

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**

Tuesday, August 6, 1974

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

**QUESTIONS**

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

**FIRE FIGHTERS**

In reply to Mr. EVANS (July 25).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The preliminary draft of the new Country Fires Bill now being prepared follows closely the recommendations of the report of the working party appointed to inquire into the functioning of country fire service organizations. That report does not contain any recommendation for the integration of all fire-fighting activities and the employment of professional fire fighters. In fact, the contrary is the case. In submissions to the working party during the course of its inquiries, councils and Emergency Fire Services organizations expressed the virtually unanimous opinion that the traditional nature of country fire-fighting bodies should remain unchanged, and I have repeatedly stated publicly that, in the Government's plans for reorganization, their voluntary character will be retained.

**YORKETOWN SCHOOL**

In reply to Mr. BOUNDY (July 31).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I confirm the statement in my preliminary answer to the honourable member that the new complex at Yorketown will be in Samcon Mark III construction. The complex will include classrooms, art and craft accommodation, and a resource centre for the high school; classrooms and resource area for the primary school; one administration building, and a physical education/activity/music/drama complex for shared high and primary use. Present planning provides for construction to commence in October of this year, with completion by August, 1975. However, I must emphasize that these dates are estimates only, and may be subject to factors outside our control that may lead to their variation.

**PRE-SCHOOL EDUCATION**

In reply to Mr. LANGLEY (July 30).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The South Australian Pre-School Education Committee, under the chairmanship of Judge Olsson, is making a survey of the present position and the future needs for pre-schools. When this is complete it will be possible to prepare a rational plan for the siting of pre-schools, so that the needs of all pre-school children can be met. The needs of the Unley area will be kept well in mind, and the honourable member's suggestions regarding the use of school buildings will be forwarded to the committee.

**MODBURY WEST SCHOOL**

In reply to Mrs. BYRNE (August 1).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If present plans are maintained, tenders for the construction of a new infants school at Modbury West should be called during October this year with a planned completion date of November 1975.

**OUTER METROPOLITAN PLAN**

In reply to Mr. McANANEY (July 25).

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Representations on the Outer Metropolitan Planning Area Development Plan and the action to be taken thereon were considered by the State Planning Authority in April and again in June this year. Revisions to the plan are being made and it is expected that the State Planning Authority will be able to submit the plan to me in September or October this year. Provided I am satisfied with the plan, I hope to be able to make a recommendation to the Governor for authorization forthwith.

**TRUST FUNDS**

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What trust fund accounts and balances were held by the Treasurer on June 1, 1970, and June 30, 1974, respectively, on behalf of—

- (a) various bodies, upon which interest is paid; and
- (b) the Australian Government and other bodies, upon which no interest is paid?

2. What funds were held by the Treasurer to cover these liabilities on the respective dates, and how were they employed?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Information showing the various trust accounts and balances totalling \$18 402 000 held on interest bearing and non-interest bearing accounts as at June 30, 1970, are shown on pages 333 and 334 of the Auditor-General's Report for 1969-70. The information is not published separately for June 1, 1970.

2. Funds held on deposit with the bank on June 30, 1970, to cover liability for trust funds and other accounts are shown on page 321 of the Auditor-General's Report for 1969-70, and amount to \$48 750 000. Similar information in respect of June 30, 1974, is being compiled, and will be published in the Auditor-General's Report for 1973-74.

**FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE**

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. What has been the delay in construction of the Flinders Medical Centre project caused by the concrete industry dispute?

2. Is it expected that the projected time of completion of February, 1976, will be met, and, if not, when is it expected that the medical centre will be completed?

3. What action will be taken to ensure continuity of medical student training, if the medical centre will not be completed on time?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. It is estimated that the recent strike by concrete batchers, followed by a more recent concrete drivers' strike has caused a five to six weeks delay in the building programme.

2. The completion of the first section of in-patient accommodation by early 1976 will need to be reviewed. However, this review is not possible until builders' claims for extensions of time have all been received and assessed.

3. If such an emergency arose, the Joint Planning Committee of the Flinders Medical Centre on which the Hospitals Department, the Flinders University, and the Public Buildings Department are represented, would decide on appropriate measures in the light of the situation at the time.

**OSMOND TERRACE HOSPITAL**

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. When did the Osmond Terrace Hospital first admit patients for treatment for acute alcoholic and other drug effects?

2. How many beds are available for these patients at this hospital, and what is the total number of beds now available in South Australia for such patients?

3. What is the daily bed occupancy of the Osmond Terrace Hospital at present, and what is the average total number of daily in-patients?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. The Government does not take possession of Osmond Terrace Hospital until September 4, 1974. Date of initial intake of patients is not known at this stage.

2. Thirty beds will be available at Osmond Terrace Hospital. After September 4, the total will be 112.

3. Not applicable—see answer to 1.

**SALT DAMP**

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (on notice): What have been the results so far of the inquiries of the committee set up in South Australia to study salt damp?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: A review of published literature and work throughout the world at physically similar geographical sites, and a study of the methods and techniques of salt damp treatment contractors is currently being undertaken. Present indications are that the salt damp problem is complex, and varies with the locality, the type of subsoil, the building material and building practice. This review is to be followed by a survey throughout the State to ascertain the extent of the problem, and the social and economic effects on the community.

**PREMIER'S OVERSEA VISITS**

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. What were the reasons for the Premier's travel overseas during the recess between this session and the previous session of Parliament?

2. What specific topics and areas of interest were studied?

3. When does he intend to report on these matters to Parliament?

4. On what day did he leave South Australia for overseas the first time and on what day did he next arrive back in Australia?

5. What are the details of his movements with specific reference to cities and towns visited on each of the days he spent away from South Australia until he first returned to Australia?

6. At what point in his itinerary did he interrupt his travel overseas to return to Australia?

7. Was the decision to return at this time made before or after the time of his initial departure, and for what reason was it made?

8. What persons accompanied him and/or were officially attached to his entourage at any time during his periods abroad, for what periods respectively were they so attached, and what were the duties of each such person?

9. What are the details respectively of the movements, with specific reference to cities and/or towns visited on each of the days during the period of the Premier's return to Australia, of each of the members of his entourage remaining in Europe?

10. What specific topics and areas of interest were studied by each of these officers during that period?

11. What are the details of the Premier's movements with specific reference to cities and/or towns visited on each of the days which he spent in Australia until he next departed for overseas?

12. On what day did he next leave Australia for overseas and on what day did he subsequently arrive back in Australia?

13. Did he resume his planned itinerary on his return to Europe at the point of his previous departure and, if not, what part of his itinerary as originally planned did he omit?

14. What were the details of his movements with specific reference to cities and towns visited on each of the days which he spent in Europe following his arrival on the second occasion until he next arrived back in Australia?

15. What was the total sum of the expenditure incurred by the Premier and members of his staff in fares, accommodation, and other travelling expenses, 'entertainment expenses, and all other expenses charged to the Government during the period from the date of his first departure from the State until the date of his final return to South Australia on completion of his overseas tour?

16. What are the details of charges to the South Australian Government incurred in respect of fares and travelling expenses by him and/or any member of his staff in returning to Australia and in subsequently returning to Europe?

17. What charges to the South Australian Government were incurred in respect of travelling expenses and accommodation expenses within Australia by the Premier and any accompanying members of his staff during this intervening period?

18. What total charges to the South Australian Government were incurred by those of his officers who remained in Europe during that period?

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. During the Premier's overseas tours in April, May and June, what staff and departmental advisers accompanied him and for what days?

2. When the Premier returned to Australia during early May, for what reasons did he return, and did any of his staff or advisers return to Australia with him?

3. If the staff did not return, what was their itinerary and activities whilst the Premier was in or travelling to and from Australia?

4. What was the total cost (travel, accommodation, and incidental) incurred by the Premier's staff and advisers during the overseas visit?

5. For what reasons did the Press Secretary accompany the Premier on these overseas tours?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies to the questions of the members for Bragg and Davenport are as follows:

1. The principal purpose of my visit and that of the officers was:

- (1) To discuss with the new Agent-General on the spot the working of his office.
- (2) To hold discussions with Imperial Chemical Industries on the Redcliff project and to examine a prototype of the works.
- (3) To look at new towns and industrial estates with particular relevance to Monarto and Redcliff.
- (4) To examine experience of and laws concerning worker participation, job enrichment and co-determination in England, France, Sweden, and West Germany.
- (5) To examine regional cultural centres of relevance to the work of the South Australian regional cultural centre working party.

- (6) To examine tourist development in:
- (a) Cornwall, of relevance to a comprehensive tourism proposal for the Cornish mining areas of South Australia.
  - (b) Of interpretative historical centres as an alternative to Swan Hill type development.
  - (c) Of high density tourist centres in the Languedoc-Rousillon areas of France that preserve large areas of coast in their natural state.
- (7) To examine the working of craft industry authorities in Sweden and Finland of relevance to the newly established authority in South Australia.
- (8) To examine the component housing industry in Sweden.
- (9) To examine work in the studios of the consultant planners of Monarto in Stuttgart and Cologne.
- (10) To have discussions with potential industry developers, and see the plant for uranium centrifuge development and cabin-taxi development in Munich.
- (11) To see the Tivoli Gardens in Denmark in view of the Torrens Bank development in the city of Adelaide Urban Systems Study.
2. The areas outlined above.
  3. It would be neither desirable nor possible to give to Parliament a diary account of all the matters studied. The conclusions arrived at on several matters have already been stated. In other cases the information gleaned will be detailed when the relevant topics are before the House.
  4. Departed from South Australia on April 6, 1974, but spent some days on private leave in Europe (during which the Premier paid his accommodation and other expenses personally). The Premier arrived in London on April 12, beginning official engagements on April 15, and returned to Australia on May 1.
  5. The details of the Premier's movements are:

Date	Place	Programme
April 16-17.....	London .....	Discussions with Agent-General, meetings with Bank of Adelaide and worker participation authorities.
April 18.....	London, Wilton and Teeside	I.C.I. Petro-chemical complex (Wilton).
April 19.....	London, Exeter, Cotehele, Morwellham, Plymouth	Interpretative centres, tourism development.
April 20-21.....	Tintagel, Newquay, Tolgus Porthcurno, St. Ives	Cornish tourism developments including Tolgus tin mine, theatre development.
April 22.....	London, Paris.....	Australian Ambassador, bank directors, French Government officials, S.A. Government reception.
April 23.....	Paris.....	Meetings with leading French industrial and commercial interests.
April 24.....	Marseille, Fos.....	Urban housing and industrial projects.
April 25.....	Marseille, Montpellier, La Grande Motte, Sete, Cap D'Agde Perpignan	Tourism development.
April 26.....	Marseille, Grenoble.....	New city, urban housing, cultural centre visits.
April 27.....	Grenoble, L'Isle D'Abeau, St. Etienne, Firminy, Paris	Visits to new towns and Maison de la Culture.
April 28.....	Paris.....	Visit to urban development in Paris area.
April 29.....	Brussels, Louvain la Nouve	Visit to Louvain la Nouve new town. Dinner Trade Commissioner.
April 30.....	Brussels, Paris, London . . .	Theatre de la Commune d'Aubevilliers.
May 1.....	London, Australia.....	

6. The Premier's itinerary was interrupted on leaving London at 1900 hours (local) on Tuesday, April 30.

7. Before. The bookings for return to Australia were made prior to departure for Europe. When the Commonwealth election was announced, it was decided to extend the period of the return visit from eight to 12 days. The purpose of my return was to make essential decisions in relation to Budget and other matters which could not be made at any other time than early in May. The Government had earlier this year commenced a new pro-

cess of forward planning of the Budget to establish guidelines for a three-year period. As the guidelines developed, decisions had to be taken early in May to allow planning by departments to continue and to provide the basis for material to be supplied to the Commonwealth for the Premiers' Conference. It was not possible to make these decisions from Europe. While the topics listed above provided a heavy programme for six weeks, there was no such unbroken period available to me this year to carry out oversea study.

Name	Period	Duties
S. R. Wright.....	Throughout visit.....	Personal Secretary.
P. R. Ward.....	Throughout visit except period when Premier returned to Adelaide.	Executive Assistant to undertake executive duties as directed.
A. E. Baker.....	Throughout tour except period when Premier returned to Adelaide.	Press Secretary for liaison with television, press, radio and other media. To provide speech notes for the Premier. For research and other duties as directed.
R. D. Bakewell.....	From May 15, 1974 . . .	Permanent Head of Department to advise and study matters related to the second stage of visit.
H. J. Bailly.....	Was overseas during this period in official capacity for Art Gallery and liaised with party in France and during period April 26, 1974 to April 28, 1974.	Director, Art Gallery; Chairman, Festival Theatre Trust.

Name	Period	Duties
A. G. Steel.....	Was overseas on matters related to 1975 Festival of Arts and liaised with party in Stuttgart to consider festival plans.	General Manager, Festival Centre Trust.
W. M. Scriven.....	Munich May 30, 1974, to June 2, 1974, to accompany party on specific joint venture discussion. Had other duties in relation to petro-chemical project.	Director, Development Division.

  

8. It is pointed out that I was involved in a shorter period of overseas tour than the Premiers of Queensland, New South Wales, and Victoria, and than the members of the Opposition on overseas study tours paid for by the Government. In addition, the staff taken by me was smaller than that accompanying the Premiers of Queensland and New South Wales.	development, urban housing schemes, central and local governmental arts programmes and tourism development.
9. Mr. Ward and Mr. Baker travelled from London via the Netherlands (staying in Amsterdam May 3-7), West Germany (Hamburg May 8) and Denmark (Copenhagen May 9-13) arriving Stockholm May 14 to meet with me on my return from Australia.	11. I visited Melbourne on May 7 and 8, and my fare and accommodation were paid by the Australian Labor Party. Also on May 7, I visited Monarto with the Commonwealth Minister of Urban Development, Mr. Uren. On May 9, I visited Sydney—accommodation and fare paid by the Australian Labor Party. For the rest of the period I remained in Adelaide and attended Cabinet discussions and conferences with Treasury officials.
10. They completed administrative details following the first part of the visit, and made arrangements for the second. They also studied policy aspects of new town	12. Departed May 14, 1974, returned June 7, 1974.
	13. Yes. However, as a result of the longer period than intended in Australia some of the work was telescoped and planned short visits to London were eliminated.
	14. As below:

  

Date	Place	Programme
May 16-17.....	Stockholm.....	Meetings with Swedish Prime Minister, Industry Minister, Swedish parliamentarians. Meetings with Director-General, National Board of Occupational Safety and Health, and with Swedish Trade Unions. Visit SAAB-SCANIA, Dinner Housing Co.
May 18.....	Stockholm.....	Visit to Stockholm City Hall and tour of new town development.
May 19.....	Nassjö.....	Meeting housing executive.
May 20.....	Vetlanda/Goteborg.....	Visit housing development companies and Volvo executives.
May 21.....	Goteborg.....	Visit to Volvo factory. Discussions with Workers' Council.
May 22-23.....	Helsinki/Tapiola/Stockholm	Visit Tapiola and Finlandia Hall. Return to Stockholm. Administrative engagements.
May 24.....	Stockholm.....	Visit factory built housing company.
May 25-26.....	Stuttgart.....	Meeting with State and local government officials.
May 27.....	Cologne.....	Discussions with Mr. Kazanski, Mr. Fred Otto.
May 28-29.....	Cologne/Dusseldorf/Bonn ..	Visits to Studio Kazanski and local urban developments.
May 30.....	Munich.....	Call on Bundesverband der Deutschen Industrie. Meeting with Confederation of German Employers Federation. Meeting with trade union leaders. Dinner Australian Ambassador.
May 31.....	Munich/Ottobrunn.....	Visit automotive factories.
June 1.....	Copenhagen.....	Visit head office and factory of Messerschmidt at Ottobrunn and briefing on ground transportation systems. Uranium enrichment process.
June 2-3.....	Tehran.....	Visit Tivoli Gardens. Dinner Australian Ambassador.
June 4.....	Singapore.....	Discussions Shiraz Festival, including Minister of Culture.
June 5.....	Singapore/Sydney.....	Discussions with S.A. Government trade agent.
June 6.....	Sydney.....	Development discussions.
June 7.....	Sydney/Canberra.....	Premiers' Conference.

15. Some debits and some credits are still outstanding, but the total cost is about \$59 000. It should be noted that, in addition to fares, accommodation and expenses, this includes the cost of official receptions given in Paris and Stockholm and of presentations to foreign dignitaries.

16. Total cost of return air fares for Premier and Private Secretary were about \$4 500.

17. See answer to 11. Fares and accommodation for the staff member accompanying me were, as is usual, met by the South Australian Government.

18. Total charges are not yet known, as normal accommodation and expenses pertain. It was carefully considered that it was a financial saving to leave these officers in Europe rather than fly them back to Australia.

#### MINISTERS' ABSENCES

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. What Ministers have been away from South Australia during the recess between this and the previous session of this Parliament, for what periods, and at what times respectively?

2. What other people, whose expenses were wholly or in part charged against the Government, accompanied each Minister and what respectively were their costs to the Government in each case?

3. What was the total cost to the Government in each case?

4. What was the greatest number of Ministers absent from the State at any one time and during what period was this number absent?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Details are as follows:

Minister	Period of absence	Times-dates of absences:		Other Persons (expenses wholly/part charged against Government) who accompanied Minister	Their costs to Government	Total cost to Government in each case (presumably each Ministerial party)	What was greatest number of Ministers absent from State at any one time? What period was this number absent?
Premier.....	About 9 weeks (ret. to Aus. during this period)	6/4/74	7/6/74	Ret. to Aust. during this period	Not yet available		4 Ministers absent overseas—
		6/4/74	7/6/74	S. Wright (Personal Secretary)			Premier,
		6/4/74	7/6/74	A. E. Baker (Press Secretary)			Min. of Works,
		15/5/74	7/6/74	R. D. Bakewell (Director, Premier's Department)			Attorney-General,
		6/4/74		P. R. Ward (Executive Asst.) proceeded on annual leave as from 8/6/74			Min. of Agriculture
Minister of Works, Hon. J. D. Corcoran	9 weeks	28/5/74	30/7/74	Mrs. J. D. Corcoran	Not yet available		May 28-June 7-
		28/5/74	30/7/74	L. W. Brooks (Secretary, Min. of Works)			11 days
		28/5/74	7/6/74	R. J. Daugherty (Ply. Counsel)			
		15/5/74	3/7/74	K. J. Shepherd (Enr. for Water Resources)			
		4/6/74	6/8/74	J. C. Killick (Enr., Water Res. Branch)			
		4/6/74	6/8/74	H. T. Tuckwell (Admin. Ofcr., Water Res. Br.)			
Chief Secretary, Hon. A. F. Kneebone	9 weeks	2/7/74	4/9/74	L. B. Gard (Dr. of Correctional Services)	\$5 700*		
		2/7/74	4/9/74	Mrs. A. F. Kneebone	\$4 300*	\$14 300	
		2/7/74	4/9/74	Mrs. L. J. King	\$4 300*		
Attorney-General, Hon. L. J. King	11 weeks	12/5/74	27/7/74	I. E. Cox (Dr. of Com. Wel.)	Not yet available		
		12/5/74	14/7/74	G. J. Crafter (Pers. Sec.)			
		12/5/74	27/7/74				
Minister of Agriculture, Hon. T. M. Casey	7 weeks	7/5/74	25/6/74	Mrs. T. M. Casey	Not yet available	\$19 917 as at	
		7/5/74	25/6/74	A. F. Tideman (Chief Ag., Dep. Agriculture)	\$3 608	31/7/74, but final	
		7/5/74	25/6/74	R. D. Walkerden (Sec., Min. of Agriculture)	\$3 535	costs not available	
				* Estimate only.			

**AIRCRAFT CHARTER**

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. On how many times did Ministers travelling on Government business make use of charter aircraft in each of the financial years 1971-72, 1972-73 and 1973-74, respectively?

2. In respect of each of these occasions—

(a) which Minister or Ministers were involved;

2.

Trip No.	(a)	(b)
(i)	Premier (and Minister of Agriculture) . .	11
(ii)	Premier.....	4
(iii)	Premier.....	5
(iv)	Premier.....	2
(v)	Minister of Transport.....	5
(vi)	Minister of Transport.....	5
(vii)	Minister of Transport.....	4
(viii)	Minister of Agriculture.....	5

1972-73

(i)	Premier.....	6
(ii)	Premier.....	4
(iii)	Premier.....	2
(iv)	Premier.....	5
(v)	Premier.....	4
(vi)	Premier.....	3
(vii)	Premier.....	2
(viii)	Minister of Health.....	4
(ix)	Minister of Health.....	5
(x)	Minister of Community Welfare (and Deputy Premier).....	7
(xi)	Minister of Transport.....	6
(xii)	Minister of Transport.....	2
(xiii)	Minister of Agriculture.....	4
(xiv)	Minister of Agriculture.....	4

1973-74

(i)	Premier.....	3
(ii)	Premier.....	2
(iii)	Premier.....	5
(iv)	Premier.....	3
(v)	Premier.....	3
(vi)	Premier.....	3
(vii)	Premier.....	4
(viii)	Minister of Works (and Minister of Forests).....	10
(ix)	Minister of Works.....	1
(x)	Minister of Works.....	1
(xi)	Minister of Works.....	1
(xii)	Minister of Works.....	1
(xiii)	Minister of Works.....	1
(xiv)	Minister of Works.....	1
(xv)	Minister of Works.....	1
(xvi)	Deputy Premier.....	2
(xvii)	Minister of Works.....	1
(xviii)	Minister of Works.....	1
(xix)	Minister of Works.....	1
(xx)	Minister of Health.....	5
(xxi)	Minister of Lands.....	5
(xxii)	Minister of Lands.....	9
(xxiii)	Minister of Agriculture.....	1
(xxiv)	Minister of Agriculture.....	4
(xxv)	Minister of Agriculture.....	1
(xxvi)	Minister of Agriculture.....	2
(xxvii)	Minister of Agriculture.....	15
(xxviii)	Minister of Development and Mines . .	8

(b) what was the total number of persons in the party;

(c) what was the destination of the flight; and

(d) what was the cost of the charter?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1.

1971-72 .....	8
1972-73 .....	14
1973-74 .....	28

1971-72

(c)	(d)
	\$
Mount Gambier.....	282
Wardang Island.....	80
Loxton.....	96
Ex Mount Gambier.....	188
Kingscote .....	80
Cummins .....	172
Mount Gambier.....	188
Port Lincoln.....	128

1972-73	
Port Augusta.....	144
Peterborough.....	132
Whyalla . . .	121.60
Renmark-Wilpena.....	283.75
Warooka . . .	105
Kangaroo Island.....	80
Renmark.....	110
Cummins.....	132
Cowell.....	114
Mount Gambier.....	446.15
Mount Gambier.....	188
Whyalla.....	136
Penong .....	316
Parndana .....	80

1973-74	
Naracoorte . . . . .	152
Loxton . . . . .	104
Whyalla to Pt. Pearce . . . . .	128
Waikerie.....	94.50
Naracoorte.....	171
Port Lincoln.....	144
Mount Gambier to Portland to Millicent . .	456
Mount Gambier.....	290
Millicent.....	300
Millicent-Adelaide.....	150
Mount Gambier.....	207
Robe-Adelaide.....	222
Millicent.....	192
Millicent.....	189
Port Pirie to Millicent.....	312
Whyalla.....	136.80
Millicent-Adelaide . . . . .	193.50
Millicent.....	193.50
Millicent.....	193.50
Wudinna.....	256
Cygnet River, K.I.....	110
Lake Eyre Basin Lands Department continuous charter—separate cost not kept.	
Port Lincoln . . . . .	128
Port Lincoln.....	115
Mount Gambier.....	210.50
Mount Gambier.....	210.50
Broken Hill.....	730
Woomera (Mount Gunson copper mine) . .	390

**GEPPS CROSS ABATTOIR**

Mr. GUNN (no notice):

1. How do costs and charges levied by the South Australian Meat Corporation in this State compare to charges made by similar abattoirs in Victoria and New South Wales?

