of a day or so ago when he quoted the remarks the Chief Justice made in his judgment in the case that led to this amendment. The Chief Justice said that this Act, whilst it might have been satisfactory in the first place, had become "a patchwork quilt". What the Leader and the honourable member are trying to do this afternoon is further patchwork that patchwork quilt. This Government takes the view that, when the Royal Commission into drugs has done its work and produced its report, at that time it will be desirable that we have a complete and thorough revision of the drug laws of this State: in other words, a new Bill entirely. That will be the Government's policy: that we require a completely new start. That is the intention of the Government, and we do not believe that patchworking the substantive law in this area at this stage is desirable. The Government believes it is most appropriate that we wait until the considered views of the Royal Commission are available to it before it undertakes the major revision of the drug laws in South Australia that I have spoken about this afternoon.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Attorney's argument is not consistent with the logic we would expect from a legal man. He says on the one hand that we have a Bill that puts another patch on the quilt because there is a loophole.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: There is no need to get nasty about it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am not getting nasty. Are we supposed to creep around here on tiptoe to please the sensibilities of the Attorney-General? I am just making the point in a reasonable assertive manner. I hope the Attorney will see the logic of what we are saying; it is perfectly simple. We have an imperfect set of laws in connection with drug offences. Nobody is arguing, point one, that we need to rewrite the whole of the law. Nobody is arguing, point two, that we have a Royal Commission, or point three, that that Royal Commission is going to take a long time to come up with its findings, and point four, a further long time will elapse before that can be enacted as law. Point five is that we now have a Bill sponsored by the Government to put a patch on that patchwork, but because the Opposition is advocating putting a further patch on the quilt until this long period expires, it is said that there is something wrong with what the Opposition is doing. We are simply going through the same operation that the Government has advocated. The reason for the Government's not accepting this amendment is surely that it is too small-minded to admit that the Opposition is improving its legislation. The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield said in the debate in another place that he acknowledged that the amendment had some merit. The Attorney-General admits that this amendment has some merit. They cannot have it both ways. The Government cannot say it has a loophole that it is going to close and then say that the Opposition cannot close a loophole because the Government is waiting for the Royal Commission to report.

Either the amendment has merit, or it has not got merit. The Government has admitted that it has merit, so the only reason for turning down the amendment is that the Government is not prepared to admit that the Opposition has put forward something that is of value to the State. That is a small-minded attitude to adopt, and I hope that the Attorney will see the error of his ways.

Dr. EASTICK: We are dealing here with human lives, and the suggestion which has been put forward by a member in another place and which is being supported by members in this place will assist in preventing misery associated with human lives. I believe it needs total support.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (22)—Messrs. Abbott, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Connelly, Corcoran, Duncan

(teller), Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (20)—Messrs. Allen, Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Vandepeer, Venning, Wardle, and Wotton (teller).

Pair—Aye—Mr. Keneally. No—Mr. Coumbe.

Majority of 2 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

The following reason for disagreement was adopted:
Because the amendment adversely affects the Bill.

Later:

The Legislative Council intimated that it did not insist on its amendment.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from August 3. Page 398.)

Mr. VANDEPEER (Millicent): In supporting the motion, I offer my condolences to the families of former members who have passed away over the past 12 months. Those members were Sir Glen Pearson, who represented Flinders for many years and who gave important representation to the rural areas; Tom Stott, who is also well remembered for his representation in the rural areas; Geoffrey Thomas Clarke, and Howard Huntley Shannon. I refer also to the early retirement of Sir Douglas Nicholls and to the excellent manner in which the Lieutenant-Governor is carrying out his duties.

The Opening Speech is what I can only describe as an innocuous document. The rural sector appears first in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech, as is traditional, but it is not uppermost in the Government's mind when it considers the economy of the State as a whole; it falls into the rearguard. The rural sector is an export-earning sector of the State, but the Government has yet to appreciate the value of our export-earning industries.

It appears that the Government is funding a programme for the control of the alfalfa aphid, which could have devastating effects on South Australia's pastures. What its effects will be is unknown but, if one considered the possible damage it could do, it is a frightening thought. It is a most damaging insect to have come into South Australia, because it could make unviable large areas of deep sands in the South-East and Upper South-East. These areas have been developed over the past 20 years or more, and the Hunter River strain of lucerne has been the basic strain of pasture used there. A small part of the large area of deep sands in that district would not have been developed if Hunter River lucerne could not have been established in those areas, which are now in a difficult economic position. Only small parts of these areas are now being developed. I fear that, if the alfalfa aphid has any drastic effect on those areas or encroaches on to them, they will become completely unviable, because no alternative pasture will grow there.

The Government's current programme of allocating funds to the Agriculture Department for the breeding of parasites and predators is commendable. We were concerned that such an allocation was not going to be made. It took the Government some time to provide the allocation, which could have been made in a matter of days, and there was agitation by the graziers in those areas for the Government to get on with the job and make the necessary allocation of funds. There is still sufficient time to breed parasites and predators and to release them in the coming spring.

Mr. Millhouse: Are you going to work for the Liberal Party after you leave Parliament?

Mr. VANDEPEER: That question has nothing to do with the Address in Reply. Put it on notice.

Mr. Millhouse: There's another vacancy in the Party organisation.

Mr. Mathwin: You could apply, Robin, and we might consider you.

Mr. VANDEPEER: I do not think that is possible. I will now continue to speak about the rural sector of our community. Dairy farmers in the South-East are in dire straits at present. Their situation is difficult, in that they produce an essential foodstuff commodity for consumption in South Australia and elsewhere, and for export. These people are producing essential commodities, such as milk, butter, cheese, and other by-products, but many people in rural areas are concerned.

Here we have essential foodstuffs, but people producing them cannot make the operation economic or cannot make enough money to be considered to be earning even a decent living. The money they spend on themselves does not amount to even the average wage here in South Australia. When one considers the hours worked, it is obvious that the return to the dairy farmers is well below the average wage. Agriculture Department officers in the South-East have recently estimated that the dairy farmer on perhaps 200 acres or 300 acres, milking about 90 cows, receives on an average $10 000 a year. This estimate, of course, did not include the number of hours worked by husband and wife, which would be considerable.

They work seven days a week, milking cows twice a day, and work for about nine months or 10 months and often for 12 months of the year. Few dairy farmers have their cows calving in such a short period that they can take two months away from the cattle. That is the ideal, if it can be achieved.

On such a dairy farm, the minimum reasonable return should be about $17 000. On that figure, the farmer would be struggling to maintain capital, to pay off capital, and to maintain interest payments and run the farm, with no expansion of any kind.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: What amount of capital would be involved?

Mr. VANDEPEER: About $100 000, or a little more. The dairy farmers usually have an equity in the property of about $60 000 or $70 000, not including the house. Serious problems are being experienced in the area. Progress is being made with a dairy stabilisation scheme for the whole of the Commonwealth, and other schemes in which the State is involved. The Minister who just interjected is probably conversant with the facts about those schemes. We hope that the dairying industry in South Australia will pick up somewhat in the next year or so, but meanwhile I urge the Government to extend every consideration to the industry.

