

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

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

STANDING ORDERS

His Excellency the Governor intimated his approval of amendments to Standing Orders, of the House of Assembly adopted by the House of Assembly on February 25, 1975.

The SPEAKER: Following the approval of His Excellency the Governor to the amendments to Standing Orders, I have to inform the House that they will operate as from now. For the benefit of honourable members, I will summarise the main alterations, as follows:

Adjournment of House: The adjournment of the House is now to be moved only by a Minister, and must be moved by 10 p.m. on Tuesdays and Wednesdays or 5 p.m. on Thursdays unless otherwise ordered by the House. If the motion for adjournment of the House is moved by these times, a grievance debate may occur each sitting day.

Urgency Motions: The intention to move an urgency motion must in future be received by the Clerk or the Speaker by 1 p.m., who will then communicate such to the Leader of the Opposition and a Minister. The debate on an urgency motion shall commence no later than 20 minutes after the time that questions without notice begin and, unless otherwise ordered, shall cease at the expiration of Question Time. Each member speaking, including the mover of the motion, shall be limited to 15 minutes.

Petitions: Petitions are to be lodged with the Clerk by 12 noon and listed to be read to the House by the Clerk when petitions are called for each day.

Questions on Notice: Questions on Notice are to be handed to the Clerk Assistant at least by 12 noon on sitting days, and will appear only on the back pages of the Notice Paper.

Notices of Motion and Orders of the Day not called on at adjournment: Notices of Motion and Orders of the Day not called on are to be automatically set down on the Notice Paper for the next sitting day, unless an indication to the contrary is received by the Clerk. Thus, Notices of Motion and Orders of the Day not called on at adjournment will no longer lapse, and also it will not be necessary for a Minister at the close of a day's sitting to move: "That the remaining Orders of the Day be Orders of the Day for the next sitting day."

Postponement of Notices of Motion (Other Business) and Orders of the Day (Other Business): In future on Wednesdays when precedence is given to private members' business, Notices of Motion (Other Business) and Orders of the Day (Other Business) not dealt with by 6 p.m. shall be automatically set down for the next private members' day unless the member in charge of such business informs the Clerk forthwith at adjournment he desires it for some other day.

Grievance Debate on Supply and Appropriation Bills: Grievances may now be discussed only on Supply and Appropriation Bills on one occasion; that is after the second reading of the Bill, when the Minister will move: "That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for consideration of the Bill." Time limits are 30 minutes for one Minister and the Leader of the Opposition or his representative, and 10 minutes for any other member.

Guillotine: The guillotine motion to limit debate may be moved at any time in the House or Committee. When the time arrives for starting business under time limit,

the business then before the House or Committee is to be postponed (adjourned if in the House, or progress reported if in Committee). When the time for finishing a stage of a Bill arrives, the Speaker or Chairman puts any amendments that have been received up to one hour before that time and the question pending decision without any further debate. The closure motion cannot be moved on a matter under guillotine.

Objection to Speaker's Ruling: Debate of 10 minutes for the mover and one member in opposition to the motion will be allowed, and the Speaker may defend his ruling, and the question is to be put forthwith.

Suspension of member: The member moving for suspension moves: "That such member be suspended from the service of the House." The penalties provided by Standing Order 171 include banishment from the building.

Closure: Closure may be moved at any time even so as to interrupt a member speaking. After the motion "That the question be now put" has been agreed to, the question that the original motion be agreed to shall be proposed forthwith, and the mover of that motion may reply for 30 minutes before the question is put.

Time limits in Committee: Except on Supply, Appropriation, and Public Purposes Loan Bills, a limit of three times of 15 minutes each time shall be allowed for all members, other than the one in charge of the Bill or motion.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: LEADER OF THE HOUSE

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Following alterations to Standing Orders, Cabinet has appointed me Leader of the House and, as such, I am responsible for giving effect to the time table set by the Government for consideration of its legislation. The Opposition has been invited to meet with me and the Government Whip at the beginning of each sitting week to discuss the Notice Paper and the business the Government wants dealt with. The Opposition will then have an opportunity to express views on the Government's programme as to the time that should be devoted to debating each item. Individual members of the House may put their views on the matters to be discussed either to the Government or Opposition Whip as they wish, so that those views may be considered at the Tuesday meetings. I must point out that the Government could not be bound by the allocation of time suggested at the meetings. Each week I will circulate copies of the time table for members' information. The time table of business for this week (which could be subject to alteration if necessary) is set out in the paper now being circulated in the House. It is the Government's aim that, unless the House orders otherwise in certain circumstances, the House should rise by 10.30 p.m. on Tuesdays and Wednesdays, and by 5.30 p.m. on Thursdays and so provide the opportunity to debate grievances. I should appreciate the co-operation of all members in this matter.

QUESTIONS

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

CARRY-ON FINANCE

In reply to Mr. RODDA (February 19).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Rural Industry Assistance Authority may assist beef producers in accordance with the terms of reference of the States Grants (Rural Reconstruction) Act, 1971, namely, producers

having sound prospects of commercial viability who have used all their cash and credit resources and cannot meet their financial commitments. Advances may be made for carry-on and other associated requirements. The authority has sufficient access to funds to service expected requirements of applicants who qualify for assistance. The attention of the honourable member is drawn to the recently announced scheme of assistance to beef producers that is being administered by the Commonwealth Development Bank of Australia. It is understood that assistance under this scheme may be given to service a deficiency in 12 months operations by advances against equity, the advances being repayable as a consolidated debt over an agreed period.

FAIRVIEW PARK SCHOOL

Tn reply to Mrs. BYRNE (February 20).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The advice I have now received confirms that, if the present building programme is maintained, the Fairview Park school should be ready for occupation in February, 1976.

CONSTITUTION CONVENTION

Mr. GUNN (on notice): When is it expected that the deferred Constitution Convention, which was to be held in Adelaide in November, 1974, will now be held?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Executive Committee to the convention will meet in Canberra on Friday, March 21, at which meeting a date and venue for the deferred session of the convention will be discussed.

ETHNIC SCHOOLS

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. What sums have been made available to ethnic schools in each financial year 1970-71 to 1974-75 inclusive?

2. What are the individual sums allocated to specific schools?

3. On what basis have payments been determined, and, if for specific projects, what inquiry has been made relative to the project and its importance to the particular group?

4. Has there been any criticism of the distribution of funds, the nature of projects to be undertaken, or the suitability of any persons employed to use funds to perform their duties adequately?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The replies are as follows:

1. The year 1974-75 was the first in which grants were made, and these totalled \$12 006.

2. Grants were made as follows:

	\$
Greek Orthodox Community of South Australia	9 126
School for the German Language.....	2 880

3. Grants were paid on a per capita grant basis following application for assistance in conducting language classes by these groups.

4. There have been recent inquiries by several groups representing other Greek organisations regarding the grants made and possibility of receiving similar assistance, and these requests are being investigated. I am not aware of any criticism regarding the suitability of any persons employed by organisations receiving Government grants in teaching their subjects.

PRISONS

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. How many inmates have been housed in each of the following prisons at the end of each month since July, 1974—

- (a) Port Augusta;
- (b) Gladstone;
- (c) Adelaide; and
- (d) Yatala?

2. What is the capacity of each of these prisons, and is it considered that there has been any overcrowding of the facilities?

3. Has any accommodation which has previously been withdrawn from use because of obsolescence been used in this period of time?

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

1.(a) 46, 54, 46, 51, 44, 47, 61, 50.

(b) 31, 41, 45, 39, 23, 20, 22, 11.

(c) 230, 208, 194, 219, 232, 182, 234, 206.

(d) 337, 328, 326, 317, 322, 324, 295, 335.

The last total in each section is at February 27, 1975.

2. The capacities of the prisons are as follows:

Port Augusta.....	100
Gladstone.....	95
Adelaide.....	about 300
Yatala :.....	about 450

There has been no overcrowding.

3. No.

GLENSIDE HOSPITAL

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. Are satisfactory heat control valves fitted to all patient shower facilities at Glenside Hospital and, if not, what methods of preventing patients from scalding themselves are adopted by the staff at present?

2. Have any patients been scalded or suffered burns because of a lack of heat control valves on showers and, if so, how many, and to what extent?

3. When is it expected suitable heat regulating valves will be fitted?

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

1. Heat control valves are fitted to showers used by patients at Glenside Hospital. They are reasonably satisfactory.

2. No.

3. It is not intended to change the valves in the near future. It is doubtful if a completely problem-proof valve is available.

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. Have complaints been received from staff members and visitors at Glenside Hospital regarding the discharge from the chimney stack of the boiler house, and its effect on clothing?

2. Have stockings and other items of clothing been replaced because of this discharge and, if so, what has been the cost involved to the Government?

3. When will a satisfactory filter be installed on the chimney stack to purify the discharge and remove the present pollution?

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

1. Complaints have been received from the nursing staff at the Glenside Hospital regarding soot fall-out from the boiler house. No complaints have been reported from visitors to the hospital.

2. No items of clothing have been replaced at Government expense.

3. The matter of modifications to boiler operations was discussed with officers of the Public Buildings Department in 1974, and recommendations made for appropriate remedial action. The Public Health Department has been advised that tenders for converting the boilers to natural gas are expected to be called before the end of June. The change to natural gas as a fuel source will solve the soot problem.

UNIVERSITY OF BOSTON

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. Has any investigation been made into the activities of an organisation styling itself the University of Boston,

based at Port Lincoln, and undertaking on the payment of the appropriate fee, to award B.A., M.A., and Ph.D. degrees without formal instruction?

2. Has any investigation been made into the activities of persons promoting the granting of knighthoods and other honours of the self-styled Principality of Boston, upon payment of the appropriate fee?

3. Is the Minister able to provide the following information—

- (a) who are the principals involved in these organisations, and what are their qualifications for making the claims and offers advertised; and
- (b) how many people have paid money to either of these organisations in return for so-called honours or degrees, and the sums involved in each case?

4. If investigations show these activities to involve false pretences, or to be otherwise questionable, will the Minister—

- (a) authorise appropriate legal action; and/or
- (b) make a statement warning members of the public of the nature of these activities?

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

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. (a) The “Dean” of the “University” is a person known as Professor W. Demchinsky who claims to be a graduate of the University of Urbaniana, Rome. The “Registrar” is James Dimitri, who apparently lays no claim to any degrees or qualifications. Mr. Tennyson Turner, a solicitor, is believed to be the “Chancellor” of the university. The prices for degrees are \$1,450 for a B.A., \$1 850 for an M.A. and \$2 250 for a Ph.D. The “university” is associated with the “Principality of Boston”, which was set up by “Prince Adam Nestor”, and sells knighthoods for \$5 950 and higher ranks at a greater price.
- (b) It is understood that 22 students have enrolled to date.
4. Inquiries into the activities of these bogus organisations are proceeding with a view to prosecution.

MISSING VEHICLES

Dr. TONKIN (on notice): Has the Minister of Transport considered arranging for the publishing by the media, on a daily basis, of details of missing or stolen motor vehicles to encourage the co-operation of members of the public in the recovery of these vehicles?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: For several years, a newspaper with State-wide circulation published daily lists of outstanding stolen motor vehicles. However, although there was some initial success, response from the public dwindled, and the newspaper discontinued publishing the details. From this experience it is not intended to reintroduce the practice.

PSYCHOLOGICAL PRACTICES ACT

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. Have significant difficulties been experienced in the administration of the Psychological Practices Act, and what complaints, if any, have been received?
2. Has the Act had the effect contemplated when it was passed, and, if not, is it intended to amend it in the near future?

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

1. The Psychological Practices Act came into operation on March 3, 1975. The South Australian Psychological

Board is now processing applications for registration under the Act. Some complaints have been received in relation to Part IV—hypnotism.

2. As the Act has just come into operation, no comment can be made on its effect at this stage and therefore the question of amendments has not been considered.

LAND TAX

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. How many landholders in the State are paying land tax assessed on areas of closed road adjacent to, or surrounded by, their own property, although they hold no title to the area of closed road?

2. Has any opportunity been offered these people to acquire the area of closed road and, if so, under what terms and conditions?

3. If it is not intended that title to these areas be given, will land tax continue to be assessed in respect of them, and charged to the owner of the surrounding property?

4. In the event of compulsory acquisition of property, surrounding or adjacent to closed roads, what provision will be made for the reimbursement of land tax previously paid in respect of the area of closed road, title of which still resides in the Crown?

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

1. Land tax is not payable on areas of closed road for which the occupier has no title. The department is aware of only one case where such land has been inadvertently included in a land tax assessment.

2. In 1946, the Roads (Opening and Closing) Act was amended to enable the occupiers of closed roads to apply to the Minister of Lands for the issue of titles for the land in their names.

3. Is not applicable.

4. If there is a correction of an assessment, as affecting the area of the land for taxing purposes, whether an increase or decrease is involved, it is the practice to adjust only in respect of the year in which the error is found.

DENTAL DEPARTMENT

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. What progress has been made in the inquiry into the Dental Department of the Royal Adelaide Hospital, and when is it now expected the report will be available?

2. What is the present state of all waiting lists for attention at the Dental Department?

3. Has there been any significant improvement in the previous critical situation?

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

1. The consultant has completed his inquiry into the Dental Department of the Royal Adelaide Hospital and his final report is now being considered by the steering committee.

2. The following is the present state of waiting lists at the Dental Department:

- (a) Prosthetic clinic: The number of new patients being added to the waiting list is greater than the number receiving treatment. However, action is being taken to rationalise the waiting list by contacting persons whose names have been on the waiting list for the longest period to inquire whether they still require dental attention. Of those contacted to date, only 7 per cent have indicated that they still require dental attention, and these are being provided with treatment immediately.

- (b) Restorative clinic: The waiting lists are being reduced, and patients who were placed on the waiting list in August, 1974, are now being called in for treatment.
- (c) Orthodontic clinic: Notwithstanding substantially increased productivity in this clinic, the number of patients seeking orthodontic treatment exceeds the number of patients for whom treatment is being commenced.
- (d) Oral surgery: No significant waiting list exists.

3 The only significant improvement is in the area of restorative treatment in so far as waiting time is concerned. However, the orthodontic clinic is treating more patients, and the rationalisation of the prosthetic waiting list will result in more accurate information as to the number of persons actually requiring treatment.

INSTITUTE GRANT

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. Why has the grant to the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science been reduced by almost \$1 000 000 during this financial year?

2. Is this the reason for the call for a 20 per cent reduction in requests for laboratory procedures made to medical staff at the Royal Adelaide Hospital?

3. What effect has this reduction had on the standard of health care provided by the hospital?

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

1. The grant to the institute is on a deficit financing basis. Actual grant in 1973-74 was \$3 342 013, and provision for 1974-75 is \$4 600 000.

2. The reason for the request was to seek greater efficiency and economy in the use of pathological services generally.

3. There has been no adverse effect on the standard of health care provided by the hospital.

ACUPUNCTURE

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Is it intended to introduce legislation concerning the practice of acupuncture and, if so, when?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There is no present intention to legislate concerning the practice of acupuncture.

TRANSPORT SERVICES

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Did the Minister, on January 3, 1975, make a written press statement concerning increases in metropolitan train and bus fares and the discontinuance of some country rail services and, if so, what was the text of such statement?

2. Did the Minister subsequently withdraw or modify the statement and, if so, why?

3. Does the Government still intend to go on with the proposals in the statement?

4. If so, when and, if not, why not?

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

1. Yes—press release attached.

2. A preliminary press release was corrected by me in the presence of the media reporters at the commencement of the press conference.

3. No final decisions have been taken.

4. See 3.

PRESS RELEASE

The Minister of Transport (Mr. Geoff Virgo) today announced a series of cost-saving measures for the South Australian Railways. The measures include increased rail

fares for metropolitan services, the possible discontinuance of three country rail services, and the replacement of one metropolitan rail service with a bus service. Mr. Virgo said the measures were aimed at improving the economic operation of the railways. The Minister also announced increased fares for the Municipal Tramways Trust. M.T.T. fares will be increased by 5c for eight or more sections, and 5c for transfer tickets.

These are the new measures that the Minister today discussed with representatives of unions with members concerned. S.A.R. metropolitan fares will be increased by 13 per cent; the discontinuance of the Mount Barker Junction to Victor Harbor rail service, the Adelaide to Tailem Bend passenger service, the Kingston to Naracoorte passenger service, and the replacement of the Glanville to Semaphore service with a bus service. Mr. Virgo said with the new rail fares, the basic single adult fare to zones 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11, and also transfer tickets would be increased by 5c. A child's fare will remain half the adult fare rounded down to the nearest silver coin. Pensioners will not have to pay the increased fares. Some season tickets would also be discontinued due to lack of patronage, Mr. Virgo said. These were adult monthly, quarterly, half-yearly and yearly tickets. Some seasonal concessional tickets for students would be discontinued and replaced with monthly periodical tickets.

Mr. Virgo said the case to close the Mount Barker Junction to Victor Harbor line stemmed from the need to spend a large sum to maintain the line in safe working order. The Adelaide to Tailem Bend service discontinuance was prompted because of extremely poor patronage. "Besides this daily passenger return train, Tailem Bend is served by the daily Adelaide-Melbourne Overland, the daily Mount Gambier train, and the three times a week overnight Blue Lake service. It's most unlikely that passengers will be greatly inconvenienced by the ending of this service," Mr. Virgo said. The Kingston to Naracoorte service, which ran three times a week, received very poor patronage. It carried on average 1.7 passengers a trip. The Glanville to Semaphore rail service is being replaced, because \$27 000 has to be spent to maintain the line in a safe condition.

Mr. Virgo said he had held preliminary discussions with the Victorian Minister of Transport to discuss the practicability of using some of the rolling stock no longer required. "I've suggested to the Victorian Minister that there may be merit in using the Bluebird carriages equipped with on-train facilities on a daylight service between Adelaide and Melbourne." No railway employees will be retrenched as a result of the new measures, Mr. Virgo said.

ATTORNEYS-GENERAL

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. When did the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General last meet?

2. Is such committee still meeting on a regular basis and, if so, how frequently each year?

3. If it is not meeting, why not?

4. When is the next meeting of the Standing Committee due to be held and where?

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

1. October 11, 1974.

2. Yes. The committee has met twice a year for the past three years.

3. Not applicable.

4. The next meeting will be held in Melbourne on a day to be fixed by the Victorian Attorney-General.

SMALL CLAIMS COURT

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. Have difficulties been experienced in the administration of the Small Claims Court as constituted under the Local and District Criminal Courts Act, 1926-1974, and, if so, what is the nature of these difficulties?

2. What actions are intended to be taken to resolve these difficulties?

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

1. Procedural difficulties have been encountered because of the commencement of the Local and District Criminal Courts Act Amendment Bill which established the small claims jurisdiction before appropriate rules of court were available or suitable administrative arrangements could be made. The early commencement of the Act became necessary, because it contained, in addition to the small claims provisions, provisions increasing the monetary limits of the Local Court jurisdiction. This was not the Government's original intention. The Bill as introduced was confined to the creation of the small claims jurisdiction. The Government intended to introduce a subsequent Bill to increase the Local Court jurisdiction. However, an amendment introduced by the member for Mitcham brought about the inclusion of both subjects in the same Act. The urgent necessity of reducing the length of the list of civil cases awaiting trial in the Supreme Court rendered the early commencement of the Act imperative. This meant that the small claims provisions had to operate before preparations were complete, and this has produced some temporary problems.

2. Rules of court will shortly be made by the Senior Judge, and the Chief Stipendiary Magistrate has administrative arrangements in hand to facilitate the operation of the new procedures.

HILLS ROADS

Mr. EVANS (on notice):

1. When is it planned to commence construction work on the upgrading of the Old Belair Road?

2. Are traffic lights to be located at the junction of Sheoak Road, Old Belair Road, New Belair Road, and Main Road and, if so, is more land in that area to be acquired?

3. When is it now planned to widen the main road between Belair and Blackwood?

4. Will State funds be made available this financial year to enable the Mitcham council to upgrade roads in Eden Hills and Bellevue Heights?

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

1. Work is tentatively programmed to commence in mid-1979, subject to relative priorities and the availability of funds.

2. Traffic lights and any associated land acquisition are not intended in the foreseeable future.

3. This work is now scheduled to commence in late 1975, but the project is being reviewed in the light of greatly increased cost estimates and the limited availability of funds.

4. There are no present proposals to which the State road funds will be made available in 1974-75.

COMMONWEALTH GRANTS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What total amount of money for specified purposes did the State receive from the Commonwealth during the financial year 1973-74, and how was such amount made up?

2. What total amount of money for specified purposes has the State received from the Commonwealth during the present financial year, and how is such amount made up?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The summary of Commonwealth funds received for specific purposes during 1973-74 and 1974-75 (to February 28, 1975) is as follows:

	1973-74 Actual \$'000	1974-75 Actual (to 28/2/75) \$'000
Capital purposes	118 210	105 490
Recurrent purposes . . .	63 854	56 982
	<hr/> 182 064	<hr/> 162 472

The above funds have been received for a wide range of programmes, the major ones being Aboriginal affairs, education, health, medical services, and social welfare.

ALCOTEST UNITS

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. Why are sales of alcotest units restricted in this State to the Police Department and Hillcrest Hospital?

2. What actions can be taken to enable members of the public to purchase these relatively cheap units, which would enable them to assess their blood alcohol level, and so avoid committing an offence by driving with a blood alcohol in excess of the legal limit?

3. Will the Minister ask the Road Safety Council to promote the use of alcotest units, and any similar unit, if they can be made available for general purchase?

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

1. Sales of the alcotest unit are reported to be restricted by the policy of the company manufacturing this device. This is apparently because incorrect results obtained in improperly conducted tests could result in bad repute for both the alcotest unit and the manufacturer.

2. The use of these units would not necessarily enable members of the public to avoid committing the offence of driving with a blood alcohol in excess of the legal limit. This is because, first, the units are only screening tests of limited accuracy; and secondly, use by untrained people will often result in low readings, thus promoting a false belief that the subject's blood alcohol is within the legal limit. At this stage there are apparently no such devices available for distribution to the general public.

3. I understand that limited supplies are available, although, if there were sufficient numbers, and they were reliable, the Road Safety Council would give consideration to their promotion.

MONARTO

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. Has the Commonwealth Government been approached concerning the relocation of Commonwealth public servants at Monarto?

2. Has examination of the Commonwealth Government operations in Adelaide indicated that at least 1 500 Commonwealth public servants could suitably be relocated at Monarto?

3. Has the Commonwealth Government given a firm commitment to relocate Commonwealth public servants at Monarto, or is it reasonably expected that such a commitment will be given?

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

1. An approach has been made to the Australian Government at the Premier and Prime Minister level concerning the relocation of Australian public servants at Monarto; and the matter has also been the subject of discussion between officials of the Department of Urban and Regional Development and the Monarto Development Commission, and

between officials of the Australian and State Public Service Boards. The Australian Government has established an inter-departmental committee which is examining the relocation of some Australian Government activities to growth centres, including Monarto; but the committee has not yet been able to examine this question in relation to Monarto.