2. If the charges in South Australia are more than the other States, why is this so?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Comparison of treatment fees, Gepps Cross (S.A.) and Homebush (N.S.W.)—

LOCAL BEEF:		185 kg		156 kg	
	Service:	Gepps Cross	Homebush	Gepps Cross	Homebush.
		\$	\$	\$	\$
	Slaughter.....	21.05	18.6800	18.35	18.6800
	Removal, collection cheeks.....	included	0.3300	included	0.3300
	Brains.....	—	0.1150	—	0.1150
	Ticketing.....	included	none	included	none
	Local inspection.....	included	0.6700	included	0.6700
		21.05	19.7950	18.35	19.7950
	Plus penalties:				
	Bulls or stags 180 kg.....	included	6.85	included	6.85
	Crippled (normal time) .....	included	11.25	included	11.25
	Possible total costs.....	\$21.05	\$37.8950	\$18.35	\$37.8950

Quartering is included in Samcor delivery fee. At Homebush it is operators' responsibility.

#### LOCAL SHEEP AND LAMBS:

Service:		\$	\$
	Slaughter.....	2.65	2.5200
	Collecting brains . .	included	.0125
	Grading for local ..	not provided	.1650
	Local inspection ...	included	.0700
		2.65	2.7675
	Plus penalties:		
	Rams, stags.....	included	.8600
	Seedy, burrs, etc. . .	included	.7000
	Crippled.....	included	1.6200
	Possible total costs .	\$2.65	\$5.9475

LOCAL PORK:		41 kg		113.4kg	
	Service:	Gepps Cross	Homebush	Gepps Cross	Homebush
		\$	\$	\$	\$
	Slaughter.....	5.10	4.4500	7.00	5.9800
	Backfatter premium.....	—	—	included	1.0000
	Chopping down.....	0.12	0.3000	0.12	0.3000
	Saving of brains.....	—	0.1150	—	0.1150
	Local inspection.....	included	0.6700	included	0.6700
		5.22	5.5350	7.12	8.0650
	Plus penalties:				
	If boar or stag over 66 kg.....	N/A	N/A	included	1.55
	Possible total costs.....	\$5.22	\$5.5350	\$7.12	\$9.6150

Delivery fees have been excluded from calculations because of difficulty in comparing Gepps Cross delivery fees with Homebush meat hall charges.

LOCAL VEAL:		41kg		80 kg	
	Service:	\$	\$	\$	\$
	Slaughter.....	5.80	5.80	12.80	12.90
	Local inspection.....	included	0.29	included	0.29
		5.80	6.09	12.80	13.19
	Plus penalties:				
	Objectionable.....	included	2.49	included	2.49
	Possible total costs.....	\$5.80	\$8.58	\$12.80	\$15.68

BEEF:		Samcor	A. W. Austin (contractor)	PORK :		Samcor	A. W. Austin (contractor)	
		\$	\$			\$	\$	
	90 kg-113 kg . . .	2.90	2.45	Yearling	Not exceeding			
	Exceeding				45 kg.....	0.85	0.75	Porker
	113 kg ....	4.30	3.60	Beef	45.7 kg-72 kg ..	1.15	0.98	Baconer
					68 kg-136 kg . . .	2.90	2.45	Chopper
	Plus penalties:				Exceeding			
	Objectionable.....	included	2.49		136 kg.....	4.30	2.45	Chopper
	Possible total costs.....	\$5.80	\$8.58		MUTTON AND LAMB . .	0.40	0.32	
					CARTONS ..	0.60	0.42	

Samcor charges include locating meat in chiller, assembling into loads and loading on delivery vehicle. A. W. Austin only load meat on delivery vehicle from bar about 6 metres from vehicle where it has previously been assembled.

2. The charges of Gepps Cross are not higher than Homebush. It is impossible for an operator at Homebush to know the exact charge for slaughtering prior to the stock being slaughtered, because of the various penalties and extra charges that are applied for rams, stags, and seedy, burred or crippled stock etc. The head charge at Gepps Cross is an all inclusive charge, and no penalties are incurred. Gepps Cross also weighs and tickets each carcass side which is not part of the Homebush service.

Note: No metropolitan abattoir is conducted by a public authority in Melbourne.

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. How many employees are employed by Samcor?
2. How many of these employees commenced employment with the corporation within the last 18 months?
3. What is the expected increase in the next 18 months in the number of employees?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The replies are as follows:

1. 1 349 (as at July 26, 1974)
2. 363
3. 450

#### LAND AUCTIONEERS

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. Is the Minister aware of the difficult situation that has arisen since the proclamation of the Land and Business Agents Act in relation to auctioneers, licensed under the Auctioneers Act, who are now precluded from offering property for sale by auction?

2. Will the board be asked to exercise its discretion to allow such auctioneers a further period of grace to continue their normal business operations until satisfactory arrangements can be made to obtain the services of suitable registered managers?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. I am not aware of a situation as described in the member's question. I am aware of one company that claims to be experiencing difficulty in obtaining the services of a person legally qualified to be a registered manager. There have been two other complaints of difficulties which have, however, been found to be unreal or not to arise out of the new provisions.

2. No. Auctioneers have been aware at least since the introduction of the Agents Bill, 1969, into the House on November 18, 1969, that it was intended that an auctioneer engaged in selling land would be required to hold a licence as a land agent and, if a company, would require a registered manager. A period in excess of six months was allowed to elapse between the passing of the Land and Business Agents Bill, 1973, containing the relevant provision, and its becoming operative on June 24, 1974, to allow persons affected to adjust their affairs to comply with its provisions. There is no case for any further extension of time in this respect.

#### COMMUNITY WELFARE OFFICE

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Where is the Adelaide district office of the Community Welfare Department at present accommodated, and is it intended to move it?

2. If it is to be moved—

- (a) where will it be located and when will it be moved;
- (b) when was the decision to move made;
- (c) why has it not yet been acted upon; and
- (d) has rent been paid for any proposed new accommodation and, if so, from what date and how much?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. The Adelaide district office of the Community Welfare Department has been located until this date at the central office of the department at 169 Rundle Street.

2. (a) As from today August 6, 1974, the office will be located at the Adelaide Community Welfare Centre, 134 Waymouth Street.

(b) The decision to relocate the office was made on October 17, 1973.

(c) Following negotiations, a lease of the property in Waymouth Street was taken up from January 1, 1974. The building needed alterations and renovations to make it suitable for the department's use. Following preparation of plans, tenders were accepted on April 24, 1974, and work was completed on August 2, 1974.

(d) Rent has been paid from January 1, 1974, at a cost of \$16 495.50 to July 31, 1974.

#### GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What arrangements have been entered into between the State Government Insurance Commission and the Savings Bank of South Australia to enable the bank's customers with housing mortgage loans to obtain cheap property insurance?

2. What are the rates offered to the bank's customers and how do these compare with the standard rate?

3. Does the bank receive commission on insurance effected or arranged with the State Government Insurance Commission?

4. How can the State Government Insurance Commission amend the rate of premiums automatically, if existing insurance cover is already with them for Savings Bank of South Australia customers, and has the commission searched through their clients' files for information to enable rates to be amended?

5. What cover is provided for standard householders' insurance?

6. Are new housing loan customers of the Savings Bank of South Australia being instructed to insure with the State Government Insurance Commission and, if so, does this instruction comply with section 40 of the Consumer Transactions Act?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. An agreement has been entered into between the State Government Insurance Commission and the Savings Bank of South Australia to enable the Savings Bank's customers to obtain homeowners' and householders' premiums comparable to those granted by the Commonwealth Banking Corporation to its customers.

2. Construction:

	Rate a \$1 000 for standard householder's cover \$
Brick, brick veneer, concrete or stone ....	1.24.
Asbestos.....	2.17
Timber.....	3.10

These rates are 15 per cent lower than the standard S.G.I.C. rate.



3. No.

4. The commission does not amend the rate of premiums during the currency of a policy, but does so at renewal date. The commission has no access to any files the property of the Savings Bank of South Australia.

5. The cover provided is the same as that provided by the insurance industry in general.

6. Yes. The Savings Bank of South Australia instructs its new housing loan clients to insure with S.G.I.C. This does comply with section 40 of the Consumer Transactions Act.

#### NURIOOTPA RESEARCH CENTRE

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (on notice): What is the future of the Nuriootpa Research Centre in terms of the recommendations of the Callaghan report on the Agriculture Department?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: In terms of the recommendations of the Callaghan report for departmental regionalization, the Nuriootpa Viticultural Research Centre would be included in the Lower-North Region, responsible to the Officer-in-Charge there. As such, administratively it would be more closely associated with the industry in that area than at present. Its technical development would not be changed.

#### NATIONAL ANTHEM

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What is the National Anthem in South Australia at official State Government functions?

2. Under what conditions is this anthem to be played?

3. Who decided what the National Anthem should be?

4. When was that decision made?

5. On what authority was it made and what considerations prompted that decision?

6. Is that decision to be reviewed and, if so, when?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. A National Anthem applies throughout a nation, and does not vary from city to city or State to State. Therefore, the National Anthem in South Australia is determined by the National Government. The Prime Minister advised me on April 18, 1974, that *Advance Australia Fair* would be played as the Australian National Anthem at the Anzac Day ceremony in Canberra and on subsequent appropriate occasions. He stated that the words were not regarded as part of the National Anthem. On occasions when the Queen was present or when it was especially important to acknowledge our links with the Queen, as Queen of Australia and head of the Commonwealth, *God Save the Queen* would be played as well as the National Anthem. The Prime Minister sought the co-operation of the South Australian Government. Subsequently, because of misunderstandings, clarification was sought in regard to occasions when His Excellency, the Governor, was present in his capacity as the Queen's representative. In reply, the Secretary, Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet, advised "the format of the Royal Anthem is in accordance with the Prime Minister's telex message of April 18, 1974, that is, the Royal salute is the first six bars of *God Save the Queen*, followed by the first and last four bars of *Advance Australia Fair*."

2. See above.

3. The Prime Minister made the announcement.

4. See 1. above.

5. So far as I am aware, there is no legislation on the subject.

6. I do not think so.

#### APPRENTICES

Mr. COUMBE (on notice):

1. Does the Government intend to introduce apprenticeships in the agricultural industry similar to the system recently introduced by the Victorian Government?

2. If these apprenticeships are not to be introduced, why not?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The replies are as follows:

1. Apprenticeable trades are proclaimed as such under the provisions of the Apprentices Act, 1950-1971, after recommendations are made to the Government by the Apprenticeship Commission. That commission has not recommended apprenticeships in the agricultural industry, nor has any request been made to it to consider the matter.

2. *Vide* No. 1 above.

#### FISHERIES DEPARTMENT

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. When will a final decision be made regarding the establishment of satisfactory accommodation, including laboratories, for the Fisheries Department?

2. Will the accommodation be at Monarto, or what other locations are being considered?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The replies are as follows:

1. The Government Office Accommodation Committee is aware of the need for suitable accommodation for the Fisheries Department. I am not able to say when a final decision will be made.

2. The committee is considering all locations where suitable accommodation may become available.

#### BANKS AMALGAMATION

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Is it the policy of the Government to amalgamate the Savings Bank of South Australia and the State Bank of South Australia and, if so, why and when?

2. Did the Premier investigate the possibility of either bank establishing a branch in London during his recent overseas visit?

3. Has either bank sent an officer to London to examine such a proposal, and what were the findings?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. The Government has appointed two members of the board of the Savings Bank of South Australia, who are also members of the board of management of the State Bank of South Australia. In this way impetus may be given to the co-ordination of the policies of the two banks. It is not intended to merge the banks at this stage.

2. Yes.

3. The Savings Bank of South Australia, which for many years has had agencies in London providing deposit, withdrawal, and advice services for its visiting South Australian depositors and intending migrants to this State, at present has an officer in London investigating the desirability and practicability of opening an additional office there, staffed by the bank's officers, to provide the same services in an improved way. As yet no conclusion has been reached or decision taken in this matter.

#### EMPLOYMENT

Mr. BECKER (on notice): What is the Government's policy and attitude to the principle of one man one job?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I do not know of any principle of one man one job. In times of economic difficulty when employment is difficult to obtain, the Government considers that as many people as possible should be able to obtain employment and that, in those

circumstances, people should not have two jobs. However, when the economy is buoyant, as it has been since December, 1972, the Government does not object to employees also doing other work on a part-time basis, provided this does not prevent any unemployed person obtaining employment.

### COAST PROTECTION

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What is the total cost of foreshore restoration and protection work from Glenelg North to West Beach, excluding work undertaken by the Engineering and Water Supply Department?

2. What is the total cost of foreshore restoration and protection work undertaken by the Coast Protection Board, and where has such work been done?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The replies are as follows:

1. \$105 000.

2. \$1 020 000 since the inception of the Coast Protection Board. Most of these funds were expended in the metropolitan coastal area between Noarlunga and Semaphore. The balance was spent in country coastal areas.

### CRIMINAL CODE

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Has a report been made either by the Attorney-General or at his direction, and by whom, on deleting references of sexuality of any kind from the Criminal Code?

2. If such a report has been made—

(a) who made the report and for what purpose;

(b) is it to be made public and when; and

(c) if it is not to be made public, why not?

3. If such a report has not been made—

(a) is it intended to make one and when;

(b) by whom will it be made and for what purpose;

(c) will it be made public and when; and

(d) if it will not be made public, why not?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. Following a reference to me by the 1974 Annual Convention of the Australian Labor Party (S.A. Branch), I forwarded a letter to the State Secretary in the following terms:

The proposal is far reaching and requires a very thorough examination as to its implications for the criminal law and its enforcement as well as its general social desirability. The State Government has appointed a committee, known as the Criminal Law and Penal Methods Reform Committee. The Chairman is Justice Mitchell of the Supreme Court. The two other members are Professor Colin Howard, an expert in criminal law, and Mr. David Biles, a criminologist. Mr. Fisse of the Adelaide Law School, is a co-opted member. This committee is engaged in a comprehensive examination of criminal law and procedure, with a view to recommending reforms to the Government. I think that the examination of the Y.L.A.'s proposal is best carried out by this expert committee. I have, therefore, referred the proposal to the committee and have asked it to examine the proposal in the course of its general examination of the criminal law. The committee is working as expeditiously as possible, but the subject which it is required to cover is a vast one and I do not know when its report on the portion of the criminal law relating to sexual crimes will be available.

Apart from this letter, there has been no report made by me or at my direction on this subject. The report of the Criminal Law Reform Committee will be published when the committee completes the relevant phase of its inquiries.

2. Not applicable.

3. Not applicable.

### WORKLIFE UNIT

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What is the Quality of Worklife Unit?

2. When was it set up?

3. What is its purpose?

4. Who are its members?

5. To whom is it responsible?

6. What results has it achieved?

7. What is its annual estimated cost?

8. Are any changes to be made to the unit and, if so, what are they and when are they to be made?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. This is the alternative name for the Worker Participation Branch of the Labour and Industry Department.

2. The first appointee commenced duty on September 10, 1973, and the last on February 4, 1974.

3. To give effect to recommendations made by a tripartite committee on Worker Participation in Management (Private sector).

4. Messrs. L. J. Prowse, C. F. Connelly, K. K. Wang and G. M. Anderson.

5. The Secretary for Labour and Industry.

6. Creating an awareness in South Australia of the need for worker participation and the benefits that can flow from job enrichment schemes and joint consultative councils, and assisting companies and Government departments, which have decided to introduce job enrichment schemes and joint consultative councils.

7. For the 1974-75 financial year, it is intended that \$45 000 be provided in the Estimates of Expenditure.

8. No changes are contemplated at present.

### PORT WAKEFIELD ROAD

Mr. BOUNDY (on notice):

1. What was the total amount spent on rebuilding the Port Wakefield Road up to June 30, 1974?

2. When will the rebuilding be completed?

3. Is the Minister aware of concrete block ducting, similar to that being used in this project, having been used effectively anywhere else in the world, and, if so, where?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

1. \$4 466 306 since and including the 1967-68 financial year.

2. 1979, subject to the availability of funds and the terms of Australian Government legislation for aid for roads from July 1, 1974.

3. To the best of my knowledge precast concrete box culverts are used effectively in many parts of the world, including the United Kingdom, Africa, and America.

### AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. Is the present head office accommodation of the Agriculture Department satisfactory?

2. Will the department stay in its present accommodation until the move to Monarto later this decade and, if not, when will the head office be moved elsewhere and where will it be located?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The replies are as follows:

1. The standard of accommodation at the head office of the Agriculture Department is not considered to be satisfactory, and the Minister of Agriculture has made strong representations to the Office Accommodation Committee of the Public Service Board Department and the Public Buildings Department on this matter.

2. The accommodation committee is examining ways of providing satisfactory accommodation for the department in the period before its move to Monarto. At this stage no firm indication can be given as to where it will be or when it can be occupied.

### IRRIGATION

Mr. ARNOLD (on notice): Will water be supplied for vegetable growing on the same basis as for permanent planting when the intended new distribution system for the Cobdogla irrigation area is completed?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: In the case of vegetables grown on ratable land—yes; otherwise—no.

Mr. ARNOLD (on notice):

1. Will the rehabilitation of the Waikerie irrigation distribution system be completed on schedule?

2. What is the estimated completion date?

3. When is it expected that the system will be fully operational?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The replies are as follows:

1. No.
2. January, 1977.
3. May, 1977.

### LEASES

Mr. ARNOLD (on notice):

1. Does the Government intend to issue perpetual lease titles for agriculture purposes to applicants in the McIntosh Division of the Cobdogla irrigation area?

2. If so, when will the leases be issued?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The replies are as follows:

1. The State Planning Authority is now preparing development plans for the Upper Murray area. Until such time as the development plan expressing the general guiding policy on land use has been authorized, it would be unwise to grant permanent tenure over the land in question. When the development plan has been authorized consideration will be given to the issue of perpetual leases in lieu of existing miscellaneous leases and annual licences where practicable and where such permanent tenure does not conflict with the authorized plan.

2. See reply to 1.

### REDCLIFF PROJECT

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What environmental surveys concerning the Redcliff petro-chemical project have been prepared and, if any, which of them have been made public and when?

2. If surveys have been made, have all such surveys been made public and, if not, which have not been made public and why?

3. If they have not been made public, are they to be made so and when?

4. Who has prepared each such survey?

5. Are any other surveys concerning this project in course of preparation and, if so, on what aspects of it?

6. When is it expected that each of these surveys will be completed and who is preparing each such survey?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The replies are as follows:

1. A number of preliminary surveys of the environment at Redcliff have been undertaken and two preliminary surveys have been completed and published. They are:

- (a) *Outline of Urban Impact Social and Economic*—October, 1973, prepared by John Patterson Urban Systems for the consortium.

- (b) *Spencer Gulf Environmental Survey by Underwater Sled*—Shepherd, S.A., and Branden, K.L. (1974)—*Australian Fisheries* 33:16-19.

2. All surveys that have been completed have been made public.

3. All the surveys that constitute the draft environmental impact statement will be published and public comment invited.

4. See 1.

5. Yes. All surveys outlined in Chapter 5 of *Sadec—Redcliff Petro-chemical Development—Plan for Environmental Study*—May, 1974.

6. The surveys will be completed at varying times depending on their nature. Monitoring of the gulf waters will be continued after the works have commenced. The consortium is responsible for preparing the studies of the impact of the Redcliff petro-chemical project on the environment.

### PREMIER'S STAFF

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Why must the Premier always be accompanied by staff?

2. Which members of his staff accompanied him during his participation in the New South Wales election campaign in May, and why?

3. What was the cost to the South Australian Government of their fares and accommodation on that trip?

4. What duties, if any, did they perform during it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. To ensure adequate security and to provide necessary secretarial services. This practice is followed by all Australian Premiers.

2. (a) K. J. Bertram (Administrative Officer) and K. Crease (Media Co-ordinator).

(b) Provide the services indicated in the above, and to liaise with media representatives and to provide press releases when required.

3. K. J. Bertram K. Crease

Accommodation.....	\$56.00	\$56.00
Fares .....	\$128.60	\$128.60

4. See 1 and 2 above.

### POLLUTION COMMITTEE

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Has the Spencer Gulf Water Pollution Co-ordinating Committee examined the report entitled *Spencer Gulf Water Pollution Studies—Reconnaissance Survey* and, if so, when, and if not, why not?

2. Has the committee made recommendations regarding the matters set out in part (c) of the Minister's reply on July 30, to Question No. 49 and, if so, what are they and when were they made?

3. Has the Government accepted these recommendations, and what action, if any, has been taken on them?

4. On what dates has the committee met?

5. Why has it not made a report?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes—August, 1973.

2. Yes—October, 1973. The recommendations provided advice on priorities for studies and corrective measures to be undertaken.

3. Yes.

4. August 9, 1973; September 25, 1973; November 5, 1973; December 13, 1973; and May 31, 1974.

5. The role of the committee is to provide the Government with recommendations on priorities and procedures and not to provide a single report.

### INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Premier say what action the Government intends taking to safeguard the well-being of the families of the many workers in the metal trades who have been and who will be stood down as a result of the lack of steel supplies? It has come to notice that not only is there 10 000 tonnes of steel on the wharf at Port Adelaide but also that South Australia's allocation was 55 000 tonnes during the 17 weeks that there has been a breakdown in the release of supplies. As South Australia has received only 8 000 tonnes of its 55 000-tonne allocation, it would be impossible for the backlog to be made up even if the strike were resolved today or tomorrow. As a result, the supply of steel for the metal industries in South Australia is in a grave and constantly deteriorating state.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yesterday afternoon there was a conference in my office called, with my accord, by the Deputy President of the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission at which he, the Conciliation Commissioner involved (Commissioner Hefferman), representatives of the Transport Workers Union, the Waterside Workers Federation and the Amalgamated Metalworkers Union, the Minister of Labour and Industry, and I were present. The conference lasted about 2½ hours. As a result of that conference, several propositions are being put today to the Commonwealth office of the T.W.U. by the Deputy President, the President of the Australian Council of Trade Unions, and me. This morning, I have had a conference with the executive of the United Trades and Labor Council to discuss this dispute, as I had a conference last evening with several employers. I have plainly indicated that I believe that the refusal of the T.W.U. to arbitrate this dispute is totally wrong, and that grave harm is being done to the South Australian economy and to the employment of other trade unionists by the action of the T.W.U. in refusing arbitration.

Dr. Eastick: How long will it extend?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I hope that, as a result of the conference yesterday and what is taking place today, the T.W.U. will rethink its position and that, before the end of the week, we will get some result in this matter. I have indicated to the Trades and Labor Council and the unions concerned that, to date, I have been able to persuade employers not to take action that could conceivably provoke wider industrial unrest, but that I will not be able to hold action any longer that the unions normally would oppose. I have been anxious to see that this matter should not escalate and get into a worse state of industrial disorder.

Dr. Eastick: If you don't have supplies, you don't have work.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am concerned as much as the Leader is to see to it that employment in South Australia is not only maintained but also, in the metal industry, improved. I believe that in this case it is unconscionable that the trade unions concerned and the union movement are unable to settle a demarcation dispute which, in itself, endangers the job of not one single employee immediately involved in the dispute—not one! However, in its effect it endangers the employment of thousands of South Australians. I have put this situation as pungently as I know how to all the people who are involved in it. I

hope that during the week sufficient pressure will be brought to bear on those who are endangering the employment of South Australians so that we can get some settlement of the dispute. If there were any area of jurisdiction to which I could turn to enforce a settlement of the dispute, I should do so, but unfortunately, within the law of Australia, at the moment there is none. I have previously said publicly (and I have said it privately at a series of conferences to all the people concerned) that I consider that there is absolutely no justification whatever for a continuance of this dispute at Port Adelaide.