The beef industry is passing through what is probably one of the worst phases it has ever experienced. It is simply a matter of over-production caused by the loss of export markets. In the rural sector, we always have this threat hanging over our heads, especially knowing that 60 per cent of our production is exported. The loss of any part of that export market results immediately in over-production. We have lost not just a small part of our

export market, but a very large part of it; therefore, we are considerably over-produced. Proposals are afoot to relieve the pressure on the beef industry and to make it more efficient in future. First, we require a classification scheme, which is a worthy scheme and one which I wholly support, and I hope it will be introduced soon. Once that is established, proposals will be considered for new schemes of marketing.

Under this scheme, animals will be sold by a computer system. The animal is described and the buyer buys it on the description, not in the usual auction system but in a Dutch auction system in which the buyer is forced to pay the top price. The bidding starts at the top and goes down, and as soon as the bid reaches his price, the buyer will have to pay or miss out.

The dairying industry is in dire straits. The seasonal prospects in South Australia do not look good at present, and I hope the Government will consider favourably any drought relief proposals, if they should become necessary, although I hope they will not. This section of the community will need considerable assistance.

In paragraph 8 of the Opening Speech, the Government, in its usual manner, has stated that the building programme for housing and other construction in South Australia will carry on, but that the Government relies on an allocation of Federal funds. Once again, we have the State Government blaming the Federal Government and saying that it will proceed if Federal funds are provided. Paragraph 10 refers to the Roxby Downs copper discovery, but the Government should be making more positive statements about this discovery. A decision is yet to be made concerning uranium, one of the minerals to be mined at Roxby Downs, but the Government has not, in my opinion, taken positive action. We badly need industrial development, and development of a mineral resource would provide it. I am sure that the mineral resource is there: it has been proved, but it requires some assistance because of the uranium deposits. The Government is being backward and could assist industrial development in this area. The Opening Speech also referred to the programme mapped out for tourism in South Australia. The assistance given to tourism by this Government has been sadly lacking.

Mr. Mathwin: It's a disgrace.

Mr. VANDEPEER: I agree. The Government has made loud noises about what it has done but, as an example of the shortage of funds for tourism, I refer to grants for tourist roads. When such grants are made, one of the conditions imposed is that the local council shall supply money on a $1 for $1 basis. With other grants, councils are asked to supply only 20 per cent of the funds. The main reason for the Government asking for a $1 for $1 contribution from councils for tourist roads is that the allocation of funds for tourism is so small that, if the council was not asked to contribute at this rate, the figure would not be worth worrying about. It would not be worth taking out the bulldozer or the trucks to do any work. The Government asks for the support of the councils, but then it says it is doing wonderful things.

Mr. Mathwin: They are huffing and puffing in your district just like they are in mine.

Mr. VANDEPEER: That is so. Look what the Government was going to do at the old town and the old seaport at Robe! At the time of the recent election, the Government was going to spend $1 000 000 in Robe, but I do not think it has spent $1. It did the same with Beachport with a similar project. The Robe project was to compete with the old-town developments in Victoria. The old port was to have been developed to look as it did 100 years ago.

Mr. Mathwin: It was a dream.

Mr. VANDEPEER: That is so, and it has not come off. None of my dreams ever come off, and I am sure the Government's dreams will not be coming off, either. The Government is to continue its programme to provide accommodation for socially disadvantaged people. As the Minister of Community Welfare is present, I do not mind admitting to him that that is a commendable project. However, I hope that the Government will not concentrate disadvantaged people in one area. We have a considerable problem in Millicent for which the Government must take the full blame, because it has encouraged, allowed, or moved single-parent families of various categories into Millicent. Believe it or not we have about 100 to 150 such people who have been brought to Millicent because there happens to be available there a certain type of Housing Trust house. A concentration of these people means that their percentage in the population is high and creates a larger social problem in the community than is normal, because the community is not large enough to absorb it. I would therefore urge the Government not to continue this practice in future, if it is to continue to supply housing for disadvantaged people.

Mr. Whitten: Where do they come from, Mount Gambier?

Mr. VANDEPEER: Adelaide, or from anywhere. Some of them have even been imported from Melbourne. Most of them come from Adelaide, but some come from Whyalla, Port Augusta, you name it: they come from practically all over South Australia.

Mr. Whitten: Why would they all go to Millicent?

Mr. VANDEPEER: They have applied to the trust for houses, but houses have not been available for them except in Millicent where the trust constructed double units which have not been popular with other people and which they avoid if possible. The trust could not let the houses to people, because people refused to have them. Therefore, the houses were vacant for several years, and the trust stated that, if single parents wanted a house, the only house that would be available for them would be in Millicent, and those people moved into the houses. It is amazing how many people are accommodated in Millicent in this way. When there is a whole street of single-parent families and, in some cases, there are four or five people living together with three or four children, it creates quite a social problem. I hope that the Government will consider the problem, and not repeat the practice elsewhere in South Australia.

Today, we have already had a discussion about the economy that was conducted by the Minister of Mines and Energy when replying to a question. He probably considers himself to be the economist of the Government benches. In an article by Mr. P. P. McGuinness entitled "The solution to our economic problems" it is stated:

It is often overlooked by the economics profession, despite its claim to objectivity, it is generally crowded with bleeding hearts. The vast majority are frustrated welfare workers.

After having listened to the Minister today, I believe that that is an apt description. Mr. McGuinness's article sums up the economic situation well. It continues:

It is becoming increasingly evident that economic recovery in the world and especially in Australia, which lags behind world economic developments will be slow in coming. In Australia there is, on present policies, virtually no prospect of an improvement in the present high unemployment situation this year and quite probably through 1978 as well.

Later, Mr. McGuinness outlines proposals to lift the economy. I believe that the proposals that have been suggested by the Government follow closely the Keynesian line. The article continues:

The response of knee-jerk Keynesians is to call for Government spending, cuts in income taxes, and cuts in interest rates.

I apologise to the House for repeating a statement that has been quoted before, but it is a relevant statement that was made by the British Labour Prime Minister, Mr. Callaghan. He said:

We used to think that you could just spend your way out of a recession and decrease unemployment by cutting taxes and boosting Government spending. I tell you in all candour that that option no longer exists and that in so far as it ever did exist it worked by injecting inflation into the economy.

That is something that this Government has not yet faced up to: it has not really woken up to how much that statement sums up the economic situation. Today, the Minister of Mines and Energy urged that we should do something about unemployment and should not adopt the policy of reducing real incomes, because that is hard on school-leavers and increases unemployment, yet the Government does not offer a positive reason to solve the problem unless it is to adopt a policy that increases inflation. Mr. McGuinness's article continues:

Devaluation would be considered by them as part of the same package . . . The trouble with such proposals is that they dismiss as of minor significance the fact that, even though we are in the midst of the most severe recession since the great depression, we are also suffering from a rate of inflation which was absolutely unthinkable at that time, although there was, of course, the example of the post World War I German hyper-inflation. Australia was not a conquered, even though perhaps a subjected, country.