2. There has not as yet been any official examination of Australian Government operations in Adelaide in this connection.

3. The Australian Government has not given a firm commitment to relocate Australian public servants at Monarto, but it is reasonably expected, after the matter has been officially examined, that such a commitment will be given. It should be noted that there will, in any case, be several Australian Government activities located at Monarto as soon as the new city requires the services normally provided in urban areas by the Australian Government.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. Will the Minister make available to members of the Opposition copies of the report relating to Monarto planning studies prepared by P. G. Pak-Poy and Associates Proprietary Limited for the Monarto Development Commission?

2. Will the Minister make available to members of the Opposition copies of the report prepared by Boris Kazanski and Associates for the Monarto Development Commission?

3. If not, what are his reasons?

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

1. Yes. A copy of the report will be made available on request.

2. Kazanski and Associates have not yet presented to the commission the report on their consultancy. This will be done on March 7, after which it will be available to any member of Parliament who requests a copy.

3. See 1 and 2 above.

FILMS

Mr. EVANS (on notice):

I. How many films are at present being made for the South Australian Film Corporation by—

- (a) South Australian film producing companies; and
- (b) interstate film producing companies?

These 11 films are:

Sponsor:

South Australian Government Tourist Bureau.....

S.A. Police Department and S.A. Road Safety Council

Education Department.....

Education Department.....

Education Department.....

Further Education Department.....

Penang Development Corporation.....

Australian Council for the Arts—The Craft Board . .

South Australian Film Corporation.....

2. How many films are at present being made by the corporation?

3. What films does the corporation have out for tender?

4. How many films are being made by the corporation without being put out for tender, and what are these films?

5. How much over the budget was the final cost of the film *Who Killed Jenny Langby*, and what moneys have been received from this film?

6. What was the total cost of producing the film *Sunday Too Far Away*, and why has it not been released?

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

1. Films being made for the South Australian Film Corporation by—

(a) South Australian film producing companies 7

(b) Interstate film producing companies ... 1

2. Films at present being made by (or for) the corporation..... 42

(comprising 15 at scripting and research stage, and 27 at various stages of production)

3. Films out for tender 3

4. Films being made by the corporation without being put out for tender 11

These are not made by corporation staff, however, but by freelance film makers specially engaged for specific films and working under the direct supervision of a corporation executive producer. This approach is taken where the special nature of the film makes it unsuitable for normal tendering: for example, educational films which at this stage of development of local production potential require more direct and detailed supervision throughout all phases of production than is feasible with wholly contracted films. Other such films are those on the recent Gilbert and Sullivan stage productions, which required special techniques outside the present capacity of local production companies; and the tourist film made in Penang for the Penang Development Corporation that required close supervision by corporation staff experienced in over-sea production conditions.

Work Title:

Yorke Peninsula (earlier production contract cancelled), film now being completed by freelance film makers under direct supervision of a corporation executive producer.

Only Two Wheels

Concepts

Expressive Arts

Motivating Reading

Farm Business Management

Penang

Jewellery

Good News Day

Gilbert and Sullivan operas—*The Mikado* and *The Gondoliers*.

5. What budget excess for *Who Killed Jenny Langby* and what revenues: As stated previously in reply to such questions, the corporation does not disclose the cost of its films nor details of distribution arrangements. To do so would be contrary to accepted industry practice, and detrimental to existing and future relationships with commercial producers and distributors. *Who Killed Jenny Langby* was made not as a commercial venture, but for the special requirements of the Community Welfare Department. As a result of successful marketing by the corporation, the film is also having some commercial success, and has returned already a substantial part of its cost. Enthusiastic public response to its recent national telecasting indicates that sale of prints both in Australia and abroad will bring useful additional revenue.

6. Cost of *Sunday Too Far Away*: As stated above, this information is not available for release.

Why not yet released: release prints are now available. Four major distributors have expressed strong interest in distributing the film, and negotiations are nearing finality. The film has been accepted by the official Australian stand at the 1975 Cannes Film Festival to be held next May, and it is desirable that the world premiere in Adelaide be deferred until after the screening in Cannes.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What is the total number of persons at present unemployed in South Australia?

2. What percentage of unemployment is caused by tariff cuts affecting the textile, electrical, leather, and general manufacturing industries?

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

1. At the end of January, 1975 (the latest period for which figures are available), there were 26 214 unemployed persons in South Australia. This represented about 4.82 per cent of the labour force, and is the lowest percentage of unemployed of all the Australian States.

2. A total of 1 211 persons (4.6 per cent) indicated when registering for unemployment benefits that they were unemployed due to structural changes; but no information is available as to which industries were involved.

MUSEUM

Mr. COUMBE (on notice):

1. Has a committee been established to investigate the resiting of the South Australian Museum, and, if so, has this committee made a recommendation to the Government?

2. If recommendations have been made, what are they and does the Government intend to implement them?

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

1. A committee was established to consider future development of the Art Gallery, old barracks building and museum. Recommendations have been made to the Government suggesting possible sites for a new museum.

2. These recommendations are still being considered.

WELFARE ASSISTANCE

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Does the Community Welfare Department make financial assistance available immediately to persons in necessitous circumstances and, if not, why not?

2. What was the total amount paid in such assistance since July 1, 1974, to February 28, 1975?

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

1. Yes.

2. A total of \$2 533 945 has been paid to February 26, 1975.

BOTTLED GAS

Mr. EVANS (on notice): What are the factors responsible for the most recent large increase in the price of bottled gas?

The Hon. L. J. KING: From January 1, 1975, the South Australian Gas Company increased its prices by 1.8c a lb. as a result of the following cost increases:

a lb.:

- 67c—petroleum tax.
- 70c—increased cost from refinery as approved by Prices Justification Tribunal.
- 43c—increases in wages, overheads, and distribution.

The increase of 1.8c a lb. is equal to \$1.80 for each 100 lbs. (45 kg).

Bottled gas is not subject to control under the South Australian Prices Act.

MAGILL HOME

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. Did the Premier, in a letter dated February 21, 1975, to Mr. V. Smith of the Australian Government Workers Association concerning Magill Home, promise to spend up to \$100 000 on renovations in the present financial year and, if so, what renovation work will be carried out using this money?

2. What renovation work will be carried out to complete the whole programme involving the expenditure of about \$1 000 000, and when will this work be completed?

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

1. A letter was sent to Mr. Smith as stated, advising that up to \$100 000 has been made available this financial year to start urgent renovation work at Magill Home. The work should commence by the end of March, 1975, and will be aimed at alleviating the main problems associated with the unsatisfactory toilet and ablution areas.

2. The major renovation programme is still the subject of studies by the Community Welfare Department, the Public Buildings Department, and the Parliamentary Public Works Standing Committee.

INTEREST RATES

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Premier say what are the current housing interest rates charged by both the State Bank and the Savings Bank of South Australia? -Further, as one private bank has reduced its rates and as other banks may follow, will the Premier say whether he knows whether any discussions are yet under way for interest rates to be reduced by either of these two banks? Recently, the Opposition applauded (in fact, we believe we were responsible for prompting) the Government's decision to increase the limit on loans from the State Bank by \$3 000, from \$15 000 to \$18 000. We considered that this was necessary, in view of the increasing difficulties that many people, particularly young married people, were having in bridging the deposit gap on their new houses. A decision that would be even more acceptable to many South Australians would be one to reduce the interest rates charged in respect of both new and existing housing loans. For example, a 1 per cent reduction in the interest on a \$15 000 loan would result in a saving of about \$3 a week for a voting house buyer. I believe that, if the Government took such action; that

might well lead to other banks taking similar action, so I ask the Premier whether he is aware of any move to reduce the interest rates charged by either the State Bank or the Savings Bank of South Australia.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The interest rates charged by the State Bank and the Savings Bank of South Australia differ, according to several circumstances. There is not one simple rate charged by either institution. I point out to the Leader that, in relation to the loans where the limit was increased from \$15 000 to \$18 000, that action was taken by this Government, and it always is taken by the Government whenever it has sufficient money available to the banking system under our special legislation for concessional interest rate money for houses, because the aim is to increase the limit on loans to the extent to which we can do it, as long as increasing the limit on the loans will not restrict the number of loans severely. That has always been the policy of the Government. Although I appreciate the Leader's interest in the matter, I assure him that he really arrogates to himself rather more credit than is his due by suggesting that it was at the prompting of the Opposition that this action was taken by the Government. In fact, the action was taken by the Government the moment that we received extra money, for which we had applied, from the Commonwealth Government.

Dr. Eastick: What about building societies?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Regarding the position of bank interest rates, more than one concessional rate is applied by the State Bank of South Australia, and these rates are concession rates below the lending rate of the trading banks to which the Leader has referred. Naturally enough, at any stage the State banks look to giving the best terms they can to borrowers consistent with their obligation to be able to continue to raise money (to buy it) in the market. The State Bank and Savings Bank Boards will be examining the position of interest rates, advising the Government on that matter. I have spoken to the Under Treasurer about it and, as soon as any announcement can be made, it will be made.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

Mr. SIMMONS: Will the Minister of Education make available to the Parliamentary Library a copy of the course guides prepared for teachers of religious education in State schools? Last evening on *Monday Conference* reference was made to various parts of the material prepared by the Education Department for use in courses of religious education to be introduced in State schools this year. Extracts were quoted in criticising the courses, but it was suggested by Mr. Ninnes, who was in charge of preparing the courses, that the extracts were not representative of the whole. So that members can evaluate the courses themselves, I ask the Minister to make a copy of the material available to the Parliamentary Library.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will do so. This year, the courses are in the nature of pilot courses; no doubt, as a consequence of our experience this year, some changes will take place in the curriculum. At least once during last evening's programme quotations from the course guide were demonstrably shown to be completely out of context. Mr. Ninnes's point of view had some substance regarding the proper appreciation and evaluation of the course guide.

MOUNT BARKER TANNERY

Mr. McANANEY: Can the Premier (who may be back in the Chamber before I finish my question) or the Deputy Premier say what plans the Government has for constructing a drain to take effluent away from the tannery at Mount Barker? At a meeting in Littlehampton last week, strong objections were raised about the smell coming from the tannery situated on a nearby hill. The understanding is that, at the negotiations that took place at which the Government encouraged Johnson and Son Proprietary Limited to close down its tannery in Victoria and come to South Australia, the Premier or his department made a commitment to have constructed a drain to take away the effluent. Otherwise, the company would not have come here and the council would not have agreed to extensions being made at the tannery. What plans has the Government to honour the obligation that many people believe it undertook to carry out at the time of the negotiations?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Government is aware of the problem but, as in any other similar case, it has no obligation other than to see that, if possible, the life style of the people involved is not affected. I received a letter from the management of the tannery inviting me or a representative to be present at the meeting at Mount Barker last Thursday. It was not an invitation from the conveners of the meeting to me or to one of my officers: the company had evidently been invited by the conveners to be present, and I suppose that, in some respects, it was trying to unload its obligation on to the Government. The Government knows about the problem existing at Mount Barker, and it has looked at it to the extent that we have an estimate of the cost of treating, on the site, the waste from the tannery or, alternatively, shifting the operation from Mount Barker to another site. However, no decision has been made at this stage. The Government is well aware of the problem but it has not, as the honourable member has suggested, submitted to any responsibility in this matter, other than as regards what I have said. I will have the matter further examined and let the honourable member know, if I can, what the Government intends.

AUSTRAL-ASIA DEVELOPMENT

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Premier provide details of the financial arrangements involved in the setting up of Austral-Asia Development Proprietary Limited? At the Penang Week dinner in the Adelaide Town Hall last Thursday, I heard the Premier announce the formation of this enterprise. Whilst the reason for setting up the company is clear I wish to know what public funds are likely to be involved and how they will be provided. Will the enterprise and its funding require legislation or (as I understand a private company is involved) a Select Committee, or does the Government intend merely to take administrative action to establish this trading company?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The amount of Government funds directly involved in all the arrangements at this time is \$50 000, and that money will be provided for the companies through the Industries Assistance Corporation provisions. Two companies are immediately involved: a company which is wholly Government owned and which holds the shares in the joint venture in which Pernas, the Penang Development Corporation, Development Finance Corporation and the South Australian Government are involved; and there will be a mirror company in Malaysia in which we have a minority shareholding. The \$50 000

covers the total investment in the two areas. As the Industries Assistance Corporation provisions have already been amended to allow for activities of this kind, there is no necessity for further legislation: it can be done by administrative action. In fact, incorporation has occurred. If the honourable member is interested, I shall be happy to provide him with the memorandum and articles of association of both the companies registered here.

SEWERAGE PROJECTS

Mr. EVANS: Can the Minister of Works say whether the State Government intends to reduce the sum it contributes to sewerage projects in the State because of an increase in allocations made by the Commonwealth Government from just over \$3 000 000 to \$5 750 000? The allocation of \$5 750 000, which was again announced on the weekend, is the same as the allocation announced twice previously. Originally, slightly over \$3 000 000 was to be the Commonwealth's allocation, and the total sum to be spent on sewerage projects in the State was to be just over \$8 000 000. At that time, the sum to be spent in the Mitcham Hills area was \$490 000 (\$90 000 more than the sum allocated in 1973-74). A recent newspaper report shows that the Mitcham Hills area will receive \$539 000 (an increase of only about \$40 000), with which it is hoped to sewer 3 500 allotments, whereas in the Morphett Vale and Christies Beach area \$1 100 000 will be spent on sewerage 6 500 allotments. This shows that the initial cost of sewerage each allotment in the Morphett Vale and Christies Beach area is more than that of sewerage each allotment in the Mitcham Hills area. My concern for asking whether the Government intends to reduce its contribution because of the Commonwealth Government allocation is that I believe there has not been a fair allocation of moneys available.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member referred to an announcement that has been made for the third time. A joint announcement was made at the weekend by the Australian Minister for Urban and Regional Development (Mr. Uren) and me. I had only two chops at it, not three. I believe my colleague the Minister of Education, in his capacity as Acting Minister of Works, had one go, and I had the other.

Mr. Coumbe: It's the same deal.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes, and I do not wish to make any secret about it. In the light of the honourable member's question, I should point out that there was some inaccuracy in the statement made at the weekend in relation to the number of connections that would be made in certain areas. I am now waiting for a correction of those figures, because officers of my department indicated to me this morning that the statement was inaccurate and that I would receive a correction some time this afternoon. Therefore, I cannot reply to the honourable member until I have the correct figures available. I will give a considered reply to this question, although I believe an error has been made in the number of connections to be made not only in the areas referred to but also in other areas.

TRACK 4 CLASSES

Mr. OLSON: Can the Minister of Education say whether it is possible to establish additional track 4 opportunity classes for students on LeFevre Peninsula? Difficulty is now being experienced by parents who have students enrolled at technical high school level. As the number of students seeking entry to such classes comprises 15 boys and one girl, will the Minister try to have additional track 4 classes introduced at LeFevre Technical

High School and Taperoo High School as soon as is practicable?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will examine the matter raised by the honourable member. I should point out, however, that it is preferable to use teachers in track 4 classes who have had some training in special education. Work done at track 4 level is designed for students who are not performing well at track 0, track 1, track 2, or track 3 levels. Although, as the honourable member points out, the number of students involved is not great, it is not possible to produce the appropriate teachers out of a hat. I will certainly have the matter examined and see to it that the needs of Taperoo and LeFevre High Schools are considered.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Works in his new capacity as Leader of the House. Can the Minister say, what opportunity, if any, will be given from now on to members of this House who do not accept the Whips of either the Labor Party or the Liberal Party to take part in debates, especially second reading and adjournment debates? I refer to the statement made by the Minister earlier today in which he indicated how the Government intended to run the business of the House in future. I ask the question because of the situation of the member for Goyder and me. The member for Flinders, even though he is a member of the Country Party, has elected to accept the Liberal Party Whip and will no doubt be represented in the discussions which are to take place at the beginning of each week and in which the member for Fisher will be involved. The member for Flinders, therefore, is not prejudiced in the way we are prejudiced. Whether the member for Goyder and I are regarded as being members of a separate Party (as we are generally regarded outside this place) or as Independents (as the Government persists in trying to do), we should have some right to take part in debates in this place. However, I especially noted (and I was listening to him closely) that the Minister referred to the Opposition only, no doubt meaning that part of it that is represented by the Liberal Party. I suggest that what should happen is that either the member for Goyder or I, as spokesman for the Liberal Movement, should be included in the discussions at the beginning of each week, and that is what I would ask the Government to allow. However, I put the question in this form to see just what is intended by the Government under the magnificent new order that has been imposed on us all.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I find this rather amusing. In fact, I find it rather difficult to understand why the member for Mitcham cannot converse with the Opposition Whip; it seems rather strange to me that he cannot. As I understand the situation, every facility has been offered to him to do so.

Mr. Millhouse: No facility—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: However, he has consistently refused to co-operate in any way with anyone in this Chamber, including the Opposition Whip. The statement I made earlier this afternoon related to a meeting that would be held each Tuesday of a sitting week: it concerned only that. I said that individual members (I did not refer specifically to the honourable member or his colleague or to any other honourable member in the House) "may, if they so desire, go to either the Opposition or the Government Whip and put forward any views they may have on legislation that is on the

Notice Paper". In turn, the Whips will convey to me, or to the meeting, any problems they may have. That applies—

Mr. Millhouse: In other words—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: —to the member for Mitcham or to any other member in the Chamber. I have stated quite clearly the constitution of that meeting. If the member for Mitcham cannot see his way clear to converse with anyone in the Chamber, thus gaining access to the meeting, that is his business and not mine. Regarding participation by the honourable member or the member for Goyder in any debate, surely the honourable member has been in this Chamber long enough to know that that is not my concern as the Leader of this House: it is the concern of you, Sir, as Speaker.

STANDING ORDERS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I should like to ask you a question, Mr. Speaker, in connection with your explanation of the changes to Standing Orders that were forced through the House last week.

The SPEAKER: Order! They were carried by the House.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Well, we will not argue the point—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: —but it was done against strong opposition from this side. Has this House the authority to exclude members of Parliament from the part of the building that the Legislative Council occupies? In your explanation of that part of Standing Orders dealing with the suspension of a member, you stated:

The penalties provided by Standing Order 171 include banishment from the building.

On the one occasion on which I have been suspended from this Chamber, there was doubt about what part of the building I could then occupy. I chose to sit in the gallery of the Legislative Council, and there was doubt at that time about whether I was allowed to sit there, so a message was sent to the President of the Legislative Council, who stated that it was all right for me to occupy a seat in the Legislative Council gallery. Therefore, I ask you, as Speaker, whether you (or this House) have the authority to decide what will happen in that section of the building that I think is under the jurisdiction of the President, of the Legislative Council.

The SPEAKER: The new Standing Orders apply to the House of Assembly and its members. The Speaker has jurisdiction only over the part of the building known as the House of Assembly section. He has no jurisdiction whatever over that part of the building that is under the jurisdiction of the President of the Legislative Council.

NATIONAL HEALTH SCHEME

Dr. TONKIN: I direct my question to the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Health, although possibly the Premier may be able to assist. Will the Attorney say whether the Government has made any decision, accepting the situation proposed under the Commonwealth Government's Medibank scheme, whereby patients in psychiatric hospitals will be specifically excluded from help under this scheme? It has been proposed under the heads of agreement that were circulated to Health Ministers by the Commonwealth Government last September that patients in mental hospitals should not be covered by the Medibank scheme. Attitudes to mental illness

have changed, and competent authorities believe now that acute psychiatric patients should be treated in the same way as any other sick person, namely, as someone who is acutely ill and in need of treatment. Most psychiatric patients do not stay in hospital for a long time. I remind the Minister that the Commonwealth Liberal and Country Party Opposition has announced, as its policy, that it will definitely include acute psychiatric cases in the benefits to be paid under the present scheme when those Parties, in Government, modify it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The latter part of the explanation is out of order. It is a comment, and comments may not be made when asking questions. The honourable Attorney-General.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I accept your ruling, but I think it is a pity that you gave it, because I should have liked to reply to the latter part of the question. I will obtain a report from my colleague on the first part of the question.

CHAFFEY PUMPING STATION

Mr. ARNOLD: In view of the press release stating that the new Chaffey pumping station will be used to relieve the shortage of irrigation water, can the Minister of Works say why repairs are being undertaken at present, instead of urgently needed additional water being supplied? At a deputation on Thursday, February 20, the Minister gave members of the deputation a minute that he had received from his Director and Engineer-in-Chief, stating that one of the new pumps at the station would be used to increase the flow from 27 Ml a day to 36 Ml a day to try to solve the problem. The minute also stated that the engineer on the site would have power to close, down the pump if it was considered that further structural damage was being caused. However, the pump was started for one day and, because of the excessively high salinity level (it was in excess of 2 000 electrical conductivity units), both the old pump and the new pump were closed down. Three or four days later, salinity dropped to about 1 000 e.c. units, and the old pump was started again. Although this meant that the irrigation programme had dropped behind by three or four days, the new pump was not started again. Consequently, there probably is more urgent need to use the new pump now than there was previously, and I ask whether there is any structural reason why it is not possible to use the new pump.

The Hon. I. D. CORCORAN: This is probably a question for the Minister of Irrigation, as the pump is really under his control. However, it is true, as the honourable member has said, that I issued a minute at a deputation at which he was present. I think that in that minute it was pointed out that we were using that pump at some risk, but it was considered then that this was warranted, because there had been a washout or undercut of the structure as a result of the flood, and this had put the whole operation of the pump at risk. Because the situation then was so desperate in terms of salinity, we decided to increase the flow from 27 Ml to 36 Ml, as the honourable member has said, to try to assist with the irrigation, and the people at the deputation accepted this. I do not know why the pump is not being used now and I can only assume that, because of the drop in salinity that has occurred (and the honourable member knows that that is significant), it may not have been considered worth while putting the pump at risk in those circumstances. In other words, the situation would have changed, and I should imagine that an assessment or appreciation was made then and it was decided that the pump would not

bemused in those circumstances; However, as I merely assume that to be the case, I will obtain a considered report for the honourable member and bring it down tomorrow, if possible.

CATTLE SALES

Mr. RODDA: Will the Minister of Works consult the Minister of Agriculture regarding a report, which I presume has come from the Agricultural Council, regarding the live-weight selling of cattle? Beef producers in my district have brought this matter to my attention and, of course, it is relevant to the Harvey report, which deals with the matter of selling centres in the south-eastern part of the State. I commend the Harvey committee for its excellent report, which refers to live-weight selling. On reviewing this matter, I find that many complicated aspects are involved in respect of the codes operating in New South Wales, Victoria, and South Australia. Although there are many advantages in live-weight selling, there are problems associated with it at times: for example, there is the period of starvation required. Apparently, it would be advantageous for an expert committee to consider this matter. On the surface, this appears to be the most satisfactory way for the producer to sell beef cattle. I shall be grateful if the Minister of Agriculture will confer on live-weight selling with Ministers from other States.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I join the honourable member in commending Dr. Harvey for the report, which I think is excellent. I do not know whether the honourable member said this categorically, but the report came down on the side of pen selling.