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Premier indicate whether the officers of the Engineering and Water Supply Department who were retrenched last week have been reinstated, and what is the Government's intention concerning the payment of wages for the period of the stand-down, in view of the order made by Mr. Commissioner Johns of the Industrial Commission that these wages be paid? Yesterday, in the South Australian Industrial Commission, Mr. Commissioner Johns, at a compulsory conference on wage claims by State Government drivers, said that in his opinion a number of the laid-off E. & W.S. workers should not have been stood down. In addition, he recommended that the stand-downs be lifted, and ordered the payment of wages to those men affected. My question is directed to the Premier in his capacity as Treasurer, because if this payment is made it will have to be accounted for to the Auditor-General. Although I agree that the men involved should not have been financially disadvantaged, and that the dispute should have been settled, I believe the Government acted too hastily in enforcing the stand-down. The order by Mr. Commissioner Johns might now place the Government in a difficult position, because it acted precipitately and must now justify its decision to the Auditor-General as regards this payment.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government did not act precipitately in this matter; in fact, in standing down employees of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, great care was taken to investigate the possibility of the continuance of their employment. Union representatives toured the various jobs with officers of the department, including the Engineer-in-Chief, and endorsed the Government's action.

Mr. Coumbe: Subsequently?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. They endorsed the minute of the Engineer-in-Chief that work was not available.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: They could not be gainfully employed.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Naturally, since there has been an order from the Commissioner, the Government will act in accordance with that order: there is no other course for us to take. In addition, the Government will not face any difficulty with the Auditor-General because, after all, we have had supply for it in this House in accordance with orders and awards.

Mr. Coumbe: What about the other section of people? Is there any decision about them?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know to whom the honourable member is referring. We cannot very well reinstate people who are on strike, because reinstatement of them is peculiarly useless and will not work. However, let me make perfectly clear that the Government will not accept a position (and we will contest the position continually) that a union can withdraw a small section of its members, make impossible the continued gainful or proper employment of a larger section of its members because of the withdrawal of that small section, and then

demand payment of the people who must be stood down because we cannot employ them, as a result of the action of the same union. If any Government were to agree to that position, it would mean that a completely impossible industrial situation would occur: it would mean that any union could withdraw a small section of workers and demand that the Government pay strike pay to that section. We will not do that in future.

Dr. Eastick: Are you doing it now?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We do not intend to do it but it would seem that that would result from the order of Mr. Commissioner Johns yesterday. Since the order has been made, we will act in accordance with it, but we will contest the principle.

Mr. Millhouse: How are you going to contest it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member will see that in due course.

Mr. Millhouse: I'd like to see it now.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In that case, the honourable member must contain himself in a little patience. I know that he wants to ferment constantly, as he and his colleagues have done in this State, and to promote industrial disputes.

Mr. Millhouse: What you're saying is an empty threat.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Torrens has asked a question, to which the honourable Premier is replying. Interjections are not permitted and replies to interjections are definitely out of order.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have stated the principles on which we will act, and I have stated them clearly to the officers of the Trades and Labor Council. This Government has, in regard to the employment of people in Government service, given more to them than has any other Government in the history of this State, and the Opposition has condemned us for doing that. It is impossible for us to be put in a position where the taxpayers of this State are required to pay moneys quite unjustly as a result of industrial action that could not properly be supported. The position that obtained before Mr. Commissioner Johns yesterday was not one that the Government accepted, and it was not in accordance with the Government's submissions to the commission. As the Commissioner has made an order, we will act in accordance with it, and there will be no difficulty from the Auditor-General on that score, because it is in accordance with the acts and proceedings of this House. However, the position that the Government would be put in if that order were acted on as a precedent that members of a union should be paid upon stand-down when that union itself had been responsible for the stand-down is a position to which we cannot agree, and we will not agree to it. That position will be contested before the courts.

*Later:*

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I meant to ask a question of the Premier. It is most unfortunate that he is not in the Chamber.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must direct his question to a Minister.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I wanted to start off by apologizing to the Premier for what I said last week, but as he is not here—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am sorry I caused the Premier the pain I did by adverting last week to his frequent absences from the Chamber during Question Time.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member knows that when he receives the call during Question Time he must ask his question of a Minister and then seek leave of the House to explain it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will have to switch the question now and ask another one of the Minister of Environment and Conservation. Here is the Premier now! I have already offered the Premier an apology. I now ask a question which is supplementary to one asked by the member for Torrens a short while ago and which arises out of the Premier's reply. How is the Government to contest the decision made by Commissioner Johns yesterday? Before I make my explanation I should like to insert one sentence. To think that I used a man's physical infirmity, especially one so painful (I understand) and embarrassing, to criticize him causes me some regret. That is the end of my apology to the Premier, but I express the hope that he will be here when I ask questions. I interjected during the Premier's reply to the member for Torrens because it is easy enough for the Premier to say that the Government will contest the principle of something that was decided by a Commissioner yesterday, but the statement means nothing unless we know (and I suspect that even the Government does not know) just how such a contest is to be undertaken. The Commissioner having made a decision, the Government says that it will abide by the decision although it disagrees with it, but that it will contest the principle of the decision in future. If there is to be any credence given to the threat made by the Premier in this place this afternoon about this, we all want to know, and I suggest we are entitled to know, just what action the Government has in mind to contest this, because I suspect at the moment that it has no action in mind and, unless we get an answer to this question, my suspicion will be confirmed. I therefore ask what action, either within the law or without, does the Government intend to take to contest the principle behind the Commissioner's decision.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The contest will be within the law but I am afraid I must tell the honourable member that he will have to contain himself in patience, although I realize it is a little difficult for him.

Mr. Millhouse: I am not the only one that wants to know.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The whole community will laugh at the honourable member, as they usually do.

### SMOKING

Mr. DUNCAN: Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Health to consider prohibiting the smoking of tobacco in all places where food is sold? This is a reform that has been advocated on previous occasions and is one which many people view as being long overdue. The matter was recently brought to my attention during a visit to Syria, where, in all indoor restaurants and dining rooms, such a prohibition exists.

Mr. Gunn: That's a democratic country, isn't it!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DUNCAN: Syria is a democratic country, as a matter of fact. The contrast between the clean, pleasant eating conditions in Syrian restaurants and the foul conditions existing in some Adelaide restaurants is marked.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Do they drink wine in Syria?

Mr. DUNCAN: They do indeed: the wine in Syrian restaurants is particularly good.

*Members interjecting:*

Mr. DUNCAN: Although this matter is being marked by some humour, I assure the House that it is a matter of considerable concern to many people. To enter some

South Australian eating establishments and food shops is, frankly, like entering an opium den, and to finish a meal in them surrounded by the swirl and stench of cigar, cigarettes and pipe smoke—

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Try sitting alongside the Hon. Hugh Hudson!

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DUNCAN: —is a repulsive experience for people who are not tobacco smokers. As this is an important matter on the grounds of both health and the general enjoyment of the majority of the community, I ask that serious consideration be given as soon as possible to prohibiting smoking in places where food is sold or eaten.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will refer the matter to my colleague.

#### NORTHERN TOURISM

Mr. ALLEN: Will the Minister of Tourism say when work will commence on toilet blocks that are to be constructed for tourists in the North of the State? The Minister would recall that last year an announcement was made that \$60 000 would be spent each year for the next three years to erect toilet blocks in the North of the State at those places frequently visited by tourists. I understand the order of priority given to the toilet blocks was Blinman, Coober Pedy, and Marree. The Minister is aware that thousands of people will visit the area this year because the wild flowers are once again at their best. Possibly he recalls that last year about 12 000 people visited the Flinders Range on the October holiday weekend. People living in the area are concerned because work on the toilet blocks has not been commenced, and they would like to know when the Government intends that it should begin.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I discussed this programme recently with the Director of the Tourist Bureau, but I cannot recall the details of the programme for the area. I shall certainly examine the situation and give the honourable member a reply as soon as possible.

#### PARA HILLS EAST SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Education consider having action taken to enclose the verandah attached to the Para Hills East Infants School? The school is situated on the top of a hill and is affected by frequent strong winds. Indeed, from my experience in visiting the school, I wonder whether those winds ever stop blowing. The wind at times lifts out of position the large asbestos tiles forming part of the ceiling of the open verandah. Some tiles have fallen to the verandah floor, creating a dangerous situation, especially as children eat their lunch in the shed.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I shall certainly look into the matter and bring down a reply as soon as possible.

#### AGRICULTURAL BULLETIN

Mr. RODDA: Will the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Agriculture, ascertain whether it is possible for special agricultural bulletin No. 3 of 1973 to be reprinted? The bulletin deals with the soil survey of the Monarto site, and queries the topography and subterranean underlay of the soil, a matter of great interest to people in South Australia. Could the Minister arrange for a further supply of these bulletins to be made available to the public through the normal outlets?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am not sure whether, in framing his question, the honourable member suggested that the supply had been exhausted.

Mr. Rodda: Yes.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I thought the honourable member was trying to steal a little of the thunder of the member for Davenport; we have been given fair warning that he will talk about this matter during the Address in Reply debate. However, I shall be happy to take up the matter with my colleague and to see whether he can satisfy the demands of the honourable member. In due course I hope my colleague will give me a report so that I can inform the honourable member of the action to be taken.

#### FLINDERS UNIVERSITY

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Minister of Education say anything about the sit-in and related activities by students at Flinders University?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If the honourable member cared to discuss the matter with the member of the Opposition who is on the Flinders University Council (the member for Bragg) he could get an up-to-date report from him.

Mr. Gunn: You are washing your hands of the whole situation. You have no courage.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: When I think of some of the actions of the students, I also think sometimes of the member for Eyre. The matter is being handled by the university authorities and I certainly do not want to say anything in this place that would make their task more difficult and make the resolution of the matter more difficult than it is already. The university authorities have my support in relation to any action they intend to take in the matter. The actions of the students are not supported by the Government. No matter what any of us may feel about the object of their criticism, the actions the students have taken in order to achieve their objective are similar to those one would expect in a Fascist state and not in a democracy. In those circumstances the Government cannot support that sort of action. Within our community we have a tradition of autonomy in the administration of universities carried out under an Act of Parliament which provides for the control of the university in the hands of a university council, and in those circumstances I do not think that it is appropriate for the Government or the Minister, or anyone else, to dictate or to try to tell the university how to run its affairs. Mr. Justice Bright will be having discussions with the students today and the University Council is meeting at 6 p.m. following the dialogue, such as it may be, between Mr. Justice Bright and the students. If the honourable member wants any mere details about what may or may not happen, I suggest that he consult the member for Bragg, who is a member of the University Council.

#### COUNCIL BOUNDARIES

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Premier assure the House that, when the Government introduces a Bill for the adoption of the report of the Royal Commission into Local Government Areas, all members will be allowed a free vote, otherwise known as a conscience vote? The Minister of Local Government has said that all people appear to be happy with the findings of the Commission but those people who know what is going on in this State, particularly in the metropolitan area, realize that

many thousands of ratepayers are irate, and expect their local member of Parliament to be able to portray their feelings to Parliament.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If a measure on local government areas is brought into this House, it will be a Government measure and all members of the Government will vote for it.

Mr. Dean Brown: Would you really—

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I suggest that the honourable member do not try to wish his water rate problems on to me. I had an amicable meeting with the Kensington and Norwood City Council last evening. I keep in touch with my local government very closely and we have the best possible relations. If members take the time to read the Royal Commission's report, which I suggest they do rather than go off half-cocked, they will see that the Commission intends to investigate the matter further to provide for proper transitional provisions that will allow for the needs of local residents to be met in any arrangements for transfer. This matter would be encompassed in any Bill put before the House and I am sure that, if members address themselves to the measure rather than to politics, they will find the needs of their local residents can be properly met in their representations in this House upon the Bill.

#### MONARTO

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I ask my question of the Premier, and I hope that his reply will be a more comprehensive one than the reply I received to a Question on Notice.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will ask his question. The honourable member for Davenport.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Will the Premier agree to the six demands relating to the transfer of public servants from Adelaide to Monarto put to him on July 24 by the Public Service Association? The Premier well knows that the association has made six demands to him for the transfer of public servants from Adelaide to Monarto, and these demands are clearly outlined in the *News* of July 15. A recent survey by the Australian Institute of Agricultural Science revealed that 66 per cent of the respondents disagreed with, or did not approve of, the Government's decision to relocate the Agriculture Department at Monarto and 62 per cent of the respondents did not think that the department could adequately fulfil its functions at Monarto. In view of this, and of the considerable discontent amongst public servants with the move to Monarto, will the Premier say whether he will now meet the association's six reasonable demands?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Having discussed this matter with Public Service Association representatives and having explained to them what is the position regarding the relocation to Monarto, I can say we have reached complete accord on this matter. I do not know what the honourable member is carrying on about. The officers of the association have come to see me about this matter and I have explained the procedures of the Government and the problems of obtaining final planning answers on Monarto, because time must be taken for planning to be done properly. The questions that must arise about relocation provisions, the working of the relocation committee, and the Premier's Department's representation on the committee were all discussed. There are continuing discussions with the association on this matter and I am certain that we shall be able to reach satisfactory conclusions.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You said you didn't—

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Opposition members obviously want to represent themselves as stirring on behalf of the association. All I can say is that, if the association had existed under a Government of the Party represented by some Opposition members, the association's members would not have the conditions they have today.

#### LAND AND BUSINESS AGENTS

Mr. BECKER: Can the Attorney-General say whether the general regulations made under the Land and Business Agents Act, which have been laid on the table, will be withdrawn and amended or whether they will stand? Several land agents have complained to me that they are experiencing difficulty in complying with the new regulations because some councils are not providing the full information they require. In most instances, the information they receive costs \$7.10. I believe that full details of mortgages on private properties must be disclosed if a property is for sale or to be auctioned, whereas I was under the impression, from the debate on the Bill, that full details of a person's private mortgages were not to be disclosed. Embarrassment has been caused not only to the person selling the property but also to the person holding a private mortgage. I understand that the Real Estate Institute sought amendments to the regulations in their present form.

The Hon. L. J. KING: Discussions have taken place with representatives of the institute and with others interested in the operation of the new legislation, and the points raised have been considered. I agree with the honourable member regarding disclosure of the principal sum secured by mortgage. Indeed, it was never my intention that that sum would need to be disclosed. As I was not in South Australia when the regulations were finalized, I was not personally aware that that was a result of the regulations. As there was undoubtedly a misunderstanding in my department on that point, the regulations will be amended in that respect.

Regarding the other matters, several points have been made (some probably valid) regarding the operation of the Act and the regulations, and they will all be considered fully. I am most anxious that the Act and the regulations should be in a form that will enable the objectives which the legislation seeks to achieve to be achieved in the most efficient manner possible and with a minimum of inconvenience either to those in the industry itself and to the public at large. Every suggestion put with that in mind will be considered carefully. It will not be a question of withdrawing the regulations (there is no suggestion of that), but I can say with certainty that there will be amendments to the regulations as a result of representations that have been made, and the matter is very much under consideration at present.

I have, indeed, informed the Chairman of the Subordinate Legislation Committee that these representations are being considered and that there are likely to be amendments, and no doubt the committee will therefore act with that information in mind. There is no question of departing in any respect from the principles underlying the Act or from the objectives the Act seeks to achieve. I recognize, however, that experience has shown (and, no doubt, will continue to show) that there are better ways of achieving the objectives than by the regulations precisely as originally drawn. This is certainly true of most innovative legislation. I intend that amendments be made immediately to try to solve any problems which have already arisen and which ought to be solved and that there be

a continuing review of the operation of the legislation, which is entirely new in many important respects, to see whether further difficulties develop and what amendments should be made from time to time to meet those difficulties. Consultations are now taking place between the various parties interested, including the Real Estate Institute, and some amendments can be expected soon, including one concerning the principal sum included in the mortgage.

#### GAOL INCIDENT

Mr. BOUNDY: Can the Attorney-General, representing the Chief Secretary, say whether a prisoner at the Adelaide Gaol cut his throat recently and, if he did, how this was allowed to happen? Such an incident has been reported and has caused considerable public disquiet. I ask my question in order to give the Minister an opportunity to inform the public of the truth of this matter.

The Hon. L. J. KING: Having read the newspaper report to which the honourable member has referred, I will obtain a report from my colleague and let the honourable member have a reply.

#### PETROL RESELLERS

Mr. EVANS: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say what are his department's intentions about the future of petrol resellers who hold a permit for the reselling of motor fuel? There are rumours in the industry that, if a person takes out a permit and not a licence, in future he may be asked to move out of the industry of reselling fuel, with preference being given to those who hold licences. The cost of a permit is \$10, while the cost of a licence is \$50. The relevant legislation provides that, if reselling fuel is a principal part of a person's business, he should hold a licence. Therefore, if a person applies for a permit, he more or less admits that petrol reselling is not a principal part of his business. At present, 10 per cent of petrol stations are being phased out of the industry, but petrol companies have made a submission to the Government requesting that even a greater number of stations than 10 per cent be taken out. People such as small storekeepers who sell fuel are afraid that, if they are permit holders, they may be asked to leave the industry. I ask this question so that some guarantee may be given to the permit holders that they will be considered to have the same rights as licence holders to continue to resell petrol. Even if the reselling is not a principal part of a person's business, it may represent an important part of it.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: According to a person's application and his requirements, a licence or a permit is issued. I imagine that each application is treated on its merits. I will certainly have the honourable member's question examined. I will discuss the matter with the board that deals with this aspect of motor fuel and bring down a reply.

#### CONSULTATIVE COUNCILS

Mr. ARNOLD: Can the Minister of Community Welfare foresee a duplication or conflict of interest in the case of consultative councils and the regional committees to be established under the Australian Assistance Plan? Consultative councils have been established by the Government throughout the State. Under the Australian Assistance Plan, I understand the Commonwealth Government intends to establish regional committees which, to all intents and purposes, will work in the same areas as those in which consultative councils work. I understand that the regional

committees, under the Australian Assistance Plan, may make recommendations to the appropriate Commonwealth department, with far more finance being available than is the case with the State consultative councils.

The Hon. L. J. KING: Although I do not really see any conflict of interest developing, I see the danger of duplication of effort, and the danger of inconsistent approaches to the needs of a certain area development. I should have preferred the Australian Assistance Plan to be implemented in South Australia through the machinery already existing under the South Australian Community Welfare Act. I put that point of view to the Commonwealth Minister for Social Security.

Mr. Gunn: Did he listen to you?

The Hon. L. J. KING: Yes, as he always does. He is an extremely reasonable, intelligent, and polite Minister. I regret to say that he did not see the situation as I saw it; he felt bound to implement a national scheme, taking the view that, in order to implement the Australian Assistance Plan throughout Australia, it was necessary to develop regional councils (to which the honourable member referred) and that it was not practicable to make a distinction between one State and another. I think that decision is unfortunate and that it will have unfortunate consequences. The Commonwealth Minister and I will seek to mitigate those consequences by trying to develop the maximum degree of co-operation between the State and Commonwealth bodies. In the central region, and indeed in the iron triangle region, the consultative councils play an important part in the regional committees set up under the Australian Assistance Plan. That is the way we will seek to solve the problems that can undoubtedly arise from the existence side by side of two regional authorities, one existing under Commonwealth law and the other under State law. That is one of the prices we pay for a federal system, and we must live with it as best we can.

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Minister take further action to persuade the Minister for Social Security to reconsider his decision to continue with the Australian Assistance Plan in South Australia that is in competition with the State community welfare services? The Minister said, in answering the previous question, that it was regrettable that the Commonwealth Minister did not see matters his way. The Minister then went on to say that that was the price we must pay for a federal system. It might be said that there is much disquiet among social workers and employees of the Community Welfare Department concerning their future. Certainly, disquiet has been expressed to me by members of the consultative councils set up by the Community Welfare Department in this State as to their future role. Those officers believe that they are being let down by the attitude of the State Minister and that he is giving in far too easily to the demands of the central Commonwealth Government.

The Hon. L. J. KING: As I said, there is a price we have to pay for a federal system, and part of the price is that at times I will not agree with a Commonwealth Minister. There is also a price we have to pay for democracy, and part of that price is that I will not always agree with members of the Opposition, including the member for Bragg, particularly when he allows his imagination to take flight, as he has done on this occasion. In fact, to my knowledge, no such disaffection exists among members of the consultative councils. If the honourable member for Bragg has encouraged anyone to think that it lies within the power of the State Minister to prevent the Commonwealth Government from implementing its own plan



in the way it thinks fit, he has misled the people to whom he has spoken. The Australian Assistance Plan is a matter for Commonwealth Government policy and results from Commonwealth law, and the Commonwealth Government will implement it in the way it thinks proper. I can make representations, and have done so, as to my view and that of the South Australian Government on how the plan should be implemented in South Australia; however, the final decision, whether I agree with it or not, rests with the Commonwealth Government.

Of course, I will keep the matter in mind, but I remain of the view I expressed earlier, a view which I have held all along. If a proper opportunity presents itself to change the Commonwealth Minister's mind I shall not fail to take that opportunity. There is no occasion for any member of any consultative council to feel confused or uncertain as to his role because it is perfectly clear that consultative councils were set up under the South Australian Community Welfare Act and that the functions of officers are prescribed by the Act: it has nothing whatever to do with the Commonwealth Act or the Australian Assistance Plan. There is no reason for believing that steps might be taken by the Commonwealth Government in relation to its plan, nor is there any reason why a member of a consultative council, set up under State law, should be confused about his role. I would prefer that there be an integration of the two programmes so that they could be implemented in South Australia through the machinery set up under South Australian law. However, if that cannot be done the next move should be to endeavour to avoid duplication and confusion, and that can be done by close consultation and collaboration between the consultative councils set up under State law and regional committees set up under Commonwealth law. So that there is no confusion, members of State consultative councils, set up under the South Australian Act, have a responsibility to tender advice, where a matter is in question, to the State Minister, and that will continue irrespective of what is done in South Australia by the Commonwealth Government under the Australian Assistance Plan.

### LOBSTERS

Mr. CHAPMAN: Can the Minister of Fisheries say what steps he has taken to eliminate the confusion in the rock lobster industry following the recent increase in the minimum length of lobsters permitted to be taken from proclaimed Commonwealth waters near this State? Can the Minister allay the expressed fears held in this industry, giving an assurance that he will not seek to make uniform the minimum lobster length by increasing the current State minimum to coincide with the new Commonwealth minimum? Last Friday evening at Goolwa, the Acting Director of the Fisheries Department (Mr. Olsen) told a meeting of fishermen that the Commonwealth Agriculture Department had introduced its new minimum length without consulting the States.

Mr. Gunn: That's not unusual.

Mr. Millhouse: As the Attorney-General said, that's one of the prices we pay for a federal system.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. CHAPMAN: In fact, the Acting Director told the meeting that the Commonwealth Government knew about the South Australian legislation and that it was acting directly in conflict with our interests. Although they have offered co-operation in policing the ridiculous situation that

they now see existing around South Australia, the fishermen seek the support and assurance of the Minister in the matter.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: We are currently considering the implications of the Commonwealth decision. I assure the honourable member that I will let him know when a decision has been made.

Mr. Gunn: That's not a proper answer.

The SPEAKER: I warn the honourable member for Eyre.

### PREMIER'S ABSENCE

Mr. GUNN: Will the Minister of Works, as Deputy Premier, say why the Premier has seen fit to attend Government House during Question Time today instead of being available to answer questions asked by members on this side so that they may be properly informed about the actions of his Government?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As I understand the situation, the Premier was called, and he went to Government House, as would every other person in this State, because it is not customary to ignore such a request. I do not know the nature of the business to be discussed but, in the course of being courteous to the Governor (after all, he is the Queen's representative in this State), the Premier decided it was more important to comply with that request than to remain in the House. However, I assure the honourable member that any Minister on the front bench is competent, and that, if he cannot answer accurately any question that would normally be directed to the Premier, he will pass it on to the Premier.

Mr. Millhouse: Is it a fact that the Governor has resigned?

The SPEAKER: Order! In accordance with Standing Order 169, I warn the honourable member for Mitcham.

