

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, February 10, 1976

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

PETITION: SUCCESSION DUTIES

Dr. TONKIN presented a petition signed by 201 residents of South Australia praying that the House support the abolition of succession duties on that part of an estate passing to a widow.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

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

MANNINGHAM RESIDENCE

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. What was the full extent and cost of repairs and cleaning required by the Housing Trust residence at 3 Rosslyn Avenue, Manningham, following the eviction on or about November 2, 1975, of tenants who had occupied the residence since about March, 1975?

2. Is the residence now tenanted and, if not, what plans does the trust have for it?

3. What action is the Government taking to ensure there is no repetition of the situation that developed in Rosslyn Avenue between March and November last year as a result of the tenancy of this residence?

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

1. The cost of repairs was not high. It would be extremely difficult to assess the cost of damage as distinct from costs arising from normal wear and tear. However, an estimate of the former places it between \$200 and \$300.

2. Yes.

3. The house has been re-let to an Aboriginal who holds a responsible position, and the trust does not expect a repetition of previous problems.

SHACKS

Mr. BOUNDY (on notice):

1. What classifications are being made of coastal and riverside shacks and why?

2. When will details be known of the classification of all shacks on land under the control of the Lands Department?

3. When will classification of shacks under the care and control of councils be completed and owners notified?

4. Has a decision been made as to the term of miscellaneous leases intended for coastal and riverside shacks and, if so, when will such decision be made public?

5. Has consideration been given to the special needs of permanent residents in these areas and, if not, why not?

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

1. Shack sites (not shack buildings) on waterfront Crown lands are being classified into "acceptable areas" and "non-acceptable areas". The purpose of the classification is to distinguish between those sites where the granting of permission for further building work will be considered and those sites where further building work will not be allowed.

2. The majority of shack sites controlled directly by the Lands Department has been classified and licensees have been advised. Those sites which have not yet been classified require further investigation by inspection on the ground and/or aerial photography prior to classification. This work will be carried out as expeditiously as staff resources will permit.

3. The majority of shack sites under local government control has been classified and the relevant councils will be advised of the classification within a few weeks. Those sites which have not yet been classified require further investigation by inspection of the ground and/or aerial photography. This work will be carried out as expeditiously as staff resources will permit.

4. Yes, shortly.

5. Permanent residents in shacks have received no special consideration as shacks were never intended for permanent residence.

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. What is the policy of the Government in relation to non-acceptable shack site areas?

2. How long does the Government intend to give shack owners before they will have to remove their shacks?

3. Does the Government intend changing the type of leases that are available for shack sites?

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

1. In non-acceptable shack site areas on waterfront Crown lands and reserves, no new sites are being let and no further building work is permitted other than normal maintenance of existing buildings and any work specifically directed by the health authorities. Any such work is subject to local government approval under the Building Act, being obtained where this is applicable. In areas outside local government boundaries, the approval of the Minister of Lands must be obtained before the work is commenced. Solid construction is not permitted. However, shacks damaged by the elements, including flood and fire, may be repaired, reconstructed or replaced subject to Cabinet consideration. In those shack areas (whether acceptable areas or non-acceptable areas) where annual licences are issued directly by the Lands Department to shack owners, the licences are to be replaced by miscellaneous leases, but this will not apply in local government controlled shack areas.

2. Current Government policy is that existing shacks are allowed to remain.

3. Yes. Miscellaneous leases will be issued in lieu of annual licenses.

SAVINGS BANK

Mr. WOTTON (on notice):

1. Why was Mr. G. H. P. Jeffery replaced as Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Savings Bank of S.A.?

2. Was Mr. Jeffery willing to continue in the capacity of Chairman of the Board of Trustees?

3. Is the appointment of the Chairman a Government appointment and, if so, how long has this been the case?

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

1. Mr. Jeffery was not replaced. The term for which he was appointed expired.

2. The question was not asked.

3. Yes. The chairmanship was by election by the trustees until 1971, when the Savings Bank Act was amended to provide for appointments by the Governor.

TRAIL BIKES

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Is it intended to introduce legislation to control the riding of trail bikes and, if so, when and upon what principles will such legislation be based?