Mr. Rodda: That is so, but the report also referred to other aspects.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not know about that. However, I questioned Dr. Harvey before the report came out, and he said that this argument would go on forever. He said that advantages and disadvantages were involved, so that it was a matter of the person involved weighing up those advantages and disadvantages before making a decision. Although I was not aware that the Agricultural Council had been involved in the matter, I will do as the honourable member suggests and confer with my colleague to see whether I can obtain any information. If and when I obtain information, I shall let the honourable member have it as soon as possible.

PETROL TAX

Mr. CHAPMAN: Can the Treasurer say, what is the current position of the State Government's negotiations with the Commonwealth Government with regard to -South Australia's being relieved of the 5c a gallon petrol tax? Newspaper reports on January 31 and February 27 state that the Treasurer has been negotiating with the Commonwealth for grants to offset this burden on South Australian motorists. Undoubtedly the Treasurer appreciates the urgent need for this relief to the general community, and particularly to those who depend on private car. transport and who consequently desire to know what is happening in this regard. Will the Treasurer confirm the accuracy of what is stated in these newspaper articles and say what is the position regarding these negotiations?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The negotiations are constant and continuing. When I have an announcement to make about their result, I shall let the honourable member know at the earliest opportunity.

MATRICULATION

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Can the Minister of Education say what is the intended future format for Matriculation assessment of students in the fifth year of secondary school? With your concurrence, Mr. Speaker, and that of members, including the Minister of Education, who likes to gag members' in this House, I should like to make an explanation.

The SPEAKER: Order! As that remark of the honourable member is out of order, it will not be permitted. If it is repeated, I shall ask the honourable member for an immediate withdrawal.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I wish to refer to some of the newspaper statements and other statements made by the Minister on this subject. On February 22, 1973, in answer to my question, the Minister said that South Australia would retain the fifth-year Matriculation, but that the general tendency in Australia was for external exams to be reduced to a minimum and, in the long term, they, would possibly disappear. In addition, a rather confused and inaccurate statement, purporting to come from the Minister, appears in the *Advertiser* of January 24, 1974. In that statement, the Minister has made what I believe to be some most inaccurate statements.

The SPEAKER: Order! Under Standing Orders the honourable member may not comment; he may only explain his question. That is all that the honourable member is permitted to do.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I point out that I said as a fact that the statement made by the Minister was inaccurate.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I rise on a point of order. Mr. Speaker, you asked the member for Davenport to abide by your ruling and not debate the matter by stating his own views.

The SPEAKER: Order! A point of order cannot be taken on an explanation of a question. However, as the point of order has been raised, I take it that leave of the House for the honourable member to make an explanation has been withdrawn. The honourable Minister of Education.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Although I am not familiar with the newspaper report of January 24, I will certainly check it now that the honourable member has raised the matter. If he intended to say that this was an inaccurate statement, I should have thought that the honourable member, might at least quote a bit of it.

Mr. Dean Brown: I was stopped by the Minister of Transport. I was gagged.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ruled that section of the question out of order.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I abide by your ruling, Sir. The position with regard to the Matriculation examination is the same as it was when I replied to the honourable member early in 1973.

Mr. Dean Brown: That was—

The SPEAKER: Order! The new Standing Orders will prevail: I warn the honourable member for Davenport.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I do not think the honourable member was interested in a reply when he asked the question.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have warned the honourable member for Davenport.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Therefore, I do not intend to answer it further.

GOVERNMENT PRODUCE DEPARTMENT

Mr. BLACKER: Can the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Agriculture, say what the Government intends with regard to upgrading the Government Produce Department at Port Lincoln, and whether it intends to maintain this abattoir at an export standard? At a recent producers' meeting it was stated that the Government Produce Department depot would be maintained as a local killing works only, and that it was unlikely to undertake export killing. On Eyre Peninsula, considerable stock is available, certainly more than the local killing abattoir can adequately handle. Therefore, we are concerned that, by losing the export section of the abattoir, we will lose a valuable market for Eyre Peninsula.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to obtain a report from my colleague and let the honourable member have it as soon as possible.

BRIGHTON ROAD

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Transport see that top priority is given to erecting traffic signals incorporating a pedestrian crossing at the junction of Brighton Road and Jetty Road, Glenelg? In reply to my question, the Minister said, in part:

The design of these signals is complicated by the requirement that they shall give priority to trams. However, subject to the availability of finance, it is anticipated that the signals will be installed by mid-1975.

I hope that the Minister is aware of the grave problems that exist at this junction and the urgent need to provide a crossing, particularly having regard to the many aged people in the area who now have to cross the widened Brighton Road at periods of dense traffic in order to do their shopping in Jetty Road.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I think that the honourable member has quoted a letter I wrote to him on the matter. Therefore, he must realise that this matter is currently receiving all possible attention. I am aware of the urgent need to have traffic signals installed at this junction but, unlike the member for Glenelg, I am also aware of the urgent need to have traffic signals installed at several other locations. We have drawn up a programme and, although individual members will argue priority for their districts (and I do not criticise them for that, because that is their natural role), as Minister I have to consider priorities over the whole State. The other aspect is that the honourable member in quoting from my letter referred to the complicated nature of the crossing caused by the involvement of trams. If my memory is correct on that point, not only is there the complicated nature of design but also the complicated nature of equipment that we are still waiting to receive. Until that equipment is available, obviously we cannot install the lights. The same problem arises at the Marion Road and the Morphett Road crossings, at which there has been undue delay in installing boom gates because of the lack of equipment. These are factors associated with this problem, but I assure the honourable member that the lights will be installed as soon as it is humanly possible to install them.

WEIGHT RESTRICTIONS

Mr. RUSSACK: Can the Minister of Transport say whether it is correct that some form of weight restriction, other than axle limits, will apply when exemptions are approved by the Road Traffic Board for the transport of primary produce, as provided in the Road Traffic Act? If this is the case, can he say when details and conditions will be announced? Originally, it was accepted by most people that the exemption would be to axle limits (6½ tonnes

on front axle, and 8 tonnes on back axle) but, because of information being received through public meetings and other avenues, primary producers are becoming most concerned, as they wish to prepare for future harvests and to transport their grain adequately. If the question of purchasing a new truck has to be considered, such new truck and trailer that would conform economically to the legislation would cost between \$15 000 and \$20 000.

Mr. Venning: That's just not on.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not know whether road safety is "on" with rural producers, but I hope that it is and that the view expressed by the member for Rocky River does not indicate the general attitude of primary producers. In fact, I am sure that it does not, because primary producers in this State are as conscious of the need for road safety as is anyone else. Legislation regarding weights passed by Parliament provided that exemptions could be granted by the Road Traffic Board. I am sure that the board will use its discretion in its approach to this task. At this stage I do not know whether it has laid down any general criteria on this matter, but I hope any obligation that the board applies will be applied to existing vehicles. I would not expect the board to grant exemptions in respect of new vehicles when, in fact, vehicles that could comply with the provisions of the legislation should have been purchased.

TENDER PRICES

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Premier say what is the situation in respect of tender prices being received for major Government works, particularly school buildings? Last Friday week the Premier, when addressing the annual general meeting of permanent building societies, indicated that the most recent tender price for a high school building was about \$4 000 000, which was a marked increase on the previous tender price of such a building. Having regard to that admission of the increase to \$4 000 000, I believe the Premier would have to acknowledge that the ability to provide accommodation for students has been markedly reduced, particularly when we compare the increased sums being made available for expenditure on education with the number of student places that were made available at the lower cost. In seeking this information, I realise that other major contracts (such as the forensic science building and the Motor Registration Division building) are available, as well as those for other Government works. I would appreciate an indication of how far above the expected cost are the tender prices that are being received. One may also relate this matter to the tender price received for the high-rise flats at Elizabeth because, when that project was withdrawn, it was indicated publicly that the cost of building was the major factor that had caused the withdrawal of the project.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: For a considerable time the tendering climate in South Australia for major buildings has not been good: in fact, it has not been good anywhere in Australia. At the Loan Council meeting last year the Prime Minister was able to point to an escalation of building costs to the South Australian Government for public works (referred to in the report of the Co-ordinator of General Works) that showed a very worrying situation as regards tendering. The Leader would be aware of the marked escalation in the cost of Flinders Medical Centre, which, although originally designed to cost about \$35 000 000, is now to cost about \$54 000 000. That is a serious situation, and I do not expect it will get better soon, because we will have further problems associated

with wage costs as a result of negotiations that have been proceeding between the master builders and the building unions. Inevitably, the Government has been keeping a close watch on tenders: in fact, tender prices that we have received for the buildings to which the Leader has referred (given that background) were excellent, and it was heartening to the Government to be able to let the contracts at what was, in the present tendering climate, a comparatively advantageous price to the public. However, I will obtain a full report for the Leader.

MOTOR REGISTRATION DIVISION

Mrs. BYRNE: Can the Minister of Transport obtain for me details of the site selected and other relevant information about establishing at Modbury a branch office of the Motor Registration Division of the Transport Department?

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

PAY-ROLL TAX

Mr. VENNING: Would it be true to say that the Treasurer is in sympathy with the move by other State Treasurers—

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the honourable member that no question is permissible when it is asked on the basis of "Is it true" or "Is it untrue". That sort of question is inadmissible.

Mr. VENNING: Is it a fact that the Treasurer is in sympathy with the move by other State Treasurers to consider raising the exemption figure from \$400 a week to \$2 000 a week in respect of wages paid before pay-roll tax becomes payable? If the Treasurer is in sympathy with the move, when may industry so affected expect some relief in this regard? It was stated in a radio programme last weekend that Sir Gordon Chalk (Queensland Treasurer) had intimated that State Treasury Departments had suggested this move should take place. What is the situation in South Australia? Is the Treasurer in sympathy with the move and, if he is, when may we expect action in South Australia?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The only move I have heard about was as a result of the statement made by Sir Gordon Chalk. Previously the only reference that had been made to the matter at a Premiers' Conference had been made by Sir Charles Court, who had forecast that, as his budgetary problems were the worst in Australia, he might well have to remove the exemptions altogether.

Dr. Eastick: You suggested that—

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I said that that was the sort of thing he was having to move to.

Mr. Mathwin: He hasn't done it yet, has he?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, and he has a ruddy sight bigger deficit than we have! I am not aware of any moves at Treasury level. Certainly my Under Treasurer has not raised the matter with me, but I will see whether something will come out of Sir Gordon's announcement.

MANOAH

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Environment and Conservation negotiate with Mr. Tom Uren (Commonwealth Minister in charge of the National Estate) to acquire immediately the property known as Manoah, at Upper Sturt? I believe this property should be part of the National Estate. Partly damaged by fire last year, it was at one time the home of Sir Josiah Symon, who helped draft much

of the Australian Constitution, and for that reason alone it is of significance. Built in the 1880's it is situated on 40 acres of land which is all that is left of the original estate of 240 acres, the rest having been subdivided and sold in half-acre and acre allotments. When the property was up for auction in December, the Commonwealth Minister sent a telegram saying that he was too late to intervene at the auction, but that if any further information came to light and the property was available for negotiation, he would appreciate receiving advice from the people concerned who should make a submission to his department. Immediately I heard there was still an opportunity to purchase the property I asked the local Commonwealth member (Mr. John McLeay) yesterday to approach the Commonwealth Minister. Last week I told the State Minister privately what was the situation, and the intending purchaser and vendor have agreed to postpone sale until Thursday of this week. The price asked is \$135 000. Will the Minister negotiate immediately with the Commonwealth Minister in an attempt to save this property for the National Estate, because the intending purchaser intends to demolish the remaining building to make way for another project.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I am not sure how badly the property has been damaged, nor am I sure that the building itself has been accepted by the National Trust as having some historical significance to the State, but the honourable member may know. I will take up the matter immediately to obtain the answer to those two questions, and on the information I receive I will consider whether it is as urgent as the honourable member says it is.

MONARTO

Mr. WARDLE: Can the Minister of Development and Mines say whether the Government intends, through the Land Board and the Monarto Development Commission, to purchase for parks all the land that the Government believes is necessary outside the designated site of Monarto, or will it give councils in the area funds to purchase land, for the parks, gardens and recreational areas it believes will be necessary to provide for the future? Local councils believe that, with the growth likely to take place to the area, not only should the Minister provide for such purchases that the Government believes are necessary outside this territory within the 10-kilometre limit, but that local councils should develop some of these areas for their own people and for the people likely to reside in the area in the future.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The second proposal is the one preferred by the Government. The Monarto Development Commission has acquired properties outside the designated site and will continue to do so where the money is available and where the area would seem to be subject to rational use by the people who are to live there. Local councils may apply under the Public Parks Act for assistance and we will subsidise their purchase of such land. We would expect that avenue for acquiring open space to be used as much in the general Monarto area as it would be in any other part of the State. The Government, through the commission, would certainly not want to see all the acquisition of land for parks and recreation areas being carried out by the commission. By all means, if we can get local government to commit some of its funds on a 50/50 basis under the provisions of the Public Parks Act, we would want that to happen. It is up to the local council to apply to the Minister of Local Government for a subsidy under the Public Parks Act.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (SIGNS)

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Road Traffic Act, 1961-1974. Read a first time.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I move:

That this Bill be read a second time.

This small Bill inserts a penalty clause in the section of the Road Traffic Act that deals with the duty of drivers to give way at intersections and junctions. As members will remember, this section was amended late last year to provide for a wider duty to give way when at a "stop" sign. A penalty clause was inadvertently omitted, and this Bill remedies that omission.

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

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF CLAUSES

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that this Bill will be deemed to have come into operation on March 1, 1975, which is the commencement date of the Road Traffic Amendment Act (No. 6), 1974. Clause 3 inserts the appropriate penalty clause in section 63 of the principal Act. This clause is identical to the penalty clause previously appearing at the foot of subsection (1).

Mr. WARDLE secured the adjournment of the debate.

INDUSTRIAL ORGANISATION (BUILDING GRANTS) BILL

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

That the report be noted.

(Continued from February 27. Page 2624.)

Mr. OLSON (Semaphore): I support the motion. There is an old saying, "Never kick a person when he is down," but the attitude displayed by the Opposition in relation to approving this loan to allow the Trades Hall to remain a viable proposition is certainly putting the boots into trade unionists and into those who occupy the Trades Hall. What has happened to the desire for improved employer-employee relations we hear so much about from members opposite, when, by their attitude towards this loan, they wish only to smash the tools of the trade union movement, tools that have grown since the inception of the movement in 1884.

Mr. Mathwin: That's a ridiculous statement, and you know it.

Mr. OLSON: It is not ridiculous; it is the attitude taken by members opposite because the Australian Labor Party has its headquarters in Trades Hall. No money is made available for it; that is what we are arguing about. Although the Bill was introduced at a time to cultivate better relations between employers and employees, the refusal of this loan will not promote better industrial relations: it is bound to cause bad feelings. In fact, it will strengthen the feeling that there has been no change of heart by the employer. It seems that the principle is still to keep the employee down-trodden.

Mr. Mathwin: What about the donation made by—

Mr. OLSON: I will come to that later when I will indicate clearly what has and has not been given. One could at least have expected that, in the interests of better employer/employee relations, the Opposition would permit the payment of funds for bricks and mortar of the Trades Hall to enable unions to function in an organised manner. Rather than condemn the trade union movement for having the courage to embark on a venture which is in the interests

of the community, members opposite should adopt the view expressed by Mr. Branson (General Manager of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry in South Australia) and realise that, if Government funds were available to employer organisations in difficulty, such money would be accepted.

If that is the case, what is wrong with making money available to trade unions? Immediately it is suggested that Government assistance is to be made available by way of a grant to the Trades Hall, members opposite complain that a case does not exist for that organisation to get special favours. However, little is heard from members opposite by way of appreciation of the way the Industries Development Committee has helped companies with funds under the Industries Development Act. Under that Act no fewer than 32 organisations have received advances since 1971. In all, about \$2 631 500 has been advanced as follows: in 1971 there were three advances for a total of \$151 500; in 1972, eight advances for a total of \$457 000—

Mr. Mathwin: Were they grants or loans?

Mr. OLSON: This relates to organisations that applied for help because they, too, like the Trades Hall, were not in a viable position. In 1973, eight advances were made for a total of \$762 000; and in 1974, 13 advances for a total of \$1 261 000. In addition, bank guarantees made by the Treasurer under the Industries Development Act to various companies totalled \$16 728 506 to June 30, 1974.

Mr. Chapman: Do you happen to have a list of the applications that were rejected?

Mr. OLSON: That would make no difference. Consideration should be given to money being made available to the Trades Hall to get it out of its present difficulty. What about the sums the Government has made available in the form of subsidies to primary producers and the rural industry generally? The only complaint one hears from primary producers is that the subsidies are not big enough. Reference is never made to the poor old taxpayer being protected in the making up of this subsidy. The member for Torrens during the course of his remarks referred to a statement made by the member for Florey when this matter was debated last November. The member for Florey said:

The position is that, when the building had to be financed, a substantial loan was negotiated. At that time, it was considered that rental payments for space in the building, plus the proceeds of hiring facilities and the hall, would return enough to meet interest commitments. Unfortunately, this did not eventuate, because the rental proposition failed and people have not utilised the facilities as expected. The return on the facilities has fallen to such a low ebb that interest payments have not been able to be made.

The interpretation placed on that statement by the member for Torrens in this debate is as follows:

... someone made a gross mistake in estimating the return ... of rental income ... the facilities have not been supported by trade unions ...

When the feasibility study was made it was expected confidently that a Commonwealth department would establish offices on a floor of the new building.

Mr. Payne: As has happened at the *Advertiser* building and at B.P. House.

Mr. OLSON: That is correct. The revenue return received by the *Advertiser* and the management of B.P. House is helping pay for the cost of those buildings.

Mr. Millhouse: To which Commonwealth department are you referring?

Mr. OLSON: The Australian Department of Health. Although the department indicated that it would examine

the proposition sympathetically, nothing came of the idea. Had something come of it, I am confident that we would not be debating this matter today. Perhaps it is true that the facilities at the Trades Hall are not used for social activities in the way contemplated when the plans were formulated. However, this is common with most clubs in the city, particularly since changes were made regarding liquor hours and drinking permits. In other words, it was hoped that many unionists employed in the city in the day time would use the facilities of the club at the Trades Hall. Obviously, with the inception of new liquor hours, if people live outside the city, they will not come back to use the hall, and this has not increased the revenue.

As late as February 23, 1972, when the Treasurer opened the Trades Hall, it was impossible for the Trades Hall Managing Committee to contemplate that the interest charge on this loan would be increased to \$12 000 a quarter, or \$52 200 a year. At present, 68 unions are affiliated to the United Trades and Labor Council of South Australia, representing 120 139 members, and 27 unions, representing 40 593 members, occupy space in the building.

The revenue for the Trades Hall Council, in addition to rental increases of 2.5 per cent from January, 1974, and receipts from car parking, at \$1.50 a week, is \$12 435 a quarter, so we can compare the return of \$12 435 a quarter to the interest alone, which is about \$12 000 a quarter. It is impossible to make progress when we have a problem such as that. The affiliations to the Trades Hall are determined by the variation in the work force. The membership fees for the unions, as determined by Australian Council of Trade Unions policy, at present is 1 per cent of salary and this is to be fully effective by 1976. We must remember that many unions pay substantially less in membership fees than 1 per cent of salary at present.

In addition, there has been a decline in the membership of some unions, due to automation and technological change, and this in turn has reduced the number of affiliates within the Trades Hall. The membership of the Trades Hall relies on the variation of the work force, and the need for amalgamation of some unions, so that the cost structure in running the organisation can be minimised, is shown clearly. Those people who are opposed to union membership, and who are supported by some members opposite, are white-anting the very foundations of the Trades Hall project.

Is there any wonder that the Trades Hall Managing Committee has been forced to ask this Government for assistance? The member for Adelaide has referred to the accommodation in the old Trades Hall in Grote Street, comparing that building to a rabbit warren. He was correct in making that assessment, because the rooms, apart from being small, were poorly ventilated and dingy. A person had to be a mountain goat to negotiate the stairway.

In addition to paying the rental charges in the old building, some unions spent much money in improving their accommodation, whilst many other unions, including mine, were forced to build their own premises outside the Trades Hall so that they could cater for their membership effectively. In 1950, when the Trades Hall Managing Committee took a census of the number of unions that would require accommodation in the new building, 48 unions indicated that they wanted this accommodation.

Mr. Chapman: How many are there now?

Mr. OLSON: There are only 27.

Mr. Chapman: What happened to the others?

Mr. OLSON: They had to get their own premises, because the project took so long to get off the ground.

Mr. Chapman: Otherwise they would be there now?

Mr. OLSON: Yes, if there was accommodation there, they would have gone back to the Trades Hall.

Mr. Coumbe: Why didn't the Trades Hall go on with the proposal at the time?

Mr. OLSON: At that time, we did not have an Australian Labor Party Government as we have now, and it was obvious that we would not get from the Liberal Government the sympathetic hearing that we have got from the present Government. At that stage it was agreed that a levy of \$2 would be imposed for each member in each union, and unions have largely faced up to this responsibility. The amount of \$156 000, which was referred to before the Select Committee, included much of the amount that had been collected on the basis of \$2 a member.

However, unions that were required to build their own accommodation and meet the costs involved in conducting their own affairs were not able to provide the Trades Hall Managing Committee with the \$2 a member, but they have made donations to the best of their financial ability.

We must remember that every union cannot affiliate to the extent of every member on the union books. In other words, all unions cannot effectively affiliate to the full extent of their membership. The cost structure of a union governs this matter and a union can affiliate only to the degree that it can afford to do so.

Aspersions, such as some members opposite have cast, that unionists could have done more to finance this building are not true. The conducting of functions, such as cabarets, raffles, socials, car competitions, and Labor Day functions, have augmented the building funds. Mr. Branson freely admitted to the Select Committee that, in the financing of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry building, the chamber recently had encountered difficulty because of altered circumstances in financial arrangements that had not been foreseen. At the same time, Mr. Branson saw nothing wrong in accepting money on behalf of the chamber if the Government was willing to make it available. In an editorial on February 28, 1975, the *Advertiser*, commenting on the Trades Hall loan, suggests that the Trades Hall fall back on its own resources, by imposing another levy on members of affiliated unions, estimating that it would require only \$8 from each member of the unions involved to pay off the total Trades Hall debt.

Mr. Mathwin: There's a difference between a loan and a grant.

Mr. OLSON: I appreciate that fact. However, I believe the statement in the *Advertiser* is nothing but arrant nonsense. If the *Advertiser* had taken the trouble to find out how many unions had registered rules permitting the collecting of levies from members, it would have found out that the number was small indeed.

Mr. Mathwin: Why not take it out of the sustenance fee?

Mr. OLSON: Deductions are already being made from affiliation fees. Is it suggested that, in order to obtain the required sum of money, the Trades Hall should impose greater hardship on the members of the remaining unions which, in most cases, would be unable to pay? It is not hard to understand that the object of denying a loan to the Trades Hall is to drain away the remaining financial resources of the unions: Opposition members, aided by the press, have carried out a spiteful and malicious campaign against the trade union movement. However, they know

that, despite this campaign, the movement is strong, for it is essential to the economic life of this community.