### LAND VALUATIONS

Mr. RUSSACK: Will the Minister of Works, as Deputy Premier, consider amending the Land Tax Act with a view to introducing a more realistic scale of charges to make them more commensurate with recent steep and drastic increases in the unimproved land valuations of rural properties? Last week I gave two examples of land valuation that would result in the escalation of the charges payable by the owners of the properties: the tax on the first property would increase by 1 000 per cent from \$48.35 to \$502.04, and the tax on the second would increase by 800 per cent from \$41.04 to \$319.32. The tax scales have not been altered since 1966 and, with present-day valuations, we have an unrealistic rating scale that will create hardship for many people in the rural sector.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As the honourable member is aware, the Treasurer is responsible for any decision to be made in this area. Appreciating the problems raised by the honourable member, I will ask the Treasurer to look into the matter and bring down a report as soon as possible.

*At 3.8 p.m. the bells having been rung:*

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE: MR. WARDLE

Mr. EVANS moved:

That three months leave of absence be granted to the honourable member for Murray (Mr. I. A. Wardle) on account of absence overseas on a Government sponsored study tour.

Motion carried.

**EMERGENCY POWERS BILL**

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Deputy Premier) moved:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable Notice of Motion, Government Business, No. 3 to be taken into consideration forthwith and that the Bill pass through all stages without delay.

The SPEAKER: I have counted the House and, there being present an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House, I accept the motion for the suspension of Standing Orders.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I support the motion. There is absolutely no doubt in the minds of Opposition members that only the Premier's childish pique prevented this measure's being brought on last Thursday as was intended. On that occasion, the opportunity was given to the House to accept that this was an emergency measure that required the immediate attention of the Parliament. It was clear that the Premier intended to bring on this measure. He had given notice of it on the preceding day and he had gone so far as to make known to members of the press his intention to bring the matter on. Indeed, in a report on the front page of the *Advertiser* last Thursday, it was pointed out clearly that that was the intention. That report states:

Dunstan's plan for crisis.

The SPEAKER: Order! The motion before the House is that Standing Orders be suspended for the purpose of considering a notice of motion. The suspension of Standing Orders, not any matter that will be debated later, is the only matter that can be debated now.

Dr. EASTICK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I assure you that I am not transgressing, because I am pointing out that last Thursday there was opportunity to discuss this measure in precisely the way it will be discussed later today. The opportunity was there, had the Premier intended, as shown in those reports and statements that he gave to the press, to allow Opposition members to consider the matter fully during the weekend.

Mr. Coumbe: And we would have forgone Question Time on Thursday.

Dr. EASTICK: We offered to do that, because we recognized, as did many other people in the South Australian community, that there was a crisis situation and that it required that the Government (indeed, the Parliament) act to allow such a measure to be considered. The report to which I have referred also states:

The Premier (Mr. Dunstan) will introduce a state of emergency Bill in the House of Assembly this afternoon.

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out again to the honourable Leader that he is digressing by referring to a matter to be debated later. At present, the honourable Deputy Premier has moved for the suspension of Standing Orders, and that is the only motion that can be debated by any two speakers now.

Dr. EASTICK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I stated, when I commenced my remarks, that I supported the suspension of Standing Orders. I state further that I supported the suspension of Standing Orders for a similar purpose last Thursday, because a vital issue had been notified to the Parliament, and the basic content of the Bill had been highlighted to the press. Indeed, members of the television channels were summoned to be in attendance at Parliament House at 3 o'clock last Thursday.

The SPEAKER: Order! Once again I call the honourable Leader's attention to the fact that we are dealing with the motion to suspend Standing Orders today (Tuesday, August 6) and that is the subject of discussion in this debate.

Dr. EASTICK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The motion that I am supporting today is precisely the one that I was willing to accept last week. I accept your ruling and I seek the co-operation of every member to allow this measure to proceed so that the issues can be debated fully. Indeed, in those circumstances, I will have the opportunity to indicate how foolish the Premier was last Thursday.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is a motion moved by the honourable Deputy Premier for the suspension of Standing Orders. The honourable member for Mitcham is out of order. Those for the question say "Aye"—

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): Mr. Speaker, I believe that I am entitled to speak.

The SPEAKER: Standing Order 463 describes what may happen on a motion for the suspension of Standing Orders. I am now putting the motion, moved by the honourable Deputy Premier, in accordance with Standing Order 463.

Motion carried.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Deputy Premier) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to make exceptional provision for the peace, order and good government of the State in cases of emergency. Read a first time.

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

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

I thank the House for agreeing to the suspension of Standing Orders. Twice in the past two years this Parliament has been asked to consider and pass, in a period of somewhat less than 24 hours, legislation dealing with situations of emergency. In each case the situations were somewhat similar, having been brought about by an expected acute shortage of petrol supplies. Notwithstanding that the Government and, indeed, the people of this State of every political complexion have good reason to be satisfied with the way this Parliament rose to the occasion, it is felt that there must be a better method of dealing with such situations than by the enactment of special legislation to cover each case.

Two considerations are paramount when an emergency occurs: first, the Executive Government must be armed with sufficient power to ensure that appropriate action can be swift and effective; and, secondly, in a Parliamentary democracy, the action taken must be open to a considered and an effective review by Parliament. An examination of these two considerations suggests that the time scale involved in the first is somewhat different from that involved in the second. For example, in the case of an expected shortage of some commodity, it is clear that immediate action must be taken to ensure that such supplies of that commodity as are still in existence are fairly distributed to the community, since if this action is not taken swiftly there will be nothing left to distribute. However, in such a case, it is by no means necessary that Parliament should be called on to examine and approve that action within that short time scale; indeed, the application of that time scale may very well substantially limit the effectiveness of the Parliamentary review. Thus, it may well be that, while Parliament agrees that some action should be taken, it has real doubts about the kinds that are contemplated and would like to consider them further: However, being mindful of the need for speedy action, it may consider that it is simply unable to give the necessary time to that review. It is with these considerations in mind that a Bill is now introduced.

In summary, it empowers the Governor to declare by proclamation that a state of emergency exists. The general circumstances in respect of which a proclamation may issue are set out in clause 3. Clause 4 enjoins the Governor to advise Parliament of the issue of the proclamation and the circumstances surrounding its issue. Provision is also made in this clause for the summoning of Parliament if Parliament is not then in session. Clause 5 empowers the Governor to make regulations dealing with the situation and gives these regulations the same effect as if they are enacted by an Act.

The power to make regulations proposed to be granted is the widest that can be conferred, in the words of the Bill, "for the peace, order and good government of the State", necessarily limited, of course, to any matter, situation or circumstance arising out of the state of emergency. The power to make regulations is subject to a further limitation which is set out in subclause (3) of this clause. The limitations set out here simply recognize the fact that the imposition of industrial conscription or the limitation of the right to strike or to take part in peaceful—and I emphasize the word "peaceful"—picketing have no place in dealing with a situation of emergency. Indeed actions such as this tend to exacerbate rather than solve problems. Subclause (4) is, from the Parliamentary point of view, quite the most important provision of the Bill, in that it provides for the laying, forthwith, before both Houses of any regulations made under this measure. Also, it provides that the regulations will expire within seven days of being so laid before Parliament, unless by a resolution passed by each House of Parliament they are continued in existence.

It is suggested that this provision will give Parliament an opportunity of considering actions taken to deal with the state of emergency, reasonably untrammelled by considerations of time. It is within this permitted week that any regulations repugnant to Parliament will either be revoked by Executive action or simply expire by the force of the Statute. Subclause (5) provides for the expiry of all regulations at the cessation of the state of emergency. Subclause (6) provides that the expiry or revocation of a regulation will have substantially the same effect as the repeal or expiry of an Act; that is, such expiry or revocation will not affect the validity of anything done under the regulation.

Subclause (7) applies the Acts Interpretation Act to regulations made under this Act. Clause 38 of that Act is excluded from this application, since it provides for the continuation of regulations until they are disallowed by Parliament. Regulations under this Act, as have been stated, require an affirmative resolution of Parliament for them to continue for more than seven days. It is suggested that the enactment of a measure along the lines proposed will ensure to people of this State appropriate protection in situations of emergency, but, at the same time, preserve, and indeed enhance, the proper role of this Parliament in dealing with such situations.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I believe that Government members would want Opposition members to have the opportunity to give just consideration to this measure, which is a completely new one. That being the case, I respectfully suggest to the Minister that the House adjourn for three-quarters of an hour so that Opposition members may consider the measure and thus be able to discuss it more meaningfully. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

*[Sitting suspended from 3.23 to 4.10 p.m.]*

Dr. EASTICK: This is a vital measure. Had the Premier acted with due responsibility last Thursday, members of the Opposition would have had an opportunity to look at the Bill in its entirety during a period of at least four days, whereas we are now asked to consider a measure the contents of which cause grave concern. Last week, when I indicated that we were concerned on behalf of the community and that it was essential for the matter to be brought on for consideration, the Premier was responsible for refusing the opportunity to bring on the measure even though he had arranged not only to introduce it but to present the details to the media.

The television crews were invited to attend at Parliament House at 3 p.m. for the purpose of the Premier's indicating what the measures were and how they would be implemented. At 3 p.m. the Premier's Press Secretary went out and told the media that the Premier would still be making an announcement, but he gave them no indication that he would not be bringing the measure on according to the plans he had outlined to the press and to this House. He used the opportunity for attacking me and the Opposition for having tried to take the running on this vital issue. But for the Premier's refusing to act responsibly, the details of this Bill would have been made known last Thursday, instead of the members of the Opposition being asked to consider the details in three-quarters of an hour and to try to sandwich in discussions on the vital issues, not only amongst members of this Party but also with the Parliamentary Counsel. In that three-quarters of an hour we were expected to test the feeling of industry, union members, and all other persons in the community who would be vitally affected by the effects of the measure. Far from being a Bill to solve the problems associated with industrial anarchy and the lack of supply of essential commodities, this Bill is an empty threat because it excludes from consideration many of those sections that are associated with supplying the essentials of life.

The Premier may say something about this matter when he winds up the debate but, during the second reading explanation given by the Deputy Premier in the Premier's absence (when we would have expected the Premier to be in this House), it was indicated that the whole measure revolved around the terms "situation . . . calculated to deprive the community or any substantial part of the community of the essentials of life". As we see, it, less of the essentials of life in the community is the result in most cases of measures outside the ambit of the Bill. Therefore, on that basis I believe the Bill contains only an idle and empty threat.

For a long time, members opposite have criticized Liberal and Country Party Governments for taking action in the interests of the public that those members say has been against the working man. Plenty was said in the campaign before the 1973 election in New South Wales. At that time, the New South Wales Government said that, if returned to office, as the need arose it would take action to ensure that the best interests of the community were safeguarded. Since being returned to office, that Government has not found it necessary to introduce such measures, as it has been able to have dialogue with the union movement and others in the community that has led to the satisfactory solution of problems that have existed from time to time. That Government has not introduced measures of the type referred to. I make that point

because so often we have been told that Liberal and Country Party Governments instigate action of that type. Clearly, present circumstances indicate that the failure of the Labor Government to get alongside the Labor organization (more particularly the union hierarchy) leads us into a situation where the essentials of life are denied people in the community. The long title of the Bill states:

An Act to make exceptional provision for the peace, order and good government of the State in cases of emergency.

Nothing that I have been able to read indicates how narrowly or widely the phrase "peace, order and good government" is to be read. It is a Pandora's box, an open sesame; there is no clear definition. An essential ingredient of the Bill is the interpretation of the "state of emergency" referred to in clause 2, which provides:

"state of emergency" means a state of emergency declared by a proclamation of emergency.

Clause 2 also provides:

"proclamation of emergency" means a proclamation under subsection (1) of section 3 of this Act:

No clear definition or yardstick is provided by which members on either side can know exactly what they are voting for.

Mr. Jennings: Would you like to try to define it?

Dr. EASTICK: As I have said, we recognize a need to have on the Statute Book a measure that recognizes that everyone in the community has a right to have the essentials of life safeguarded. However, I cannot accept that the Bill, as presented, will satisfactorily cover that situation. At this juncture, I can only support the Bill at the second reading stage, but I believe the Bill must incorporate essential amendments before it will satisfactorily provide the protection that I hope all members want for the South Australian community. The definition of "proclamation of emergency" refers to clause 3 (1), which provides:

If at any time the Governor is of the opinion that a situation has arisen, or is likely to arise, that is of such a nature as to be calculated to deprive the community or any substantial part of the community of the essentials of life, the Governor may by proclamation declare that a state of emergency exists.

How difficult it is to analyse the content of that provision. The first word "If" is open to conjecture. The subclause refers to the opinion of the Governor. We recognize that the Government of the day will advise the Governor, but is that the only case covered? Could the Governor act without the advice of the Government? The subclause then refers to the essentials of life, to which I have referred already.

Mr. Jennings: Bread and milk.

Dr. EASTICK: Are they the only essentials of life? I should think that the weekly income of a worker who is responsible to provide for his wife and family is an essential of life. Certainly that income is essential to the worker and his family, and it is essential if he is to meet his commitments. However, apparently members opposite will not accept that this is to be included in the definition of "essentials of life". Why should a person not expect that his weekly income would be protected as an essential of life? Naturally, he should be able to expect this, yet, as I read the Bill, that protection is not included in it.

If members opposite agree with the member for Ross Smith that the essentials of life are only bread and milk, they should say so. If they believe that additional items should be included in the essentials of life, they should say what those items are. There is complete silence

now from members opposite. Is hospital linen not an essential of life for those confined in hospitals? In this connection, I refer to the closure of hospitals as a result of anarchist activity. What about the situation last weekend of children at the Strathmont Hospital? They had to be farmed out to people in the community because the hospital was unable to provide the necessary clothing for them as a result of lack of laundry facilities brought about by the breakdown in the system. Are napkins and other clothing not essentials of life for the children at Strathmont? Yet where is provision made in this Bill to allow that situation to be overcome?

Is petrol an essential of life? We have to expect that it probably is, because the Deputy Premier has indicated that on two fairly recent occasions rapid action has been required in connection with petrol supplies. Which part of the availability of petrol is recognized as an essential of life? Is it only that part that ensures medical services and the distribution of foodstuffs can continue? What about people who are denied the opportunity to go to work to earn money to look after their families? Is that an essential of life within the meaning of this Bill? Again Government members are silent, because they have not thought through this Bill and are not willing to stand up and represent their constituents.

Mr. Payne: Perhaps we are being more courteous than you are when we're speaking.

Dr. EASTICK: Coming from the honourable member, that comment is almost hilarious. In introducing this Bill the Government is walking away from its responsibility to the people of this State, and it is abdicating its responsibility for the inaction it has recently perpetrated on the South Australian public. Clause 5 (3) provides:

Nothing in this section contained shall be held or construed as empowering the Governor to make regulations—

- (a) imposing any form of industrial conscription; or
- (b) making it an offence for any person to take part in a strike or peacefully to persuade any other person or persons to take part in a strike.

Surely, if a lack of supplies or a failure to provide the essentials of life is a result of a strike, any further strike arising subsequent to that event or any continuation of the strike that causes the further denial of the essentials of life should not be a binding out arrangement such as exists in this Bill. Also, we must consider the situation where other people become involved following the initial breakdown in the supply of the essentials of life.

I have already said that I will support the second reading of this Bill in the sincere hope that, between now and the Committee stage, amendments will be brought forward which will give this Bill teeth and which will truly protect the needs of the South Australian public. This Bill has become essential because of the inadequacies of the Administration that is in control of South Australia at present. When provisions for adequate protection are put into the Bill, it will be advantageous to the people of South Australia, but it is not advantageous to them in its present form. It is on that basis that I take my stand.

Mr. WELLS (Florey): Of course, I support the Bill. Having heard the Leader discuss his Party's views on it, I find it easy to understand why once again we are seeing chagrin, disappointment and frustration on the part of the Opposition: that is, because they are not getting a measure that will kick the insides out of the trade union movement of this State.

*Members interjecting:*

Mr. WELLS: There is no mention whatever of penalties against the trade union movement of this State, and it is for this reason that the Opposition sought the suspension of Standing Orders last week, so that the Bill could be considered then. The Opposition thought that it saw capital in this, and it wanted to exploit a situation fraught with anxiety and worry for everyone in respect of the disputation that was then occurring in the trade union movement.

Mr. Mathwin: We expect more than 45 minutes to consider a Bill of this kind.

Mr. WELLS: In seeking the suspension of Standing Orders last week, the Opposition did not care about the welfare of the community: all it cared about was to have a weapon to bludgeon and batten down the trade unionists of this State. It has been obvious from the Leader's remarks and from remarks we have often heard from the Opposition that Opposition members desire to shatter the trade union movement. However, the Opposition will never succeed while we are in this House.

Mr. McAnaney: You won't be here much longer, the way you're going.

Mr. WELLS: I do not know about that, but the honourable member will not, either. Perhaps in the future we will have a Liberal Movement Opposition which will take a different attitude. The Leader and other Opposition members undoubtedly want restrictions on the trade union movement. They want measures whereby penalties can be introduced so that trade unionists can be shackled to such an extent that they will not dare to raise their voices in opposition to the masters of industry, who are at present unable to achieve their aims. Any amendments moved by the Opposition will undoubtedly provide for shackles on the trade union movement. It is amazing how greatly Liberal Party views differ from State to State. On the other hand, the Labor Party has a very solid policy and a uniform platform. It is clear that Liberal Party members do not get together very much and do not understand each other, because they do not understand the varying requirements of the States. I wish to demonstrate the confusion that exists in this respect. I will say this for Sir Robert Askin: at least he knows better than to try to shackle the trade union movement of New South Wales. This has been demonstrated frequently. The following is the definition of "emergency" in the State Emergency Services and Civil Defence Act of New South Wales:

"emergency" means an emergency due to an actual or imminent occurrence that causes or threatens to cause loss of life or injury or distress to persons, or danger to the safety of the public or any part of the public, or destruction of or damage to property, in the State;

Clause 5, which deals with the limitation of operation of the Bill, is very enlightening. I commend it to members opposite, particularly in the light of what the Leader said in respect of amendments, which, no doubt, will be moved later. Sir Robert Askin's Government introduced the Bill through Mr. Willis (at that time Chief Secretary but now Deputy Premier), who was Acting Premier during Mr. Askin's absence overseas. That clause provides:

Nothing in this Act authorizes the taking of measures amounting to, or making preparations for—

- (a) actual combat against an enemy;
- (b) the putting down of a riot or other civil disturbance; or
- (c) the bringing of a strike or lock-out to an end.

That Bill was introduced by the Liberal Government in New South Wales, whose opinion it was that hands should be kept off the trade union movement. I suggest to members opposite that they should take notice of Sir Robert Askin's advice and keep their hands off the unions in this

State. Although the Premier introduced this measure for the benefit of the people of South Australia and to protect the community, it was not designed (and we would never be party to a Bill that was designed) to shackle the trade union movement and to bring it to a point where it would be subjugated to the wills and wishes of the master employer. I support the measure.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): This is a most important Bill. I was surprised to hear the member for Florey, when speaking about such a serious matter, abuse members of the Opposition on a subject hardly mentioned by the Leader. He became heated when talking about shackling unions, yet this was not even mentioned by the Leader. This is what the honourable member's speech was built around.

Mr. Wells: You'd better read *Hansard* tomorrow.

Mr. COUMBE: I will. The Leader mentioned the position in New South Wales, to which the honourable member just alluded, but the honourable member knows that that Bill is not yet in operation. What do we face in South Australia today? The Government has put before this House a Bill that is extremely far-reaching indeed. We have had exactly three-quarters of an hour to consider this Bill, the features of which are so important that they could affect, in certain circumstances and under certain conditions, every man, woman and child in South Australia. The Bill deals with a state of emergency and could affect everyone living in South Australia at present or in the future. Furthermore, it could seriously affect the rights, privileges, and procedures of this Parliament. It affects all the rights of members of this Parliament—the whole democratic process of this Parliament (as against the powers of the Executive Government)—and we have received only three-quarters of an hour (less the time taken in ringing the bells for five minutes) to consider it.

Mr. Langley: You said you'd put it straight through the other day.

Mr. COUMBE: The member for Unley has, no doubt, had the privilege of being able to study the Bill for several weeks.

Mr. Langley: You're not right. You don't know what you are talking about.

*Members interjecting:*

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. COUMBE: We have had only three-quarters of an hour in which to consider a matter that will affect the future of the people of this State. The Bill contains clauses that deal with the calling together of Parliament, and certain other aspects, so it will also affect the processes of this Parliament. I regret that the Premier did not see fit to introduce this Bill last week to enable members to study it over the weekend.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You offered to put it through last week.

Mr. COUMBE: We offered on Thursday afternoon, by the suspension of Standing Orders, to allow the Premier to introduce a Bill and to give his second reading explanation so that we could consider the matter.

Mr. Langley: You did not.

Mr. COUMBE: We also offered to forgo Question Time, and that is in *Hansard*.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You offered to put the Bill straight through.

Mr. Langley: And to sit at night. You know that.

Mr. COUNBE: Let me make it clear to the Premier, who is getting hot under the collar, that I intend to support the second reading of the Bill but will try to improve it in Committee: it is our democratic right to do so. We have had exactly three-quarters of an hour to consider the Bill. On Thursday afternoon, had the second reading been given, we would have asked the Premier to adjourn to allow members to consider the Bill.

The Hon. D.A. Dunstan: And you would have had three-quarters of an hour in which to consider it. We would have been pleased to give it to you.

Mr. COUNBE: Then why did the Premier not proceed at that stage?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Because at that stage I did not think it would be necessary until this week.

Mr. COUNBE: Have conditions in South Australia slipped further out of the Government's hands?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I didn't say that.

Mr. COUNBE: But I am saying that the Government is not in complete control of the affairs of this State and that matters are slipping out of its hands. Members of the Opposition listened carefully to replies given this afternoon during Question Time, and it was interesting to note what the Government was saying about the present industrial situation. It is a very grave situation. I believe that every member would agree that that is the case and that possibly the worst set of conditions, regrettably, exist: they are probably worse than I can recall, and possibly as bad as any members can recall.

Mr. Langley: What about the depression?

Mr. COUNBE: I was a small boy at that time, and I should have thought that the member for Unley was even smaller. I was talking about times that I could recall. It is fundamental that we should link up several of the definitions, because the Bill provides that, where in the opinion of the Governor a certain situation could occur, he may by proclamation declare that a state of emergency exists. These matters are contained in the definition of "state of emergency" and the phrase "peace, order and good government of the State", and must be linked completely when considering the import and implications of the Bill, which provides that "state of emergency" means a state of emergency declared by a proclamation. This must be tied up with clause 3, which sets out that if the Governor is of the opinion that a situation has arisen, or is likely to arise, that is of such a nature as to be calculated to deprive the community or any substantial part of the community of the essentials of life, the Governor may by proclamation declare that a state of emergency exists. They are the phrases that must be linked to obtain the correct import of this measure, if it is to be passed and to be meaningful.

In clause 3 (ii) we see that, at the moment a state of emergency ceases to exist, the Governor may take action by proclamation to declare that the state of emergency ceases to exist. We must then consider the definition of "essentials of life": I realize it is an umbrella-type phrase to catch all types of likely emergency that are likely to deprive people of the essentials of life, whatever that phrase means. I take that to mean things without which people could not live or without which they could live only under extreme hardship—things such as the fundamental supplies of food, electricity (and other services such as water and gas), milk or petrol.

Mr. Mathwin: How about cigarettes?

Mr. COUNBE: They may be a health hazard. This is the way in which I interpret these essential supplies without which people could not continue to live or continue their affairs in everyday life. Tied up with this matter is the method of supply of the goods and services to the consumer or the average citizen (man, woman, child, small baby or sick person). I emphasize again this aspect, which involves providing emergency supplies to sick people, patients in hospital, and the aged who cannot get around in the normal way.