2. If legislation is not to be introduced, why not?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes, in the coming Budget sitting. The Environment Department issued a report on "Off-Road Recreation Vehicles (SADEC 3)" at the end of October, 1975. This report was widely circulated to allow for public comment on the proposals it contained for control of such vehicles. It was originally requested that all comments be submitted before December 31, 1975. At the request of interested persons, that date was extended to January 31, 1976. Trail bikes form one component of off-road vehicles, and the principles on which legislation could be based to control them and other off-road recreation vehicles are being developed in the light of that report and the public comments received. A copy of the report was lodged in the Parliamentary Library for the information of members.

2. See 1.

LAW REFORM COMMITTEE

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Does the Government accept any of the recommendations contained in the thirty-second report of the Law Reform Committee, and, if so—

- (a) which does it accept and why; and
- (b) which does it not accept and why?

2. What action, if any, is to be taken to implement recommendations in the report, and when?

3. When was this report received?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The replies are as follows:

1. The Government at this stage has not accepted nor rejected any of the recommendations contained in the thirty-second report of the Law Reform Committee. The Government has referred those recommendations to a departmental committee to consider the practicality of the proposals made in the report and the mechanics of their implementation. As part of this review the departmental committee is also considering other aspects of this matter. This has been necessary because the thirty-second report of the Law Reform Committee is not in itself a code for action in this area. This fact was recognised by the committee in the last paragraph on page 8 of the report where the committee reported:

This general approach to the topic gives rise, however, to certain practical problems; we comment on these later in this report. Subject to these comments we would recommend that should the Government take action it should do so on the lines sketched broadly above; but we would reiterate that we are not psychologists, psychiatrists or criminologists and have no opportunity to consult such people. We can only make very tentative recommendations in the absence of this information and evidence.

The Government has not previously taken action on this matter as it was awaiting the recommendations of the Criminal Law and Penal Methods Reform Committee.

2. See 1 above.

3. November 12, 1973.

OVERSEA VISITS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Is the Premier to make a trip abroad in the near future and, if so—

- (a) when;
- (b) where is he going;
- (c) for what purpose;
- (d) is he to be accompanied and, if so, by whom and why;
- (e) what duties will each person accompanying him carry out;
- (f) is the Government paying any of the expenses of this trip and, if so, which expenses; and

(g) what is the total estimated cost to the Government, and what benefit, if any, is expected to accrue to South Australia, as a result of the trip?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:

(a) April, 1, 1976.

(b) Malaysia, Iraq, Libya, Algeria, Austria, United Kingdom, Yugoslavia, Poland, U.S.S.R. (Russia and Siberia), and Japan.

(c) In Malaysia the visit is at the request of the late Prime Minister to further South Australia's involvement in northern regional development. In Iraq, Libya and Algeria for discussions on development of dry-land farming consultancies and the sales of South Australian expertise and equipment. In Yugoslavia and Austria for examination of worker-management relations in mixed governmental and private undertakings. In England to visit the Agent-General's office, which is part of the Premier's Department, and to carry out discussions at the request of the Agent-General and to have discussions with the Tavistock Institute on the progress of industrial democracy programmes. In Poland to further proposals on a joint fishing enterprise. In U.S.S.R. to discuss barter deals for sale of meat, and the development of trade with Russia's east coast. In Japan to pay a brief visit to the South Australian agency in Tokyo.

(d) (1) Yes.

(2) W. L. C. Davies, Director General for Trade and Development; J. N. Holland, Chief Administrative Officer; R. Dempsey, Executive Assistant; S. R. Wright, Personal Secretary; K. Crease, Press Secretary.

(In the Malaysian section the Permanent Head, Premier's Department, Mr. R. D. Blakewell and Ms. A. Koh will be present in lieu of Holland, Dempsey and Crease.)

(3) To perform duties appropriate to above titles. As appropriate various officers will accompany me to discussions and will have separate discussions with officials. In addition, the Chief Administrative Officer will be responsible for arrangements relating to the itinerary and monetary aspects and the liaison necessary for the continuing work of the Premier's Department, the Executive Assistant will do research work, the Personal Secretary will act in that capacity and, as might be expected, the Press Secretary will be responsible for arrangements with the press in the countries concerned and Australia.