Unions are built up at immense cost in human effort in order to protect and advance the cause of their members. We realise that, between many people inside and outside the trade union movement, there is a lack of understanding or sympathy with regard to each other's philosophies and aspirations. This cannot be better illustrated than by the attitude of Opposition members towards this loan. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): We are basically debating the report of the Select Committee and the recommendation (although not reached unanimously) that the Trades Hall Managing Committee be given \$200 000 to help sort out its difficulties. From being a direct grant, the committee now recommends that there be a loan of \$200 000 that will be repayable on the most generous terms, with a moratorium before any repayments have to be made. On carefully examining the balance sheets presented to the Select Committee, I very much doubt whether \$200 000 will be nearly enough to do more than get the managing committee off the hook for the time being.

Mr. Payne: You disagree with Mr. Carey.

Dr. TONKIN: I believe that, judging from the balance sheets, difficulties will occur. Therefore, it is not just a problem of deciding whether to give the Trades Hall Managing Committee \$200 000: we must foresee being asked to approve further grants or loans. Considering the terms of the loan recommended, I do not think there is much difference between a loan and a grant. When will we be asked to approve a second grant of \$200 000? So it will go on.

I have no doubt that this project has been in difficulty right from its inception. I do not think that is necessarily the fault of those who conceived it, but I believe they did not have all the information they now have. The member for Semaphore referred to the number of unions that had to find premises away from the Trades Hall when the project was delayed. Only 27 unions are now represented at the Trades Hall. I presume that the other unions own their own premises or have considerable equity in premises. The membership of South Australia's 60 unions is, I think, 120 139, but only 40 593 union members belong to unions that use the Trades Hall.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You mean constantly, but they all use it at times.

Dr. TONKIN: I know that may be the case. However, this could be the crux of the problem. I suspect that not many of the 40 593 members of the unions that have their headquarters in the Trades Hall use that building. Although union officers may use it, the members probably do not use it much at all.

Mr. Keneally: They meet there as often as you use the Adelaide Club.

Dr. TONKIN: This Bill was introduced, in a roneoed form, with some haste. It was not until this request for a grant was made that we realised that the financial situation of the Trades Hall organisation was so serious.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: How long ago was that?

Dr. TONKIN: I cannot remember, but it was in the last day or two of last year's sitting. In addressing the Leader of the House, when I use the term "Leader" I think it may be confusing, as I may be referring to the Leader of the Opposition. I should like this matter clarified.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member knows very well what is the honourable Minister's title.

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Deputy Premier do? We are now being asked to make this grant, and it is still basically a grant. Members opposite have gone back into history to back up their case. We have seen them wring out their handkerchiefs. Reference has been made to grants in 1890 to help the Chamber of Manufactures set up an industrial exhibition to promote the manufacture and distribution of goods. Members have referred to the Centennial Hall building programme; we have been told that to have it there suits only a small section of the community. One member opposite said that it benefits only primary producers. That is a load of rubbish, because Centennial Hall is used regularly by hundreds of thousands of South Australians; there is nothing sectional whatever in its use.

I have had expressed to me from the general community the most united opposition to this move that I have ever experienced in relation to any matter. It is a feeling shared by many members of the community, especially young people who are having the most difficult time that they will have in their lives. However, it does not concern only young people: many pensioners and superannuated people in Burnside and other highly rated areas are having difficulty, because they cannot meet this Government's inflated and grossly unfair rates and taxes. Many people from both major political Parties believe that this money should not be given to the Trades Hall Managing Committee, because no-one in this community deserves especially favourable treatment when many others are having financial problems.

That is the crux of the matter. It is not because it is the trade union movement that is in difficulties: it is simply because everyone is in a similar situation (to a greater or lesser extent), but others in the community do not expect the Government to get them out of a hole with a hand-out. These people have had to make an effort to solve their problems, but a similar effort by the Trades Hall seems to have been rejected by Government members. Probably, the Labor Party's policy of hand-outs in the welfare State has engendered a tremendous degree of dependence, but there are many reasons why people should be encouraged to help themselves. I believe the trade union movement should be encouraged to do that. I make one or two suggestions in a spirit of constructive criticism, and I hope that is how they will be accepted, although I doubt that they will be.

Mr. Millhouse: What are they?

Dr. TONKIN: I understand that many unions, because of their rules, cannot impose levies on their members, and we are told that that is the end of the matter.

Mr. Millhouse: The rules could be changed.

Dr. TONKIN: Why not change the rules! If members of unions honestly and sincerely wish to participate in the Trades Hall and to help the committee out of the appalling situation in which it finds itself, why are not moves being made to change the rules of these organisations that ban the imposition of levies?

Mr. Duncan: Because many are federal unions.

Dr. TONKIN: How is that relevant? I should think that, before the trade union movement came to this Government and requested \$200 000, it might have gone to its Commonwealth organisations and suggested that these rules be changed. Does the honourable member

suggest that South Australian unions would not receive the support of their colleagues in other States? I cannot believe that.

Mr. Crimes: Of course you can!

Mr. Duncan: You know the D.L.P. history of these rules only too well.

Dr. TONKIN: It seems that the harmony and degree of co-operation between members of trade unions that we have been led to believe exist do not exist. Why not change the rules, so that levies can be imposed? However, I believe that the present situation of the Trades Hall Managing Committee is very much the result of the way in which trade union members have been treated in the past. If unions were doing their jobs and serving their members, and if members were members of unions because they wanted to be and not because they had been told that they had to be, then members of unions would be pleased to support the committee and help it out of its present troubles. However, it may be too late, and I believe that the trade union movement, by its past actions, has created this feeling of antipathy in its own members.

The present situation demonstrates clearly the effect of the insistence on compulsory unionism. People can be press-ganged into the organisation by threat of industrial action and reprisal, but neither their respect nor their co-operation will be earned by these actions. The managing committee should consider seriously these matters, because I believe that therein lies the only chance to solve its present problems. A change of attitude will not come about in a few minutes, but I believe that trade unions and officials should make every effort to set their own house in order and to do what trade unions were first formed to do: that is, serve their members. Union membership should be made attractive, so that it would be a pleasure to join a union. If that happened, many people, as proud members of a union (and I honour them for this), would put their hands into their pockets and give money.

It may not be much but, if the figures of union membership quoted by the member for Semaphore are accurate (and there may be some doubt about this for various reasons), those people who want to be members of unions would support the Trades-Hall committee. Whether we like it or not, I believe we are now seeing the long-term result basically of an attitude of "go your own way" expressed by union officials. I was surprised to read in the evidence that Mr. Shannon said unions had had a constant struggle to obtain sufficient union fees each year to cover their administration. That confirms what I have been saying: not only has there not been enough money for the Trades Hall but, in addition, the trade unions have difficulty in getting enough money to cover their administration, and that factor should have been looked at closely before the project was undertaken.

One or two Government members have said that this situation is comparable with that of the Nurses Memorial Centre, but it is not at all comparable. There are many fewer nurses than trade unionists, but the nurses have worked hard in the community to raise the money they needed to get started on their project. Even though they were muddled around by Government activities and the building was delayed for a considerable time, when building commenced they had enough money to make it a viable financial proposition. The nurses were able to increase the amount of their loan by virtue of a Government guarantee, and that was fair enough. I believe that that sort of activity, which is not a charge on the Government, is well

worth while, but the nurses can in no way be compared with the trade unions as regards the building of their respective centres.

The Nurses Memorial Centre will be paid for, every dollar and cent of it, by the nurses themselves, through their activities. They are solving their own problems, and if they can do that I believe the trade unions of this State can do it; there is no reason why they cannot. I believe that trade union officials need to change their attitude completely with a view to turning compulsory union membership and membership under duress into enthusiastic union membership and participation in the Trades Hall. However, if nothing else comes out of this, I believe a lesson will have been well and truly learnt by members of the trade union movement.

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): The House may be surprised to learn my attitude towards this subject. During this debate, conflicting statements have been made about my attitude towards the trade union movement and the future of Trades Hall. Let me make quite clear that, for the following reasons, I cannot support the recommendations contained in the report. The member for Bragg spoke about the lack of true support among unionists for their union organisations. Surely this is an ideal opportunity to test that point. Let the Government, which is sponsoring this Christmas gift to the Trades Hall management, determine whether members of the respective unions are behind their organisations or whether they are there by force.

Before attempting to clarify certain points made by the members for Adelaide and Elizabeth, I will deal with the comment on blackmail made earlier in this debate. I ask members on the Government side what difference there is between blackmail and the black ban imposed by various trade union organisations, especially the Australian Workers Union. The member for Elizabeth accused me last week of being a slave driver and said -that the attitude of the Opposition towards this request for assistance was blackmail. One does not have to have a very long memory to recall the sort of blackmail tactics that were inflicted on some South Australians recently, especially people on Kangaroo Island.

While that memory is clear in my mind, no way in the world will I be sympathetic towards a union movement that has forced members to become financial but has failed miserably to help itself. It has refused dogmatically to call on those members for funds and thereby expose the real feeling existing between the organisation and its members. Nor will I be sympathetic towards an organisation that continually calls on its sponsors to help it when it is in trouble. The member for Semaphore said we should not kick a man when he is down, and implied that is what the Opposition is doing by refusing to support the calls for funds in this instance.

Mr. Payne: I do not think he implied that: he said it directly.

Mr. CHAPMAN: If that is what he said, it confirms further my attitude to this matter. If the Opposition is being branded for kicking the trade union movement when it is down, is it unreasonable to brand the Government for kicking those persons in rural and secondary industry who are attempting to establish themselves in business but who are refused applications for funds? I am aware of genuine requests for funds from people in the tourist industry, rural industry and secondary industry who have been refused support by the Government because their proposals have not met the criteria of the respective lending authorities. The Government has denied many people the

opportunity to become established. There is no difference at all between free enterprise operators and the trade union movement as regards seeking funds: the capacity to repay must be examined in all cases, and I have no doubt whatsoever that, if the trade union movement demonstrated that it had the capacity to service a loan, many lending authorities in South Australia would provide the necessary finance.

Without going into the whole history of events that led up to this situation and without blaming any party for the mismanagement of Trades Hall, I consider that this organisation could not repay a loan if it obtained one. If it were in a position to assure a reasonable banking authority that it could repay the loan, it would not have to run cap in hand to the Government. I believe that is clearly proved by the evidence before the House. The organisation is so deeply in debt that it has no hope of getting out of it, anyway. That evidence has been reinforced by arguments put forward by Government members, especially the Treasurer, when he said that these people would have to sell up if the Government did not help them.

We are now all aware that the trade union managing committee, which controls the activities of the Trades Hall, is in such a mess that there is no hope of recovery. To pour \$200 000, or any sum for that matter, into the organisation would be to pour good money after bad money. If and when the organisation can show positively, by drawing funds from its members or another source, that it can help itself I believe it will be in a position to come back to the banking authorities and/or the Government for a guarantee in order to borrow funds. In the meantime I have neither sympathy for nor a donation to give the organisation.

Among allegations made across the Chamber during the debate is one by the member for Elizabeth last Thursday that related to the question of child slave labour, a term which he often uses in the House and which he invariably directs at this side I am interested to know what he means by that term, because it seems that, throughout the Labor Party and even in some Government departments, there are rather unusual interpretations placed on the use of child or family effort in business undertakings. I refer to an incident that occurred recently in my district simply to illustrate the sort of interpretation placed on child slave labour by the member for Elizabeth when he uses the term.

Two officers from the Labour and Industry Department who were recently in my district called on a storekeeper, presumably for the purpose of inspecting records and wage returns. When the proprietress of the shop attempted to explain that she herself did most of the work in the shop and did not employ labour, one of the officers said, "We do not believe you; you could not possibly manage the work in this store on your own." The proprietress, however, was rather upset about the remark and admitted to the officer that on some occasions her children worked with her in the store. She quickly went on to explain that they helped on weekends when they were not at school and that they enjoyed assisting her. One officer, as he was about to leave the shop, said, "That is a true example of child slave labour." I cannot agree with that interpretation; in fact, I support family and child involvement in private enterprise wherever possible.

If the member for Elizabeth and his back-bench colleagues support that interpretation, I certainly do not, and it is unfortunate that the member for Elizabeth is not in the Chamber to hear my remarks. What will

happen if Parliament agrees to advance the proposed funds to the Trades Hall Managing Committee? It is proposed that \$200 000 shall be lent directly to the Trades Hall Managing Committee and that that loan will not attract any interest for 10 years. I suggest that, if the Select Committee's recommendations were implemented, the South Australian Government would be granting \$200 000 as well as lending \$200 000 at 10 per cent interest over 10 years. That amounts clearly to a grant of an equal sum.

If we adopt the balance of the recommendations that the capital loan be repaid over 40 years and apply to it a reasonable interest rate of 10 per cent, it amounts to an additional \$400 000 gift over the repayment period. Therefore, on behalf of South Australian taxpayers, the Government intends to grant to Trades Hall funds so that it can exploit the capital loan to the extent of \$600 000. No responsible person could fairly agree to exploiting moneys to that extent. I do not believe there is any justification at all for extending a grant, or a repayable loan as proposed, to the Trades Hall Managing Committee. I do not agree that the Government is justified in granting or lending any organisation funds amounting to such sums and under such terms as suggested. The Government does not practise this procedure industrially or agriculturally.

I have not referred to lending authorities that are sponsored by the Government to lend funds to organisations in South Australia. When an application is made to the rural assistance organisation, it is considered on the basis of the capacity of the applicant to repay the loan. If there is any suggestion that he cannot do so, his application is refused. I have seen applications and subsequent correspondence pointing out that fact. I have heard submissions and complaints from persons who have tried to get finance for development in other fields of industry but have been refused. In some cases, there has seemed to me to be a reasonable chance that the money would be repaid but, as I have said, if there has been any reason why it has been thought that the person could not repay, the organisations have refused his application.

I do not consider that the Opposition can be held to ransom over this matter or stood up to fix a situation that the Government itself has brought about. The trade union movement in South Australia, as in every other State, has been sucked dry. With the two Commonwealth elections of the magnitude of those in December, 1972, and May, 1974, it is no wonder that the Trades Hall on South Terrace and the remainder of the trade union movement in Australia are broke. We cannot have our cake and eat it too. The trade union movement cannot finance the A.L.P. across Australia to the extent that it has done in the past four or five years and also build storey upon storey on a magnificent structure, whether on South Terrace or anywhere else.

A similar situation applies in private industry and private enterprise. We cannot have money in the bank and go on building, and we cannot go on spending money on political luxuries as the trade unions in Australia have done in recent years. It is about time members opposite decided whether they wanted to suck the public dry and spend the money on political campaigns or whether they would responsibly direct funds and union fees towards the building on South Terrace. The ball is in those members' court, and they can sit on their backside and swirl if they want to do that, but if they, do not get up and work they will be out of business. I am disappointed that the member for Adelaide is not present to throw in a chip or two while I am speaking. I am beginning to enjoy this subject.

Mr. Keneally: This is the best part of your speech to date.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I accept the favourable comment by the member for Stuart and I am pleased that he appreciates hearing the real reason why his unions are in difficulties.

Mr. Keneally: I meant because you were quiet for a while.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I think the situation will improve only when the trade union movement establishes a relationship with its members whereby the members will help the organisation when it is in difficulty and whereby the unions will spend their money where their mouth is (in this instance, by paying their debts) before they expand the political Party that is at the head of the organisation.

Genuine attempts have been made to help the trade union movement on an appeal basis. Only a few days ago while this House was sitting, members on this side were writing out cheques to support the appeal for the Trades Hall. While an Opposition member was writing out his cheque for \$10, he was being abused from the other side because of the "miserable" contribution he was making. I suggest that, if each trade union member whose union is affiliated to the Trades Hall contributes \$10, the amount obtained may well recover the debt, or at least part of it.

I am not sure of the actual figures involved, but a colleague has suggested to me that a contribution of \$10 by each member of the trade unions concerned would more than offset the debt and allow the organisation to have money in credit. When the matter is all boiled down and one compares the total debt with the number of members involved in this organisation, one sees that that is not out of their reach. If there was another Commonwealth election, it would be interesting to see whether the members of the trade union movement, or the managers on their behalf, would contribute a large amount to the Labor Party once again.

However, throughout the days of debate on this matter, no evidence has been put forward that in any way rocks my sympathy. I see the situation now as clearly and distinctly as in the early stages, whereby the organisation has gone bad. Whether that was because of the organisation's management, I will not argue about, but the Trades Hall is in difficulty and the unions have made no real attempt to help themselves. I challenge the trade union movement to help itself now, because it is frightened to put people to the test. That movement in South Australia would fall apart if a demand was made for individual contributions and, while the movement does not assist itself, I cannot support any proposal to approve a gift, as this is, to the organisation from taxpayers' funds.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): I rise in amazement that such a piece of legislation should have come before the South Australian Parliament, at least in my time as a member. I have heard the Treasurer putting the case for the Bill in this Chamber. We all know that he has the ability to perform, and he performed well that day, but not to the extent of pulling the wool over the eyes of members on this side. For that reason, I suggest that, if the Treasurer wants to perform, the right place is not in the South Australian Parliament but next door, in the Playhouse, or at the zoo, where he has performed previously. He should not perform in this Chamber, because it does not work. Many members on this side have been brought up the hard way and we know how tilings must tick, otherwise we would not have survived.

That is the position regarding this Bill. When the Treasurer brought down the report of the Select Committee he stated:

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

I ask members opposite where they provide the money to pay for the full-page advertisements in the *Advertiser* a few weeks ago, condemning General Motors-Holden's. Members opposite did not have only one advertisement inserted: they put it in for a few weeks. I also want to know where the unions are getting their money for the new radio licence that we are hearing so much about at present. It seems to me that the Labor Party has plenty of money and that it is trying to do something shonky in relation to this loan from South Australia's taxpayers. Do we give the Trades Hall this extra money to play around with, or do we say, "Do the same as all other industries are expected to do"?

The member for Alexandra laid it on the line this, afternoon when he referred to the situation now facing other industries, be they secondary or primary industries. We have a classic example of this in the committee which has been set up and which is managed by Mr. Albie Joy. Although I have sent to Mr. Joy applications for assistance from several of my constituents, I was not able to obtain help for them. Had I not thought that those applications warranted support, I would have not sent them to Mr. Joy. The Trades Hall must be able to obtain money elsewhere and, if it is able to do this, irrespective of the rate of interest that must be paid, it should do so. However, I do not believe the Trades Hall Managing Committee went through that exercise.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask honourable members' not to interject, and I request the honourable member for Rocky River to confine his remarks to the Bill.

Mr. VENNING: The management of Trades Hall has not approached other lending authorities, and I believe that that aspect is relevant to the debate on this Bill. Time and time again members have gone to the Treasurer with urgent cases relating to people who have been affected adversely by situations similar to the one facing Trades Hall. I refer, for instance, to the adverse effect that succession duties can have on widows. Although other people have sought assistance from the Treasurer, they have not received it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The matters referred to by the honourable member for Rocky River are outside the scope of the debate, as they relate to other legislation on the Statute Book. I therefore ask the honourable member to confine his remarks to the Bill.

Mr. VENNING: Although I will abide by your ruling, Sir, I am amazed at it, as I am referring to Government lending. There is preference to members of all unions in South Australia, and I believe that these unions should be able to levy their members to raise this money. Some Opposition members have tried to give a lead to Government members in this matter: they have tried to show Government members what to do to get out of the financial difficulty facing Trades Hall. However, it was only a token gesture, as Opposition members have their own organisations

to look after. For instance, United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia Incorporated has a building on South Terrace, and it does not go to the Government asking for help like the Trades Hall management is at present doing.

I now refer to the terms of the proposed loan. It is amazing that the Select Committee recommended that the word "grant" be amended to "loan". If a loan of \$200 000 was made to the Trades Hall, the first repayment would not have to be made until June 30, 1985. One hopes that before then there will be a change of Government and that the present rate of inflation will have been arrested. However, if the loan was granted and the first payment on it did not have to be made until 1985, what would be the money value of the repayment then? The member for Alexandra did an exercise in this respect. He said that if the rate of interest on the loan was 10 per cent, \$600 000 would have to be repaid. Opposition members are amazed that the Treasurer has given this matter a go. I know there are times when we take a punt and try out certain things. However, despite his mannerisms, ability and training, the Treasurer's efforts in this respect have not worked, and I hope they do not work in future.

I should like now to refer to the proposed new radio station in which the union movement is interested and on which evidence is at present being taken. I think the Treasurer would have liked to get this thing off the ground and finished before the unions gave evidence to the tribunal regarding the additional radio station in South Australia. However, he did not get it through Parliament before that happened, and I hope he does not get it through. I am disappointed at the way in which the Government has brought this matter forward. This seems to be the way in which it does business not only in this regard but also in other regards. The proposed loan to Trades Hall is just one of the many funny things happening within the Labor Party. I oppose the motion.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): Although I oppose the motion, I pay a tribute to the trade union movement and agree that there is a need for it in the community. The Liberal Party of Australia adheres to the system of conciliation and arbitration, and I fully support that system. If we are to have conciliation and arbitration, it is essential that we have it between the two appropriate bodies that can speak for those concerned. Obviously, there needs to be one organisation to represent employers in any situation and also someone to represent employees, so that arbitration and conciliation can be carried out. Our industrial system, which is unique in the world, has worked extremely well, although on occasions the Australian Labor Party has tried to destroy it. However, I support the system, which I think has great merit, particularly when it is compared to the collective bargaining system, although I do not want to debate the relative merits of the two systems now. If we are to support our present system, it is essential to recognise and support the trade union movement. Before I am misunderstood by members opposite, I point out that I do not advocate or support compulsory unionism. As a Liberal, I stand for the principle that people should not be compelled to join any organisation. At the same time, as I recognise the role played by trade unions, I would encourage people to join them. In addition, I would encourage some unions to play a more responsible role than the role they play at present.

As I believe the trade union movement should be regarded in the same light as is any other organisation in the community, I must ask myself whether we can morally justify granting a loan on the basis proposed

in the Bill to any outside organisation. In this sense, I am referring to an organisation that is not related to any section of this Parliament. We should first consider whether this legislation will assist a totally independent outside body. Unfortunately, the trade union movement, for better or worse (and I believe it is much for the worse), is closely affiliated to the Labor Party, which governs this State. This fact imposes further restrictions on the code of ethics I would adopt in granting outside aid. To consider previous financial assistance granted by the Government to outside bodies, I think we should go to the Statutes. An appropriate Act would seem to be the Industries Development Act, 1941, and its subsequent amendments, particularly in 1972.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Assistance has been handed out under that Act.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I know. I am now putting forward a case for providing assistance to the trade union movement on that basis. I can see no reason (and no reason has been put forward by Government members) why the Government should deal with the Trades Hall as a special case. I will argue that it should be regarded on a basis similar to that on which other organisations are regarded, and therefore dealt with under the Industries Development Act as other organisations are. I wish to refer briefly to the conditions under which grants or loans can be provided under that Act, which specifies clearly that assistance should be by means of a guarantee. When a Government guarantees a loan it is similar to a Government granting a loan. If a Government gives a guarantee, an organisation is able to get a loan from some other financial source. The interest rate that might be given by the Government must then be compared to the interest rate charged by a bank or finance company on a loan guaranteed by the Government.