In considering the provisions in clause 4, which deals with the calling together of Parliament in an emergency, I think that the real point we must consider is what might happen if Parliament has been prorogued. Rather than go through all the formal business of calling the Houses together and of the Governor conducting a formal opening, the House may be called together in certain special circumstances, as set out in clause 4. Clause 4 (2) provides for the making of a proclamation by the Governor calling Parliament together, notwithstanding any other legislation. Regarding clause 4 (3), there could be difficulties if Parliament had been dissolved, not prorogued, and if an election were in the offing. Perhaps the Premier will expand on this matter when replying to the debate.

Clause 5, which deals with the state of emergency, sets out the whole set of circumstances in which regulations may be made and the effect they will have. However, this so-called emergency Bill contains no teeth. The Bill, which has received publicity in the press, has been heralded as being a Bill to give emergency powers to provide for the "peace, order and good government" of the State, necessarily limited to any matter, situation or circumstance arising out of the state of emergency. The Bill contains no teeth to enforce or give legislative effect to the regulations set out in clause 5. It takes away completely the method of implementing or enforcing the very powers for which the Premier is asking the House to provide.

How could some of these regulations and powers be enforced under the provisions of clause 5 (3), which deals with industrial conscription and with possible offences involving any person wishing to take part in a strike? To return to my earlier point, no-one could accuse me of being a strike breaker. I make the important point that the essentials of life depend to a large extent on the delivery of supplies, and we are experiencing the difficulty of such deliveries right now. If transport facilities are cut off and denied and the sick and other people in the community cannot obtain these so-called "essentials of life", a vague term, what is the use of the Bill?

As the Bill has no teeth, I suggest that clause 5 (3) be reworded. I believe that a suitable amendment could be worked out to cover the provisions of this subclause. I read with some interest the Minister's second reading explanation of the Bill which deals with these provisions and which states:

The imposition of industrial conscription or the limitation of the right to strike...

Such a provision could lead to other problems that would have no place in dealing with a situation of emergency. Surely South Australia is getting into a state of emergency now, and many of our problems are being caused directly by industrial strife. I am not referring to the situation which arose previously and to which the Minister referred in his second reading explanation, namely, the situation regarding petrol. I recall that Parliament met on a Monday afternoon on one occasion to pass legislation with regard to petrol supplies. We are dealing not only with

this matter, for the Bill is as wide as can be: it is all-encompassing with regard to the essentials of life. I say categorically that South Australia is getting into a serious position because of its industrial conditions, more especially because of its transport difficulties.

I repeat that many essential supplies are tied up with the question of transport. If the whole of the State's electricity or natural gas supplies were cut off, would the Bill, under the provisions contained in clause 5 (3) in its present form, enable action to be taken to provide these essentials of life? I suggest that these provisions completely remove the teeth from the Bill and should be amended. If subclause (3) were amended in a suitable form, it might be well worth while. The Bill's provisions regarding the sittings of Parliament are acceptable, but the remainder of it is completely ineffective and innocuous, and the Premier knows that. This legislation could not be implemented. It might be all right to issue petrol coupons in time of a petrol shortage, but petrol is only one of the essentials of life.

I have in no way touched on essentials of life as regards the difficulties of keeping men in employment because supplies cannot be obtained. I support the Bill at the second reading stage and hope that it will be suitably amended. In its present form, the Bill is a lot of white-wash. It is another glorified public relations effort on the Government's behalf: a high-sounding measure to deal with emergency powers, the whole purpose of which is negated completely by clause 5 (3).

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I am generally uneasy about this legislation; I am uneasy about the manner of its introduction; and I am uneasy about its provisions. In Stephen Potter's work on gamesmanship and lifemanship he refers to the "flurry": it seems to me that this whole Bill has been introduced in an atmosphere of flurry. Apparently, it was ready to be introduced last Thursday, when the Opposition was willing to have it introduced and to examine it if it was really urgent. When I saw the Premier's reaction to the Opposition's attitude at that time, I could only have serious doubts regarding the real purposes of the Bill.

This is enabling blanket legislation to cover any one of many possible actions. Indeed, it is wide open, although on the surface it appears to be perfectly in order. I suppose that, if a state of emergency should arise, it should be competent for the Government to take urgent steps to deal with it. However, those urgent steps should wherever possible be approved by Parliament before they are taken, and I hope that the Premier will assure members that this course will be followed if this Bill passes and becomes law. While sounding fair on the surface, clause 4, which enables Parliament to be called together within seven days of the making of a proclamation of emergency, does not cover the situation which was outlined by the member for Torrens and which is so briefly covered by the three lines of subclause (3) as follows:

Where at the time a proclamation of emergency is made one or both Houses of Parliament are dissolved for the purposes of an election, the Governor shall so soon as may be call Parliament together.

If Parliament has been dissolved and the time for an election has been set some weeks away, the Governor may find that his hands are completely tied, and the state of emergency may continue for several weeks before Parliament can be called together. Indeed, an election may have to be held before the Governor may, "so soon as may be", call Parliament together again. This is a total abrogation of the normal Parliamentary process. The Executive should

necessarily be responsible to Parliament. Indeed, this is a fundamental principle upon which Parliamentary Government is based, and any move such as this, to weaken the power of the Parliament, even though it may be used only in exceptional circumstances, is to be deplored. I am not pleased about clause 5, and particularly subclause (3), part of which provides:

Nothing in this section contained shall be held or construed as empowering the Governor to make regulations—

(a) imposing any form of industrial conscription;

Although I do not oppose that as a general principle, if we are to spell out that provision we should also provide that the Governor shall not make regulations prohibiting any person from performing work of any sort, whether paid or unpaid. In other words—

Mr. Olson: Scabs!

Dr. TONKIN: Let us not have it just one way: let us have it both ways. If we are to be fair and square about this Bill, let us put both in and prohibit industrial conscription (which is all right) and, as well, make sure that no-one is prohibited from working if he wants to do so, particularly if he wants to work, in the public interest, in a certain industry. I should like to hear what the Government members who have interjected would say if doctors, or indeed anyone else performing an essential service, were to go on strike. I do not like clause 5 (3) (b), which provides:

making it an offence for any person to take part in a strike or peacefully to persuade any other person or persons to take part in a strike.

That is an even more biased provision. It could well be necessary for action to be taken and for the Governor to make regulations. However, I cannot foresee such circumstances, and I am sure Government members cannot either. Although paragraph (a) could be contemplated as coping with a possible situation, I do not really think paragraph (b) could be. In matters of extreme urgency, whether the matter of urgency was an industrial one or, indeed, any other form of emergency, Labor members must put themselves on exactly the same footing as that of every other member of the community. They must do this in the interests of peace, order, and good government of the State, and they must rely on the judgment of the Governor and his advisers (presumably Cabinet), just as every other member of the community must do so. In other words, in terms of clause 3, if at any time the Governor is of the opinion that a situation has arisen, or is likely to arise, that is of such a nature as to be calculated to deprive the community (or any substantial part of the community) of the essentials of life, the Governor may by proclamation declare that a state of emergency exists.

There are no exemptions from this. If the situation is so serious that a state of emergency must be declared, there must be no exceptions. We must all stand or fall by what the Governor, in his wisdom and after receiving advice, decides. For that reason, although I cannot understand the purpose or the thinking of those who drafted the Bill, I think they will on reflection see that they are asking for special consideration (in other words, an exemption) when no exemptions should be given. I do not therefore like that provision, and I hope that Government members will on reflection see that it is totally unfair to the community generally. I have gone into detail regarding aspects of the Bill that distress me. I dislike the whole principle of blanket legislation, especially when it is blanket enabling legislation such as this, enabling regulations to be made. Even if it is for so short a period as seven days, I do not like it.

Mr. Duncan: Are you supporting it or opposing it?

Dr. TONKIN: I believe that any state of affairs that is sufficiently serious to lead to the declaration of a state of emergency should be sufficiently obvious and apparent for Parliament to be informed of it beforehand. It is unlikely that insufficient warning would be possible. I believe that every state of emergency and the situation that might lead to one should be considered on its own merits when it arises. I should like to see Parliament called together, wherever possible, before this action is taken. This Parliament has previously been assembled on other than a normal sitting day. Indeed, it happened in the session before last in relation to petrol rationing. I, for one, was pleased to attend that sitting on a Monday, as I am sure every other honourable member would be. I believe that this is the situation that should apply. What emergency has suddenly cropped up over the weekend? The Premier has said, "The emergency existed last week," and then he has said, "No, it did not." He was not game to take advantage of an offer by the Opposition to debate the situation: no, the matter could wait until the next week.

Mr. Coumbe: Perhaps he himself had an emergency.

Dr. TONKIN: He could have had an emergency. Now the position has changed over the weekend and the measure has been brought forward again. We have not completed the Address in Reply debate, which normally takes precedence, yet suddenly, because something has changed, we are considering this emergency legislation that was urgent last Thursday and later was not.

I can only think that something has happened regarding the transport industry. The Minister was busy this afternoon. Perhaps the transport workers' strike will extend throughout South Australia and perhaps we in this State will be in serious trouble. If that is so, the Premier should tell the House. Goodness me, we hear enough about open government, and we should be told whether an emergency confronts this State at present. If it does, let us be told what it is and let the Premier explain to the House why it is necessary to pass this sort of legislation. If he will not keep Parliament informed and if his policy is to be not to do so, I suppose we have no option but to consider these blanket provisions that have been put before us. I do not care for the measure in its present form, and I will support the second reading only so that amendments can be moved to make the Bill less objectionable. Even if those amendments are accepted, I intend to oppose the third reading.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I oppose this Bill, and I am amazed at the attitude that the L.C.L. part of the Opposition has adopted last Thursday and again today. Last Thursday the Leader of the Opposition moved a motion for the suspension of Standing Orders and, if the Government agreed to that motion, the Bill could have been passed on Thursday. There is no doubt whatever about that. Members of the L.C.L. may not have realized what was in the motion that their Leader was moving, but I have stated that its effect was to allow for the passage of the Bill without delay.

Why on earth the Leader should try to make some point about that this afternoon and say that, if the Bill had been brought on last Thursday, he would have had the weekend to examine it, I do not know, because his own motion, if passed, would not have allowed that to happen. Apart from that, which is merely a procedural

irrelevancy really, I oppose this Bill most strongly, because of what it provides and what it does not provide. This House has been given no information to show that we in South Australia are in such an extreme state of emergency today as to justify putting a Bill of this kind through Parliament at one sitting. Not one word has been said about that.

I tried to speak this afternoon in the debate on the motion for the suspension of Standing Orders but, under Standing Orders, I was blocked from doing so. However, the Deputy Premier, when he moved for the suspension of Standing Orders, did not give one reason why this Bill should be pushed through the House today, and the Leader of the Opposition also did not give a reason. The Leader merely complained about what had happened last Thursday. I remind honourable members that on that day the Premier linked this Bill with a crisis in the distribution of petrol, and he said that the Bill had been in the course of preparation for many months. On Thursday he denied that there was any emergency that would justify putting the Bill through Parliament then. What has happened in the meantime to justify the action now being taken?

Certainly, we in South Australia are in a serious situation, but it is not so much more serious today than it was last Thursday that it justifies this action. I consider that this Bill is being pushed through in the shortest possible time so that members and, more important, people in the community will not have an opportunity to examine it and understand its true purport before it has been rushed through Parliament. Well, it should not really have taken the L.C.L. even three-quarters of an hour to conclude that the Bill was thoroughly bad, but in that time the L.C.L. concluded that it would support the Bill.

Let us consider the measure clause by clause and find out what it provides. I sum the measure up by saying that, in my view, it means the suspension of constitutional Government in South Australia for no less than seven days or, in some cases, for substantially more than that. I pass over clauses 1 and 2: they do not matter. However, clause 3 (1) provides:

If at any time the Governor is of the opinion that a situation has arisen or is likely to arise—

The situation may not even have arisen: the position may be merely that in the opinion of the Governor it is likely to arise. What does the phrase "the Governor is of the opinion" mean? It means that the Government of the day desires to proclaim a state of emergency. It would be almost impossible, if not completely impossible, to persuade any court of law to go behind the proclamation that had been issued, and I am sure that the member for Elizabeth and, if he was here, the member for Playford would agree with me on that.

A court is extremely loath, if it ever is willing, to examine, if it has the power to do so, what the opinion of the Governor is as expressed in a proclamation pursuant to legislation such as this. Therefore, first, in that way we give the Government *carte blanche* whenever it wants to issue such a proclamation, and there is no effective remedy for that. As I have said, the situation need not have arisen: the Governor always acts on the advice of the Government, and the point made by the Leader about that had no substance. The Governor need say only that a situation is likely to arise, and we are caught with it. Clause 3 (1) continues:

that is of such a nature as to be calculated to deprive the community or any substantial part of the community—  
What is a substantial part of the community? Goodness knows! That phrase has no precise meaning. We do not know whether it is 5 per cent of the community, 10 per cent



or 90 per cent, and we do not know how we would measure it, anyway. The provision continues:  
of the essentials of life—

What are the essentials of life? I think the member for Ross Smith interjected and said that they were bread and milk. Is petrol an essential of life? Again, this term is so broad as to be completely meaningless. The provision continues:

the Governor may by proclamation declare that a state of emergency exists.

Clause 3 (1) is so wide as to enable a Government (not necessarily this Government but perhaps a future Government) to declare a state of emergency at any time it wants to do so, and there is no redress if that action is taken.

Clause 3 (2) does not matter. Clause 4 (1) provides:

Where a proclamation of emergency has been made the occasion thereof shall forthwith be communicated to Parliament.

That is all right if Parliament happens to be sitting at the time, but we sit for probably four months or five months in a year. Certainly, in my experience Parliament has not been actually sitting for six months, and the period of seven days applies only if Parliament is sitting. If during the remainder of the year (which is more than half the year) Parliament is not sitting, it must be called together, if possible within seven days; the regulations are laid on the table when it is called together, and they do not expire under this provision for another seven days.

Mr. Chapman: Are you sure about that?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Alexandra will put me right if he can, but let us look at clause 4 (2):

If Parliament is adjourned or prorogued and that adjournment or prorogation will not expire within seven days of the day of the making of the proclamation of emergency—

that is if Parliament is not sitting; say this had occurred a month ago—

the Governor shall, by proclamation, call Parliament together on a day to be fixed being a day that falls within that period of seven days—

The proclamation can be made and Parliament called together for a day six or seven days ahead. I hope the honourable member is with me so far and that he will bear with me as I go on with the explanation.

Mr. Chapman: It is more than seven days.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Let me now take the honourable member to clause 5 (4). It should be obvious, even to him. This subclause states:

Regulations made under this section shall be laid before both Houses of Parliament as soon as may be after they are made and shall expire after the expiration of seven days from the day on which they were so laid unless a resolution is passed by each such House providing for their continuance.

Regulations cannot be laid on the table of the House unless Parliament is sitting. Therefore, if Parliament is not sitting at the time the proclamation is made, there must elapse some days (up to seven) before we are called together, the regulations are then laid on the table of each House, and they go on for seven days from that day. I am pleased that the member for Alexandra now acknowledges the accuracy of what I am saying. The period of seven days that has been bandied about is largely illusory. Most of the time it would be longer than seven days. If we return to clause 4 (3), we realize that if Parliament has been dissolved for the purpose of a general election (and let us not kid ourselves about this; it may not be thinkable today, but in a few years time what better time to call a state of emergency than in the

week before an election to cause terror and dismay and do what you may just before election time?) it may be four or five weeks before Parliament could be called together, by the time the result of the election is known and the writs are returned.

The state of emergency goes on all that time and might have had a very vital influence on the result of the election itself. Let members not ignore that possibility which today may be hypothetical in our community, but the way we are going it may not be in a few years time. This Bill is being put through on a permanent basis; once on the Statute Book it will remain until it is repealed.

These are my fundamental objections to the Bill: the sweeping nature of the powers bestowed by clause 3 (1), and the period of time that could elapse. The Bill, at the lead, is capable of being so much abused by a Government for political ends that one should oppose it, and there is no gainsaying that at all. We may be prepared to trust ourselves, and members opposite are certainly prepared to trust the present Government, although I am not sure that I am. However, this Bill will stand on the Statute Book of this State until it is repealed, and it is a most dangerous Bill indeed. Without any reasons being given, it is being pushed through in one day with the contrivance of what it likes to term itself, anyway, as the official Opposition. I cannot credit that there could be such foolish people on this side of the House. I have dealt with clause 5 (4) especially for the benefit of the member for Alexandra, but this clause states:

Where a state of emergency exists the Governor may, subject to subsection (3)—

which is something members in the L.C.L. have already picked up and about which I will say something, I hope a little more moderately than they did, although not much more—

make such regulations in relation to any matter, thing or circumstance arising out of the state of emergency as in the opinion of the Governor—

there is that phrase again: it would not be possible to go behind that phrase (no court would interfere with it, certainly not on the spot, as it would have to be done to have the necessary effect)—

are necessary for the peace, order and good government of the State and any such regulations may provide for and prescribe penalties—

That power is sufficient to allow the Government to do anything it likes, with no redress at all, and very heavy penalties may be imposed. There are no limits to that power, and I remind members there are not meant to be any limits. The second reading explanation said as much: it must be as wide a power as can be achieved for the Executive Government without any control by Parliament on what it is doing. That is quite conclusive in confirming me in my complete opposition to the Bill as it stands.

Let me sum it up by saying that I oppose the Bill, first, because of the period that could elapse, which is far longer than seven days; secondly, because of the power it gives to proclaim an emergency at any time at the behest of the Government without, in my opinion, there being any remedy at law; thirdly, because of the extremely sweeping powers, the completely sweeping and absolute powers given under the Bill to make regulations during that period. We were told by the Premier last Thursday that this was because there was likely to be the threat of a shortage of petrol. Can anyone believe it is necessary to pass a Bill of this nature to deal with a petrol shortage? Of course not! It is a thoroughly bad

and ill-advised piece of legislation. I know members of the L.C.L. will spend most of their time dealing with clause 5 (3), so there will be no need for me to say too much about it.

I agree with the member for Bragg that, if in fact there is an emergency, it is an emergency for everyone in the community, not for the community less members of trade unions, and yet this is what one would imagine from clause 5 (3). If we were facing a shortage of petrol because of industrial action, no doubt the only effective way to deal with the matter would be by taking some action which affected trade unions or a strike that had occurred. The Government, by its very action, is making sure that power is not given. What could be the reason for inserting this subclause? The only reason could be as a sop to trade unionists. It cannot have any other reason, because at present there is no point in that; the Government does not have to make any regulations which would impose any form of industrial conscription or create any offence, such as picketing, and so on. There is no need to put this in; the only reason is to make sure that the Bill is not opposed by the people who at present are causing the disruption in the community. It is a sop to them, it is not for any other reason, and it is thoroughly undesirable.

If there is to be a state of emergency we are all in it together, and we all should be liable to the same penalties and the same duress. I need say no more about that; I am sure members of the L.C.L. will go on about it at some length. In the time I have had I cannot say any more about the Bill, but I think I have had long enough to see that the Bill is bad. It is certainly opposed to every principle of constitutional government that we know. No reason has been advanced that is sufficient to support it at all, and certainly not in the short run. I would not, in any circumstances, support even the second reading of this Bill, and I hope that members (at least on this side) who have had a little more time and opportunity to think about it will change the stand they have taken, or their Leader has taken, and oppose it as well.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): We have had another interesting contribution from the independent from Mitcham: I would not suggest that it was a constructive contribution. The independent from Mitcham never ceases to amaze me with his capacity to criticize, and I have been amazed at his singular lack of ability to make constructive suggestions. His speech today was worthy of those two comments that I direct to him. The independent from Mitcham has suggested that the L.C.L. sought to have the Government's Bill introduced last week for the sole purpose of facilitating its passage. The independent from Mitcham is in error, because the Opposition sought to facilitate the introduction of the Bill so that we could find out what it was all about. We certainly gave no undertaking that we would facilitate its passage if, in fact, the Bill had been considered to be undesirable.

Precisely the same circumstances apply now. We are willing to take the Bill through to the second reading stage, but, unless we learn far more than the Government has told us in the second reading explanation of what the Bill is about, there is no guarantee that the Opposition will facilitate its passage on the third reading. Several speakers have made it clear (and if the independent from Mitcham had been listening, it would have been abundantly clear to him) that the Bill will be opposed on third reading. I cannot but agree with some of the comments of the independent from Mitcham, but we seek to take a somewhat more responsible attitude to legislation than does he with

his uncritical rejection of it. If it were apparent to the Opposition that a state of emergency existed (or was likely to exist), in the next day or two, it would be completely irresponsible of us as an Opposition to reject the measure out of hand. It should be clear to all members, including the independent from Mitcham, that we hope to move amendments and elicit more information from the Government. I hope the independent from Mitcham will listen to what we have to say in Committee. At present he seems to have pulled up his tent pegs and gone: perhaps he has a Tuesday evening appointment.

Mr. Rodda: I don't think he has been with us for a long time!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Perhaps the independent from Mitcham has opposed the Bill because he has a Tuesday appointment to supplement his regular Wednesday appointment, which prevents his attending this House and participating in debates.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: I think the independent is looking after one of his dependants at the moment.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Again I was unimpressed by the contribution of the independent from Mitcham. I am slightly perplexed about the Government's time scale in relation to this measure. Apparently, there was a move to introduce the Bill last week, but the second reading explanation has given no inkling of any pressing urgency. An opinion widely held last week was that a strike by the Transport Workers Union may have affected petrol supplies, and that is the construction we are led to place on the contents of this Bill. However, the Premier apparently believed that last week's emergency had passed, and deferred introducing the Bill until today. I am sure the Bill was drafted last week, but perhaps the intervention of the Australian Council of Trade Unions in this matter had to be considered.

Mr. Nankivell: It was ready months ago.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: This Bill applies to the long term but, if it has been introduced to cater for a situation likely to arise in the next day or so, the Government should tell us about that situation. However, nothing of that sort of thing is referred to in the second reading explanation, although it states that Parliament previously passed emergency measures relating to an acute shortage of petrol supplies in this State. I would rather follow the action taken at that time than introduce, at the shortest notice, a Bill to cater for long-term effects and to cover any future emergency. It is unreasonable for the Government to introduce a Bill that it has had ready at least since last week (but probably for months, as indicated by the member for Mallee) without the Opposition having any knowledge of its contents. It seems that the Government is treating Parliament with contempt. This Bill should have been introduced last week and the debate adjourned until this week. The Opposition would have had time to examine it and its implications, but the Bill has been introduced today and the Opposition given about three-quarters of an hour in which to study it. The Bill is supposed to cater for a state of emergency that has not been referred to in detail in the second reading explanation.

The tenor of the second reading explanation is aimed at what could possibly occur in future: it contains no reference to any situation that has developed, or is likely to develop, today or tomorrow. In these circumstances, I believe the Government has again treated this Parliament with contempt. The Opposition has adopted an entirely responsible attitude in suggesting that it will allow this

Bill to pass the second reading stage so that the Government can explain the emergency that requires the passage of this Bill within a day or so and why we have been given such short notice. We have had no explanation from the Government that the urgency today is to deal with the possible activities of the Transport Workers Union.

Dr. Eastick: Has it anything to do with the Premier getting his paddy up last week?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Maybe it has. If the mood of the Ministers is to deprive Parliament of a proper explanation simply because of a fit of pique, it is a sorry reflection on the Government. The front page of the *News* tells of the threatened strike by the T.W.U. No doubt, that could lead to a state of emergency. If that is so and this Bill is introduced for that purpose, why does the Government not say so? Why are we being asked to consider at short notice a Bill that will be of long standing and on the Statute Book, designed permanently to cater for any state of emergency that may occur in the future?