Inflation is a tremendous problem in our economy today. No good will be done for the country by increasing the inflation rate, because that will increase unemployment. Mr. McGuinness states that retail prices in Australia actually fell steadily during 1920 to 1929 and from 1930 to 1933 inclusive, that is, during the great depression. Today, retail prices are still rising, as are wages. Mr. McGuinness continues:

But, of course, in the current recession prices have continued to rise rapidly, at first lagging behind wage increases but now ahead of them. In such circumstances policy prescriptions, which are certain to have an inflationary impact, cannot lightly be recommended, nor is it sufficient to tack on proposals for price control as a means of overcoming this problem.

I agree that imposing price control would not do any good at all. Mr. McGuinness continues:

Any proposal for measures to relieve unemployment and promote economic recovery therefore have to take account of the fact that those which will push us back into accelerating inflation will at the most provide temporary relief since, by their effects on our exporting and import-competing industries, and by their general impact on the distribution of income and the profitability of capital (including the ability of industry to finance new investment from internally generated surpluses) they will worsen our problem. This is the major reason why Keynesian measures are not applicable to the current situation. In any case, it is arguable that they were not even appropriate in the depression.

Mr. McGuinness has summed up the situation well, and Government members should study carefully this article. As I say, they do not understand that, if the inflation rate increases, unemployment will get worse. What they and the unions do not seem to understand is that the wage cake is only just so big. If unions and those in employment today continue to demand higher wages (that is, a higher proportion of the wage cake) someone must go without. They are then forcing those unemployed to go without. This is a fact that they do not seem to be able to understand. If they stopped increasing their own wages, some of that money could be used to prevent unemployment by creating more investment moneys and more possibilities of investment, and thus expand our economy. They continue to ask for higher wages, and so we continue with an unemployment situation that is quite deplorable. Mr. McGuinness refers to unemployment, and I agree with him, when he says:

The problem of overcoming unemployment is essentially one of reducing the real wages of those actually in employment.

We are not union bashers. Unions, as I have said before, are necessary. I criticise the attitudes or policies of unions. I do not consider that as bashing unions. Government members crawl out of all their arguments against measures to bring our economy into better shape by saying that everything we say is union bashing. The article continues:

—so as to restore profits, which are, in Marx's words, "the engine of capitalist growth."

Marx is quite right; profits are the engine of capitalist growth. He did not like it but it provides the means for expansion. The article continues:

This is virtually impossible to achieve by limiting money supply growth when there is a powerful trade union movement and a highly institutionalised award wage structure which flatly refuses to see any connection between the level of real wages and the level of unemployment.

That is a statement that Government members could study carefully. They must realise that all wages and wage increases must be related to productivity. If productivity is not rising, we cannot expect to have a rise in wages.

Mr. Mathwin: If they get too much, they do themselves out of a job.

Mr. VANDEPEER: They do work themselves out of a job easily. Mr. McGuinness continues:

However, the present level of unemployment is a severe social problem, which ought not to be tolerated.

I agree with him.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Have you heard about indexation?

Mr. VANDEPEER: Yes. If you read articles on indexation, you will find that most economists will say that indexation is inflationary. I think the truth always hurts when it comes from this side. Mr. McGuinness continues:

No civilised society should accept that 350 000 people should be unemployed, the greater number of these certainly by no choice of their own. Nor should it accept that the only occupation now available to many school leavers is dealing in narcotics.

I agree with Mr. McGuinness. I do not agree that there should be any unemployment. I firmly believe that, if we are to relieve unemployment, those in employment must be willing to make some sacrifice. So much for Mr. McGuinness's article: it does not seem to have made much impression on Government members. Be that as it may, I shall continue by repeating that, if we are to get out of this situation we are in, we must relate wages to productivity.

I say something about the industrial democracy programme we are moving into in South Australia. An article by Mr. Tim Congdon that I have been studying states:

Calls for a greater measure of industrial democracy have been common recently. They have received much of their impetus in Britain from dissatisfaction with the prevailing economic system and from consequent demands

for an "irreversible shift" in the balance of power between labour and capital. It is no exaggeration, although not perhaps a compliment, to say that industrial democracy has become fashionable.

It is no wonder that our Premier is involved in industrial democracy, if it has become fashionable. Fashionable or not, it is difficult to know what is in the Premier's mind concerning industrial democracy. I should like to read from an article about someone else's opinion of the industrial democracy programme in the country of Yugoslavia. We all know that the Premier has sent one of our industrial leaders, Mr. Gnatenko, to Yugoslavia to study its industrial democracy programme. This article states that the Yugoslav system of worker management, is the prototype of industrial democracy, although there are several variations on the same theme. It is a useful and perhaps unique stepping stone towards a more general appraisal, but discussion is made difficult by the diversity and complexity of the Yugoslav system. I hope that Mr. Gnatenko can understand the complexities and diversities of the Yugoslav system. Concerning the system there, one article states:

A kaleidoscopic succession of drastic changes have taken place since the 1950's, and the system has not yet reached a fixed and stable form.

That describes the Yugoslav system at present. The article is very enlightening in many respects, and states:

It is not possible to own capital goods in Yugoslavia. But there is an incentive (of sorts) for the workers' council to make allocations to the business fund or, in other words, to invest. An allocation to the business fund adds to the firm's capital stock. This means a larger scale of operations and increased profit. Part of the extra profit may be attributed to the wage fund, thus increasing workers' take-home pay. The incentive is feeble, however, in comparison with a private property system—

The writer then describes the way investment capital is handled and the way it is encouraged to be invested, but says that, with all the changes they have made over the past 20 years, the result is still under-investment. Other articles I have read on the Yugoslav system of industrial democracy show that there has been, for some years, a drastic problem with the lack of investment finance. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted, debate adjourned.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Education) moved:

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

Motion carried.

Mr. VANDEPEER: Having referred to the industrial democracy programme that was being conducted by the Government and said something about the programme that exists in Yugoslavia, I believe that the programme being conducted in that country has resulted in a gross shortage of investment capital, and has also created a large unemployment problem. It seems unbelievable that an industrial democracy programme should do either of those two things, but there are several reasons for this. The system used in Yugoslavia does not encourage people to possess capital. Therefore, on any money that they save and invest as capital, they receive only the interest as a return. In most cases, they lose their capital, so who will save money to invest in industry if he gets only a return of perhaps $5 on $100 each year and loses the $100 that he has originally invested? However, apparently that is the position in Yugoslavia, and it has led to a big lack of investment capital. The report I have obtained states:

There are two consequences. First, the labour market is rigid and inefficient. Unemployment in Yugoslavia has been very high, even according to published official statistics, for many years. The ratio of vacancies to unemployment has consistently been the lowest of any O.E.C.D. country. The migration of Yugoslav workers to the freer economies of western Europe has been one response to the sparseness of job opportunities.

It is interesting that a socialist-communist country adopts a worker participation programme but can keep unemployment down only by encouraging those unemployed to move into the free enterprise economy of its neighbours. I do not think that that speaks highly of the industrial democracy programme. The article also states:

The financial return to owners of capital is likely to be reduced because they no longer have exclusive rights to do as they wish with their property. The almost certain result is a transfer of investment from those activties where control is diffused to those where it is not. Investment shifts from large-scale enterprise (where industrial democracy would most seriously impinge on the ownership-control nexus) to small-scale enterprises and residential property.