Mr. Simmons: That Act was amended three years ago.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I have the amendments and will read them.

Mr. Simmons: They are more than guarantees: they are grants.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The honourable member is referring to the 1972 amendments. I refer specifically to section 14, which was amended in 1972, and I will refer to the amendments. In the conditions laid down in the Act, the reference is to a loan or guarantee. Referring to the Industries Assistance Committee, section 14 (2) provides:

No such guarantee shall be given unless—

(a) the committee has first inquired into the business or proposed business in connection with which the guarantee is to be given:

I think we can fairly say that the Select Committee has looked into the appropriate business of the organisation concerned. Paragraph (b) provides:

the committee has reported to the Treasurer that in its opinion there is a reasonable prospect that the business or proposed business in connection with which the guarantee is to be given will be profitable:

In 1972, the following amendment was enacted:

(b) by inserting in paragraph (b) of subsection (2) after the word "profitable" the passage "except in the case of a business being the carrying on of any sporting, cultural or social activity not for, or in the expectation of, profit or reward, where it shall be sufficient compliance with this provision if the committee has reported to the Treasurer that there is a reasonable prospect that the business or proposed business in connection with which the guarantee is to be given is capable of earning an income sufficient to meet its liabilities and commitments";

A further condition is included in subsection (2) (c), which was inserted in the Act in 1972, as follows:

the committee has reported to the Treasurer that, in its opinion—

(i) the effect of giving the guarantee will be to increase or maintain employment in the State at the recognised award rates of pay;

or

(ii) the giving of the guarantee will be in the public interest,

and the committee has recommended that the guarantee be given:

To some extent, I think it could be said in this case that the giving of the guarantee would be in the public interest.

Mr. Keneally: If you continue in this vein, you'll be supporting the motion.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Obviously the honourable member has accepted my argument so far. If he listens a little longer, he will have to accept the rest of my argument and vote against the motion. Section 14 (2) also contains the following two paragraphs:

(d) the person to whom the loan has been or is to be made has agreed to pay to the Treasurer, as consideration for the guarantee, a commission at an agreed rate, not exceeding two per centum per annum, on the amount of the loan for which the guarantee is given, and to comply with any other conditions imposed by the Treasurer on the recommendation of the committee: and

(e) the said person has given the Treasurer such security (if any) as the Treasurer requires for the repayment to the Treasurer of any money which the Treasurer becomes liable to pay by virtue of the guarantee.

The last two paragraphs clearly lay down the conditions for guarantees or loans to organisations. The first condition is that there must be an accepted basis for an interest rate for either the guarantee or loan.

Mr. Simmons: The 1972 amendment provides for grants.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: This condition obviously applies to a guarantee for a large sum of money.

Mr. Simmons: There's no interest on a grant.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I know, but this is not a grant: it is a loan. The honourable member is simply trying to confuse the terminology. There is no reference in this provision to a grant.

Mr. Simmons: You keep talking about a guarantee.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I think a guarantee and a loan are similar. As I have said, a guarantee by the Government ensures a loan from a bank. In this case, the Government is giving both the guarantee and the loan. As the member for Torrens will appreciate, in this case a loan is to be granted but no interest rate will be paid on that loan. I wish to bring out two points about the motion: a loan is being given without any interest rate; secondly, a loan is being given without any security.

Mr. Keneally: How can a loan be given?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: This loan is being given; there is no interest rate. Paragraph (e) of section 14 (2) of the Act states quite clearly that security should be provided when a person has convinced the Treasurer that there is adequate security. In this case, however, we are given no security whatever. Paragraph (d) provides that an interest rate should be paid for a guarantee, or a loan as in this case (it is not a grant), yet we find that no interest rate applies to this loan to the Trades Hall. One could look at other instances where we have given a similar guarantee to an outside organisation. I refer to the Nurses Memorial Centre of South Australia Incorporated (Guarantee) Act, 1973, by which the State Government gave a guarantee of funds for the building of a nurses memorial centre. Within the provisions of that Act and the subsequent amending

Act it is stated quite clearly that it is up to the Treasurer to set the conditions. This he did, first, as to the security, and secondly, as to the interest rate on that guarantee. Having set that as our standard for all outside bodies, we see the Government today trying to bend the conditions in relation to a specific organisation. On that first ground I would vote against the motion. I would support it only on the ground that it complied with an Act. However, a further argument must be taken into consideration. This outside body is closely affiliated in this State to the Australian Labor Party.

Mr. Keneally: That's the real reason, isn't it?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: That is why we must ensure that the same standards apply in this case as apply to any other organisation. I am not saying this is a reason for not giving it the same sort of regard as we give to any other organisation, but it is one reason why we must be doubly sure that the same conditions apply to Trades Hall as apply to any other organisation. Any conditions more lenient than those laid down for other organisations can be described only as trying to line the pockets of our friends, knowing, of course, that there is eventually and indirectly a kick-back to their own financial support.

Mr. Wright: How do you explain the support of the Government of the day for the agricultural society?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I think the honourable member knows full well that that was not political. There is no political affiliation between that organisation and any political Party in this State.

Mr. Max Brown: Break it down!

Mr. DEAN BROWN: There is not. If the honourable member is prepared to produce evidence, I shall accept it, but I know full well he will not be able to do so. It is time the Government stopped trying to raise red herrings on this issue, time it forgot these stupid examples it has thrown up through previous speakers, and got back to the sort of basis laid down for other organisations. I find it most disturbing to see the Government selecting the Trades Hall to have special conditions that other organisations in the State cannot obtain, but it is even more disturbing to find that there is a close political affiliation between the Trades Hall and the A.L.P. Government in this State.

For those reasons alone I would oppose the motion. I would not oppose it on the ground that the money is going simply to a body affiliated to the A.L.P., because I think such bodies are entitled to exactly the same sort of conditions as those given to any other outside body. However, I am unable to support it in this case, because special conditions apply. There can be no doubt in anyone's mind that the conditions under which the loan is given are ludicrous. There is to be a complete moratorium on repayments for 10 years, and at the present rate of inflation that means that the loan is virtually a gift; furthermore, a further 40 years will be allowed to repay the loan, free of interest.

It is not a loan; it is a straight-out gift. It is a gift of money for a certain period with no penalty for the giving of that money. That makes it a gift. A gift is a one-way transaction. What does the State Government get in return? It gets no security, no interest payments, nothing whatever. It is purely a one-way transaction to Trades Hall. For this reason I oppose the motion, and I hope the honourable member opposite who agreed with my arguments right to the end will now vote against it.

Mr. JENNINGS (Ross Smith): The honourable member for Bragg, the honourable member for Rocky River, and then the honourable member for Davenport have talked

today about compulsory union membership. Perhaps they should realise that the policy of the Labor Party in South Australia is not for compulsory union membership.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I did not at any stage during my speech imply that the policy of the A.L.P. was for compulsory unionism, which is what the honourable member has just said.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The matter raised by the honourable member for Davenport is not a point of order. The honourable member for Ross Smith.

Mr. JENNINGS: The member for Alexandra said he might be astonished that we would be astonished at his attitude to this motion. Sir, I do not think that any member on this side was in the slightest astonished at his attitude to the motion. I would be astonished at any other member on this side who was astonished at his astonishment. True, many members on this side were embarrassed initially at the introduction of this legislation—not that it is immoral, not that it is unique, nor indeed that the use of Government grants or guarantees is unusual in this Parliament. After all, we have a special committee of Parliament to recommend Treasury guarantees for worthwhile industries in this State. If some members can cast their minds back a few years, when another Party was on the Treasury benches, we had all sorts of things, such as the Farmers Assistance Board and the B.H.P. Indenture Act: in fact, we still have that Act. These were mighty concessions made to private enterprise.

I wonder how many guarantees given by the Treasury to the Industries Development Committee have failed. I do not know, but this sort of thing is a part of sponsoring and fostering industry. How much more important it is to have organisations which have contributed so much to the smooth running of industry having a place to themselves from which they can carry on their activities. Here, I refer to the trade union movement in South Australia. The embarrassment to which I referred has shifted to the Opposition, because of the attitude it has shown in its antipathy to trade unions. I think every Opposition member who has spoken in this debate has shown straight out and bare fanged how bitter he is towards the trade union movement. In the past, they have usually said, "Oh, well, we know that is a fact of life" and made similar statements: but not this time, because they considered that they had the chance to put the boots in, and they have done just that. They would be conducting themselves in a true statesman-like manner by supporting a Bill that would enable the trade union movement in South Australia to have a home of its own and to be able to continue its principal role of striving for industrial peace and, in the end, to cost not one cent to the taxpayers of this State. We hear nothing here from Opposition members about organisations that are completely subsidised by the taxpayers of this State.

Mr. Venning: Get your facts straight!

Mr. JENNINGS: I refer to the huge profits gained by private financial institutions in this State. They gain profits not because of the efforts of their investors but by the efforts of those who work in these organisations and from the people who buy their goods. These companies are subsidised completely by the ordinary workers of this State, and all of their profits go to private investors.

Mr. McAnaney: Half of the profit goes in company tax and half goes—

Mr. JENNINGS: I am referring to net profits.

Mr. VENNING: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. On the basis of your ruling this afternoon, I draw

your attention to what the honourable member is saying, which has nothing to do with the Bill.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not uphold the point of order raised by the honourable member for Rocky River. The honourable member for Ross Smith is discussing a motion before the Chair in relation to the Industrial Organisation (Building Grants) Bill, and I ask the honourable member to confine his remarks to the Bill and to the motion. The honourable member for Ross Smith.

Mr. JENNINGS: Thank you, Sir. I will do that with great pleasure. It is not shareholders of private enterprise companies who make the profits: it is the people who work for the companies or the people—

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I rise on a point of order, Sir. I think you asked the honourable member to refer to the motion and not to continue speaking about profit motives and other matters totally unrelated to the motion. I heard you give the ruling, and I think the honourable member should defer to your decision.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no point of order in the matter raised by the honourable member for Davenport, but I ask the honourable member for Ross Smith to confine his remarks to the motion.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, Sir, that will be very easily done, because I have finished. I have said all I wanted to say, and I hope that, even at this late stage, wiser counsels will prevail on the other side, so that we will have a unanimous vote on this important matter.

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): In supporting the motion, no doubt I will disappoint the member for Davenport when I say that I will not support his argument. In the early part of his speech he kept to the facts, but then he wandered far from the truth. I think many members have used this debate to express their spleen, spite, and hatred of the trade union movement. All of these members are Opposition members, who at times have expressed mealy-mouthed support for the trade union movement and what it stands for, but when they are put to the test they vote strongly against this movement. I shall put one or two simple questions to the House, and hope that I will receive replies to them. The first is: does this Parliament accept that the trade union movement in South Australia has contributed enormously to industrial peace and harmony in this State? Secondly, I ask this Parliament whether it believes that the trade union movement is worthy of its support. Thirdly, do we further accept that the Trades Hall Managing Committee has investigated every possible avenue of funding before placing before Parliament its difficult financial position? Fourthly, if we accept these propositions (and I am sure that we must), is Parliament willing to ensure the continued viability of the trade union movement in South Australia? My first proposition is that the trade union movement has made an enormous contribution to industrial peace and harmony in South Australia, and has also contributed to our standard of living in that the fabric of our society is based in no small way on the efforts of trade unions and the trade union movement.

Mr. Dean Brown: I thought you asked Parliament to answer those questions.

Mr. KENEALLY: I did, and members will be able to express their points of view when they are asked to vote: I suggest that the honourable member should consider seriously the points made by the member for Ross Smith and the member for Semaphore in this debate. He should

also consider seriously his own points when trying to justify his opposition to the motion. After considering all these factors, he will find himself forced (I believe) to support an organisation that has made a considerable contribution to the life style of South Australians. I believe the trade union movement in South Australia is worthy of the support of this Parliament for the reasons I have given. I think we ought to agree, despite the snide suggestions that have been made, that the Trades Hall Managing Committee has made every effort within its power to raise the money. To come to Parliament must have been the last card in the pack for these people—

Mr. Becker: Rubbish!

Mr. KENEALLY: —and the member for Elizabeth has already emphasised the tremendous effort that has been made by individuals and unions occupying the Trades Hall in their attempt to raise this money. It is not (as the honourable member for Hanson said) rubbish to say that it is the last card in the pack for the Trades Hall to ask Parliament for support. I believe this support should be given because of what the trade union movement means to South Australia and its people. I defy any member of the Opposition to stand up here and say that the trade union movement is not worthy of the support of Parliament, that it has not contributed greatly to the standard of living we have in South Australia, or that it has not contributed to industrial peace and harmony. If members opposite are able to stand up and say that they can justly vote against it, but if they agree that the trade union movement in South Australia has made the contribution I suggest, then I believe their principles should make them vote in favour of the recommendations of the Select Committee. I believe members will vote in accordance with their view of the propositions I have put forward. If people will not support the trade union movement and they do not believe it has made a contribution they will vote against it. If they believe the movement is a viable organisation in South Australia, and it is essential for it to continue being a viable organisation, they will vote for the motion.

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): I oppose the motion as it stands because I cannot support the principle behind it. I believe it could set a dangerous precedent for future activities of this Parliament. The precedent set by the argument to support outside organisations is very dangerous inasmuch as if this motion passes and a similar circumstance should arise next week the Government would have a moral obligation to support that request. It could snowball to insurmountable proportions and it could become unworkable. Somewhere along the line the Government would have to say “No” to someone. If it helps the trade unions on this occasion it may have to say “No” to someone else.

It would be very unwise to set a standard now because it might be difficult for other Governments to follow this precedent. The Government has said that a precedent has been set by previous Governments, and Government members referred to Centennial Hall and the Royal Agricultural and Horticultural Society. I cannot accept that comparison, because Centennial Hall is used by all sorts of people, and trade unionists are involved in the running of the showgrounds. Without doubt, most of the people who use and benefit from that hall would be trade unionists. So, it is foolish to compare Centennial Hall with the Trades Hall. The Select Committee's report recommends that a free-of-interest loan of \$200 000 be made on a 40-year term, with the first repayment in 1985.

The report provides for no guarantee and no security. Consequently, ordinary people regard this as a hand-out. What will happen during the period of 40 years? The Government hopes that the matter will be lost in the archives of Parliamentary proceedings and will never again see daylight. It has been said that there are 68 unions and 137 000 members. I believe that 27 unions, representing 47 000 members, are actively involved in the Trades Hall. I have taken these figures from earlier contributions to the debate; I do not wish to misrepresent the situation. If the sum of \$200 000 is divided by the number of members of unions involved in the Trades Hall, we arrive at about \$4.50 a unionist; over the 40-year term, this amounts to only a few cents for each unionist. If the amount is paid in a lump sum, it is about \$4.50 a unionist. Is that figure unreasonable? There is something more involved in this matter.

The sum of \$200 000 should be relatively easy to acquire or borrow by normal financial means. In view of the reaction of Government members, one cannot help feeling that the problem is far more serious than that. If Parliament approves a contribution of \$200 000 from the taxpayers' money, what guarantee have we that this will be the only claim made on the Government? I strongly suspect that such claims will be a continuing process. By agreeing to the first \$200 000, Parliament will be committed for the lifetime of the Trades Hall.

Mr. Venning: It is the thin end of the wedge.

Mr. BLACKER: Yes. If we commit the first \$200 000, how much further will we be asked to go if there is further poor management?

Mr. Coumbe: It is setting a precedent.

Mr. BLACKER: It has been said that Party finances have been assisted as a result of union affiliations; that is only one aspect of the matter. There have been references in the press to discussions by trade union officials on the question of applying for a radio station licence. So, it can be seen that union ambitions are fairly high. When such ambitions are considered in the light of the proposed loan, people start to wonder whether the \$200 000 will go toward a radio station, a political campaign, or the Trades Hall. Initially, the loan will pay for the hall. The real obligation of the Trades Hall Managing Committee should be to finance the hall, not to divert the money elsewhere. If all producer organisations (I am deliberately referring to sectional organisations, because the Trades Hall caters for a sectional interest) decided to erect a building and affiliate to a political Party and if some developed it into a political organisation, that would be a similar set-up; such producer organisations could include the Wheat Board, the Barley Board, the coarse grains group, United Farmers and Graziers, and the Stockowners Association. I cannot imagine any responsible Government allowing any finance to go to that kind of purpose; that is why it is a dangerous precedent to grant a long-term loan to the Trades Hall Managing Committee.

I am not opposed to unions or unionists, because they play an important and necessary part in the work force. I am the first to admit that there are questionable employers; on the other hand, some people in the employee field try to take others down. I was concerned when the member for Semaphore referred to statements by the Opposition as spiteful and malicious attacks on the Government. However, some of the Government's retaliatory remarks were equally spiteful and malicious. All such remarks were unwarranted. It is ironic that an organisation believing in the Socialist doctrine should have its fingers

burned through dabbling in a free-enterprise exercise; this is the crux of the matter. For those reasons, I oppose the motion.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I, too, oppose the motion and, consequently, I will oppose the Bill. After listening to the pathetic speeches from Government members, I believe that the Select Committee should reconsider the matter. Irrespective of what the member for Stuart has said, I do not believe that the Trades Hall Managing Committee has examined all possibilities of refinancing the Trades Hall project. The whole thing is a catastrophe from the business viewpoint. It is a catastrophe that all the money was borrowed and that a loan of \$900 000 was obtained from the Commonwealth Bank in two parcels, one of \$750 000 (which we assume was a long-term loan) and another of \$150 000 (an overdraft). From what I have been able to see from the balance sheet, the sum has been offset by working moneys from another account, and working funds have been eroded.

The Trades Hall Managing Committee is starting to panic. The large reserve that was there is now not covering the overdraft, and so the committee is up for more than \$900 000. The whole thing is a catastrophe, because some group in the Trades Hall (they could be friends of the Government) used its influence on someone in the Commonwealth Bank and was able to raise this money. This loan should never have been granted in the first place. It was poor banking policy, but much was attached to the loan. The issue behind it (and one gets this in private enterprise and in business, particularly in a competitive business such as banking) is that the Commonwealth Bank was keen to obtain all the accounts associated with the Trades Hall.

These accounts and reserve funds far exceeded initially the sum the bank was lending. That is typical of the Commonwealth Bank's lending policy from time to time. As I have witnessed the bank's operations, it is not difficult for me to understand that the managing committee was fooled into thinking that it could borrow \$900 000 and repay the loan. If the committee was honest and sincere, we should have heard that it had gone to the Commonwealth Bank and tried to negotiate a far more generous term for the repayment of the loan. It does not matter how much it would cost, but I would like to know the terms for the repayment of the \$150 000 overdraft and whether that sum is offset against the moneys initially raised for the project.

Obviously, there are some reserves in the Trades Hall operating account. The hall is in strife, and the member for Stuart said that all possible avenues had been investigated. Not one representative from the managing committee, as far as I know, has approached the Opposition. Several Opposition members who have had experience in banking and business circles would, if approached, not be beyond giving a sympathetic hearing or trying to use their contacts in order to help. That shows how stupid the Trades Hall representatives are. I do not sympathise with them. They are too proud to go to the Opposition. They should say, "We are in trouble and we need help." Why should they not approach the Opposition, because many other people have? They make stupid statements such as those made by the member for Stuart, but they are not game to approach the Opposition.

Mr. Keneally: They have gone to the Leader of the Opposition—Mr. DeGaris.

Mr. BECKER: You should approach this Opposition and ask for its help. You were sucked in by bad bank-

ing and by bad bank lending policies. You could cry poverty to us.

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the honourable member that the word "you" must not be used in Parliamentary debates. The honourable member for Hanson.

Mr. BECKER: The \$200 000 loan at 9.8 per cent interest, which is about the high peak of bond rate at present, will cost the South Australian taxpayer \$579 000 over 50 years, of about \$12 000 a year. That is just not on. This is the bait that is being dangled before the Opposition: give the Trades Hall \$200 000 outright as a grant and forget it, or be willing to subsidise the hall at the rate of \$12 000 a year for the next 50 years.

Mr. Langley: How much each person does that represent?

Mr. BECKER: There is no reason in the world why I, as a taxpayer, should have to subsidise the Trades Hall. If a person does not want to be a union member, he or she does not have to be, and the member for Unley knows that well. The Trades and Labor Council is not going to stand up and deprive the people of their rights regarding whether to join a union. How many private enterprise firms are being put to the wall and blackmailed? One city firm, employing eight people, will close down if the trade union movement insists on its employees joining a union.

Mr. Langley: They'll take the benefits, though!

Mr. BECKER: No they will not, because they are doing better than union members are doing. That firm will close down, because it is unwilling to be blackmailed and stood over by a bunch of high-handed dictatorial people who are suddenly given a bit of power every now and then. It is to the great shame of the genuine unions in this country that the odd ball comes up through the ranks, is appointed a shop steward, and cannot be controlled. He is the one who is causing all the trouble with industrial sabotage. The people of the State are paying dearly for having to put up with people in the movement who cannot be controlled. Trade union secretaries and union leaders are worried that, unless they can control the rank and file, the saboteurs within their union will bring discredit to it.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member must come back to the Bill.

Mr. BECKER: The Government has accused the Opposition of union bashing. I believe that the Select Committee has not done its work thoroughly. It should have insisted on more evidence and should have examined the proposal more thoroughly. I do not agree that the Opposition is not interested in helping the Trades Hall. The hall's representatives should approach the Industries Development Committee with a proposition, and I know that the committee would give every consideration and ensure that every avenue would be investigated. If the Industries Development Committee could find its way clear to assist, the one thing it would insist on would be the appointment of at least one nominee on the managing committee. It would not be a bad thing if someone was selected from the financial world to guide and assist the managing committee.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Would you be available?

Mr. BECKER: I would be willing to assist. It is not a matter of "God help the Trades Hall." I would do all I could to help.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: If we agreed to that proposal, would you vote for the Bill?

Mr. BECKER: The whole matter needs further investigation.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Therefore, your proposition is a phoney?

Mr. BECKER: No. The Minister fully understands the role of his Party and of mine. I would not be beyond offering my services, but that does not necessarily mean that I will vote for the Bill as it stands. What I do not want to see is the hall having to go into a scheme of arrangement; that could be forced on it if all avenues were not thoroughly investigated. If the hall went into a scheme of arrangement, the onus would be on the Commonwealth Bank, and that is where I would put it. The bank, which was the lender, is now stuck with the advances, and they have to ride it out. The only other alternative (probably unacceptable to the Government but one that should be examined, if it has not already been examined) is that it is not beyond the realms of possibility to attract a developer to take over the building on a 99-year lease-back arrangement. The building's foundations are suitable to support an additional four storeys. I would approach a developer and say—

Mr. Keneally: Have you anyone in mind?