Unlike the independent from Mitcham, we intend to facilitate the passage of the Bill on second reading, and then to move amendments to find out what the Government is thinking. If there is an impending emergency, we should not like to be held responsible for tying the Government's hands when strong action is necessary in the next day or so. Several members of the Opposition have dealt with the clauses of the Bill. Much of the explanation is fairly vague, I am afraid. The Government makes much of "peaceful picketing", and so on. Let me read the relevant part of the explanation, because I intend to direct some remarks to the limitations of the Bill as spelt out in clause 5. I intend to move an amendment merely to find out what the Government is thinking about this specific matter of strike action.

The member for Florey was at great pains to accuse the Opposition again of hating trade unions. Of course, we point out on every occasion that he does so that it is not a hatred of trade unions: it is whether trade unions should in fact be exempted, by peculiar and discriminatory clauses, from the provisions of the law that apply to all other sections of the community. However, be that as it may, let me refer briefly to what is said about "peaceful picketing":

The limitations set out here simply recognize the fact that the imposition of industrial conscription or the limitation of the right to strike or to take part in peaceful—and I emphasize the word "peaceful"—picketing has no place in dealing with a situation of emergency. Indeed, actions such as this tend to exacerbate rather than solve problems.

That seems to me to be simply a recognition of the fact that the Government is powerless against trade unions. What is the demarcation line between peaceful picketing and violent picketing activities? What about the picketing activities by trade unions in Victoria when they literally tore down part of the Ford plant?

Mr. Evans: That was peaceful!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Was it? Was it or was it not the unions' fault? That statement, which is no definition of what constitutes peaceful picketing and what does not, is simply a sop to try to justify the peculiar and discriminatory exemptions that appear in clause 5. I shall not be daunted and swayed by the abuse of the member for Florey when he seeks to justify this sort of exemption. All it points to is the fact that the Labor Government

cannot act, and has no will to act, in defiance of the trade union movement, and it cannot act without the approval of that movement.

If there is some other explanation, let us hear it in Committee when an amendment is moved to strike out that part of the Bill that gives peculiar and discriminatory exemptions in favour of the trade unions. Surely the Government has the wit to understand that it is often strike action that causes a state of emergency. The Premier made what I believe to be probably some of the more courageous statements which he is not wont to make but which he made today in connection with the T.W.U. and its part in the situation obtaining at Port Adelaide.

The Premier has said previously, and again here today, that he and the Government completely condemn the activities of the T.W.U. for what it is doing at Port Adelaide in holding up the movement of steel supplies. He also previously acknowledged (and he acknowledges here today) that there is no jurisdiction, legal or otherwise, that he and the Government can exercise; there is no option open to them whereby in this situation, which they acknowledge is critical, they can take action.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What action would you suggest in relation to the Port Adelaide position could be taken that would not make the position worse than it already is? If the honourable member wants to make his point, he should answer that question. What law would you pass to ensure that steel became available without creating an extension of the stoppage?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The question to which I am addressing myself is that of the specific exemption, which is a similar situation to that which exists at Port Adelaide. If the Minister will listen to me, he will understand the situation. I am explaining that this exemption in this Bill could lead to that sort of situation, where the actions of the trade union movement have led to an emergency. The Government may think that these activities hurt the whole community but in terms of this Bill, because of the specific exemptions, it can take no action. If there is some other explanation, let us have it in Committee. Therefore, it seems to me that the Government is seeking to weaken the composition of this Bill simply because it has had pressure, as it always has, from this strong trade union wing that exists not only in the Parliamentary Party but also in the organizational section of the Party. I believe that such pressure can lead to the sort of situation existing at Port Adelaide at present. Again today, the Premier deplored the fact that he had no authority to take action in the present situation. However, the Bill excludes strike action by trade unions.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Are you arguing that strike breaking should be included in the Bill and that this would not make matters worse in the present situation?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: If the Minister believes that what I am saying is not factual, he can speak in this debate, instead of simply pouring invective on Opposition members.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I am not pouring invective; you're doing that. I'm just asking a question.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: By way of interjection, the Minister has referred to strike breaking. If the operations of a union led to a situation of emergency in which, in the interests of the community, the Government considered it necessary to take action against the union for what was deemed to be an illegal strike, I believe the Government should have the power to do so.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Do you believe that that wouldn't make matters worse?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Is the Minister asking me to espouse a philosophy of peace at any price?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: No, I'm asking you to answer my question.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I think I have made my point. I believe the Minister understands what I am saying with regard to the discriminatory exemption in the Bill relating to the trade union movement. I certainly do not favour that. What would happen in a situation of emergency would be at the discretion of the Government. Obviously, the provision to which I have referred ties the hands of the Government. Whether the Government would undertake what the Minister seeks to call strike-breaking action, I do not know; it would depend on the circumstances. However, I do not believe that we should write this exemption into the Bill for all time. If that explanation does not satisfy the honourable Minister, let him take up the matter in this debate.

I share the concern expressed by members on this side about the far-reaching nature of the Bill. If there is an impending emergency to which we should address ourselves, let it be detailed. Do not let us have this repetition by the Government of its record of keeping legislation up its sleeve and not letting the Opposition know what it intends to do. Apparently the Government likes to make some cheap political point or ensure that the Opposition is ill prepared for a debate. I think that what I have said accurately describes the Government's attitude since I have been a member: it has not sought to inform the Opposition. This legislation has been prepared for some time. If there was a possibility that we might have to pass the Bill this week, the Government should have introduced the Bill last week and adjourned it until today, giving us time to find out what it was about. Although I am willing to support the Bill at the second reading stage, I intend to move the amendment to which I have referred.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no amendment before the House.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I trust that, in the remainder of the second reading debate, members opposite from the trade union wing (which is the predominant wing) will not follow the example of the member for Florey but will desist from this constant barrage of abuse to the effect that we hate the trade union movement, because we do not hate it. However, at the same time, we do not believe that there should be a special exemption in the Bill for the trade union movement.

Mr. Keneally: Or for farmers.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, for farmers or any other section of the community. There should not be special exemptions from the impact of emergency legislation if it can be shown that the efforts of an organization (a union, an employer group, or whatever) are inimical to the welfare of the citizens of the State. In such cases the law should cover everyone. I will say more about this matter in Committee. With the grave reservations to which I have referred, I support the second reading, hoping that more information will be elicited later in the debate.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): In general principle, I support the Government's having emergency powers. It is unfortunate that the efforts of this Government and the disgraceful actions of the Australian Government have produced the situation in which we now find ourselves. My basic opposition to the Bill is that it discriminates between sections of the community. Emergency powers

are provided to restrict the activities of members of the community as a whole, but one group will be exempted. On Sunday night, I heard that great Communist (Mr. Munday), who says he will take over Australia, say, when asked what the general community thought of his activities, that the general community was made up of people who were all trade unionists, so that they must be benefited. However, not long ago fewer than 50 per cent of members of the work force were trade unionists. Since compulsory unionism was introduced, that percentage may have increased. Surely, as members, we should represent the attitude of the average man in the street. However, in the Bill one section of the community is exempted, and I oppose that provision. I hope that the attitude of the Labor Party will not lead us into a situation in which Communism can flourish.

Mr. Wright: What about Fascism?

Mr. McANANEY: Fascism only arises when another group tries to take over. Fascism only took over in Germany because the Communists were rife and were trying to gain power. There is little difference between what is involved in Fascism and Communism; both try to direct the average man in the street.

Although I have great admiration for the member for Florey, I was disappointed to hear his reference to master employers. Under the Bill, action could be taken against employers and not against unions, and that would be unjust; all sections of the community must be considered on the same level. The member for Florey referred to the legislation in New South Wales, saying that the Liberals in that State had agreed to the legislation, whereas we would not agree to such legislation here. He referred to lock-outs and strikes. I have heard the Minister of Labour and Industry say in this House that strikes were necessary but that lock-outs should be illegal. I do not think his attitude has changed; he believes in one rule for one section of the community and another rule for other sections. That is a shameful attitude to hold.

The Hon D. J. Hopgood: Who locked out the airline pilots only a few months ago?

Mr. McANANEY: I am not talking about the rights or wrongs of lock-outs: I am saying that in legislation justice must be done by all sections of the community. We cannot say to one section, "You are little white-haired boys; you can do as you like." I do not know what my Party would do, but I know what I would do concerning the situation at Port Adelaide, especially if someone wanted to take steel from the docks and was stopped by peaceful picketers. The Government of the day must take strong action, even if it involves further industrial strife. Surely we have enough guts and determination to say that one section of the community cannot stop another section from doing something. A man has a basic right to stay home from work if he wants to, but no man should be allowed to tell another that he cannot touch property belonging to another involved person.

Yet that is what the Government is trying to do in this whitewashing legislation today. This same situation has occurred time and time again. I refer to legislation introduced last year concerning petrol. Seamen said they would not deliver petrol to Port Adelaide, and Port Stanvac refinery employees said that petrol belonging to other people was not to be delivered or transported from the refinery. Indeed, the Premier nearly cried about the stand taken by petrol resellers who said that they would not sell petrol because of the attitude taken (indeed, I can see the Premier's face now; he is the greatest actor of all time).

The Premier said, "Look what I have done for them over the years; I have done this and that, and now they have let me down and will not sell petrol when I want them to." This is complete hypocrisy. It is all right for seamen to commit piracy on the high seas and not deliver petrol to Port Adelaide, and it is all right for Port Stanvac employees to keep petrol locked up, yet it is not all right for petrol sellers, who are not trade unionists, to decide not to sell petrol. They are committing a crime! I say not that action should be taken against a specific group but that every section of the community must be treated fairly. Everyone should be treated alike—

Mr. Goldsworthy: The law should apply equally to all.

Mr. McANANEY: True, and some of my colleagues annoy me by referring constantly to help for primary producers. Surely we must look at the effect of such legislation on the average man. We should ensure that any action taken should not be in the interests of only one section of the community. Laws should be fair and just in respect of every section of the community, irrespective of whether a powerful group or union is involved. It is said that one cannot do anything about several unions when they are doing something morally wrong and unjustified. We are told that we must not do anything to them because they might get more militant or demand more than they currently seek.

I would be ashamed to be a member of this House if we passed legislation that was so discriminatory in favour of various sections of the community. About two years ago legislation was passed prohibiting discrimination on the grounds of race, creed, colour and sex, but now we must bring in legislation providing that there be no discrimination against a person because he is not a member of a trade union. If we are to be just and fair, that is the attitude we should adopt.

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

Mr. McANANEY: It is sad that the economic mismanagement of the Australian Government is such that we have to face up to such emergencies. We have reached this situation as a result of the Australian Government's creating an excessive demand for goods and as a result of indiscriminate pressure by various sections of the community for wage increases. Some legislation is necessary, but I will not support legislation that discriminates against one section of the community or grants one section of the community a special licence to do whatever it wants to do. A person has the right to strike, but no-one has the right to stop someone else from working. I am particularly concerned about the type of strike that prevents milk from being picked up from farms and causes it to be poured down the drain; such a strike is a crime that should not be allowed by any sound Government to happen.

There is some merit in the Bill, but it needs amending to make it fair and square to every section of the community. Last Sunday night in the television programme *Federal File* a leading Communist, when asked about the people who were hurt by strikes, replied, "The people are the unionists, and they will not complain." However, the unionists are in the minority. I realize that the number of unionists has grown since there has been compulsory unionism, but most people still do not belong to unions and they want the right to obtain goods and services without serious disruption. The Prime Minister has admitted that his Government will be in peril if these kinds of action continue. I cannot see why the Bill

should provide immunity for certain sections of the community in connection with any action they take that is detrimental to the living standards and essential services of the people of South Australia.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): Mr. Speaker—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Oh, no!

Mr. GUNN: I am pleased that the junior Minister is pleased that I am on my feet, and I hope every member on this side stands up in indignation at the standover tactics that we have seen from the Government today. Members, particularly Opposition members, have been held in complete contempt by this arrogant Government. The Deputy Premier was about to deny us 45 minutes in which to study this Bill, which will have widespread effects on the community and will threaten the democratic processes of this country.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You were going to put it right through last Thursday.

Mr. GUNN: It is obvious that the Minister of Transport is embarrassed by his Government's arrogant attitude.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I am embarrassed by your arrogant attitude.

Mr. GUNN: The whole Parliamentary process is under attack when a Government capitulates to trade unions, fails to show any courage, and lacks the guts to stand up to the dictates of left-wing and Communist-controlled unions in this country, which are holding the Australian people to ransom. The Minister and the Socialist member for Spence can laugh, but they know very well that what I am saying is correct. One would expect that legislation of this nature might come from the Greek colonels or from Mr. Vorster of South Africa, but not from a so-called democratic Party. This Bill gives the Government an open book to take complete charge of this State. I will support the second reading, but I make clear that, if the amendments that we intend to move are not accepted, I will vote against the third reading. I make no apology for saying that.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Will you call a division?

Mr. GUNN: Certainly.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You won't have anyone to count.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You will be opposed to the Bill on the third reading and you will call a division?

The SPEAKER: Order! This is a second reading debate.

Mr. GUNN: The Minister is trying to intimidate members on this side, but I assure him that we are not afraid to show our colours. When the third reading of the Bill is put, if the Government has not accepted proper amendments that we will move to introduce a sense of responsibility, we will certainly divide on it.

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the honourable member for Eyre that there are no amendments before the House at present.

Mr. GUNN: I was simply foreshadowing what we had in mind. Clause 3 (1) provides:

If at any time the Governor is of the opinion that a situation has arisen, or is likely to arise. . . What will happen if the Governor disagrees to the advice of his Ministers? We have already seen today a typical case where the Governor disagreed to a directive.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the honourable member for Eyre is well aware of what Standing Orders provide. Any reference to the Governor in that manner is definitely out of order. The honourable member for Eyre.

Mr. GUNN: I did not in any way wish to reflect on the gentleman I mentioned. I was making a passing reference—

The SPEAKER: Passing references are also out of order.

Mr. GUNN: —to a situation that could arise. I hope I made myself clear, because we have already seen such a case.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I could not understand what you were talking about.

Mr. GUNN: I am not concerned about what the Minister understands or does not understand. He is a past master at trying to mislead the House, as he has tried to mislead the public on many occasions in the past.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That is a reflection on me.

Mr. GUNN: It is not a reflection: it is a fact, as the Minister knows. If the Government was really sincere in introducing this Bill, why did it not afford the Opposition the right to scrutinize it over the weekend? We tried to facilitate the business of the House for the Premier so that all Opposition members (including those belonging to the two minority Parties) could consider the Bill during the weekend and let industry and other sections of the community have a good look at it before it was undemocratically forced through both Houses. This Government claims to preach democracy and the rights of the individual and the people. The Socialist member for Spence spoke at great length about—

Mr. Langley: What happened last Thursday? You said you'd put it through in one day.

Mr. GUNN: We did not say that. The member for Unley knows that well.

Mr. Langley: That's exactly what you said.

Mr. Jennings: You have a majority in the other place.  
*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GUNN: The community at large will judge the Government on its failure to allow proper consideration of this measure, and it will also judge it in its failure to take responsible action against people who act irresponsibly. I make no apology for saying that in the past actions of this Government in promoting industrial unrest in the community have caught up with it at last and it is now afraid to take action against the trade union movement, when action is obviously needed in certain cases. Each member opposite who has been interjecting is afraid because he knows—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You are a pedlar of untruths.

Mr. GUNN: Each member on this side is fully aware that members opposite owe their positions in this Parliament to their allegiance to trade unions: The Labor Party knows that its finances come from trade unions.

The SPEAKER: Order! For the benefit of the honourable member for Eyre, if he is not fully aware of the situation, we are discussing a Bill in its second reading stage, and the honourable member will therefore conform to Standing Orders and discuss the Bill now before the House.

Mr. GUNN: This measure has implications as wide as the farm gates, and anyone who reads it in detail—and I doubt whether members opposite who have been interjecting have read it—would be aware that its implications are far-reaching and a threat to the democratic processes of Government. Any member who cannot see the implications is living in a fool's paradise. One has only to read

through the provisions of clause 5 to be aware of that. It is measures such as this that dictatorial Governments have introduced in the past: it is a measure we should be loathe to introduce and to put on to the Statutes, as it creates a situation that will allow a Government of any complexion to take over and destroy the democratic processes of Government. With those few remarks, I indicate my support of the Bill at the second reading stage, but I hope that the Government will take a responsible course of action and accept the foreshadowed amendments.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I, too, will support this Bill at the second reading, but rise to indicate that I should like to see amendments introduced and accepted during the Committee stage. I wish not to discuss those amendments now but merely to clear up a misconception regarding the deliberate attitude of the A.L.P. to mislead the House. At no time last Thursday did the Leader of the Opposition say, in attempting to suspend Standing Orders, that he would debate the matter that day or say that he was for or against the Bill.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You mean he was just grandstanding last Thursday?

Mr. Langley: Whom are you kidding?

Mr. Millhouse: Then why—

Mr. EVANS: If the independent member for Mitcham will be quiet, I will read from *Hansard* what was said on that occasion. The Leader said:

We are willing to forgo Question Time if need be so that the Bill can be introduced and so that we can study it and give it due attention. I am willing to stay here this evening, if it is such an emergency that it requires attention this evening, or to come back tomorrow or consider it next Tuesday. If there is a real emergency—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You're just telling us that he was grandstanding on Thursday. We knew that.

Mr. Dean Brown: Dry up!

Dr. Eastick: The Minister consistently mishandles the truth.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You were frightened that the member for Mitcham would move first.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Fisher.

Mr. EVANS: The Leader continued:

I believe that the Premier and all of his colleagues will be willing to support the suspension of Standing Orders so as to allow them to introduce their own business forthwith. If any honourable member reads and takes an interest in those comments before criticizing them, he will see that the Leader did not at any stage say that the Bill would be put right through or that the Opposition would support it. The Leader said that the Opposition did not know the contents of the Bill, except for what had been reported in the press.

Mr. Millhouse: But what—

Mr. EVANS: The independent member for Mitcham is a past master at trying to mislead the House. His cynical and snide remarks are reported in *Hansard*. He criticizes for his own political gain. He does little benefit to his own credibility by his snide remarks. He speaks untruths, as he did earlier today.

Mr. Millhouse: Now read the terms of the motion: I challenge you to do that. You will not do that, will you? You're not game.

Mr. EVANS: The member for Mitcham knows that, if the House suspends Standing Orders to enable a Bill to be passed through all stages, it is a procedural matter; it does not necessarily mean that the second reading debate will

continue, as the honourable member knows. He also knows that the mover of the motion does not have to say whether he supports the second reading. The purpose of the motion was merely to suspend Standing Orders to enable the Bill to be introduced for the scrutiny of Parliament, so that the people of the State would know what the Government intended doing, and so that the Opposition and the trade union movement would have the time over the weekend to study it, or did the trade union movement have a look at the Bill long before the Opposition had a chance to do so?

Mr. Goldsworthy: Of course it did.

Mr. EVANS: I would say that the Opposition was the last to study the Bill, and the employers have not yet had a chance to study it.

*Members interjecting:*

Mr. GUNN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to Order No. 159, and ask you to apply it to the Minister of Education.

The SPEAKER: With all due respect to the honourable member for Eyre, I should have thought he would be the last honourable member to draw my attention to Standing Order No. 159, because he has been warned more times than has any other honourable member. I will not uphold the point of order, because Parliamentary procedures here and in every other Parliament are such that interjections are out of order. The honourable member for Fisher.

Mr. EVANS: Regrettably, I support the second reading, and will have more to say in Committee.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I object to the shocking manner in which the Government has introduced the Bill, giving the Opposition no chance to consider its implications. Last Thursday, the Opposition gave the Government an opportunity to introduce the Bill so that proper consideration could be given to it over the weekend. Why did the Premier give the minority Party no opportunity to study the Bill? Was he hiding something? Why is he so smug when he is in the Chamber? He seems to be pleased about introducing a Bill and giving the Opposition only three-quarters of an hour in which to study it before having to debate it. It is completely wrong and dictatorial for the Premier to do this. A state of emergency Bill is usually introduced in war-time, but some provisions in the legislation, unlike those of war-time legislation, protect certain sections of the community. The Bill provides that the Governor may proclaim that a state of emergency exists. This means that the Executive (the Government) will decide when such a state of emergency exists.

Clause 5 empowers the Governor to make regulations for the peace, order and good government of the State regarding any matter, situation or circumstance arising out of the state of emergency. Clause 5 (3) contains certain limitations regarding the regulations. Subclause (3) limits this power by providing it shall not be construed as enabling regulations to be made, making it an offence for any person to take part in a strike or peacefully to persuade any other person or persons to take part in a strike. Who shall define a peaceful picket? The situation at a wharf at Port Adelaide has existed for about 41 months. One man holds the whole State to ransom by picketing the wharf. As a result of his action hundreds of men are out of work. He has threatened anyone who would dare to touch the steel, which is rotting and rusting on the wharf and which will soon be useless for anything but salvage.

Recently, picketing took place at the rendering-down works at Wingfield, as a result of the transport drivers' strike. Butchers claim that there is a 30 per cent waste with their meat, and they must get rid of the wastage for health reasons. The waste was not collected for rendering down, so the butchers had to take it to Wingfield themselves. They found that they were unable to enter the boiling-down works, which are the butchers' own operations and which are controlled by them. They were threatened by the picket on the gate that, if they left their waste there, no more waste would be collected from their shops. I suppose one is to believe that it was a reasonable picket. Perhaps the Government might think that this was above board, but I consider it is wrong, and the position becomes worse and worse.

On Thursday the Premier insinuated that there was no urgency for this legislation to be passed, whereas today the Deputy Premier said that the legislation was urgently required and that we had only 45 minutes in which to consider the Bill before passing it through all stages of the House today in order that it could go to another place this evening. Why is the legislation urgent today, whereas it was not urgent last Thursday? I have been told that two tankers berthed at Port Stanvac yesterday loaded with oil. However, because they refused to be unloaded, they had to turn back and are now at anchor. Indeed, they have been at anchor all last night and today. Is that why the Premier has introduced this Bill today? If it is, why does he not say so? If this is an emergency, let him tell us why the tankers are there and what he intends to do about it. Clause 5 (3) provides:

Nothing in this section contained shall be held or construed as empowering the Governor to make regulations—

(a) imposing any form of industrial conscription.

Why, if there is a state of emergency, is the Government not allowed to impose industrial conscription? Why cannot it direct the labour force to do certain things in order to ease the situation? Paragraph (b) provides:

making it an offence for any person to take part in a strike or peacefully to persuade any other person or persons to take part in a strike.

Why is it good for the whole community to be under a state of emergency and for the unions not to be? What is the reason for this? What is it all about? One wonders why this section of the community that takes strike action should be treated in a special way. Why should it be untouchable? I suggest that the Government has been listening to Mr. Munday, of green ban fame, who has been most outspoken.

Mr. Langley: He is on your side, and you know it.

Mr. MATHWIN: This Government must know what Jack Munday is advocating: deliberate damage to property in support of unions. He denounces as interference with an industrial dispute any action that is taken to protect the public from assault. One wonders why the Labor Party protects the unions in this way. I now refer to an *Advertiser* report of May 15, which is headed, "\$10 000 gift made to A.L.P. 'blackmail'" and which states that the Commonwealth Public Service—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Glenelg can speak only to the Bill before the House. That is the only subject to which he can refer during the second reading of this Bill.

Mr. MATHWIN: Thank you, Sir. I am trying to link up my remarks with clause 5 (3), by which the Government is seeking to give special dispensations to a certain section of the community, namely, the unions. I am also trying to

pursue the reason for this, which is plain to me when I read the *Advertiser* report to which I have referred and which states that the Commonwealth Public Service Fourth Division gave \$10 000 to the A.L.P. campaign funds to support workers' claims.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the honourable member is stretching it too far in trying to link up these remarks with the Bill, which relates to special powers in cases of emergency. The honourable member for Glenelg.

Mr. MATHWIN: Very well, Sir. In accordance with your direction, I will not pursue that matter any further. However, surely Government members must realize that what I have said is true. There must be some reason for protecting this section of the community, and it is obvious that those members of Caucus who have in the past been union secretaries or organizers must be biased in this matter.