They have had a movement whereby people who save capital invest it not in industry but in residential property, because the people in Yugoslavia can own residential property, and this movement has been so extensive that it has resulted in the Government's bringing in controls. The writer continues:

In Yugoslavia, for this reason, legislation has recently been passed against luxurious second homes and seaside chalets.

I think that the industrial democracy programme in that country is having the wrong effect. Mr. Congdon also states:

"Industrial democracy" will be an effective rallying-cry for critics of both the liberal-capitalist and command economies for many years to come. But its supporters will tend to emphasise the rhetorical appeal of the idea and refrain from very detailed proposals.

Perhaps this may also be the case with our present State Government. Although it has put out proposals today, I find on a cursory glance at them that they are rather ambiguous. The writer continues:

Such a tactic is wise. Industrial democracy is less distant from the contractual freedoms of a private property economy than a centrally planned economy with total public ownership. But it is far enough away to make the attainment of the social optimum elusive and perhaps impossible.

Finally, he states:

Industrial democracy either rediscovers private property or degenerates into a command economy.

That sentence is worth remembering. This gentleman virtually says that, if you adopt an industrial democracy programme (doubtless with the proviso that it is carried out to the ultimate degree), it then either moves away from that policy and, as he says, rediscovers private property or degenerates into a command economy, that is, an economy under the complete control of Government departments—a communist economy. I am not really in favour of the Premier's industrial democracy programme, although I can see that workers need to have something done about the work they now carry out day after day. The monotony involved is unacceptable in a modern society, and I agree that something should be done about that. I believe that workers should know more about their industry, about the way their factories operate and the general economic policies followed by their company.

In our society the people who manage these large companies, the so-called "technocrates", are there because of their ability. It does not matter what one does, those people with ability always rise to the top. It cannot be any other way. Although we might advocate various means of allowing people to rise to the top, we have not yet

found a better system than that presently existing in Australia. So much for the industrial domocracy programme. I do not intend to take up much more time of the House but I should like to refer finally to a speech made by Mr. Roy Hattersly, United Kingdom Minister of State. Talking about the economy, I am pleased to see the member for Stuart in the House, because the honourable member stated last evening that Opposition members had not been talking about the economy. Mr. Hattersly stated:

You know that Britain has had a biding, indeed a chronic, problem of inflation. It is in part the result of the years of austerity we suffered from the beginning of the Second World War until the early '50s. It is in part the reaction of industrial workers to the peculiar difficulties they face during a period of major economic adjustments. That inflation is now being brought under control. We are now the only country in the free world in which the working population and the people who represent them have freely agreed to a policy of wage limitation. That policy, it was applied in 1975 and it will apply again well into next year, has already more than halved our inflation rate.

Mr. Keneally: We've got wage limitation in Australia—

Mr. VANDEPEER: Not to the extent introduced in Great Britain. That statement relates to what I was saying earlier about the economy, that wage increases must always take into consideration productivity. If there is not increased productivity, we cannot afford increased wages.

Mr. Keneally: It is determined more by capital investment than by wage demands. That's the problem in the United Kingdom, as you know.

Mr. VANDEPEER: Until those who are employed realise that they must make some sacrifices and limit their wage demands we will continue with the unemployment we have in Australia today. If the Fraser Government is allowed to continue with its policies (and I am sure it will be), it will get the inflation rate down and, when that happens, we will see a reduction in unemployment.

Mr. RUSSACK (Gouger): I support the motion, and I express regret that Sir Douglas Nicholls was unable to continue as Governor of South Australia. I vividly recall that in about 1936, when I was a youth, I was in Melbourne and had the privilege of being introduced to a young Aboriginal who was dressed in a nice navy suit and a shirt with white cuffs. I was told he was a league footballer, and his name was Douglas Nicholls.

Mr. Keneally: That is an incredibly patronising statement—to say that you were introduced to an Aboriginal who was dressed in a neat, blue suit and a shirt with white cuffs. That is appalling. What is so significant about an Aboriginal dressed in a neat, blue suit and a shirt with white cuffs? You don't say that kind of thing about a white Australian.

Mr. RUSSACK: It was my privilege about three years ago to be in Melbourne again, when I met the same gentleman and Lady Nicholls. In the intervening years I had followed his progress and achievements with great satisfaction.

Mr. Keneally: I hope he was still neatly dressed.

Mr. RUSSACK: I take objection to the interjections of the member for Stuart, who often makes unjustified inferences. I referred to Sir Douglas Nicholls because I wanted to show my respect for him, and I take objection to what the member for Stuart said.

The SPEAKER: Order! There have been enough interjections from both sides.

Mr. RUSSACK: I regret that this man, who embraces the Christian religion and who fearlessly endeavours to carry out the principles of that faith, could not continue in office as Governor of South Australia. I am sure that, had sickness not intervened, he would have discharged his duties as Governor of South Australia in a commendable manner. I wish him and Lady Nicholls every success in their retirement. I commend the Lieutenant-Governor, Mr. Walter Crocker, for the manner in which he is performing his duties.

I now refer to the four former members of Parliament who unfortunately have died since the opening of the previous session. Of those four former members, I knew only Sir Glen Pearson, whose assistance in years gone by I appreciated. I support what has already been said about Mr. Tom Stott's contribution to and guidance of primary industry in this State over many years. I express my sympathy to the relatives of the late Mr. Geoffrey Clarke and the late Mr. Howard Huntley Shannon.

I turn now to paragraph 3 of His Excellency's Speech. Apparently it is traditional for agriculture to be referred to early in the Speech. It is unfortunate that this year, as with last year, there has been uncertainty as far as the farming community and the harvest is concerned. The other day I spoke to a farmer and asked him what he considered was the greatest need for primary industry, and he said, "rain". Rain is still needed in a number of parts of the electorate that I represent. There has been relief in some areas, but rain is greatly required in others, so there can be a reasonable return.

Mention was made of the reduction in stock numbers in South Australia. During recent weeks there has been controversy concerning the export of live sheep. I commend those who were responsible for the recent successful shipment of live sheep from Wallaroo. It was hurriedly arranged, and I know there were difficulties regarding water. I thank the Engineering and Water Supply Department, which I know did its best, for in fact making it possible for that shipment to be effected. The township had some difficulties, but I am sure the local people responsible for any further shipments will solve these problems. I hope that in the future Wallaroo will see many more shipments of live sheep from that port.

When the new legislation was introduced restricting vehicle mass for the transportation of agricultural products, the Road Traffic Board agreed that there could be a 40 per cent overloading with a maximum speed of 50 kilometres an hour. This was very successful. The safety record of farmers in transporting grain and other products to the points of delivery has been maintained and was maintained during the period of 40 per cent overloading. It was a great disappointment when the *Government Gazette* of October 21, 1976, carried a notice from the Road Traffic Board, which reads:

Pursuant to the provisions of section 147 (6) of the Road Traffic Act, 1961-1975, vehicles carrying a class of load consisting of grain, grapes, fresh fruit or vegetables shall be exempted from the requirements of subsection (4) and (5) of section 147 subject to the following conditions . . .