Mr. BECKER: No. I would point out that the building needs extra money spent on it, and probably the only way the Trades Hall can get it is by borrowing. This is not a problem that cannot be solved by the unions, Parliament and the business community thoroughly investigating. We heard only today about proposed investment in a radio station. Why could not Mr. Hayes, a leading business man and the principal of United Motors Limited (and you would not get a bigger wheeler dealer than he, who is into everything for a dollar), be called on to assist? United Motors would not pass up any opportunity if there was a chance for it to profit. It is unfair for the Government to say that the Opposition and the business community are against the Trades Hall; that stupid furphy is constantly spread throughout the entire community. It is said that members of the Opposition are union bashers. Why does the Government not face the facts of life and tell the truth for a change? Why should the Government keep harking back to compulsory unionism, when there is a law providing that unionism is not compulsory? It seems that it is not in the Government's interests to tell the truth. As soon as a member of the Opposition insists on receiving a fair go for the people, the Government says that he is wrong. Someone has to stand up to the Government and be willing to have a go for the rights of the taxpayers of South Australia. Government members may believe they have to swallow their pride to approach members of the Liberal Party; that is not so. It is another stupid furphy.

Members opposite should ask people in my district about this matter. They should ask people who are paying land tax that has in some cases increased by as much as 900 per cent. Those people are not happy about those increases; they are certainly not happy to see their money put into projects such as this. My telephone has run hot about this matter. Members opposite should ask the 86-year-old pensioner who came into my office the other day what he thinks about the situation. He receives more than most pensioners, but his rates have increased so much that, even with his maximum concession, he still finds it difficult to maintain his house, and he will probably have to sell up his property. He is not too happy that the Government is offering a \$200 000 gift to the Trades Hall.

If the Government asked people who have to close down industries or retrench people from those industries about this matter, it would discover that several big manufacturing organisations are interested only in maintaining their work force; they have forgotten about trying to make profits at

present. All they wish to do is keep the plant operating and ensure that people who have worked for them for many years will still be employed. Taxpayers generally are not sympathetic towards this Bill in any way, simply because their taxes are higher than ever before. It is just not on to ask them to support a straight-out gift of this nature. It is a case of bad public relations by the Trades Hall Managing Committee and the Government. The Government hopes that legislation to be debated in the following weeks will make people forget this issue, but I assure Government members that if this legislation is passed it will not be forgotten.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I do not support the motion. We should look at what we are discussing logically to see why the Trades Hall is in the position it is now in. In doing that we should realise that the Australian Labor Party has not vigorously debated this issue; the Party has taken it quietly. Members of the community know that the gun is pointed at the heads of A.L.P. members by organisations which, in the main, support those members financially in their political fights. It is common sense for us to understand that, if the Trades Hall is in trouble, the first and simplest method of attempting to get out of that trouble is to follow the course that has been followed in this instance and, if, as is normally claimed, the Trades Hall's political allies are in control of the State Treasury benches, it is common sense to ask the Government of the day to make money available to the Trades Hall by way of a grant. If the money could not be obtained by way of grant, the Government could attempt to provide funds in a similar way over a long term. If a business man could obtain \$200 000 to invest for 10 years without interest or capital repayment, and have 40 years to repay the sum at \$5 000 a year, I venture to say that he would be a millionaire before the end of the 50-year period, if he lived that long.

We all understand that, with today's inflationary trends, if the Labor Party can get this measure through it is, in essence, making a gift of the people's money to the Trades Hall. I do not believe that the A.L.P. needs to apologise for putting up a sham debate.

Mr. Venning: That's all it's been!

Mr. EVANS: I believe it had to try to convince the trade union movement that it was genuine in its desire to obtain a grant or, at second best, a loan over a long period which, as has been explained, will end up by being a grant. I do not take the A.L.P. to task, because I know that the trade union movement would be able to say, "We'll have to put some of our money that normally goes for political fighting into the bin to save the building if you don't obtain the money for us by this method." It is common sense that members of the A.L.P. in South Australia who came from trade union ranks would put terrific pressure on Cabinet and especially on Caucus to promote such a Bill as this. This measure could go as far as the Commonwealth sphere, because the Labor Party in Government in that sphere would claim to have a close affiliation with at least some of the trade union movement. The financial reservoir within that movement or the sum available by that means is unknown to members of this Parliament: we do not know how much is held by each trade union. I suppose it is not our right to know but, if such an organisation is coming to us to obtain funds to save a building that, is its home, at least we should have some indication of the money invested or held in trust accounts or other accounts throughout the State, in other States, or even overseas.

That information is totally unknown to members of this place: it was not supplied to the Select Committee. Who manages the Trades Hall? In the main, it is people who have originated from the trade union movement: people with backgrounds similar to those of the majority of people who represent the A.L.P. in this Parliament and who in many cases aspire to be future politicians; people who aspire to walk into this Chamber to manage not the Trades Hall's finances but the State's finances. It is those people who have failed to handle efficiently such a minor matter as the finances of the Trades Hall.

Mr. Slater: It's a different situation altogether.

Mr. EVANS: It is, because, when it comes to handling the State's finances, if one has the numbers one can increase taxes to gain money that can be thrown around willy nilly. However, with the Trades Hall that is not the case. The Government does not have the full opportunity to tax the people, unless it controls both Houses and can put this Bill through overnight. I do not know what will be the end result in another place, but if the same trade union inspired majority had control of the Upper House it would be a foregone conclusion; in fact, we probably would not even be considering the report of a Select Committee, a measure such as this having automatically passed through both Houses. The only protection for the people's money comes from the opposition raised in the newspapers, by the man in the street, and by Opposition members.

Whether there will be opposition in the Legislative Council remains to be seen. I am sure that, had the Labor Party controlled both Houses, this measure would have been pushed through both Houses as quickly as possible before the average citizen had an opportunity to object to it. As the financial management of the Government is in the hands of basically the same political type of person as manages the finances of the Trades Hall, I wonder what position the money of the people of the State is in at present. From the Trades Hall came that great phrase "worker participation in management". We are worried at present about making a grant—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: A loan.

Mr. EVANS: In the long term it is a grant of \$600 000 in interest not payable. This organisation thought up the term "worker participation in management", yet it cannot manage the one project in which it has an interest in the city. It has claimed the right to help manage industry. Before this project was commenced, the Liberal Government of the day warned the Trades Hall organisation that the proposition was not viable, but the management went on with it. If trade unions have any real complaint, it is with their Commonwealth Parliamentary colleagues, if those members are still their colleagues.

Despite its stated policy in 1972 of lower interest rates, the Commonwealth Government has increased those rates, and that is why the Trades Hall is in trouble. It has been let down by the Commonwealth Government. If the Trades Hall organisation had not poured all its money into the Labor Party campaign at the Commonwealth election and had used that money to pay off its building, it would now be closer to having that building completely paid off and it might not be confronted with higher interest rates, for the Commonwealth Labor Government might not have won the Commonwealth election. The Trades Hall brought about its own downfall, if this is its downfall.

The Labor Government has raised interest rates so high that the Trades Hall cannot meet its commitments. I have

not heard one member opposite ever say that the Commonwealth Government's interest rate policy is totally wrong, as it affects people on smaller incomes, such as young marrieds who are attempting to pay off their houses. Let us imagine what help could be provided to these young people by using \$200 000 toward a moratorium on the interest payments they have to make on their houses. That would be a move in the direction of helping those not able to help themselves. We have no real proof that the trade union movement is not able to help save the Trades Hall. I agree with the member for Hanson that the Trades Hall organisation fears that, if an appeal were made to the members of trade unions (few as there may be with offices in the Trades Hall), those people would reject the appeal.

As the member for Hanson said, the reason would be that rank-and-file trade unionists are disappointed, disgusted and disillusioned by the fact that radicals have led them down the path of inflation. They know what has occurred in trade union ranks and that they have been misled. If the Trades Hall organisation or union leaders made an appeal to the trade union movement tomorrow, I believe most unionists would reject that appeal and I think they would be right in doing so. If those who lead a movement do not bring the best return in purchasing power, they do not deserve support. We all know that, when an organisation such as the Trades Hall has to raise \$100 000 a year to meet interest payments, there is a problem.

I do not believe that \$10 contribution by a few Liberal members will solve the problem. However, if a television, channel, radio station, or newspaper were asked to conduct an appeal (for instance, some form of telethon), and if it received the right response, the Trades Hall debt could be wiped off. If it did not receive the right response, that would prove that the people did not support the proposition. We represent the man in the street, but he never had this proposition before him at the last election. No-one can claim a mandate for this proposal.

Mr. Wright: No-one has.

Mr. EVANS: I accept that. However, the challenge is there. The trade union movement, the Labor Party, and other Parties could support the move for an appeal; there is no harm in that. I am not against the average trade union member.

Mr. Slater: You are not pro, either.

Mr. EVANS: I would be more pro than would the honourable member, because I do not support the radicals who have led the average trade unionist to the present economic situation as a result of the lack of interest and apathy of these people. If an appeal were set up seeking support for the Trades Hall, I would contribute again. However, if the community will not support such an appeal, it is not worth the support of this Parliament. That is the cold, hard truth. What will happen if the Trades Hall has to be sold up (and that is the worst thing that can happen)?

Although I heard the member for Stuart say that this would be the last card in the pack for the trade union movement, I do not believe that is the case. In this instance, we are not discussing the trade union movement, as fewer than half of the trade unions in this State have their office in the Trades Hall. If the Trades Hall were sold up, the trade unions that now have offices there would find other offices, as many unions have done in the past, apparently finding those offices more beneficial from the point of view of finance and convenience. The member for Stuart talked of the whole trade union system collapsing. That is a joke, and I believe the last card in the pack is the

joker. I do not think there is any basis for the argument that, because the Trades Hall may have to be sold, the trade union movement will collapse.

The most lucrative return, whether for a trades hall or for any other building in the city square, comes from office accommodation. I believe the entertainment section of the Trades Hall is most uneconomical and unnecessary. It may be desirable, and perhaps it is beneficial for socials, and so on, but it would be possible for it to be partitioned into offices. The management could forget about the social side, except for the bar section. At some future time, when the proposition is viable, the partitions could be removed and the Trades Hall could be used for the purpose for which it was originally designed. The trade union movement has its eyes on a radio station, and is interested in such a proposition. It may not be in total the same trade unions as are involved in the Trades Hall, but at least some of them are interested in that venture. I do not deny anyone the right to invest if he thinks he can gain by investment on a reasonable basis, but I cannot support a group saying, on the one hand, that it has money to invest, money which it has to spare, when, on the other side of the ledger, it asks people to subsidise it because it cannot manage its affairs.

That is what is being done. I know of several attempts in the trade union movement to work in participation with management, and also of attempts by workers to manage their own businesses. Bourke's store, in Melbourne, is still struggling along, with no great advantage. It has not brought in other industries and it has had problems making the business pay and getting people to participate by buying from the store. In South Australia we had the case of the glove factory, North's, at Whyalla. The trade union movement was going to manage that factory and it was to have been a great success. The kid gloves were taken off; industrial gloves were to be produced. I understand, however, that not even the State Government buys gloves from that factory; its gloves are imported. The trade union movement could not even manage that enterprise when it was acquired virtually as a gift. It could not operate such a venture satisfactorily.

Let us leave aside for the moment the average individual who is attempting to pay off his house at a high interest rate. The A.L.P. Government is ignoring such people with this proposal. I could quote the case of the Onkaparinga brickyard, in the district of the member for Kavel. That organisation wanted \$100 000 to survive, but now it has gone by the board. It is closer to Monarto than are most established brickyards within the State. It was an example of decentralisation, established near Lobethal, in an area where other industrial problems existed and where there was loss of work for people in the small community. Now it is hoped that another private group will take an interest in the brickyard to save it because, as recently as a month ago, the Government refused to help.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must link his remarks to the motion.

Mr. EVANS: I am linking them up. Here is a private enterprise venture producing one of the most vital materials for house building, wanting \$100 000 to survive, yet the Government cannot find it. It was in trouble only because of the Commonwealth Government's interest rate policy. South Australia needs the bricks and the houses just as much as the trade union movement needs the Trades Hall. The Trades Hall is the home in South Australia of the A.L.P., and no doubt the A.L.P. pays rent for its offices.

I do not deny that. However, when Government members debate this issue we understand they are trying to protect their Party's home. They are not attempting to protect it as vigorously and as enthusiastically as they would be doing if they thought it a just cause. They know they have not got a just cause, and one or two vigorous speeches will be needed so that the trade union movement outside can at least get the impression that the A.L.P. supports its cause with this venture.

All the time, Government members will be debating on that basis with tongue in cheek, hoping that the matter will be settled today in this House. The Trades Hall is the hub of the A.L.P.'s financial resources, and all the spokes branching out point to A.L.P. members. As the wheel turns, the spokes point to at least one Government member who has had some affiliation in the past with the trade union movement. I do not deny Government members their right to jump, to squirm or to shift in an effort to find a solution, but in no way should they ask the people of South Australia to pay the bill for bad management. If this is an example of what the A.L.P. believes to be good management, or what people from the trade union movement aspiring to be future A.L.P. members regard as good business, let us hope the people of South Australia will wake up and cast out the A.L.P. Governments, both State and Commonwealth, because of their failure to manage the State's finances, just as the Trades Hall has failed to manage its finances. I cannot support the motion under any conditions.

Mr. SLATER (Gilles): I support the motion. We have had several speakers in this debate, and it is obvious that Opposition speakers have little or no appreciation of the internal affairs of the trade union movement. I do not say this with any disrespect, because I appreciate that they have not had an opportunity to be as closely involved as have members on this side, and as a consequence of their lack of direct involvement they do not appreciate the difficulty of finances in the trade union movement. I recall the old Trades Hall in Grote Street. Anyone who knew that building would have to agree that it was probably the worst accommodation in Adelaide. I spent some years there. A decision had to be made as to whether the trade union movement should take action to rebuild.

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

Mr. SLATER: Before the adjournment I had been referring to conditions that existed in the old Trades Hall, which had been occupied for many years. During that time it, had depreciated considerably not only in value but also as a building and, consequently, conditions were most unsatisfactory. The Trades Hall Managing Committee (of which I was a member at that time) had to decide whether to build on the old site or on an alternative site and, after much discussion and certain procrastination, it decided to build on the site at South Terrace. This was not a unanimous agreement by all members of the trade union movement, but it was a majority decision. Immediately, at a meeting of the Trades Hall Council, a motion was passed to levy \$2 from all members of the movement. This levy was implemented and a substantial amount raised.

Mr. Coumbe: Was that on every union?

Mr. SLATER: The decision was binding on all unions: I do not know how many did not co-operate, but most of them did, and a substantial sum was raised for the new hall. During this debate Government members have been accused of referring to history, but I go back slightly in history because the present situation of the Trades Hall has

not occurred only in the past few years but has been taking place over many years. I instanced the problem of accommodation in the old hall. The unions were, to some degree, victims of their own circumstances. I believe that the attitude of trying to run trade union affairs on the cheap was a thorn in the sides of many people, but trade union finances must come basically from individual union membership. During the period to which I am referring (that is, from the 1900's to when the trade union movement vacated the old hall), a philosophy existed that trade unionism should be operated on the cheap.

Nevertheless, the movement was a victim of a situation in which workers at that time did not receive high incomes, because South Australia was acknowledged as a low-wage State and, consequently, trade unions had to charge a suitably low contribution rate from individual members. Therefore, the trade union movement could not build up a substantial balance. In many cases unions were in financial difficulties, and could not contribute to the cost of building the new Trades Hall. It has been said in the debate that the decision to build the new hall on South Terrace was a mistake. It is convenient to be wise in retrospect, but my point to the Opposition is that the committee had to decide whether to acquire modern accommodation. No Opposition member would deny the trade union movement the use of reasonable accommodation in which to conduct its business in the interests of its members and of the State.

Mr. Venning: Under good administration.

Mr. SLATER: It was not a question of bad administration: if the honourable member had listened to me, he would have understood, but it is obvious that he is not willing to understand. I am trying to convey to Opposition members that their attitude towards the trade union movement during this debate has confirmed our previous opinion that they have no basic consideration for an organisation that is important to the welfare of everyone in the State. Because of the decision to move into the new premises at South Terrace, the Trades Hall Managing Committee received a substantial sum by way of levy and also from donations. Following an appeal for donations, individuals, trade union secretaries, business people, and a wide sector of the community responded favourably.

Mr. Coumbe: Was that a levy?

Mr. SLATER: No, a contribution by way of donation. At that time a levy of \$2 was imposed on each trade union member of every affiliated union. On that basis, the building of the hall was undertaken, but, as a substantial amount had to be raised to finance it, a loan was obtained from the Commonwealth Bank. During the past two or three years increased interest rates have had a substantial effect on the finances of the committee. Unions are in a difficult situation: they pay rent according to the current rate for the building they occupy on South Terrace, and they are obliged to pay rates and taxes for offices they occupy. Also, from my experience of the union with which I was associated, a large sum had to be spent for furnishings following the shift into the new premises. The only source of income of the trade union movement is individual membership contributions: it is not a profit-making organisation, and that is the essential difference between some organisations and trade unions. They are in the game not to make a profit but for the benefit of their members and of the public generally.

At present the Trades Hall Managing Committee has to raise a substantial sum just to cover the interest payable on the loan. I do not blame the managing committee or the people who assisted in building the Trades Hall in so

many ways, but compliment them on the attitude they had adopted at that stage. It is a pity that some Opposition members cannot see the situation in the same light as did those who assisted us originally. At present the managing committee has to service a loan at the appropriate interest rates, and to meet its commitment the committee is now seeking a loan of \$200 000 from the Government. I believe that this will not be the ultimate solution to the problem of the Trades Hall. Nevertheless, it must be realised that the trade union movement is not a profit-making organisation. Previously, it had levied its members, but I would be reluctant to advocate a further levy on individual members.

The only avenue existing by which assistance can be given is through the State Government. This idea is not new; the Liberal Government in New South Wales guaranteed a loan of \$2 000 000 for the Sydney Trades Hall Committee to assist in building the hall in Sydney. So, the proposal in this Bill is nothing new. We have heard varying reasons from members opposite about why the Trades Hall Managing Committee should not be assisted. Those reasons boil down to the fact that the Opposition does not have a deep appreciation of the problems of the trade union movement; I do not say this disrespectfully.

The Opposition has a basic bias against the trade union movement; no other conclusion can be drawn. This bias is evident in the remarks of members opposite. To some degree members opposite may be honest, but if they were honest with themselves in this matter they would certainly help a non-profit organisation to assist, its members and the State generally. The Chamber of Commerce and Industry is entitled under this Bill to receive assistance, and that provision is fair and just. I would not be surprised if such assistance was given in the future and I would support it.

Perhaps some people in the community may not see the situation as Government members see it, because those people are influenced to some degree by the press. Editorials have not supported the Bill. The press has some degree of bias against the trade union movement, and that bias has been evident in the editorials. Of course, people in the community are influenced by the press. If the situation was explained to the people and if they understood the problems of the trade union movement, I believe they would support the Bill. Because the people have not known the full facts, letters to the Editor have opposed the Bill. Because I believe the Bill is justified in the public interest, I support the motion for adoption of the Select Committee's report.

Mr. WARDLE (Murray): I am not willing to support the motion. I am at least willing to give the member for Gilles credit for being an honest man, even if he is not willing to be as generous in his attitude to me. The Government has failed to advance a convincing argument that all avenues of self-help have been tried; this is the biggest difficulty I have in relation to accepting the report. No Government member has put forward a complete case-stating that the Trades Hall Managing Committee has gone through all the procedures that most organisations would go through on the basis of self-help. It is no good Government members saying that the Opposition does not support the Bill because, according to Government members, the Opposition wants to get rid of the trade union movement; to get rid of the union movement would be stupid. Some Opposition members belong to unions; I still hold my membership, and I am proud of it. It is absolutely essential for my group to be co-ordinated and to speak with one voice to assist the people in my occupation.

I can see advantages in accommodating all unions in one building. One of the worst aspects of dealing with Government departments over the years has been that one has had to go from street to street and from building to building in an effort to find departments. What a pleasure it now is that so many people whom one wants to see are centrally situated in the State Administration Centre. Similarly, what an administrative advantage it must be for so many trade union officials to be accommodated in the Trades Hall. It is no good Government members saying that the Opposition wants to see the situation split up; the Opposition does not want to see that. I understood from what the member for Gilles said that a levy was imposed when the Trades Hall was to be built; that is good. However, I point out that scout groups and kindergarten groups not only have an appeal at the commencement of a building project but also have appeals year after year until the building is paid for.

Mr. Harrison: The Australian Government assists them.

Mr. WARDLE: No-one opposite has said why the union levy was not continued year after year. It is not sufficient to say that there was an appeal at the outset; that is not the sort of self-help that we find in local groups, which show great tenacity and dedication. Indeed, some groups have taken on far bigger responsibilities than has the Trades Hall Managing Committee, on the basis of the number of people involved and the ability of people to pay. Not one Government speaker has made a comprehensive statement about whether the Trades Hall Managing Committee has explored every avenue of finance.

I am disappointed that there is no public appeal. In this morning's *Advertiser* a gentleman said he was willing to contribute to such an appeal; I do not know the gentleman's background. Do we know how much money industry would contribute to the project? I am referring not to just one appeal but to an annual appeal to keep the organisation viable. I, like many other Opposition members, would be one of the last who would wish to see this hall sold up. I believe the Government knows that the Opposition would not want to see this happen.

Members interjecting.

Mr. WARDLE: No honourable member who is interjecting has been on his feet to prove to us what kind of effort has been made. Therefore, I am satisfied that Government members must admit that they have not been able to prove to the House why Opposition members should support the Bill. As levies were made originally for funds, surely that means could be used each year. Surely that would be the best means of obtaining income for the Trades Hall administration. Obviously, no new material can be brought into the debate at this stage, except for the point which I made and which I repeat: we have not had a good case from the Government side that would convince anyone to support the motion. Therefore, I do not support it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): Opposition members who have addressed themselves with seriousness rather than rhetoric and rodomontade to this debate have suggested, as the last speaker did, that there has been no proof that adequate efforts have been made in this regard. I cannot think that the member for Murray has read the minutes of evidence adequately, because repeated efforts have been made by the Trades Hall Managing Committee to raise the necessary moneys to meet its present commitments.

Mr. Coumbe: What form did they take?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Appeals, approaches to individuals, and a series of fund-raising activities, but to obtain money of this kind in appeals in Adelaide requires the commitment of funds from large institutions. As the Premier of a Government involved in many public appeals in South Australia, I know the kind of thing that is constantly said to me by the money-raisers of the community, the people who raise money for charitable purposes of one kind or another; I am not talking about a scout or guide hall but about substantial funds.

Mr. Wardle: They're substantial in their own right in a small area.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, in a small area, but in this case we are raising a large sum.

Mr. Dean Brown: The kind of money raised for a radio station?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Rather more than would be raised for a radio station, with the 10 per cent involved.