(e) See above.

(f) Yes. Official expenses.

(g) Probably about \$45 000. Inflation in various countries makes estimating difficult. The benefit to South Australia is in the on-going negotiation of increasing trade with Arab countries (Iraq is already one of South Australia's largest customers), the experience of the Premier and officers overseas relevant to current implementation of policy, and the pursuit of business matters set out in (c) above.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Is the Leader of the Opposition to make a trip abroad in the near future at Government expense and if so—

- (a) when;
- (b) where is he going;
- (c) for what purpose;
- (d) is the Government paying for any persons accompanying him and, if so, who are they and why; and
- (e) what is the total estimated cost to the Government, and what benefits, if any, is expected to accrue to South Australia as a result of the trip?

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

1. April 5, 1976.
2. Greece, Italy, West Germany, Austria, France, United Kingdom, United States of America, New Zealand.
3. The Government makes an overseas trip available to the Leader of the Opposition and his wife and one member of staff once in each Parliament.
4. Mrs. Tonkin and his Press Secretary.
5. Duties allocated by the Leader.
6. Yes. Official expenses.
7. About \$20 000: inflation in western countries makes estimating difficult. The general benefit of the State having a better informed Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Are any Ministers planning to make trips abroad in the near future, and if so—

- (a) which ones;
- (b) when;
- (c) for what purpose; and
- (d) at what cost to the Government?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Apart from the Premier, the Minister of Mines and Energy will go overseas from mid-June to the end of July for discussions with Governments and companies on energy problems and developments, and an investigation of planning arrangements in European countries prior to a revision of the Planning and Development Act in this State. The cost to the Government will be normal Ministerial travel costs. The Minister of Labour and Industry will go overseas from April 15 to June 6 to discuss with representatives of Governments, national employer associations and national trade union associations, job security, redundancy, trade union rights, co-determination and the relationship of Governments with trade unions. It is expected that the cost will be about \$19 000.

SUPPLY

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Does the Government intend to seek Supply during the present sittings of Parliament and, if so, when?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government does not intend to seek Supply during the present sittings of Parliament.

MOANA LAND

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): What work is being done either by or for Government departments on the land immediately north of Robertson Road, Moana, and why?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Sewer mains are being constructed in a new private subdivision.

CHRISTIE DOWNS HOUSES

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What type of dwellings are being erected by the Housing Trust in Flaxmill Road, Christie Downs, and why?
2. Are such dwellings for purchase and, if so, at what price?
3. Are such dwellings for rental and, if so, at what weekly rental?
4. Is each dwelling being erected on a separate block of land and, if so, what is the average size of the blocks?

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

1. The Housing Trust has erected many types of dwelling in Flaxmill Road, Christie Downs, but it is assumed here that the honourable member is referring

to the dwellings being constructed as a home park. The dwellings are framed construction and have been substantially pre-made.

2. The units are not for sale.
3. The units are for rental, and rents payable will be determined at the completion of the project, but will be comparable with other trust rents for similar accommodation.
4. Each dwelling has an area of private indoor and outdoor space. These two spaces are placed in a communal garden setting, and there are no allotments as such. Similar home parks are proving a useful and successful form of medium-density housing.

Since medium-density housing depends so much on planting and various forms of landscaping, such areas frequently look rather gaunt when under construction.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. For how long is it expected that the present sittings of the House will last?
2. When is it expected that Parliament will meet again thereafter?

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

1. Present indications are that the present sittings of the House will conclude on February 19, 1976.
2. Present indications are that Parliament will resume on June 8, 1976, and adjourn on June 10.

LAND TAX

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. How many rural properties will pay State land tax this financial year, and what is the expected return to the Government from rural land tax?
2. How many non-rural properties pay land tax, and what is the amount collected from these properties?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: At this stage accurate information is not available in respect of primary production land within the metropolitan planning area. Therefore, the answers to the questions relate only to land outside that area. Land tax statistics relate to taxpayers and not to individual properties, and a lengthy analysis would be necessary in order to extract the number of properties from the records. Subject to these qualifications, the answers are: (1) about 4 000 taxpayers who will pay an estimated \$1 050 000; (2) about 260 000 taxpayers who will pay about \$17 000 000.