It sets out that exception. Paragraph 5 states:

That the gross vehicle mass limit and gross combination mass limit applicable to the vehicle as shown on the certificate of registration may not be exceeded, by more than 40 per cent up to and including February 28, 1977. As from March 1, 1977, the limits referred to in this clause shall be reduced to 30 per cent and from March 1, 1978, shall be further reduced to 20 per cent in line with section 147 of the Road Traffic Act.

Following the reduction to 20 per cent on March 1, 1978, the conditions laid down in clauses 1 to 5 above shall no longer apply.

I appeal to the Minister of Transport to have this matter reconsidered. Many producers will be greatly disadvantaged

by this reduction from 40 per cent to 30 per cent this year and to 20 per cent next year. Because of the safety record, and because there seems no apparent reason for this lowering of the percentage, I appeal to the Minister for new consideration to be given to this matter, and I ask that the 40 per cent overloading for the transport of primary products be reinstated. Paragraph 12 of His Excellency's Speech states:

The effect of my Government's policy of expanding the electoral base of local government will become apparent in the ensuing year and my Government will continue to further its policy of encouraging local government to be responsive to and representative of its whole community.

That is a very good intention. I suggest that local government is representative and responsive in relation to government in the community. The elections of July 2 did not go smoothly; there were difficulties, frustrations and confusion. A report which appeared in the *News* of June 28, 1977, and which was headed "Voters roll chaotic—angry councils", stated:

South Australian councils are angry at the way the State Electoral Office has prepared the rolls for Saturday's local government elections. Councils say the new rolls are confusing and contain many anomalies. Under adult franchise, residents as well as ratepayers will be able to vote in Saturday's elections. Changes have also been made in company and partnership votes.

South Australian Local Government Association secretary, Mr. Jim Hullick, said today many member councils had written and telephoned their alarm at the possible inconvenience caused to elections on Saturday. "The association reminds all electors whether they appear on the roll or not, that they can demand a declaration vote if there is any confusion." A declaration under the Electoral Act allows voters to claim a vote if they think they are entitled to one, on the same basis for local government as Federal and State elections.

Mr. Hullick said the case had been clearly made for local government to have the responsibility for preparing its own rolls. "Obviously, the State Electoral Office does not know where people live and are unable to identify the wards in which to place people. We will be taking this to the Local Government Minister, Mr. Virgo, in the strongest terms to ensure that it does not occur in the future."

While that report refers to the difficulties experienced by electoral officers, I believe they had a job that was impossible to do in the time allocated. I refer also to a report in the Port Pirie *Recorder* headed "Election costs $1 per vote", as follows:

The aldermanic election held in Port Pirie last Saturday cost city council ratepayers almost $1 per vote. Alderman Bill Jones, who was one of two aldermen elected on Saturday, said this at the first meeting of the new city council on Tuesday night. He said that less than 1 000 people had voted in Saturday's poll which had cost the city council nearly $1 000 to conduct. Alderman Jones was highly critical of the state of the electoral rolls at the declaration of the polls on Saturday night and he again criticised the State Electoral Office at the council meeting.

I believe that the State Electoral Office did not have time to collate the rolls properly with the information it had to receive from local council clerks, because it was impossible for the clerks to prepare the information in the time allotted to them. The article continues:

He said this was the first local government election in South Australia in which anyone over 18 on the State electoral rolls could vote. The rolls provided to the returning officer, Mr. Darle Baker, three weeks before the election had 1 500 names missing. An amended roll, provided only two days before the poll, still had 300 names left off it. Many people who have voted regularly at local government elections over the years had become indignant when told their names were not on the roll. He said these people had left without voting when asked to sign a declaration form. Alderman Jones said it was their own choice not to vote, but their attitude was understandable. It was a disgrace that an election should have been held under such circumstances. Alderman Jones said the council should give serious consideration to asking the Spencer Gulf Cities Association to institute a move for compulsory voting at local government elections. He said it might also be wise for the State Electoral Office to assume responsibility for conducting elections. The council decided to refer the matter to the next S.G.C.A. meeting.

I do not agree with compulsory voting for local government, and I will have more to say about that matter later. I refer to the statement made by Alderman Jones that there was insufficient time, and I turn to the report of the debate in this House, at page 3085 of *Hansard*, dated March 31, 1977, when I said:

I express my appreciation to those people who have approached the Government and made these representations—

concerning the recent legislation on full adult franchise—because it is through this pressure that this otherwise unworkable Act (No. 77 of 1976) will become workable. I say this because I am sure that, because the Minister is so keen to have this legislation implementing the philosophy of adult franchise apply to local government elections in July, 1977, he would have had the Act proclaimed long before now. The Act was assented to on December 9, 1976, but it has not yet been proclaimed.

I suggest that it is because of the fiasco and the shemozzle that this legislation has caused in local government that it has been necessary to bring forward these amendments so that the Act can be implemented as soon as this present measure is passed by Parliament. If it is the Minister's intention (and I believe it is) that the provisions of the Act apply for the July local government elections, then this matter is being dealt with in indecent haste. In the preparation of rolls there is much work that must be done. The Electoral Commissioner is responsible for the compilation of the rolls and, in order to do that, it is necessary for councils and their clerks to be called upon to provide much data. I know that councils have been called upon to do additional work that has been most difficult for them to accomplish. This measure is being dealt with in indecent haste if the legislation is to apply to the July local government elections.

In reply, the Minister of Local Government said:

Yes, and that is the very reason why the Bill is now before us. The approach regarding this matter is well known to councils, which have been circularised. It is not, therefore, a matter of our foisting the matter on them. To their credit, all councils have co-operated extremely well with the Electoral Commissioner and the Electoral Office. The compilation of the rolls is well under way already and, although a few outstanding matters associated with nominee voting are being clarified by the Bill, the procedures are continuing.

I reject any suggestion that local government will experience great difficulty in implementing the scheme in the coming year. It will have no more difficulty in the coming election than it will for the elections to be held in 1978 or 1980. One could keep putting this off for another year for ever and ever, as there will always be some reason why a case could be stated. This problem has been somewhat magnified, as statistics show that elections are held in about only half the areas. So, we are not talking about all councils, anyway. Councils will have ample time to act between now and mid-June, when the rolls will be ready.