Mr. Venning: What about the full-page ad in the *Advertiser*?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier has the call.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Although interjections are permitted, we do not want a series of persistent and consistent interjections, and I ask honourable members to show the necessary decorum to the serious matter under consideration. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I was trying to pay members the courtesy of imagining that they were attending to this matter with seriousness and responsibility. If Opposition members take the attitude to this debate that this is simply a matter of shouting and carrying on, or if they want me to put on the kind of turn that always brings from them the remark that it is some performance by a member of Actors Equity in the House, I am not going to do that. I do not see why, on a matter as serious as this is, I should get up and be required to shout down the stupid remarks with which members have seen fit to punctuate the past few minutes. Regarding fund-raising in Adelaide, it is common for members of the Adelaide Establishment, well known to Opposition members, to approach me and say, "We think that we can get from the major institutions in South Australia sums of this kind, but it will be required of the Government that it prime the pump to this extent in order to get contributions from these people." If we are going to raise \$200 000 in Adelaide, that is what it is at.

Dr. Tonkin: You're talking about your Monday afternoon conferences.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am not, because that is not where it happens. The honourable member has apparently not got his reports of those conferences accurate, because fund-raising in Adelaide is never discussed there.

Dr. Tonkin: I've heard about the conferences.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member has heard about the Monday afternoon conferences, I can only say that the industrialists in Adelaide attend them regularly and express appreciation of the help given to them. The honourable member obviously does not like the fact that industrialists in Adelaide constantly consult with this Government, but I put to him that, however

entrancing it may be to wander amongst the garden of bright images, he should take his mind to a subject of equal importance, namely, the business before the House.

Fund-raising in Adelaide is not a matter of raising money for a scout or guide hall; it is a matter of raising money of the kind in this Bill. In this case, it is not possible to go back to the major financial institutions of Adelaide and ask them to subscribe again to the Trades Hall. That is the plain fact. The rest of the money cannot be gained simply by the kind of public appeal about which the member for Murray talked. The honourable member cannot get \$200 000 in Murray Bridge, and we could not get it in Adelaide, either, in these circumstances. The point is that the order of funds is different, but let me get to the question raised by the member for Bragg.

Dr. Tonkin: Are you going to build a Trades Hall at Monarto?

The SPEAKER: Order! We are not dealing with Monarto.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member wants answers on the matters he has put, he should treat this matter seriously instead of making the silly and stupid kind of interjection he is making in his childish fashion. Regarding the amounts of money to be raised, I will give a contrast between the contribution this Government made to the Nurses Memorial Centre, with which the honourable member was involved, and the Trades Hall. The Nurses Memorial Centre represents a tiny proportion of the trade union movement in South Australia.

Dr. Tonkin: They've done remarkably well on their own, haven't they?

Mr Langley: Under this Government.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They have, but they could not have built their premises without a gift from the Government, because they got not only the guarantee for a loan and representations by the Government to the Savings Bank of South Australia to provide the loan to them at the interest rates at which it was provided but also a gift of parking rights over the land.

Dr. Tonkin: It was the least you could do after you mucked them around for so long.

Mr. Langley: Why don't you ask the women concerned?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member has the temerity and the gall to come into the House—

Dr. Tonkin: Yes!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not mean it lightly. What he has just said is that what was given to the nurses in relation to their centre (the giving of parking rights over Government land) was an electoral bribe to keep nurses' support.

Dr. Tonkin: Because you had mucked them around before.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: At no time in the history of the Royal Australian Nursing Federation has it had the kind of assistance from a Government that it got from us.

Dr. Tonkin: How long was their building delayed?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Originally, they did not have either the area of land or the money.

Dr. Tonkin: They had the money and a site, and you didn't have the site you offered them.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The federation had neither the land nor the money to erect the building it intended to erect. What the federation got from this Government was the provision of moneys through the Savings Bank of South Australia, a guarantee from the Government, and the gift of parking rights over Government land which, capitalised, would represent not less than \$50 000 in a straight gift.

Dr. Tonkin: That is about what they suffered from all the mucking around.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: When the federation ran into trouble and was unable to complete the operation that it originally intended, we extended the loan and the guarantee.

Dr. Tonkin: You wouldn't let them start for about 18 months. .

Mr. Langley: Why don't you change the record!

The SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member for Bragg and the honourable member for Unley are going to infringe Standing Orders continually I will have no hesitation in warning both of them. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The attitude of the Liberal Party to this whole proposal cannot be better exemplified than by the attitude of the member for Bragg a few moments ago and by his interjections and intervention in the debate. What has happened as far as the Liberal Party is concerned is that members opposite stood over members of the Select Committee.

Mr. Venning: That's rubbish.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BECKER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Treasurer has made the accusation that members on this side stood over members of the Select Committee; that is untrue and I ask that the remark be withdrawn.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member raises a point of order and then asks for a withdrawal. The point of order is not upheld: it is not a point of order at this point of the debate.

Mr. BECKER: On a further point of order, Mr. Speaker. I ask for a withdrawal, because the Treasurer has made the accusation and it is not true. I ask that it be withdrawn.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member raised a point of order, and then asked for a withdrawal. I am not going to, ask for a withdrawal, because in my opinion the term used is not considered to be unparliamentary.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: It's used every five minutes.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister knows full well that when the Speaker is on his feet he has certain rights. The honourable Minister will suffer the consequences if he disregards those rights. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I rise now on a question of order. The Leader of the Opposition and the member for Davenport said quite clearly in the House, and it was audible here, that I told a lie.

Dr. Tonkin: So did I.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Very well. I demand that that be withdrawn.

Dr. Tonkin: So you did.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier has asked for a withdrawal of the statement allegedly made. I first ask the honourable Leader of the Opposition whether he desires to withdraw it.

Dr. EASTICK: To withdraw the assertion that has been made would be to walk away from the facts.

The SPEAKER: Order! At the request of the honourable Premier, I ask the honourable Leader of the Opposition whether he will withdraw the statement allegedly made.

Dr. EASTICK: It was not allegedly made: it was made. It was a fact and I am unable to withdraw it.

The SPEAKER: Will the honourable member for Davenport withdraw?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I do not wish to withdraw it.

The SPEAKER: I will not take the matter further, because it is a term that has been used in this Chamber on many occasions: it has been used by many members. When a member requests the withdrawal of a statement to which he objects, that request will be put to the member concerned. At this stage I repeat the term is used on many occasions but, on this occasion, I will not persist with the request. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Very well then, Sir, I will prove my statement, since that is the view you hold. The position is that the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Eyre, before the Select Committee made clear that it believed some action should be taken to assist the Trades Hall, because it could not continue without assistance from the Government, requested, the Government to prepare a series of proposals that they could consider in the Select Committee. The Leader of the Opposition proposed at the meeting before the—

Mr. Venning: Proposition?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, the meeting before the first meeting of the committee; the final proposal—that is, the Leader of the Opposition said that he believed that what the committee should put forward was a provision—

Dr. Eastick: No, I didn't.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, the Leader did. He said he believed that the kind of proposal that should be examined was a provision—

Dr. Eastick: "Examined" is the key word.

Mr. Venning: It's no good: it was found to be—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Rocky River will find out that Standing Orders will prevail if he continues to interrupt in that manner. This is his last warning before I warn him in accordance with Standing Orders.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The provision put forward by the Leader was for a non-interest loan with a moratorium. He said he believed that that was the sort of approach that should be adopted. He asked for the Government to prepare the various proposals that would allow an examination of the kind of costs to Government. That was prepared, and he asked whether he could take it away. When the committee reconvened, there was an obvious change of heart. Somehow, in the intervening period between the time when the Leader and the member for Eyre had said

that they did not want to see the Trades Hall in the kind of difficulty the evidence disclosed, that they believed something should be done, and that they wanted time to take away the proposals and look at the various alternatives of how something could be done, and the time they came back again, something occurred so that they then said that they could not agree to anything at all. If members opposite ask us to believe that in the meantime they had not been to a Party meeting where their views were changed, I can only say that they expect us to exhibit a naivety that we do not have.

Mr. Mathwin: As Chairman of the Party, I can say that it's a fact that it wasn't discussed in the Party room. So you can stop day-dreaming and get on with it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If members opposite who were on the Select Committee did not go away and consult their Party colleagues and did not have the views expressed by them at the Select Committee meeting changed, how did the sea change occur? Members opposite have a great habit of telling us that somehow or other we have been stood over by people elsewhere and do not come to conclusions ourselves. They say that, although we maintain a consistent view in this House. What are we to think of members opposite who carry out the kind of performance that we saw from the two Opposition members of the Select Committee? We can come to only one conclusion.

Dr. Tonkin: What about the other three members?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The other three members of the committee had a clear view from the start.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We do not resile for a moment from that view, which is that the trade union movement in South Australia is an essential part of the social fabric of our society, and that it is essential for the continuance of the common weal of South Australia that the trade union movement remain effective and viable. If that is the case, it would be a gross dereliction of the duty of this Parliament not to ensure that the necessary assistance was given to the movement so that it could remain in that condition. This has been the view of the Government and Parliament in relation to organisations in every other area of our society.

Mr. Chapman: What would you do with other organisations that do not enjoy facilities on South Terrace, such as the Australian Workers Union?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member does not know anything about the trade union movement.

Mr. Chapman: It's what the member for Elizabeth told us in this House.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Alexandra having already spoken in the debate will not be allowed a second opportunity to speak, and that applies to all honourable members.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Members opposite just do not take notice of the facts. The fact is that unions that have offices outside the Trades Hall also use the Trades Hall.

Mr. Chapman: They use it during strikes, and that's useless for the rest of the community.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is not necessarily when they are on strike. I point out one example to the honourable member, who should know about this from reading the newspaper. A short time ago when members opposite were protesting the appeal of the Government concerning

the increase in pay granted by a Conciliation Commissioner in the police case (an appeal which was won by the Public Service Board), the meeting that I attended of the police officers was held in the Trades Hall, not in the Police Association building, which could not have accommodated all who attended. When meetings of that kind have to be held, the one place in which they are conducted is the Trades Hall; that happens in the case of every union in South Australia, including unions outside the Trades and Labor Council. Why is it that members opposite simply will not recognise that these common facilities of the Trades Hall are essential to the trade union movement, and that it would be disastrous for South Australia if these facilities were not to continue to be provided? The reason for the opposition of honourable members is obvious from the way in which they have expressed their views about trade unions time and time again.

Dr. Tonkin: Come on!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will come on all right. The member for Bragg has expressed his view about the Royal Australian Nursing Federation, and I think that is quite enough to show the attitude he takes. His only consideration in this matter is not one of assistance to genuine organisations, whether or not they agree with him.

Dr. Tonkin: I don't think yours is, either.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, it is. I have never thought I have received terribly much support from the federation politically at any time; however, I think that the honourable member thought that he did. I believe it was right to do what we did in relation to the Nurses Memorial Centre. If members opposite had any sort of genuine view of what was proper, reasonable, and politic for South Australia they would agree with the Select Committee's report.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I claim my right under Standing Order 141 to correct a statement made about my contribution to the debate.

The SPEAKER: In accordance with Standing Order 141, the honourable Leader has that right, but he must confine his remarks entirely to some material part of his own speech.

Dr. EASTICK: I will, Sir. I simply wish to reaffirm what I made clear in my speech in this debate: that I had welcomed the opportunity of listening to the evidence placed before the committee by the various persons to whom I referred. In that speech, I said that it was as a result of a complete assessment of the evidence put before the committee that I had arrived at a decision. I draw the attention of members, particularly the Treasurer, to Standing Order 395, which deals with the action to be taken by the members of a Select Committee regarding the confidentiality of evidence. Those are the only other contributions I wish to make.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader has claimed certain rights in accordance with Standing Order 141, and that is the only Standing Order under which he is permitted to speak at this stage. The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

Dr. EASTICK: It is the only Standing Order by which I claim the right to speak. The evidence I received as a member of the Select Committee, and to which I referred in my contribution to the debate, was received by me and used by me. It was not divulged, before the report was tabled, to members of this Party or of this Parliament other than those who were members of the Select Committee.

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out again that the honourable member sought leave of the Chair to explain certain matters relevant to the speech he made. That is the only permission granted under Standing Order 141, and to bring in something that was mentioned confidentially and that therefore cannot be conveyed to the House is not a material matter that can be used by the honourable member in this House, as he himself has said.

Mr. GUNN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I claim, under Standing Order 141, to have been misrepresented by the Treasurer.

The SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member for Eyre claims to reply to misrepresentation, he is not claiming rights under Standing Order 141.

The House divided on the motion "That the Select Committee's report be noted":

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

Noes (18)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick (teller), Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, McAnaney, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. McRae and Wells.
Messrs. Nankivell and Rodda.

Noes—

Majority of 5 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

Tn Committee.

Clause 1—"Short title."

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

To strike out "Grants" and insert "Loans".

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): So that there may be no misunderstanding of the position my colleagues and I hold in respect of this alteration, to allow it to proceed without resistance would be to suggest that we condone a loan as being better than a grant. Whilst an argument could be put forward in relation to a loan being better than a grant so far as the finances of the State are concerned in the long term (and no-one could deny that), members on this side resist the whole premise taken, by the Government in bringing forward this measure. Therefore, I completely oppose that alteration of words.

Might I say in relation to its being a loan or a grant that earlier we were given to understand that, as a result of certain instruction having been taken which altered an opinion in respect of its being a grant or a loan, in relation to either the original Bill or the amending stages we are considering at present, as I stated briefly only minutes ago, having regard to the restraint placed on members of a Select Committee by Standing Order 395, I want it to be quite clearly understood that there was no discussion with my colleagues regarding alternatives which might be under consideration by members of the Select Committee. Be it a grant, a loan, or any other configuration of words, I want all members to appreciate fully that assertions made against the member for Eyre and me were totally unfounded. They were unfounded when they were made, and they are now.

Mr. GUNN: I support the Leader's comments. This is just the first back-down and turn-around that the Government has taken on this matter. I seek to clarify my personal situation concerning this amendment and this matter generally. Accusations were made by the Treasurer,

and they included untruths without any skerrick of evidence to support the suggestion that I was lobbied or coerced, and that I threatened to oppose this Bill. I now tell the Treasurer and every member of the Committee that we on this side, and I especially, make our own judgment in relation to such matters.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I think the honourable member is getting a bit wide of the short title.

Mr. GUNN: I believe it is relevant, Mr. Chairman, because the Government in its wisdom changed the whole content of the Bill examined by the Select Committee. A proposition was put before the committee, and the Leader and myself examined the whole matter and asked several questions so that we could be properly informed and could make a proper judgment. We did not want to be "Yes" men, and we did not want a smokescreen drawn across the issue. Yet that is what the Treasurer has tried to do to this Committee this evening. The allegations the Treasurer made tonight cannot be substantiated and I challenge him to repeat them outside this Chamber.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Your challenge will be taken up. The honourable member has raised matters concerning the Select Committee, and I think I should tell this Committee something of the comedy that occurred. At the outset, when we discussed this matter after the conclusion of the formal evidence, the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Eyre expressed themselves as being concerned about the situation of the Trades Hall. They believed, and they said, that something must be done by the Government. They said that to the committee, and I am sure they will not deny it now.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, under Standing Order 395, unless this information referred to is actually in evidence taken by the Select Committee and presented to this Chamber the Treasurer is out of order. He is breaking Standing Order 395 if he continues with what he is saying.

The CHAIRMAN: I rule the point not in order. We are dealing with a Bill, not a Select Committee. The honourable Treasurer.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: In that case, Mr. Chairman, I take a further point of order and ask that the Treasurer's comments be limited purely to the Bill and not to the Select Committee.

Mr. Venning: That is right.

The CHAIRMAN: I warn the honourable member for Rocky River. As Chairman of this Committee I will decide these matters. The honourable Treasurer.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: After that, we came back and found that the Leader of the Opposition—

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I rise on a point of order. I thought that we were debating a Bill. The Treasurer is now debating what happened in the Select Committee. There appears to be a valid point of order here. The Treasurer should confine his remarks to the Bill before us, and to the short title.

The CHAIRMAN: There is no point of order. The Treasurer is explaining the position.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Since these matters were adverted to by members opposite, I will give them the benefit of the facts. After honourable members returned to the Select Committee after considering all those matters prepared by the Treasury that they wanted to examine, they said that they could not agree to any help for the Trades Hall. That was rather different from what they had said before.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I take a further point of order, Mr. Chairman. I ask you to refer to Standing Order 395, which provides that no member is allowed to disclose what went on at a Select Committee meeting.

The Hon. I. D. Corcoran: You should read it properly.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I have.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have ruled the honourable member out of order previously, and he ought to know this. The honourable Treasurer.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am simply adverting to matters that were raised by the honourable member's Leader and the member for Eyre. I am dealing with those matters that they were allowed to advert to.

Mr. Dean Brown: You certainly have an impartial Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: At that stage of proceedings, Mr. Speaker—

Dr. TONKIN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman, as I believe the Treasurer should address you by your proper title.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Mr. Chairman, at that stage of proceedings the honourable members said that they could not agree to anything in the way of support (although previously they had said that it was obviously necessary on the evidence). The motion was moved that the Bill simply be reported and recommended to the Chamber, and that was opposed by the honourable members. When it was found that if the Bill were reported to the House without an amendment it would be difficult for the House to have a Committee stage in which any amendments or compromises could be discussed, it was decided to call another meeting of the Select Committee so that the matter could be looked at. In fact, some amendments were circulated by the member for Adelaide. Then the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Eyre opposed the rescission of the very motion that they had opposed at the previous committee meeting.

Dr. Eastick: Why shouldn't they do that in the circumstances?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Obviously—

Dr. Eastick: They had concluded their work.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If they had wanted to get to the gravamen of the matter before the Parliament, if they wanted the Parliament to discuss it in detail and be able to look at alternatives or anything of that kind, then that was not the action that they should have taken. However, it was obvious by then that it did not matter what inconsistency they would go to: they would support a resolution in one committee meeting which they had opposed in a previous committee meeting.

Mr. Goldsworthy: The end result was worse than the first situation.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I can say only that honourable members opposite seem to be in a strange situation when at one meeting they say that they are opposed to reporting the Bill to the House recommending the original proposition, while at the next meeting they oppose the rescission of the very motion that they had opposed at the previous meeting.

Dr. Eastick: Put it in proper perspective.

Mr. Chapman: You're telling untruths—put it back on the right road.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There is no untruth in that. The fact about this matter is that honourable members opposite had got themselves to a stage where they just did not want honourable members to be able to discuss this matter in great detail in Committee, to look at alternatives, or to discuss any positive suggestions. The attitude that they then adopted was that they would obstruct the Bill in any way that they could.

. Mr. Chapman: They did not agree with the principle behind the Bill. It is as simple as that.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I know that the member for Alexandra would never agree to the opinion that there should be a trade union movement in South Australia at all. The honourable member has made that evident. Perhaps he is typical not of the inner feelings of Opposition members but of their expressed opinion, because for the most part Opposition members pay lip service to the existence of trade unions although they do everything they can to kick them into the ground.

Mr. Coumbe: Come on!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If Opposition members were genuine and concerned to see to it that the system of industrial organisation evolved in South Australia were to continue, they would not take their present attitude.

Dr. EASTICK: I think that this matter should be placed in its proper perspective and that all members should be able to see the other side of the coin. I do not dispute, nor do the minutes suggest otherwise, that I voted for the original report that was to be tabled one week before a report was tabled. I voted against the original report, because I believed there was no purpose in the Bill proceeding further, either by using the word "grants" or "loans". A report had already been written indicating that the six proposals to be considered and for which an adjournment had been sought were to receive no consideration.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That wasn't put forward by anyone...

Dr. EASTICK: Yes, it was, and you know it. It was to proceed in the form in which it had been originally presented here. I reacted to the fact that we had a report that made that statement before members of the committee had the chance to put their point of view about the six alternatives. We had the spectacle of the Treasurer trying to make an issue of the fact that the member for Eyre and I subsequently refused to vote to rescind the original report. When advised that to fail to omit rescinding the motion would seem ridiculous, I told the Treasurer then (and I repeat) that I did not accept his view, and that I would not accept public criticism which he might attempt and which he threatened, and told him not to be bloody foolish. Concerning the member for Eyre and me, the report that had been arrived at 10 days before the subsequent report to Parliament and which included the word "loans" instead of "grants" did not indicate there was any need for a second or further meeting. I trust that all members on both sides, on considering the statements made by the Treasurer and me, will acknowledge that there were two sides to the coin.

Mr. GUNN: I support what my Leader has said, because he gave a completely factual account of the happenings of the committee in relation to the matters raised by the Treasurer. The Treasurer has tried to discredit the Leader and me and our attitudes to this matter, but we gave proper consideration to every matter put before the committee. When the Treasurer realised that he could not get his own way, he made threats, but the Leader

clarified the position of Opposition members on that committee. It ill behoves the Treasurer to make false accusations, and it does him and the office of Treasurer little credit for him to act in this way.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: As a member who was not on the Select Committee, it seems that the Treasurer and Government members have based their argument on the premise that they think Opposition members had a change of heart during the hearings of the Select Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member to confine his remarks to the clause. I will allow the debate only on the amendment.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Are you ruling that I cannot debate the matters that have been canvassed by the Leader, the member for Eyre, and the Treasurer?

The CHAIRMAN: I allowed the Treasurer to reply to the Leader and the member for Eyre: also, I allowed the Leader and the member for Eyre to reply to the comments of the Treasurer. Now, I request members to confine their remarks to the amendment before the Chair.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Points of order raised by the member for Davenport in relation to the comments of the Treasurer were not upheld, and it seems that the only interpretation one can place on that ruling is that the comments of the Treasurer were relevant to the question before the Chair. I am trying to give a point of view of a member not on the Select Committee. Can I assume that the matter now ruled out of order was previously in order?

The CHAIRMAN: I have given my ruling, and I ask honourable members to confine their remarks to the amendment before the Chair.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Treasurer made the point that the Leader had changed his mind during the course of hearings of the Select Committee. The member for Adelaide accused the Leader and the member for Eyre of doing this. However, this is a completely peripheral matter. The Opposition members were not happy with the Bill as it was originally presented; nor are they happy with the Select Committee's recommendations. The amendments amount to substantially the same thing as the contents of the original Bill.

A loan with no repayments for 10 years and then repayments by equal instalments for 40 years with no interest amounts, in essence, to a grant. By enlarging on irrelevant detail, the Treasurer is attempting to draw attention away from the core of the argument, which is whether a grant or what amounts to a grant of \$200 000 should be made to the trade union movement. The Opposition has made its position perfectly clear: it rejects both propositions. If the Government puts forward something more reasonable, the Opposition will be willing to consider it. It is useless for the Treasurer to accuse the Opposition members of the Select Committee of equivocation. We did not agree to the original proposition; nor do we agree to the amendments.

Mr. BECKER: Can the Treasurer say whether it is necessary to continue with this Bill, because such money could be made available through the Industries Development Committee?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As a member of the Industries Development Committee, the honourable member ought to know that one of the conditions of any money made available through that committee is that it must increase employment.

Mr. Coumbe: What about the amendments?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The purpose of money made available through the Industries Development Committee is the provision of employment.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

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

Noes (18)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Becker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick (teller), Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, McAnaney, Nankivell, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

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

Majority of 4 for the Ayes.