Mr. Langley: You know that there are more non-union members on this side than there are union members.

Mr. MATHWIN: It is all right for the member for Unley to try to protect these people in that manner if he wants to do so, but he knows that this whole matter is a one-sided proposition. Why should the people who go on strike be exempted? In July, we had the following strikes, which, under the Bill, would be exempted: about 350 men, members of the Chemical Workers Union who were employed by Adelaide and Wallaroo Fertilizers, were on strike for three weeks; 800 milk processors were on strike for six days; 350 members of the Baking Trades Union were out on strike for four days; 10 000 members of the Builders Laborers Federation were out on strike for five days; and 400 members of the Australian Government Workers Association were out of work for four hours over a dispute involving domestics at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. On July 16, 500 student teachers boycotted lectures (and I suppose that could be termed a dispute), and a steel dispute at Port Adelaide also resulted in loss of time.

Mr. Langley: What would you do?

Mr. MATHWIN: Under the Bill, all these people will be exempted. Therefore, few people would come under its provisions.

Mr. Langley: What would you do? Why don't you tell us?

Mr. MATHWIN: I will support the second reading, with the proviso that the Opposition will move some reasonable amendments in Committee. If the Government accepts those amendments, I will support the third reading of the Bill, which, as it stands, is a toothless, useless measure intended to protect a privileged section of the community.

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): I support the second reading, because the Bill gives a most necessary protection to the people of South Australia. Frankly, I could not get perturbed about who introduced the Bill; I do not mind the Premier's having done so. I do not mind who takes action to protect the community. Indeed, I believe that the action the Government has taken is responsible action. I agree with what I see to be the principal intention of the Bill: in an emergency it is necessary for the Government, in order to protect the community, to be able to take urgent action to provide essential goods and/or services. Although some aspects of the Bill disturb me, I am confident that, as a result of my supporting the Government's intention in introducing the Bill, it will see reason when later this evening some of the unfair and anomalous aspects of the Bill are pointed out. The

member for Glenelg became disturbed in his speech when he referred to the measures that are necessary in war-time. I do not suggest that it is necessary to introduce such protective action only in war-time. Without wishing to seem or sound dramatic, I say that I believe that there have been such occasions in this country, and I believe also that there will be future occasions when, unless the Government takes fairly firm action, there will be bloodshed in our own community.

The Bill could be said to be rather disguised and something like the policy that was put to the people before the two most recent elections, when such things as Socialism have been renowned to be disguised by the Australian Labor Party until it has got into Government. Much has been made of the protection built into the Bill for the trade union movement. Ordinarily I would not have any great fears about protecting the trade union movement, or any other movement, except the Liberal Movement.

Mr. Millhouse: I thought the L.M. did not exist now, and that we were independent, according to the member for Kavel.

Mr. CHAPMAN: It is, incredible that the honourable member thinks at all sometimes.

Mr. Millhouse: I thought I showed you the error of your ways this afternoon.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I am willing to protect any section of the community that deserves protection, and that includes the trade union movement in this country, as we used to know it. However, the trade union movement is no longer a minority group or a small or insignificant section of the community. It is no longer a unit assisting and financing the Australian Labor Party; in fact, it governs that Party. We know that in the A.L.P. in this State and federally neither Don nor Gough governs his own Party. Those people only sing the song to the trade union music. They dance around the floor to the dictates of that organization. Because that is the position, particularly in South Australia, I consider that we must examine closely any protection that is offered to this group.

Mr. Olson: Therefore, you want to starve them to death?

Mr. CHAPMAN: Clause 5 (3) provides:

Nothing in this section contained shall be held or construed as empowering the Governor to make regulations—

- (a) imposing any form of industrial conscription; or
- (b) making it an offence for any person to take part in a strike or peacefully to persuade any other person or persons to take part in a strike.

That provision clearly and distinctly has been inserted to protect the section of the community to which I have referred, and no-one, in an emergency, should receive any special protection. If we are to take at face value the Government's intention regarding this measure, the State generally must be protected. We must not have some people protected in a special way. I support the Bill to allow members later to amend the undesirable parts of it that show up so clearly.

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (38)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Broomhill, Dean Brown, Max Brown, Chapman, Corcoran, Coumbe, Crimes, Duncan, Dunstan (teller), Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Groth, Gunn, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, Mathwin, McAnaney, McKee, McRae, Nankivell, Olson, Payne, Rodda, Russack, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.



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

Majority of 36 for the Ayes.

Second reading thus carried.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Interpretation."

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I should like the Premier to give a clear and concise definition of "a state of emergency". We have had no clear indication of the factors that would determine a state of emergency.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): That matter is covered in clause 3, under the provisions of which a situation of a state of emergency has to be advised to the Governor by the Government. Under the provisions of this Bill that situation has to be accounted for by the Government to Parliament. A state of emergency is where we cannot continue the essentials of life to a section of the community or the whole of it, where we cannot provide that the normal essential services of the community are continued, and where an emergency can arise when people's very conditions of existence are endangered. This is not new drafting. This measure has been copied from measures on the Statute Books of other British-speaking jurisdictions. It is not possible to spell out the particulars, simply because there must be a discretion in relation to matters of this kind. It is not possible to list in detail all the foreseeable conditions, but I believe that the next clause makes perfectly clear what the basis, is of the advice to the Governor.

Mr. COUMBE: Notice of the introduction of the Bill was given on Wednesday of last week; the matter was adjourned on Thursday last, and the Bill was introduced today. What situation exists in the community to make the Premier consider it so urgent that this Bill should pass all stages in this House today and possibly be considered in another place?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member is aware that a national transport stoppage is threatened. That stoppage could threaten essential supplies in the community. While it is true that we have been able to agree with the Transport Workers Union that, in the event of a national stoppage, most emergency supplies will be continued, there is difficulty regarding some areas of essential supplies to people in the community who need those supplies simply to continue existence. It is essential for us to ensure that, where goods are in short supply as a result of industrial stoppage or unrest, we have supplies for the people who most need them. I am sure we will be able to do it in accordance with the provisions previously existing in the State under special regulations brought down on other occasions; I think we will be able to achieve this quite satisfactorily.

The only reason I am proceeding with the Bill out of the normal order of Parliamentary business is that there is a possibility (and I do not put it any higher than that) that, by the end of this week, we may need to invoke some emergency regulations to ensure that essential fuel supplies and essential food supplies are provided to the areas of the community requiring them. That is why we are now proceeding. I hope we will not have to invoke any emergency regulations this week; I think at the moment it is very likely that we will not have to, but I do not want to be left in the position of not being able to act should it prove necessary. That is why, the particular dispute having got to the stage it has, I am seeking to take the necessary precautions.

Dr. EASTICK: While I am not completely satisfied with the information supplied, and as the matter will be dealt with further in the next clause, I take no further issue on the words "a state of emergency" at the moment.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Premier say why the state of emergency appeared to evaporate last week but would seem to have been revived today so that the Bill had to be introduced at short notice? Why was the Bill not introduced last week so that we could look at it? What is different today from the position prevailing on Thursday last?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As I explained on Thursday, the Bill was not drafted on the basis of any particular emergency, and last Thursday the Government did not believe there was an immediate emergency situation. Last week Opposition members tried to take business out of the Government's hands when, without notice to me, the Leader moved that Government business should be proceeded with immediately and for the Bill to be put through this Chamber *in toto*.

Dr. Eastick: It is the same motion as moved by the Minister of Transport and by you.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: At that stage we did not consider that a situation had arisen that meant we should proceed with the measure outside the normal course of Government business.

Dr. Eastick: It was petulance.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No. The position had not arisen that there was a threat to emergency supplies that would cause us to pre-empt normal business.

Mr. Mathwin: It was the two tankers that were not unloaded yesterday that made you bring it in today!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, it was not. The Government introduced the measure before the end of the Address in Reply debate because we have a threatened national transport stoppage. We do not know whether it will occur for more than 24 hours, but there is a possibility that it could. In Melbourne certain essential services are not occurring and, although our situation is rather better than the situation in Victoria, the possibilities are obvious to the Government, which was determined that the situation that has occurred in Melbourne under a Liberal Government would not happen here. I believe it has been necessary to introduce the Bill so that, as a result of a decision made tomorrow by transport workers that could mean a continued stoppage, by the end of this week we would be able to introduce emergency regulations regarding essential supplies for the health, welfare, and safety of the people of this State, should that prove necessary. None of these conditions existed last Thursday and, whilst I hope that the situation will not go beyond tomorrow, it would not be proper for this State to refrain from taking some action. In Victoria no harbor lights are being shown and an ambulance cannot get on the road.

Mr. Gunn: That's a fine state of affairs: the unions should be proud of it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As I believe necessary provisions should be made to ensure that this does not happen in South Australia, the Bill was introduced today.

Dr. EASTICK: My motion was refused last Thursday because the Premier got his nose out of joint: if he has the guts, he will say so and admit it.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Don't be childish.

Dr. EASTICK: As has been pointed out, last Thursday the Premier, through his press officer, had arranged for television camera crews to be here in order to learn the

details of the Bill to be introduced immediately after Question Time. Page 1 of last Thursday's *Advertiser* indicates that the second reading would be explained on that day.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Crimes): I have allowed a certain latitude in the debate so far, but the Leader of the Opposition should now confine his remarks to the clause being discussed.

Dr. EASTICK: A state of emergency, which was here last Thursday, is a critical part of this clause. I moved a legitimate motion so that the matter could have gone beyond the first reading stage. The state of emergency is no greater today than it was last Thursday. The opportunity that existed for people in industry and commerce, for Opposition members, for the press, or for anyone else was denied because of a state of pique by the Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: When I gave notice of this measure I expected the Address in Reply debate would have finished earlier than it has proved it will. I was requested by the press and television stations to expand on what the Government was about in relation to this Bill. As a consequence of a series of requests from the media, I consented to explain the measure to them last Thursday and to state briefly what it was about.

Dr. Eastick: After delivery in here!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I did not say that it would be delivered in here. I said that the measure would proceed, and I constantly said that it would proceed at the end of the Address in Reply debate. I said that the Government was not introducing this Bill as a matter of urgency—it was part of the normal Government programme of legislation; and I repeated that constantly to the press and the television stations. The suggestion that I refused to go on with the measure last Thursday having intended to do so is completely false; it is an absolute damned lie. I never undertook to do any such thing.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Having asked the Premier the original question, which seems to have sparked this outburst, I think on examining the answer that it boils down to the fact that the Premier did not think that a state of emergency existed last week but thinks it is possible there will be a state of emergency this week. That is what he said earlier—"there is a strong possibility". Just how strong it is we do not know, because he hopes the matter will be resolved, so it is difficult to assess just what the Premier's assessment of the situation is.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! I suggest that the member for Kavel confine his remarks to the clause.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The matter was introduced by the Premier in reply to my query.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I warn the honourable member that his remarks do not come within the matter under consideration.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Premier has not satisfactorily answered the question why he did not simply introduce the Bill and let it lie over. If this was part of the Government's long-standing legislative programme and it was possible that trouble would brew within a week or two, it still does not explain the gross discourtesy.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I ask that the honourable member deal with the clause under consideration.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I have said what I wanted to say, but during the discussion of this clause this topic has been opened up, and the Premier has seen fit to spread his wings somewhat beyond the ambit of the clause.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I was only answering your Leader.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I suggest that the matter go no further and that the honourable member deal with the content of the clause.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Mr. Acting Chairman, are you ruling that, when I am seeking information from the Premier on why the Bill was not introduced and left to lie over, I am out of order?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: If the honourable member has a question relating to the clause, he is in order; otherwise, he is not.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The only information I have managed to elicit from the Premier is that he thought there was no state of emergency last week but thinks there is a possibility of a state of emergency this week. That is the only information we can elicit about the gross discourtesy shown to the Opposition by the way in which the Government has decided to handle this measure.

Clause passed.

Clause 3—"Declaration of state of emergency."

Dr. EASTICK: I seek information from the Premier on the extent of the definition of "essentials of life". Both in debate and in addressing ourselves to the previous clause, it has appeared that the whole issue revolves around the phrase "essentials of life". I believe that "essentials of life" in this context relate not only to petrol and milk, bread, and other food commodities but also to the ability of the person who is a breadwinner to obtain wages so that he can provide for his family. The clear indication we have had from some members opposite tends to suggest that an individual cannot expect to be able to obtain his weekly wages so that he can benefit his family in terms of the definition of "essentials of life". Because it is such a vital issue, I seek from the Premier a full definition of that expression.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In the Government's view (and this is what we will advise the Governor) it means the maintenance of food, fuel, and shelter, and the movement essential to those things.

Dr. EASTICK: Surely my reference to the receipt of wages or salaries comes within the provision of shelter or food. If the Premier denies that a person who is a breadwinner has the right to obtain wages or a salary so that he can provide food and shelter for his family, then we are clearly legislating for only a part of the total problem or crisis that is likely to engulf the community. Neither the Premier nor any member opposite or on this side of the House hopes that this measure, if passed, will need to be put into effect; but, if food, materials and shelter or the ability to obtain the wherewithal to pay for these things are involved, then clearly the provision should be here and the interpretation should be wide enough to allow that to happen. I should like an assurance from the Premier that that is intended to be the way in which the Government interprets the clause, if it is called upon to implement this measure.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not intend to enlarge on what I have said.

Mr. EVANS: Earlier today, the Premier said he was concerned that in one particular dispute some persons were denied their jobs while those people involved in the dispute were still receiving wages. An individual must

have his wages to be able to get food and shelter. The Premier is not prepared to state that that is so. All he is saying is that, food, shelter and fuel are directly involved; he will not admit it is essential for an individual to earn a salary or wages to pay for the needs of his family. Surely, in considering this measure, we should consider all sections of the community and give them some protection.

This is one of major issues at present—a strike about steel on the wharves stopping people from doing a job and earning wages; they are sitting down waiting to shift the steel. Surely, it is an emergency where people do not have wages or money to buy the essentials for living. The Premier says he is not prepared to include that in his own interpretation, as the Leader of the Government, as a recommendation to the Governor; he will not include it in his definition of what is essential for family life. Surely it is an essential. I hope the Premier will widen the definition he has given us.

Mr. McRAE: I strongly defend what the Premier has said. The New South Wales legislation refers to cases of earthquake, flood, epidemic, bush fire, and one or two other matters of national disaster. Specifically excluded, in legislation of the largest industrial State of the nation, are industrial disputes.

Mr. Chapman: What legislation are you referring to?

Mr. McRAE: The State Emergency Services and Civil Defence Act of 1972.

Dr. EASTICK: That New South Wales Act to which the honourable member refers is entirely different from legislation mooted by the New South Wales Government in the 1973 election campaign. Since it was returned to office, that Government has found it unnecessary to implement such legislation. The fact that there is no reference to industrial disputes in the Act to which the honourable member has referred merely diverts attention from the real issue, namely, that before the election in November, 1973, the New South Wales Government said that, if industrial unrest continued at the same momentum, it would have no hesitation in introducing emergency measures to deal with industrial disputes.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Although I do not expect the Premier to pinpoint exactly the areas in which the Government would act in a state of emergency, I should like him to give an assurance that such cases as health care would be included in the phrase “essentials of life”. Only recently, as a result of strike action, there was a desperate shortage of hospital linen. In similar circumstances, would such a case be covered by this legislation?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I consider that the matter to which the honourable member has referred would come within the terms I have used. I would certainly include in them the maintenance of essential health services.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I am concerned about the words “or is likely to arise” appearing in subclause (1), as I believe the Governor could place virtually any interpretation on those words, even taking them to include the case of a trade union’s threatening to go on strike. I presume that the Governor would make a decision at a meeting of Executive Council. If that is the case, will the Government try to influence a decision, as it has tried to do recently?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member must know well that a reference to the opinion of the Governor is a reference to the Governor in Council. Under the Letters Patent in South Australia, the Governor is required to act on the advice of his Ministers.

Mr. GUNN: I infer from the Premier’s reply to the member for Alexandra that the Government would consider taking action in cases where certain organizations disrupted the operation of hospitals.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government would ensure the continuance of health services. In fact, I do not believe that in emergency situations we would fail to get the co-operation of trade unions in maintaining health services. When a situation of some difficulty arose at the weekend in the case of the Group Laundry and Central Linen Service, that was immediately dealt with. This morning, when I had a discussion with the executive of the Trades and Labor Council about this matter, I was assured that essential services of this kind would be maintained. I do not think there will be any need for emergency regulations of this kind. If the Government were faced with a clear threat to the health of citizens who required medical treatment, obviously in an emergency situation it would have to make necessary regulations to ensure that the health of those people was maintained, and the Government would advise the Governor accordingly.

Mr. McRAE: I point out that, since being returned to office, the New South Wales Government has done nothing to change the 1972 legislation to which I have referred.

Clause passed.

Clause 4—“Parliament to be informed.”

Dr. TONKIN: In the case of one or both Houses of Parliament having been dissolved, with an election pending, how long would it be before Parliament was called together after a proclamation of emergency had been made?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The direction to the Governor by the legislation is that Parliament must be called together at the first available opportunity. Normally, the maximum period that could then occur would be about four weeks. But the Parliament could be called together immediately the election had taken place.

Mr. Millhouse: What about writs?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In the circumstances outlined by the honourable member, I think the writs would be returned within a four-week period. That would be about the maximum that one would expect.

Clause passed.

Clause 5—“Emergency regulations.”

Dr. EASTICK: I move:

In subclause (2) to insert the following paragraph:

(aa) shall forthwith be published in the *Gazette*;

In subclause (4) no stipulation is made that the regulations shall have been gazetted, either in a normal or an extraordinary publication of the *Gazette*. However, section 38 (1) of the Acts Interpretation Act, 1915-1972, which is referred to in subclause (7), provides:

Any regulations made under or by virtue of such provision—

(a) shall be made by the Governor;

(b) shall be published in the *Gazette*;

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I accept the amendment.

Dr. EASTICK: The error can be overcome simply, and I am pleased that the Premier accepts the amendment.

Amendment carried.

Mr. CUMBE: I move:

To strike out subclause (3).

This subclause takes the teeth out of the Bill and makes it completely ineffective because of the lack of control during the state of emergency, as defined in the long title of the Bill. Clause 3 (1) of the Bill is clear. In reply to me about clause 2 the Premier referred specifically

to the current transport strike. He agreed on the need to provide emergency transport in cases involving the supply of the essentials of life, especially the provision of health services. The Premier said he would seek to maintain health services and, if my amendment is not accepted, the Government could not exempt certain persons to carry out essential services and provide medical attention and supplies.

With an exact interpretation of these words, the Government could not even call on its own employees to conduct emergency services, because this would involve a form of industrial conscription. So, on the one hand the Premier states that he wants to provide essential services during a strike, and on the other hand he includes certain words in this Bill which, on a strict interpretation, prevent him having these services provided. Subclause (3) is included in the Bill by a Government seeking to obtain emergency powers for the State while trying not to upset its own trade union supporters.

I refer to the words "picketing" and "peacefully to persuade any other person or persons to take part in a strike". How do we have peaceful persuasion? Many members have seen picketing in action. Is the Premier sincere? During a state of emergency, such as that provided by this Bill, if the amendment is carried one cannot take part in a strike. It would be an offence if one did. Surely, if we are to have a Bill of this kind on the Statute Book, we must have one that will really work. If subclause (3) remains in the Bill, there will be no possibility of enforcement. The Premier has said that he wants to be able to provide essential services, such as health services, in the event of a major breakdown in industrial affairs but, if he is to do that, he will need to have people to provide such services. Yet at the same time he supports the provision that will prevent regulations being made that impose any form of industrial conscription. My amendment will make the Bill workable.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I cannot agree to the amendment; obviously, the honourable member would not expect that I would agree to it.

Dr. Eastick: What do you want—an emasculated emergency Bill?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not agree with the honourable member's interpretation of the words "industrial conscription". I used the term in its generally accepted sense, and this Government will not support industrial conscription or strike breaking.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I am surprised that the Premier has taken that attitude. The Opposition is not seeking in this amendment to provide that the Government shall take certain action: it is seeking to remove the subclause which provides that the Government shall not take certain action. I support the amendment, and I hope the Premier will instruct his Party to do likewise.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I support the amendment but, in view of some of the things said by the member for Torrens, I want to say something about it. When I spoke in the second reading debate I gave some reasons for not liking subclause (3). As I prophesied, some members have decided to concentrate their comments on that provision. I do not think it is necessary for me to do other than say that I see no reason to discriminate in favour of or against one section of the community, but this provision tries to discriminate in favour of one section of the community in an emergency, and I do not think that that is justified. The reason why the Govern-

ment believes that it is justified is clear. There is a cleavage of opinion in this connection, but the member for Torrens is absolutely and utterly wrong (and so are the other members of his Party) in believing that this provision draws all the teeth out of the Bill.

The inclusion of the provision may mean that the Bill is ineffective in the case of certain persons, but I assure the honourable member (I have said this before, but it has not sunk into the thick skulls of L.C.L. members) that there are plenty of teeth in this Bill as it stands. Most members would be very greatly affected by this Bill, whether or not the provision remains in it. The Premier has given no details whatever as to what action he intends to take if he is given these powers. Members may guess at what is involved, but we do not know what the Premier would do. He would have complete power to do anything: he could order people to empty their deep freezers and hand over the food that was in them. He could send us to Oodnadatta with our motor cars to transport people there. This Bill would give all that power over every citizen of the State—except in regard to the matters covered by subclause (3).

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I should like to send the honourable member to Oodnadatta.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am sure that the Premier would like to do that, and he is not the only one; that is made abundantly and painfully obvious by all members from time to time, and I must say that I rather enjoy it, because it means that at least I make some mark in this place occasionally. There are plenty of teeth in this Bill, and I believe that they are unnecessary and undesirable teeth, whether or not this provision remains in the Bill. Whether subclause (3) remains or not, this is a most tyrannical Bill.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I support the amendment. It would be wrong and false for this Parliament to discriminate in favour of or against any section of the community. We have already given the Premier power to say to a person with a motor car, "We will stop you from driving your car, even if you have petrol." The Premier can take any action—except for one select group of people, which accounts for 85 per cent of the power in the State Council of the Australian Labor Party.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You ought to do your homework.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The last annual meeting of that council rejected a proposal to bring the figure down to 75 per cent. It would be adopting a double standard, as the Premier is so capable of doing, if we exempted that group of people, who are actually causing the state of emergency. I hope the Premier will cease adopting double standards, and I hope he has the guts to stand up and put the trade unions on exactly the same basis as everyone else in the community. Up to the present, the Premier has been scared to do that. The very man who said that we must remove discrimination against Aborigines is now willing to implement discrimination in favour of trade unions. I hope the Premier will have the courage to change his attitude.

Mr. GUNN: I support the remarks of the member for Davenport and others on this side who have cast grave doubts on the wisdom and reasoning of the Premier in relation to this matter. It is obvious that, under clause 5, the Premier and the Government have the power to take control and to direct the activities of people who run service stations, butcher shops, grocer shops, or any other such enterprises: they will have power to step in

and seize goods that many shop owners paid for in hard cash or have suffered financial embarrassment to pay for. The Premier will have complete power to direct them and stop them from getting a return from goods they have acquired. The Premier, it seems, is not prepared to stand up and show any courage against the section of the community that may have caused industrial anarchy and brought a section of industry of this State to its knees by involving itself in a political strike, a strike in which people are not pressing for better wages or conditions.

Members on both sides of the House are fully aware of the statements of union leaders such as Messrs. Carmichael and Munday, who have made it abundantly clear that they will use the trade union movement to hold the people of this State to ransom to further their political ends. The Premier has failed to show courage and stand up to these irresponsible people. Any member in this House, if he has courage and puts the people of this State before political gain or the dictates of the Trades and Labor Council, should support the amendment. Clause 5 has wide-ranging effects because, as it now stands, the Premier could stifle the Opposition in this State.

Mr. Mathwin: He's already doing that.