That was the Minister assuring the House, councils, and the people of South Australia that there would be no confusion as regards the election, but we know now what confusion resulted. The Minister said that there would be no more confusion in this election than there would be in 1978 or 1980. I hope the Minister is right. I hope that there will not be the confusion in future council elections that there was in the election on July 2, simply because the Minister wanted to push this franchise legislation through indecently, thus causing dissatisfaction and confusion. Regarding compulsory voting in council elections, an editorial in the *Recorder*, dated July 8, 1977, under the heading, "Compulsory voting", states:

Alderman Bill Jones has opened up a controversial subject with his proposal that the Spencer Gulf Cities

Association should push for voting in local government elections to be made compulsory. Certainly, the results of last Saturday's poll in Port Pirie were disappointing. Figures released at Tuesday night's council meeting revealed that it cost Port Pirie Corporation ratepayers something like $1 per vote to hold the election, which is a high price for democracy. Alderman Jones' proposal is worthy of serious consideration, but it is not a measure to be adopted lightly. For a start, council elections are held every year, not at three-year intervals as is the case with State and Federal elections. There are already complaints that we have too many elections—how will people react to being required to vote every year? Or do we further amend the system by only having local government elections every two or three years? If voting is compulsory, there will be more pressure on council candidates to get their message across to potential voters. This either means more cost to candidates and a narrowing in the number of people who can afford to stand or, alternatively, outside assistance—either in the form of grants from State or Federal Government to pay campaigning costs, or more likely from political parties. This then raises the spectre of Party politics becoming a real force in local government. Alderman Jones is right to be indignant at the poor turnout at the polls, but there must be doubt as to whether compulsory voting is the best answer. Perhaps, as a first step, we should be calling on the Local Government Minister (Mr. Virgo) to mount a sustained campaign to explain people's rights under the new local government electoral system and the role of the council in the community. If this fails to improve voting percentages, then it would be time to seriously consider introducing compulsory voting. In the meantime, it can do no harm to initiate a debate on the subject so that all points of view can be put forward.

That article contains some valid points. Compulsory voting in council elections would introduce Party politics into local government. I know it is there now in some instances, but it is undesirable that it should enter into local government.

Mr. Slater: Which Party has been endorsing candidates?

Mr. RUSSACK: There are many Caucus meetings before councils in this State, in the metropolitan area and elsewhere. If politics enter into local government I am sure that it would be most undesirable, and we would rue the day if it occurred. The *Recorder* related the fact that many people were dissatisfied that they were not on the roll because they did not have a nomination or had not nominated an agent by a certain date. I believe that the new adult franchise system was introduced too rapidly and too soon, and that no concerted effort was made to inform the people of their privilege in the matter. The only reference to transport in the Opening Speech was the following statement:

Further progress will be made this year on the Swanport deviation of the South-Eastern Main Road to allow through traffic to by-pass the town of Murray Bridge. The project includes what will be the longest road bridge in the State. This bridge will cross the Murray River approximately five kilometres down-stream from the present ageing structure at the town of Murray Bridge.

In recent days, we have heard much about local government finance and the present difficulties of local government. I want to speak about road funds. I have a news release dated February 25, 1977, from the Federal Minister for Transport (Hon. P. J. Nixon, M.P.). Amongst other things, the news release states:

I told my State counterparts that unless and until I can be certain the Government's priorities for local government are met, it is the Commonwealth's intention to channel its funds in such a way and to such an extent that there can be no credence to any claim that the Commonwealth is responsible for road funding difficulties at local government level. In indicating the Government's priorities, Mr. Nixon said, however, that he was prepared to listen to views and suggestions from the States as to how the Government's concern in the area of funding of local government might be met. Mr. Nixon said, "The Government has directed funds to the local government sector mainly through savings in allocations to urban arterial freeways.

I am sure that when I look at that allocation I will find that that is true. There has been a reduction in some categories. In 1976-77, the Federal Government made available $38 800 000 to South Australia for road grants. In 1977-78, that amount had been increased to $40 400 000, but there has been a decrease in national highways funding from $17 300 000 to $15 000 000. For national highway maintenance there has been an increase from $1 400 000 to $1 900 000, and for national commerce roads the allocation remains the same, $1 300 000.

For national highways last year we received $20 000 000 and this year it is $18 200 000, which is a reduction. I understand the reduction is because of the completion of the Eyre Highway, which is a national highway running through South Australia. Regarding other categories, for rural arterial roads last year the allocation was $3 300 000, whilst this year the allocation is $7 000 000, an increase in real terms of 87·7 per cent, after inflation has been taken into account.

For rural local roads there has been an increase from $5 300 000 to $6 700 000, an increase of 11·9 per cent in real terms. However, for urban arterial roads there was a decrease from $7 600 000 last year to $4 600 000 this year. For urban local roads there has been an increase from $1 100 000 to $2 200 000, an increase in real terms of 77 per cent. For Miters the increase has been from $1 500 000 to $1 700 000. From the news release and an understanding of what I have just outlined in regard to the allocation of the various categories to rural areas, one would assume that this year more money should be going to rural councils than was provided last year, but because of the reports I have received from various councils I believe there has not been that increase. I refer to a letter I received from the Clinton District Council (and other members have received a similar letter), which states:

Following advice from the Highways Department, which indicated that my council's road grants for 1977-78 have been reduced by some $10 000 from the amounts generally received in previous years (about $27 000), I have been directed to bring this matter before your notice. Furthermore, members of my council were of the opinion that the Federal Government had increased the allocation for distribution towards rural roads. Any inquiry into this disappointing state of affairs would be gratefully appreciated by my council.

I understand that the Commissioner of Highways is conscious of this situation, and I give him credit for the fact that he has visited country and rural councils, attended local government conferences, and explained the allocation of road funds. I have a copy of the speech made in which he started by saying:

The present is an opportune time to explain in some details the changes that have occurred in policy relating to the allocation and administration of grants generally.

The speech is too long to read, so I will quote only selected parts of it. It continues:

The responsibilities of councils are, of course, subject to and modified by powers and duties conferred by other legislation such as the Highways Act. Under the latter Act the Commissioner of Highways can take over specified powers of local government, in particular, the construction and maintenance of certain roads. The Commissioner of Highways uses his powers in this regard to assume responsibility for what broadly can be called the major road network of the State, that is, for those roads having the greatest importance to the State as a whole. At this stage, the Commissioner is responsible for something like 20 per cent of the length of the State's road system. Although this may seem a low percentage, it is pointed out that this part of the system carries something like 80 per cent of the total traffic (in vehicle/kilometres)

using the State's roads . . . It must be emphasised that road needs in a particular area are not static, and that no individual council can expect to receive any given proportion of funds, or indeed, any grants at all. Councils have no entitlement to any annual level of grants. Funds will be directed to areas of highest priority on a State basis, and it naturally follows that no council has an entitlement to a constant annual level of grants.

Although I appreciate fully the problem that confronts the Commissioner of Highways in determining the allocation of funds, I believe that the Federal Minister's intention has not been carried to its conclusion in this State and that the funds are being allocated on a State-wide basis, with the metropolitan area possibly receiving greater consideration than the rural sector. On April 5 this year I asked the following question of the Minister of Transport:

1. What amounts have been allocated by the Commonwealth Government and the Highways Department, respectively, for 1976-77 in the following categories:
   (*a*) rural local roads;
   (*b*) urban local roads; and
   (*c*) minor traffic, engineering and safety improvement?
2. Is it anticipated these amounts will be increased for the financial year 1977-78?

The Minister replied as follows:

1.

Road Category	Commonwealth 1976-77	Highways Department 1976-77
(*a*) Rural local	5 300 000	3 100 000
(*b*) Urban local	1 100 000	500 000
(*c*) Miters	1 500 000	Nil

2. It is anticipated that the Commonwealth Government allocations in these categories will be increased. State contribution to rural local and urban local roads will be decreased. State contribution to Miters will be nil.