Amendment thus carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 2 and 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Grant to Corporation."

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move to strike out the clause and insert the following new clause:

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

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

This amendment provides for the loan, the principles of which we have already debated.

Mr. COUMBE: Regarding new subclause (2), what will be the position if, at June 30, 1985, or at any subsequent due date, the corporation cannot meet its commitment as provided under this Bill?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It will have a debt to the Crown which can be sued on.

Mr. Coumbe: What action would be taken?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I hope that we will be in Government at that stage, the legal position being that there is a debt payable to the Crown, which debt can be sued on.

Amendment carried; new clause inserted.

Clause 5—"Grants to prescribed organisations."

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

In subclause (1) to strike out "such terms and conditions as he sees fit to grant" and insert "terms and conditions as nearly as possible the same as the terms and conditions provided for in section 4 of this Act, advance by way of loan".

This is a consequential amendment.

Amendment carried.

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

In subclause (2) to strike out "amounts granted" and insert "loans advanced".

This is a consequential amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 6—"Appropriation."

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

To strike out "grant" and insert "advance".

This, too, is a consequential amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Title.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN moved:

To strike out "grant of money" and insert "loan"; and to strike out "grant or grants, of money" and insert "loan or loans".

Amendments carried; title as amended passed.

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

That this Bill be now read a third time.

The House divided on the third reading:

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

Noes (18)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Becker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick (teller), Evans, Goldsworthy, Mathwin, McAnaney, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

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

Majority of 5 for the Ayes.

Third reading thus carried.

Bill passed.

WHEAT DELIVERY QUOTAS ACT AMENDMENT BILL (COMMITTEE)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 27. Page 2619.)

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): I support the Bill on the basis that the second reading explanation of the Minister representing the Minister of Agriculture in another place is intended to conform to the Bill. I found, when studying the Minister's second reading explanation (and I draw his attention to this), that it did not conform to the Bill as it left the other House. In fact, however, the second reading explanation is in line with the explanation given by the Minister in another place, and apparently the explanation of the Minister in this Chamber should have been amended before he gave it. The point I make is that the Minister's second reading explanation states:

... a chairman appointed by the Governor on the nomination of the appropriate farmers' organisation (the United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia Incorporated) and two persons appointed by the Governor.

I believe the explanation should read as follows:

two nominations from the United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia Incorporated, one to be the Chairman and one other to be appointed by the Governor.

If that is correct, and I believe it is from my understanding of the situation—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: There was a revised version of the second reading explanation.

Mr. VENNING: The original version is apparently printed in *Hansard*. I just draw the Minister's attention to that. I support a reduction in the number of members on the Wheat Delivery Quotas Advisory Committee. The view has been expressed in country areas that it is perhaps unnecessary to alter the legislation because a quota year has to be proclaimed by the Minister in any case. If a year is not proclaimed a quota year the quota committee is not active. Some people were of the opinion that the larger committee, consisting of delegates representing each area of the State, could have carried on as a watchdog, examining the industry in all areas. I believe that, with the wheat and grain situation as it is today, quotas will not be required for some time and that to reduce the size of the committee from 11 members plus a secretary and a typist to a holding committee of three is good policy.

I understand that the purpose of the holding committee will be to adjust records when land transactions take place. It is rather significant that last season, although quotas

were proclaimed, one did not have to be a licensed grower to deliver grain to the bulk handling authority all one had to do was apply for a number for the purpose of the computer and one was then allowed to deliver grain. During this past season, about 57 000 bushels has been delivered to the authority in South Australia by people not in possession of a quota. What happens in Australia regarding the growing of grain is of fairly minor importance when compared to the other main exporting countries, namely, the United States of America and Canada. Good crops in those countries can bring on quotas fairly rapidly in Australia? Notwithstanding that situation, I believe a new formula will be necessary to set up quotas in the State, if and when the need arises, but the present holding committee will have to attend only to the machinery of recording land transactions so that the records are up to date.

I read with much interest the debate in another place and the various amendments that were put forward there. The Bill, as it left the Upper House and was introduced in this place, is in order. The committee is to consist of three members, two of whom will be appointed by the recognised authority (United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia Incorporated), one to be the Chairman, and the other to be appointed by the Governor. I believe the committee will be able to handle the situation. I, along with other members and growers, am interested to know what time the committee expects to spend on its new duties. The previous committee set up to handle quotas did not have an easy task, to perform; there were many problems. Quotas are based on production of grain in South Australia, and the same situation applies in other States. The grain quota set for South Australia has never been realised, so it does seem, looking back on the situation, that nature plays an important part in the production of grain and in every other aspect of rural industry.

The Minister must proclaim a year to be a quota year, although I believe we will not have quotas for some time. However, when we have large carry-overs of grain the Minister will proclaim a quota year. In the meantime production will be free and open to all growers who desire to produce grain. Whilst that situation is welcomed by many primary producers, there are problems associated with additional costs, such as those incurred when the superphosphate bounty was removed. However, I support the Bill in its entirety and recommend that other members do so.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I join with my colleague in supporting the Bill, the principal part of which deals with the Wheat Delivery Quotas Advisory Committee. That committee did an important job for South Australia in what was a trying time for the industry. It became a closed industry and we saw much heartburn among people who had to alter their way of life. I hope that the wheatgrowing industry in the next decade will settle down and that we will see continue the stability that is now being experienced on the rural scene. This is one industry that is paying its way and, indeed, making a profitable contribution to the State.

The effect of this measure is that the committee will be reduced from 11 members to three members. I suggest that we must keep an eye on this legislation because, if over-production occurs, we will have to look at its effects. Scattered across the State there are people who own their own properties. In my area, I pay a tribute to the work done by Mr. E. G. Buckley of Bordertown, who is a devoted wheatgrower not only interested in producing wheat but equally interested in administration and the welfare of his

fellow wheatgrowers; I pay a tribute to him and his colleagues for the great work they have done on the Wheat Delivery Quotas Advisory Committee. They are now able to wait in the wings and to use their experience again if wheat quotas are necessary.

Recently much has been said in this House about Monarto. Many people who have had to leave that area have come to the Districts of Mallee and Victoria but have not been able to transfer their wheat quotas, so they have found themselves in some difficulty in resuming their livelihood. However, the happy sequel is that they have now been given a reprieve, being able to establish themselves in their new areas in an industry with which they are familiar. I know that this matter has been referred to by my colleagues in another place. I am pleased that these wheatgrowers have had this opportunity. I support the Bill.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I believe this Bill is long overdue. I have been interested to know for some time why it has been necessary for the Wheat Delivery Quotas Advisory Committee to continue with its current membership. I have wondered what its members have done to employ themselves gainfully. I am pleased to see that the Minister of Agriculture has reduced the size of the committee, which I sincerely hope will not be necessary in future.

Mr. Nankivell: What will three members do, anyway?

Mr. GUNN: That will be interesting, too. I hope that in future it will be unnecessary for the committee to have any function, as I hope it will be unnecessary to reintroduce wheat quotas. However, because of the attitude of the current Commonwealth Government towards marketing, anything could happen, so it may be necessary for the quotas to be reintroduced. We have already seen the disgraceful spectacle of the Australian Minister for Agriculture bowing to the pressure of left-wing and Communist unions and preventing the sale of 40 000 000 bushels of wheat. That is a scandalous state of affairs that could have the effect of making it necessary for this committee to sit again to reimpose wheat quotas. Every market should be exploited. However, we have seen unions on the waterfront dictating the policy of this country.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must come back to the Bill.

Mr. GUNN: I have said enough to indicate where members on this side stand with regard to the attitude of the Commonwealth Labor Government. I hope it will not be necessary to reintroduce quotas. Members should consider what I have said about the attitude of the Commonwealth Government.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

STATUTE LAW REVISION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 19. Page 2453.)

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): The Opposition supports the Bill, which is designed to put into effect the work of the Commissioner of Statute Revision (Mr. Ludovici). Members on this side compliment him on the work he has carried out at this stage. We sincerely hope that he will be able, by December 31, 1975, to bring about the consolidation of the Statutes. Everyone who has cause to work with the Statutes will appreciate the work he has done, and we look forward to the completion of his task. We have pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Mallee): I am delighted to have the privilege of addressing myself to the first grievance debate in this Parliament. It may well be because I have been crusading for so long for some sanity in the sittings of this House. We may believe we are impressing people by sitting late into the night and legislating by exhaustion, but I am certain that people outside wonder why we are paid so much to behave so stupidly. I have some reservations, however, regarding the powers to be granted under the amended Standing Orders, because they provide that an unscrupulous Minister at some future date may guillotine important legislation or gag debates on controversial matters. In this respect, I must say that I believe the press has been substantially behind these amendments, and I hope the press will act responsibly now that they have been introduced so that, in the event of such a situation developing, the press will do what I think is its proper function and draw the attention of the public to such procedures.

I have a grievance, but that is not it. That was by way of introduction. My grievance goes back to February 20, when I introduced into this House a petition, signed by 324 residents of the Riverland district, in relation to damage caused by a freak cyclonic storm in the area of New Residence. The petition was drawn up at a meeting convened by the Mayor of Loxton and attended by some 90 people. At that meeting, about \$900 was contributed by those present, and ultimately the Riverland areas contributed about \$3 700 towards a disaster fund.

On February 25, I received a reply from the Treasurer to a question I asked on this matter. He pointed out, first, that some assistance had been given by the Community Welfare Department to five families, which had been given \$100 each, but he said that no response had been received to the department's offer of assistance beyond that initial payment. My inquiry showed that the people concerned did not know that they were obliged to make any request for further assistance. My specific reason for asking the question at the time was that there is no provision to help people in an uninsurable position when they are faced with a catastrophe that is an act of God and completely beyond their control. It is no good saying to those people that they can use the provisions of the Primary Producers Assistance Act, because there are many reasons why an application for assistance under that Act may not prove effective.

Mr. Venning: It may not apply.

Mr. NANKIVELL: As the member for Rocky River has said, it may well not apply, particularly in view of the need to establish viability. I do not know whether I have lost my capacity to impress people, but I must say that the people in my district have been impressed by the Government's almost instantaneous reaction to the representations of the member for Alexandra on behalf of Kangaroo Island people. I understand from him that some arrangement has been made not only to consider providing these people with concessional transport for their stock and concessional freight for fodder to be moved in, as well as other forms of assistance applied previously in drought disasters, but that serious consideration has been given to providing Government guarantees for overdrafts of the people concerned at their private trading banks. I believe this is something which, until now, has been denied the

people in my district, those for whom I made the original appeal.

No such offer has been made to them to meet the continuing problems confronting them at a time when their future is unknown. It is not only unknown to those who were previously in serious financial difficulty but it is also unknown to those who were in a reasonably satisfactory financial position before the disaster struck them. I ask the Government again seriously to consider the proposal I put before it in the question I asked, following the introduction of the petition, for a disaster fund from which either direct disbursements or supplementary disbursements could be made to augment funds collected locally at properly constituted appeals, such as those sponsored by local government.

In this instance, there was a properly constituted appeal, and it was subscribed to generously by people in the community. They saw what happened in Darwin and how generous the Government and other people were when disaster struck there, and they were well aware of what happened following the bush fires on Kangaroo Island, so they want to know why they cannot get the same kind of consideration, help and assistance from the Government as has been offered to these other people. I ask the Government to consider this problem and to take advice from an in-depth survey undertaken by one of the Premier's officers on the precise and actual position of those persons involved in the calamity. Fifteen families are involved, and the original estimated loss sustained was \$250 000, which is a substantial loss to be sustained by people who were about to reap their harvest for the year. They are faced now with a situation in which they have no on-going finance and in which they may have no prospects of obtaining any finance unless they can get assistance. They have no income, and they have properties they cannot leave or sell. There is an area here where at Government level we have some community responsibility to provide for disasters of this type in cases where people who are unable to insure against disasters are struck by such a calamity that their livelihood is in jeopardy or is taken from them. Everyone has a right to a livelihood, and we must consider the needs of these or other people in such a situation. I hope the Government will urgently consider the grievance I have raised.

Mrs. BYRNE (Tea Tree Gully): My grievance relates to noise pollution. When I was first elected to Parliament I did not receive many complaints about this problem, but in recent years the number has increased significantly. The public has become more aware of the problem, perhaps in the past five years, and campaigns have been conducted against pollution. The main targets have been unclean air and dirty water, probably because those are visual pollution problems and easier to tackle. In Australia in recent years, the main change in the environment of cities has probably been the decline of quietness. Of course, there was noise 25 years ago or 100 years ago, but that type of noise was different. In those days noise included that made by the shunting of steam locomotives and by trams clanging down the street. The city streets were noisy, and there was noise from the docks and from the factories. Because these industries were distant from residential areas, however, there were not many complaints. However, in recent years people who have retreated from the more noisy areas to the quieter residential suburbs are being disturbed by increasing noise in these residential suburbs, despite the existence of zoning regulations.

Some of the complaints I have received are as follows: noise from service stations that are open at night; the noise

of dogs barking and roosters crowing (I suppose all members have received such complaints); noise made by neighbours; noise made by air-conditioning plants; noise from suburban milk depots; noise emanating from electronic amplification at halls, clubs, hotels and private homes; and noise emitted by mini bikes and trail bikes.

I intend to refer mainly to the problem involving noise from mini bikes and trail bikes and the noise emanating from electronic amplification. I have received complaints about these matters, and other honourable members have probably received similar complaints from their constituents. Excessive noise generated through electronic amplification should be overcome by legislation in conjunction with the monitoring of sound levels, but the control of noise from mini bikes and trail bikes is not so simple. Of course, we cannot accurately predict that the noises to which I have referred will end here, because I am certain that more rowdy machines and other innovations will be introduced. We must accept that there are many young people in our community who wish to use these machines. In many cases, mini bikes and trail bikes have already been purchased and, if young people were prevented from using their machines, hardship would result. Therefore, we must face the fact that people should be allowed to ride mini bikes and trail bikes, because they enjoy doing so.

Another problem caused by the riders of these motor bikes involves the illegal trespass by them on State Government land. These motor bike riders ride on vacant land owned by the Housing Trust, the Highways Department, the Education Department and the State Planning Authority. The local council has told me that it has received complaints about mini bikes being ridden on council footpaths, council reserves and vacant allotments. The council has been so concerned about this problem that last year it sent a letter to the Minister of Local Government, part of which states:

' During the past year there has been a marked increase in complaints from residents about the nuisance caused by the riding of the types of motor cycles known as trail bikes and mini bikes on footpaths, reserves, and vacant allotments within the city. Most of these types of motor cycle are unregistered and uninsured and the riders are usually under the age to hold a driver's licence. Children as young as five years of age have been seen riding mini bikes along the footpath areas—

I will not name the areas—

and up to 50 trail and mini bikes have been seen in the council reserve adjacent to the ford. Complaints from residents of the Vista area have also been received about the damage being done by trail bike riders in the proposed regional park in the Hills Face Zone adjacent to Perseverence Road, Vista. As most of the bikes are unregistered and they are very quick to move away when a council or police vehicle appears, it is almost impossible to catch the riders. Apart from the nuisance caused to residents by the noise and dust, there is the ever-present hazard of some innocent by-stander being seriously injured by one of the machines and, as they carry no insurance, he would have very little hope of receiving compensation.

Part of this problem can be solved by the Government and councils allocating certain areas for the use of the biking fraternity, thereby stopping the current illegal use of land. Nevertheless, land has to be found remote from residential areas for this purpose, and this, too, is difficult.

I should also like to see some land allocated for beach buggies. Last year it was heartening to see an information sheet from the South Australian Environment and Conservation Department indicating that the department recognised noise as being a major environmental and social problem. The information sheet listed matters that were of legitimate public concern, including high-

revving motor cycles, go-carts, speed boats, heavy quarry trucks, captive model aircraft, some buses and heavy trucks, ordinary cars with inadequate exhaust muffling, hotted-up cars with special exhausts to make more noise, any aircraft, but especially supersonic jets, motor mowers, air-conditioners in houses and institutions, discotheque amplifications, public address systems used in outdoor sports events, some shop advertising, transistors carried in public, and barking dogs.

It is recognised that, apart from the Environment and Conservation Department, several Government departments, including the Public Health Department and the Transport Department, are involved, and legislation is currently being drafted and is expected to be introduced during this session. Such legislation is difficult to draft because, after agreement on standards is reached, the more difficult task of producing effective noise controlling regulations must be faced.

Noise is the only form of pollution that leaves no residue. Certainly, what annoys one person does not necessarily annoy another person. Additionally, once an Act dealing with this problem comes into force, more inspectors will have to be appointed, and there will also be the difficulty of policing the Act. The aim of the legislation should be to protect people where health and amenity are being unreasonably affected, without creating unreasonable hardship for anyone else. For the reasons I have advanced, I believe that the community is looking forward to action by the Government in this matter, and I trust that the relevant legislation will be introduced as soon as possible.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): I am pleased to see that the member for Tea Tree Gully has supported the plea I made in this House only two weeks ago concerning the need for urgent legislation to control noise levels in the community. The noise problem is one of the major problems facing people in residential areas. Despite this, I am amused, because the Government itself must now be prepared to come under the control of this legislation. In the post today I received a letter from someone complaining about excessive noise heard in his house between 10 p.m. and 6 a.m. from the air-conditioning plant on the roof of the new building of the Government Printer. I understand that this plant causes excessive noise in the surrounding residential area.

Mr. Payne: Is that in your district?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: If a person writes to me, I am more than willing to take up any cause. I am pleased to see the member for Tea Tree Gully support this claim for legislation to control noise levels. I only hope that the Government has the guts to come out and fulfil its continual promises. It promised this legislation last year. Such legislation was recommended in the Jordan report in 1972. The recommendation was given top billing before the current session of Parliament commenced, yet we still see no legislation.

I should now say how pleasant it is to be able to speak in this debate. As members know, I moved earlier in this session for such an adjournment debate to be adopted but, unfortunately, the Government has removed other rights of members to air grievances. I said that I would oppose such moves, and I and other members have opposed them. It is interesting to note that Government back-benchers did not object to the stifling of comment from Opposition back-benchers. My main grievance is about the public examinations system, as applying to fifth-year secondary students. Today, I asked the Minister of Education a question about present policy and he said that his policy was the same as

it was in 1973. On February 22, 1973, in reply to a question the Minister said:

South Australia will still retain a five-year Matriculation. However, the general tendency in Australia is for external examinations to be reduced to a minimum, and in the long term they may possibly disappear.

This afternoon, before being silenced (gagged is probably the appropriate word) by the Minister of Transport, who was following the habit of his colleague the Minister of Education, I was about to quote from a newspaper report of January 24, 1974. It is the report of a speech made by the Minister of Education about the Matriculation examination. In that article the Minister makes clear that he has a policy to abolish public examinations. He speaks about first using school assessments to select the first 75 per cent to 80 per cent of students for tertiary institutions, and then using some assessment of an intelligence test to select the remaining students. As it does not refer to public examinations, that system suggests that the Minister intends to abolish public examinations for Matriculation. I put that to him this afternoon in Question Time, and he did not deny it. I believe the policy of completely abolishing public examinations is wrong. I will give my policy on this matter later, being one who has an alternative to the Government's policy. Initially, a school assessment will introduce tremendous personal bias when the student is assessed. The Minister knows that the assessment will be subjective rather than objective, and that there could be a personality conflict between the teacher and the student that will be reflected in the assessment. Many parents have complained to me about such a conflict. Recently I had an interesting morning's discussion with a group of intelligent women with children at school concerning the major problem they had in relation to their children's education. Everyone put forward a specific case in which there was a conflict between the child and the teacher. I have great faith in teachers and I know they do the best they can, but there must be introduced a personal bias in the assessment of students. Secondly, such a system will establish elitist schools in our system. The average I.Q. of students at the Norwood High School is above that of students at other high schools in the metropolitan area, a statement that I think will be agreed with by the Minister, as he has already admitted this situation in the House.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I haven't!

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Students from such a school will be much sought after, and institutions of tertiary education will look for students from a particular school. Also, some schools may give a false assessment to try to lift the standard of the school. Thirdly, the system of pure assessment of the work of students is unsuitable for tertiary institutions, and I think the Minister knows the views of the University of Adelaide, and I am a member of its council. In the newspaper article, the Minister said that the first 75 per cent or 80 per cent could be selected from a school assessment, and I agree. However, he then stated that 20 per cent to 25 per cent could be based on an intelligence test. Research by the Australian Council for Educational Research suggests that such tests are not suitable to select students for tertiary institutions, and are not as good as the present public examinations system. Finally, a school assessment that only partly suits employers is certainly not acceptable. Many employers have assured me that, whilst they accept partly a school assessment system, they would like to retain the public examinations

system. The policy that I suggest to the Minister (and I hope he will adopt it) is a rational one. I know the Minister cannot see any rationale in other areas, such as Monarto, but I hope that he can see it in my suggestion. It would be a system in which, at the end of Matriculation there would be a school assessment based on the school work with, in addition, a result produced from a public examination. The student needs both: a school assessment with a finite result and a public examination with a finite result. I plead with the Minister to adopt the school assessment system as quickly as possible and allow a flexibility of curriculum, but also to retain the public examinations system, which is a vital part of the process of selecting a student. Employers of this State would be sad to lose the public examinations at Matriculation level.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): Several members who have spoken in this debate seem pleased to do so, but, all I can say is that I would far rather not have the chance for this debate and not have lost other privileges and rights we had to free speech in this place. This is a very poor substitute for what we have lost. The fact is that the Government and the Liberal Party between them (and on this I am sure they are united) now have the chance to squeeze out the member for Goyder and me from speaking in this place, certainly in second reading debates and in the grievance debate. If we are not willing to accept the Whip of the Liberal or Labor Party, we will not then be put on any list, and our only chance to speak in second reading debates will be at the end of the debate. All that the Government has to do is impose the guillotine, and there will be no chance whatever left for the member for Goyder or me to take part in what are very significant, if not the most significant, debates in this place. I was elected as a member of Parliament with the right of free speech in this place.

Mr. Chapman: You were elected as a member of the Liberal Party.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: At the time of the most recent election the team to which the member and I belonged was called the Liberal and Country League. Why, Mr Speaker, you may ask (and you have asked me) do we not accept the Whip of the Liberal Party, and make your lot easier by working through him? The fact is that we are not members of the Liberal Party. We believe we are entitled to be recognised as a Party in this place but, whether we are or not, we are not members of the Liberal Party and, therefore, we are not beholden to the Liberal Party any more than we are beholden to the Labor Party, and we are not going to put ourselves in the power of the Labor Party or the Liberal Party to decide the order of speaking. One can imagine what will happen in a significant debate if we are to accept the Whip of either Party. The chances of our speaking anywhere but among the also rans will be nil, and we are not going to put up with that situation. What we have seen happen in this place today is the beginning of the end of free speech here. From now on the Government at its whim has the chance—

The SPEAKER: Order! The question before the House is "That the House do now adjourn."

Motion carried.

At 10.2 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, March 5, at 2 p.m.