Mr. GUNN: He could have regulations drawn up to prevent the Leader of the Opposition or any other member on this side from making public statements or engaging in activities that the Premier might consider detrimental to the peace, order and good Government of the State.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You would do far better—

Mr. GUNN: It is just like the Premier to make irresponsible interjections. He is happy to allow the situation to continue. If it is claimed that people should be allowed to exercise their democratic rights, indications should be given by the Premier that he is willing to write into the Statutes of this State that, during any industrial dispute, union members should have a right to exercise their own opinions through a secret ballot.

Mr. Wright: Rubbish!

Mr. GUNN: The member for Adelaide says that that suggestion is rubbish, but I believe that, if there is one measure which this Government could pass and which would have the effect of preventing the irresponsible actions of certain trade union leaders who are vying for political power, it is to introduce a system of secret ballots for dealing with union disputes. It is a democratic suggestion; it is fair and just. How could any so-called Democrat, and I expect the Premier would consider himself a Social Democrat, justify opposition to that suggestion or opposition to the amendment?

The grandstanding that has taken place this evening is deplorable. Obviously, the Premier is capable of taking strong action against a section of the community, but he says that we must keep our hands off the trade unions because they can do no wrong. They, it seems, are always right, it is the other sections of the community that are wrong. The double standard displayed by the Premier today is disgraceful and deplorable, and if he continues as he has he should not have the right to continue to govern: his has been a complete abdication of responsibility. I believe that, if the Premier does not have the courage to stand up to these people, he should hand the Government over to people who do have the courage to stand up to them.

Mr. McRAE: If the Premier has double standards, so has Sir Robert Askin. The New South Wales Act of 1972, designed to achieve what this Bill is designed to achieve, exempts strikes from its operations.

Mr. Mathwin: Is the New South Wales Bill in operation now?

Mr. McRAE: Yes, and it is unchanged since 1972. Sir Robert Askin, re-elected in November, 1973, has done nothing about it. Any grandstanding that has taken place in this House today has been done by Opposition members, because, if history has proved anything, the worst way to solve an industrial dispute is to try to solve it forcibly. The cannons of the 1890's showed this, as much as the marches in Victoria Square in 1924, and forcible measures are nonsensical. In comparing the three amendments, I see some amazing contradictions. One member at least shares the Premier's view on the definition of "industrial conscription". The member for Bragg is caught in a difficult situation so far as doctors are concerned, so he has had the member for Kavel do his work for him.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I am amazed that the Premier has not tried to defend himself this evening. By not doing so, it appears that he has displayed to the Committee and to the people of this State that his recent brave, dynamic statements to the press and other news media were nothing but whitewash and a hollow sham. I am amazed that the Premier has been willing to admit that to the people of the State. He has come out with fine words, but he is unwilling to back them up with action.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Words are cheap.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Exactly. People are beginning to appreciate that the Premier has a background of acting and that he is afraid, and they are starting to see through him. This evening's performance was evidence of that.

Mr. McANANEY: The Minister's second reading explanation states:

...and I emphasize the word "peaceful"—picketing has no place in dealing with a situation of emergency. When does peaceful picketing become violent picketing? Peaceful picketing is going on at Port Adelaide now but, if someone bought the steel, went to the wharf, and the pickets stopped him from picking it up, there might be an argument about who hit whom first. What action would the Government take under the legislation? This must happen if people have courage in their belief of right and wrong, whereby a group of people cause workmen to lose their jobs or milk to be poured down the drain. What action would the Government take under the legislation if, in the course of shifting a person's property, a peaceful picket were to interfere?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not accept that picketing needs to be non-peaceful. At present, I know of no situation in which it is other than peaceful. If breaches of the peace occurred, police action would have to be taken to prevent them.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

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

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

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Venning and Wardle. Noes—Messrs. Burdon and Langley.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negated.

Dr. TONKIN: I move:

In subclause (3) (a), after "conscription", to insert "or prohibiting any person from undertaking any work whether that work is remunerated or not".

I am disappointed that I have had to move this amendment, the reasons for which are clear, because I had hoped that the previous amendment would be carried. Nevertheless, as we are to have "any form of industrial conscription", it is only right to balance the coin, or to show the mirror image, by prohibiting any regulations that might, in turn, prohibit any person from doing any work, either paid or unpaid. In conditions of industrial unrest, volunteers could be brought in. Indeed, we saw this recently in a small way when people volunteered to collect garbage in the city of Adelaide. Such people should not in any way be prevented from taking this voluntary action. Any voluntary action that might contribute to the well-being of the community in a state of emergency should not be inhibited. Having had a fizz-whizz splutter outburst from the member for Florey and a brief lecture from the member for Playford, both of whom have said that we should concentrate on natural disasters, I point out that the Opposition did not raise the industrial aspects of this Bill. The Bill contains specific references to industrial matters, and for that reason the Opposition is concentrating on them.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Although I do not support any strike-breaking action, I do not see anything in the terms of the amendment that will cause any trouble.

Amendment carried.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I move:

To strike out "or" and paragraph (b).

The provision I seek to strike out is a specific and discriminatory exemption for people engaged in a strike or attempting to persuade others to strike when an emergency exists. The Premier and another Government member referred to strike breaking. If a state of emergency exists as a result of strike action and there is a possibility of further strikes, and certain people are persuading others to go on strike, that is obviously the cause of the emergency, and further strike action would exacerbate the emergency even further. It seems completely unrealistic in those circumstances to take other action to come to terms with the emergency when the emergency is, after all, the direct result of industrial action.

I cannot see any justification for this exemption. It seems to me that the sort of power that this provision seeks to exclude would be just the sort of power that a Government could require in an emergency that is the direct result of strike action, and further strike action is contemplated. It was interesting to note that the independent member for Mitcham supported the amendment. His point was that the Bill was no good anyway, in which event we should try to lump the whole trade union movement under this particularly offensive Bill. Although I cannot completely follow his logic, I think it is unreasonable to have the specific exemption that this clause seeks to insert.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I should not imagine the member for Kavel would imagine that I would accept this amendment, and I will not do so.

Dr. TONKIN: I am not surprised that the Premier will not accept the amendment. However, I am disappointed because, if the Government is seriously trying to do what it professes, it should make no exemptions at all. In an emergency, no group in the community should suffer at the hands of another group. No group must suffer more than any other, and certainly no group must

be advantaged more than any other; we must all be in it together. I cannot see how the Premier can introduce a Bill containing this sort of exemption for the trade union movement, because that is exactly what it is. This is a direct negation of the overall aims of the Bill, which is supposed to affect states of emergency not only from industrial action but also from natural disasters.

Mr. GUNN: I support the amendment, which, in his usual cynical fashion, the Premier rejected out of hand. He is obviously willing to set up within the community a privileged group of people that will enjoy advantages not enjoyed by any other group. He is happy to say to non-trade unionists, "You shall carry out the dictates of my Government, but one group shall be above the law." Is that justice? The Premier knows full well that that is disgraceful and deplorable. It is a shallow and hollow argument that he has advanced. If members opposite believed in the well-being of the people of this State, they would oppose the Bill. However, I do not believe they have the guts to do so, because they know their endorsements are on the line.

Mr. Harrison: We know whose endorsements are on the line!

*Members interjecting:*

Mr. GUNN: It is obvious from the interjections that what I have said is correct. This Government depends for survival on the people in the Trades and Labor Council, who dictate the terms of legislation. We know how the Premier and his colleagues succumb to pressure, but when we are considering such a far-reaching measure as this surely the Premier will accept proper amendments that make every section of the community the same before the law.

Mr. McRAE: As one whose endorsement always is on the line, I oppose this amendment wholeheartedly, not because of conscription against me but because of my knowledge of industrial history and industrial legislation throughout the country. Legislation such as is suggested by the Opposition is not in operation anywhere in Australia, because it cannot work. Liberal Governments have accepted that and, if members opposite had made a historical analysis, they would know that, in dealing with strikes, violence or force prevails.

That is not the way to get industrial peace and, in a situation like the present, only special legislation relating to a strike is referred to. All the other award-making machinery and awards, determinations and regulations are subject to variation. The one single exception is acknowledged by every Government in the country, including that led by the Fascist dictator in Queensland (Bjelke-Petersen), who has a separate piece of legislation to deal with his trade union difficulties apart from his essential services. Therefore, if that banana republic and that Fascist acknowledge it, it would not be difficult for honest-minded people to follow the logic and see how simple the matter is. If Bjelke-Petersen can see it, any dill can see it.

Mr. GUNN: The member for Playford has made astounding accusations and has tried to draw comparisons. Legislation with such wide powers as those in this Bill is generally on the Statute Books only in Fascist dictatorships.

Mr. Millhouse: Yet you supported the second reading!

Mr. GUNN: One would expect legislation such as this to be used by the colonels in Greece or the junta in Chile.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member to return to the amendment.

Mr. GUNN: The member for Playford answered his own argument about there being something wrong with what we

wanted to do. He missed the point that clause 5 would give the Government powers that he alleged that only Fascist Governments had.

Mr. RUSSACK: I support the amendment. I read subclause 3 (b) to mean that the Government would not have power to make regulations that made it an offence for any person to take part in a strike or peacefully to persuade any other person or persons to take part in a strike. I understand the provisions to mean that, in a state of emergency, persons can persuade other persons and encourage them to expand a strike, thus creating a greater emergency. I ask the Premier whether I have read this provision correctly.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I consider that the words of the provision are plain. The intention is that no action will be taken by the Government that will prohibit the right to strike.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

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

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

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Venning and Wardle. Noes—Messrs. Burdon and Duncan.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negated; clause as amended passed.

New clause 5a—"Strikes and lock-outs."

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

5a. While a state of emergency exists a person shall not take part or continue to take part in a strike or a lock-out.

Penalty: \$500.00

If the State is to operate effectively, no employer group should be able to continue a lock-out and no union group should be in a position to continue a strike if, in the opinion of the Governor, an emergency exists. When the emergency ceased to exist, this clause would allow the situation to revert to normal, and the employer could take action if he wished. The Premier has indicated that my amendment is not acceptable to the Government. It would appear I have as much chance of success as I would have in competing in a sheaf-tossing contest with George Schwerdt, but I ask members to support the amendment.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I think the honourable member's pitchfork prediction was right.

Mr. McRAE: What extraordinary grandstanding when the honourable member pre-empts the power granted elsewhere in the Bill to establish penalties and then sets out to establish a separate penalty for strikes or lock-outs. It is a clear demonstration of the pertinacity of the Opposition and its determination to highlight its vindictiveness against trade unions.

Mr. EVANS: The new clause covers employers as well as employees. I am not attempting to discriminate. If the member for Playford thinks the penalty is too high, perhaps he would care to move to amend it.

Mr. MATHWIN: In supporting the amendment, I object to the manner in which the member for Playford attacked it. Obviously, it refers to strikes and lock-outs

alike. If he were to rethink his attitude, I am sure he would see that no malice is intended to any section of the community.

The Committee divided on the new clause:

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

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

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Venning and Wardle. Noes—Messrs. Burdon and Duncan.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

New clause thus negated.

New clause 6—"Expiry of Act."

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

6. (1) This Act shall expire on the thirty-first day of December, 1975, and on that day shall for all purposes be deemed to have been repealed by an Act.

(2) Any regulation under this Act that is in force on the day mentioned in subsection (1) of this section shall, by force of this subsection, expire.

The purpose of the amendment is to place a time limit on this legislation. Because of the wide-ranging powers contained in it, it should be scrutinized by Parliament and not left on the Statute Book indefinitely.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I move:

That new clause 6 (1) be amended by striking out "thirty-first day of December, 1975" and inserting "thirtieth day of September, 1974".

I agree that this legislation should be limited, but the period proposed by the member for Eyre is too long, because too much damage could be done in that time. The farthest I will go (and I go unwillingly) is to give the Government the powers in this Bill to deal with the present emergency, and those powers should be restricted to the remainder of this month and next month. We have heard little justification for pushing the Bill through this evening, the only suggestion being the probability of a transport strike. Although this was not sufficient for the Premier to introduce the Bill last week, it has suddenly become necessary for him to want to push the Bill through tonight. No Opposition member has asked what action the Government intends to take.

Mr. Nankivell: You haven't been here for all of the debate.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have been here for the whole debate.

Mr. Chapman: Oh, twaddle!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The honourable member is as offensive as he is ignorant in what he has just said.

Mr. Chapman: I am pleased you took the point.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The honourable member is utterly uncouth. Members of the L.C.L. have not asked the Government how it intends to use these sweeping powers, and are willing to give it a blank cheque to use them. This would be the most far-reaching Bill to have been introduced since I have been a member. I would not have believed, if it had not been for the caper last Thursday, that I would see a Party in Opposition agree in principle to handing over legislative powers *carte blanche* to a Government. I support the idea behind the amendment moved by the member for Eyre, but I believe the period should be limited until the end of September.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am willing to accept the amendment of the member for Eyre because I think it is wise that this measure should be required to be scrutinized again by Parliament within the period of this Parliament; so I think the honourable member's provision is sensible. I can resolve the doubts of the member for Mitcham by saying I cannot agree to his amendment to the amendment of the member for Eyre, because it seems to me that the emergency could take us a little longer than that in some circumstances, and the honourable member's camel journeys to Timbuktu will take longer than September 30.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The question before the Chair is the amendment moved by the member for Mitcham to the amendment of the member for Eyre.

Dr. EASTICK: On a point of order, I do not believe that that is exactly the situation. I understood that one was referring to 1974 and one was referring to 1975. On no occasion has the year been used to designate what it is we are voting on.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Eyre moved for December 31, 1975. I moved to amend that by inserting in lieu thereof September 30, 1974.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: My copy of the amendment does not show 1974.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am sorry about that, but that is the way I moved it.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I will accept that.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Are we voting on the member for Mitcham's amendment or the member for Eyre's amendment?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The question I will put is the amendment moved by the member for Mitcham to the amendment moved by the member for Eyre.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I seek information from the member for Mitcham: do I take it that if his amendment is accepted he will support the Bill?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The question before the Chair—

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I take it it is in order to seek information during the Committee stage. I am genuinely seeking information. If this amendment is carried, it may well influence my support for it. If this amendment is carried, I take it the member for Mitcham is supporting the Bill; I take it the honourable member is not prepared to reply.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! I think the position is clear. The question before the Chair is that the amendment to the proposed new clause be agreed to.

The Committee divided on Mr. Millhouse's amendment:

Ayes (3)—Messrs. Blacker, Boundy, and Millhouse (teller).

Noes (38)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Becker, Broomhill, Dean Brown, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Chapman, Corcoran, Coumbe, Dunstan (teller), Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Groth, Gunn, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, Mathwin, McAnaney, McKee, McRae, Nankivell, Olson, Payne, Rodda, Russack, Simmons, Slater, Tonkin, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.

Majority of 35 for the Noes.

Mr. Millhouse's amendment thus negatived; new clause inserted.

Title passed.

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

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

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): Notwithstanding the fact that the Bill has been amended in Committee and is now different from what it was when it was first introduced, I do not believe that in its present form it is in the best interests of the community. Earlier, I said that unless the Bill were amended so that it did not discriminate between sections of the community members of the Party I lead would oppose it. The Bill (particularly clause 5) gives far too great an opportunity for a despotic Government to create a situation not in the best interests of the people of the State. For instance, it is not impossible that the activities of the courts could be interfered with by the provisions of clause 5. Under the Constitution Act, a judge can be removed from office only by an address to both Houses of Parliament. Therefore, that situation cannot arise under the Bill. However, the work of the courts can be stopped by the provisions of the Bill. We cannot place the people in that situation. Several other features of the Bill are against principles that any true democrat would hold. On that basis, I oppose the third reading.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I, too, oppose the third reading, as I have opposed the Bill from the beginning, for it is a thoroughly bad Bill. I deplore the fact that the Government, by suspending Standing Orders, has forced this measure through in one day. As I have said, this is the most sweeping piece of legislation that has come into the House in the nearly 20 years that I have been a member. I must say that I am glad the L.C.L. will oppose the third reading. Of course, it was obvious from the beginning what its tactics would be: that it would support the second reading, express some pious hopes in which it had no belief whatever that meaningful amendments would be made in Committee, and then vote against the third reading. In that way, it hoped that it would have it both ways. Its victory in relation to the new clause dealing with the limitation of time must have been rather painful, because that somewhat weakened its strategy.

I am glad that some limitation has been placed on the legislation; I hope that limitation will be far severer when the Bill comes back from another place. The acceptance of the new clause in the Bill reminds me that for 26 years legislation relating to price control has been renewed. I prophesy that for as long as this Government is in office, anyway, this legislation will be renewed annually and will be permanently on the Statute Book, so that it needs little indeed—

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the honourable member for Mitcham that we are now dealing with the third reading of the Bill under discussion. The only subject matter for debate can be the Bill as it came out of Committee; no extraneous matters of any type can be dealt with.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Quite, Mr. Speaker; I pass to another point. The Bill provides for the suspension of constitutional Government in this State and rule by decree. This may be for a period as short as seven days or as long as, on the Premier's own admission, four or five weeks. The Premier estimated a period of four weeks for calling Parliament together after an election, but I remind him that seven days thereafter will elapse before the regulations cease to operate. I further remind honourable members that, under the Bill in its present form,



it is possible for a Government, even when the regulations lapse, immediately to re-enact them and thus continue them indefinitely. Perhaps that is unlikely, but I hope that the whole situation is unlikely. Nevertheless, it could happen, so that the limitation of seven days after Parliament meets may be more illusory than real.

The Bill provides for a suspension of constitutional Government; it hands over to the Executive power to rule by decree. It represents the abdication by this Parliament (even if only for a limited time) of a belief in the rule of law. As the Bill contains such grave provisions, I am amazed that any Opposition member could for one moment have supported it without having a chance (and the Opposition has admitted this) to consult people outside to see what are its effects. Although the Bill may contain hidden ramifications that none of us has seen in the time we have had to consider it, Opposition members have been willing to support the second reading. I greatly regret that the Government has introduced the Bill and, without giving, in my view, any justification at all for doing so, has pushed it through in one day, with the contrivance of the L.C.L.

The House divided on the third reading:

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

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

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Burdon and Duncan. Noes—Messrs. Venning and Wardle.

Majority of 4 for the Ayes.

Third reading thus carried.

Bill passed.

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.  
(Continued from August 1. Page 244.)

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): Last Thursday I was speaking about total leisure in the community, and I have been encouraged to continue my remarks on that subject by the rapt attention I received from the House.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Hear, hear!

Mr. KENEALLY: It has been suggested that I will not receive that same degree of attention this evening, but I will see how I go. Leisure is fundamental to both the physical and mental well-being of individuals in the community and, in referring to leisure, I refer to the opportunity for people to be active and to utilize leisure time creatively. The opportunity of people to follow a variety of leisure pursuits is a good indicator of the quality of life they enjoy. I refer to the whole ambit of leisure time that an individual has outside his normal working hours, when he is free from chores and free to engage in any activity he wishes. That freedom means to me the opportunity to participate in active sport, perhaps football, cricket or tennis.

Mr. Dean Brown: What about a game of squash?

Mr. KENEALLY: I suggest that the honourable member's major leisure pursuit is listening to himself speak.

Mr. Becker: You can talk! He mentioned squash.

Mr. KENEALLY: Well, whatever I had to say about the member for Davenport certainly applies to the member for Hanson. Apart from active sports, I refer also to the

more passive sports, such as chess and bridge. It has been suggested that bowls is a passive sport. The caloric value of playing a game of bowls is not as great as that of jogging about 2.4 kilometres. However, even though bowls may not get people fit, as a leisure pursuit it gives hundreds of thousands of people in Australia a means of enjoying themselves, and it can help keep people from getting ulcers and other illnesses.

Sport is not the only leisure pursuit available to people in the community, although certainly it is the area in which I am most interested. Many other people are interested in the arts, including the performing arts. Further education is another pursuit in much demand. I compliment the Education Department on the opportunity it gives people to study the many courses offered by the department.

Some people are so interested in their work that they seek to work most of the time that they are awake. If, after working eight or nine hours a day, in the time still available they choose to go back to work, then for such people their work is their leisure pursuit. Further, as they experience difficulty in other areas, the poorest people in our community have the most difficulty in participating creatively in recreational opportunities. This is obvious and is well known to all members. I refer to the situation applying in certain Adelaide suburbs far from beaches and swimming pools. In these areas children are not able to travel the necessary 20 km or 30 km to the beach, and I refer here, for example, to children living at Elizabeth.

Therefore, it is not much good talking about Adelaide's magnificent beaches and other facilities to the many children living in the Adelaide metropolitan area who cannot use them, because they are members of a family unable to take them, either in their own vehicle or on public transport, to these places. A poor person often does not know where recreational facilities are available, but middle-class people and upper-class people are likely to know where such facilities are available, with the result that they can probably put their leisure time to more creative use. This does not mean that such people do not sometimes experience problems in connection with leisure time. Some retired people are completely lost and do not know where to turn. The Government has a great responsibility for these people as well as for young people.

Our hospitals would not be so tightly packed if people did not have so much spare time on their hands. They tend to get into anti-social habits, with the result that there is a great deal of mental and physical breakdown in our society. The Government has a responsibility in this respect, and I am pleased to say that the Commonwealth Government and this Government are facing up to this responsibility, having established sport and recreation departments. In the last few months I have attended a seminar in Canberra arranged by the Australian Government and a seminar in Adelaide arranged by the South Australian Government on this very important subject. As a result, I have been alerted to the wider spectrum of leisure pursuits that the community needs; it is called the "supermarket approach". Of course, the leisure pursuit that suits me may not suit another person. So, there must be the widest variety of choice available; if there is, it is a good indicator of the quality of life. Watching television can be a leisure pursuit if there is a choice of perhaps 10 other leisure opportunities. If a person chooses to watch television, that is all right; however, if watching television is the only recreational avenue available, it can hardly be said to be a leisure pursuit in the sense in which I am using the term.

Mr. Coumbe: It is entertainment.

Mr. KENEALLY: Entertainment is a leisure pursuit. Whatever one does in his spare time outside normal working hours is a leisure pursuit. It has seemed in this Chamber today that a leisure pursuit of the Opposition has been calling for divisions. There have been about six divisions, and members have at least got exercise and enjoyment walking from one side of the Chamber to the other. Because opportunity for recreational pursuits is so limited, many people have physical and mental breakdowns, so I believe that life assurance companies, instead of building big office blocks, should spend the money on health camps for middle-aged people or for other people requiring the assistance that a health camp can provide for some weeks each year. It would be a wiser and more economic way in which life assurance companies could spend their money, as the returns would be very worth while. Life assurance companies could encourage people to acquire a certain degree of fitness by giving concessions on premiums in the same way as insurance companies give premium concessions in connection with motor vehicle comprehensive policies. There would be less risk for a life assurance company if its policy holders were fit.

Mr. Becker: You are not dinkum?

Mr. KENEALLY: I am very dinkum about this matter, because every organization with the opportunity of encouraging people to be physically and mentally healthy should take that opportunity. There are wonderful facilities in our schools, particularly in the schools

in the Stuart District, where school buildings are used very constructively. Headmasters of schools in Port Augusta and Whyalla readily make their schools available for community use. In those cities the schools have been a godsend. If there was one thing lacking in Whyalla it was recreational facilities. Although at present there is a plan to provide a major recreational complex in Whyalla, the community to a degree has had to depend on school buildings. The member for Whyalla and I have referred to the situation at Whyalla Stuart, where the people's only gathering places are these school buildings. Because most people in Whyalla Stuart are migrants, the need for gathering places is particularly great so that they may develop social contacts.

Mr. Dean Brown: This is dry stuff.

Mr. KENEALLY: It may well be to the honourable member, but this subject interests me greatly. The honourable member can turn off if he wants to, but some people will be interested to read about this matter. To the utter chagrin of the member for Davenport and other members who would like to hear me further now, I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 10.51 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, August 7, at 2 p.m.