I assume from that reply that the Federal Government has increased its allocation to rural road funding but that the State will decrease its allocation so that rural areas will not receive an increased allocation and greater sums will be spent in the metropolitan area and on committed work. I appreciate the problem facing those responsible for the allocation of funds, particularly where work has been committed. At the same time, I earnestly plead that adequate funds be channelled to local government, according to the intent of the contribution made by the Commonwealth Government.

I turn now to the beverage container legislation. I have been contacted by storekeepers in some towns in my district who are finding it impossible nowadays to sell cans with a deposit, because there is no collection depot nearby. I have previously said that some people were ignorant of their rights and privileges in connection with the council elections held earlier this year, because of the haste with which the electoral changes were made, and I believe that the same kind of situation applies in connection with the can legislation. There has been insufficient time for the depots to be organised so that everyone in business has the right to sell canned drinks. This is detrimental to many small businesses in some country towns, where they cannot sell canned drinks because there is no depot. I know it has been said that they can establish depots of their own, but that takes finance, which is unavailable to small business proprietors.

I appeal to the Minister for the Environment to do something expeditiously so that small business people in country towns can trade in canned drinks. For example, there are two delicatessens at Hamley Bridge that are unable to sell canned drinks; this was the situation in the latter part of last week, when I checked. Last week it was said that the same thing applied at Two Wells. I point out that there is a small town only 6·4 kilometres from Hamley Bridge, where the business people can sell canned drinks because the town is in a different council area and a depot is available. Small businesses are of immense value to this State. An article, headed "Trading hours change proposed", in today's *News* states:

Mr. McCutcheon said that, of the 9 835 retail outlets in metropolitan Adelaide, 7 927 employed staffs of four or less, including the manager.

That is an immense number of businesses of that type. We should all be doing everything possible to ensure that small businesses continue to operate, because such businesses, with an average staff of two, three or four employees, keep country towns alive. If each of the small businesses throughout the State employed one more person, many more thousands of people would be employed. I believe the work is there. Let us take as an example a delicatessen in a country town, or anywhere else. When an employee goes on leave, the proprietor of the small delicatessen (and I say, before I get any interjections from the other side, that I do not deny the standard of wages or the conditions of any employee; I believe that an employee is justified in having the best conditions possible) faces a difficulty. If an employee goes on his four weeks holiday with a 17½ per cent loading on his holiday pay, the delicatessen owner has to find about $550 to $600, which is an immense sum, and there is no possibility of that small delicatessen owner's being able to meet that cost.

There are other problems in the retail trade because a shop assistant must have every other Saturday morning off, or, where there are 20 employees or less, the proprietor or manager can determine that the employee has one Monday off each four weeks. For this to be done satisfactorily there has to be casual staff. Because of these situations, it is difficult for small businesses to increase their staff. I hope a formula can be found whereby small businesses can increase staff. If the 7 927 small businesses in the metropolitan area could all employ one more person, thousands more people would be employed in this State.

I know it is often said by members opposite that we on this side do not understand the trade union movement. That is because many people on the other side have been so vitally and directly involved with that movement. I believe that members opposite do not understand fully the position of private enterprise.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: I will have to—

Mr. RUSSACK: The Minister is a professional man, but I am speaking of traders. There must be discussion so that there is a better understanding on both sides. While speaking of unions and preference to unionists, I will read from a copy of the minutes of the annual general meeting of the High Schools Councils Association of South Australia held on Friday, April 29. When referring to preference for unionists, the minutes state:

Instruction from Minister as on page 862 *Education Gazette* No. 39 (24th November, 1976). Many schools not able to attend our meeting had written their decision and a summary of these was given by the Secretary. Lengthy and vigorous discussion took place on this subject by the 39 high school councils represented. Mr. Jim McDowall moved: "That this association write to the Minister of Education asking him to reconsider the instructions concerning ancillary staff preference to unionists, *Education Gazette* 24th November, 1976, since it may not necessarily operate in the best interest of school management and the children." This was seconded by Mr. Angus Schulz. An amendment was moved and seconded that the word "withdraw" be inserted in place of

"reconsider". This was carried. It was felt that "reconsider" was not strong enough. Voting on "withdraw" was 22 for and 17 against. The amendment became the motion and was carried.

The submission to tell us how the vote would have been had it stayed as it was. This result was 29 for and three opposed to that motion. Mr. Roger Swaine moved, "That an addition to this letter that there be a deputation to the Minister to present the views of the H.S.C.A. as detailed in correspondence and the minutes of tonight's proceedings." This was seconded by Mr. B. Jones and carried. Dr. Ian Walker supported the motion but feels Parliamentarians react to letters. It is suggested that each school council sends a letter to their local member of Parliament as to their views on this subject.

I have received many letters from school councils objecting to that instruction, which was sent out to high schools by the Minister of Education. I should like now to refer to the matter of pay-roll tax. Again, particularly in country areas, a problem exists regarding costs. I have before me a letter that was written by a gentleman who employs 30 people in the small country town of Alford, about 17 km north of Kadina. This gentleman, who has markets in Western Australia, produces certain farming implements such as harrows, and so on. I raise this matter to show that there are in the country people who are trying to employ skilled labour and others but who are finding it difficult to meet their pay-roll tax commitments.

This letter was inspired by an announcement made by the Premier, possibly last year, regarding pay-roll tax, and assistance being given in country areas to encourage decentralisation. Being enthused about this matter, a number of businessmen from the district met at Kadina and drafted this letter, which I believe was handed personally to the Premier when he visited Kadina last year. However, they have not yet received a reply. Whether the Premier is like many men who put letters in their pocket and do not take them out, I do not know. However, I appeal to him to answer this letter, which was written with good intentions to help in establishing industry in country areas, and to relieve businesses of most, if not all, of the burden of pay-roll tax. Dated November 10, 1976, and written by Mr. N. D. Newbold of Alford, the letter to the Premier is as follows:

We refer to the announcement by the State Government (*Advertiser* October 5, 1976) of your Cabinet's decision for assistance to businesses moving into or expanding in this area. A recent meeting of proprietors of locally owned small businesses who employ labour and pay pay-roll tax carried the following motion:

> We strongly object to the penalty of payment of pay-roll tax, realising that it is the businesses that create and maintain employment in this country area, and they should not be penalised for so doing.

We the undersigned feel that assistance should be offered to existing businesses who are employing labour. One area in which, we consider, assistance can be given is by exempting us from paying pay-roll tax. As an example, a cross-section of 10 local businesses employs 187 employees and pays $4 972 a month pay-roll tax. From this it can be seen that if exemption was given it would enable wages to be paid to an extra 10 to 12 people for little extra expense. This would, of course, reduce unemployment and lower our costs of production, which must assist to stem inflation.

Mr. Groth: They're after more profit.

Mr. RUSSACK: No. Members opposite say that they understand the trade union movement fully and that we do not. However, we understand private enterprise and the difficulties that it is going through now, while members opposite do not understand that. Every time an appeal is made by people in private enterprise, someone opposite says that they want more profit, but they do not want that. Besides his business, this man has other interests. He does not have to have his business for a living. If one investigated his situation, one would see that he was doing it to employ people. The letter also states:

We also feel that, with ever-increasing costs, including workmen's compensation, Government taxes, union demands, etc., many of us would be financially just as well off if we reduced our number of employees and curtailed our business activities, which in turn would considerably reduce our mental and financial problems. Most of us have a loyal group of employees who have worked with us for long periods. The last action we wish to take is to retrench these people. We want to keep our community. We don't want to add to unemployment or cause any hardship to any member of our community. However, we live in an area which is completely reliant on primary industry. Increased costs have eroded their spending power. This has restricted their ability to purchase the services and goods we have to offer. For these reasons, we strongly urge that consideration be given to our request for the exemption of the payment of pay-roll tax. We eagerly await your decision.

The letter is signed by representatives of several firms, such as the gentleman I have mentioned, and representatives of engineering firms in Maitland, retailers in Moonta and Kadina, and motor dealers and traders in Kadina, and on other parts of the peninsula. I appeal to the Premier to consider these genuine business people on northern Yorke Peninsula who employ many people and are trying to retain employment for them.

Mr. Slater: Doesn't that apply everywhere throughout the State, not just up there?

Mr. RUSSACK: Yes, but the Government assisted certain industries regarding pay-roll tax relief and, if it can do that to induce new industry, why can it not assist existing industry so as to retain employment in country areas?

Mr. Groth: You fellows didn't assist the Trades Hall.

Mr. RUSSACK: I ask the honourable member to look at the receipts. Small businesses in country towns help to keep the community alive. I appeal to the Government to give every consideration to assisting in these interests I have brought before the House.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. WARDLE secured the adjournment of the debate.

MOTOR FUEL DISTRIBUTION (TEMPORARY PROVISIONS) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendment:

Page 4—After clause 15 insert new clause 15A as follows:

15A. (1) In this section "Emergency Order" means an order made pursuant to subsection (2) of this section.

(2) The Minister may, by order in writing, direct a person—

(*a*) to take such action;
or

(*b*) to refrain from taking such action, in relation to the supply or distribution of motor fuel, as is specified in the order, where, in the opinion of the Minister, the giving of that order is necessary for the operation of a service or facility that, in the opinion of the Minister, is essential for the health, safety or welfare of persons.

(3) A person to whom an Emergency Order is directed shall not, without reasonable excuse refuse or fail to comply with that order.

Penalty: One thousand dollars.

(4) A person shall not—

(*a*) prevent a person from complying with an Emergency Order;

(*b*) hinder or obstruct a person in his compliance with an Emergency Order;
or

(*c*) counsel or procure a person to contravene an Emergency Order.

Penalty: One thousand dollars.

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour and Industry): I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment be disagreed to.

This amendment substantially alters and expands the scope of the Bill. The Bill simply seeks to deal with a situation in which, for whatever reason, a shortage of fuel exists. In such a case the Bill provides the means by which the available fuel can be used equitably where it is most needed. The amendment tries to convert the Bill into one that gives an overriding power to, in effect, control the whole of the oil industry, including its industrial relations

Serious implications could arise out of this. To expand power in this way would require consultation with all the parties involved, and would need much more consideration than we have time for at present. Time will be given later to debate the whole issue in greater depth. As I warned the House yesterday, there will be more permanent legislation brought into this House later this session. If the Opposition wants to debate it further, it will be given every opportunity to do so. The Opposition has been told that this is emergency legislation that the Government requires. If the Opposition wishes to raise these questions the appropriate time will be when the Government's Bill for a permanent measure is being considered. The present Bill is virtually identical with legislation which was used successfully as a short-term stop-gap measure in 1972 and 1973, and which was passed unanimously at that time. As I see no good reason why it should not be passed today in the same way, the Government opposes the amendment.

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition obviously supports this amendment because, although it has been brought in in a slightly different way, by adding a new clause following clause 15, it brings into effect what would have been the same intent as the amendment moved in this House.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: As it was?

Mr. TONKIN: It is exactly what it is meant to do, and it is predictable that the Minister will not have a bar of it. In the earlier debate the Minister made his position quite clear on this matter. He has not changed from it, but he is just as illogical. He does not make sense on the matter at all and, in going further than he did in his explanation made in this place in the Committee stage, he has put his foot into it even further. He says that this legislation is designed to operate when there is a shortage of fuel. He wants the power to be able to ration the fuel available: if there is a quantity of fuel available for the community, he wants the power to ration it. He is not willing to accept any power and, therefore, obviously he is not willing to accept the responsibility to take positive action in this regard, and this amendment, this new clause (which will be in addition to the existing clause 15) gives him the power not only to prohibit or restrict movement of any specific consignment of bulk fuel, but will also enable him to require the movement of any specific consignment of bulk fuel.

Every member knows that this legislation is being introduced in anticipation of some form of industrial action. Fuel rationing may well become necessary, but when it does there will be no value in the Minister's having the ability to ration fuel if there is no fuel available for him to ration simply because he lacks the power to require consignments of fuel to be delivered to delivery points where they can be rationed.

Mr. Mathwin: What is he frightened of?

Mr. TONKIN: Of course. It is ridiculous that this situation should obtain. This is the only sensible amendment that could make total sense of the legislation. When I said the Minister had put his foot in it even further, he has. He has said that there was not time to consider the sort of amendment proposed by the Opposition here and which has now been introduced by the other place. There was not time to consider all the deep ramifications of this. What he really meant was that there was no time to get permission and his orders from his union bosses. Having said that, he went on to say that similar legislation was introduced in 1972 and 1973, and it was certainly passed.

The Minister seems to imply that there has been no change since then. What he is really saying is that he has had time since 1972 and 1973 to have discussions for which he now says he has not had time. He makes no sense at all. The answer to it is exactly the conclusion we came to before: that is, that the Minister is willing to take any action he can to back up industrial action. In other words, to prohibit the movement of motor fuel, but he is not willing to accept the power and therefore the responsibility to make certain that people in the community get available supplies of motor fuel after they are rationed in the fairest possible way. That is what it comes to. This will be said to be a sham.

All the Minister is asking us to do is to pass legislation to ensure that the union or union official taking part in any sort of industrial activity will be backed up by Government action, and if he is asked to do anything more he will be able to say, "I am sorry, I cannot help you, the Act prohibits me from requiring that fuel be moved." It is taking away from the Minister the responsibility that he should have. I challenge him once again to accept the responsibility that is implied in this amendment and do his job as a responsible Minister of the Crown.

The Committee divided on the motion:

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

Noes (19)—Messrs. Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin (teller), Vandepeer, Venning, Wardle, and Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Jennings and Virgo. Noes—Messrs. Allen and Coumbe.

Majority of 2 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

The following reason for disagreement was adopted:

Because the amendment alters the concept of the legislation.

Later:

The Legislative Council intimated that it did not insist on its amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House at its rising do adjourn until Tuesday, August 16.

Motion carried.

At 5.46 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, August 16, at 2 p.m.