In reply to Mr. CHAPMAN (February 5):

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: At a joint delegation of the United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia and the Stockowners Association of S.A. held on January 22, 1976, the Treasurer advised that the Government was prepared to consider remissions of land tax to primary producers in cases of hardship and that applications should be made to the State Taxes Department. Determination of hardship and the degree of remission which it may justify will require a close examination of an applicant's financial position. The Rural Industries Assistance Branch of the Lands Department has considerable experience in this kind of assessment. The Treasurer proposes that the branch assist the Commissioner of Land Tax with these applications and arrangements have been made accordingly. Primary producers who consider that payment of the present financial year's land tax account would result in hardship should apply to the Commissioner of Land Tax for relief, enclosing relevant information to support their claim.

FLINDERS HIGHWAY

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. When is it expected that work will again commence on the Flinders Highway?

2. How much will be spent on this project?

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

1. July, 1976.

2. The total estimated cost of the Talia-Streaky Bay project is \$2 750 000.

RAILWAY BRIDGES

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. During the 12 months immediately prior to the transfer of the South Australian Railways, on what dates were the railway bridges between Broken Hill and Crystal Brook inspected by staff of the railways, which officers made the inspections, what bridges were inspected, and what reports and/or recommendations were made on the structural safety of these bridges?

2. What action, if any, was taken following the receipt of these reports and on what dates was this action taken?

3. Which specific bridges have had additional supports or reinforcements, what is the nature of this additional work, on what dates was it done, and for what reasons were these supports and/or reinforcements necessary?

4. When was the most recent report on the safety of these bridges made to the South Australian Minister of Transport, what were the recommendations of this report, and when was it made?

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

1. Following receipt of the bridge inspector's report of his inspection of bridges in November, 1973, the Assistant Chief Engineer inspected the bridges between Hillgrange and Mannahill in August, 1974. This inspection concerned reports of transverse cracking of bridge decks, water seepage and rust stains.

2. It was thought that the grouting of stressing bars was not complete and so Monier grouting section of Concrete Industries Limited was approached to investigate and report on this defect. Monier conducted on-site investigations in November, 1974, and trial grouting and tests on site in February, 1975. The report that followed indicated that all stressing bars were correctly grouted, rust stains resulted from construction oversight when grouting was not cleaned off steel before painting, and seepage through transverse cracks was not serious and may be arrested by cleaning out and extending the blocked weep holes. This work was carried out by the works foreman's forces (bridge gang), completing same in September, 1975. Work included painting of bridge girders. During the 1975 year, reports, mainly from the bridge gang working on the bridges, sometimes from the district foreman, were submitted on scour in creek beds at the inverts of bridges. Scour protection work was then carried out at these locations using stone and concrete by the bridge gang.

During August, 1975, a further complete inspection was carried out by the bridge inspector and reported upon in October, 1975. In November, 1975, the bridge inspector inspected all bridges between Port Pirie and Broken Hill, reporting on any scour which occurred at the inverts following the preceding heavy rains. On receipt of this report work was put in hand to place stone, bound with concrete, at the reported locations.

3. A follow-up investigation related to scour was conducted by an engineer under the direction of the Designing

Engineer. This resulted in work being carried out at two bridges on the Rocky River near Gladstone which still had water covering inverts. The procedure here was to drop sand bags filled with cement and sand into the suspect scour holes around piers. The only bridge which has had additional supports or reinforcement is the bridge at Winnininnie. Two piers of this bridge were scoured as a result of heavy rain on December 12, 1975. The deck has been supported by four sleeper stays which show no significant movement. At present the bridge gang is concentrating on filling in scour holes adjacent to piers and placing stone bound with concrete in bridge inverts between Yunta and Cockburn. The gang of three men at present is equipped with a three-ton truck and Massey Ferguson front-end loader and back hoe.

4. The most recent general report to the Minister of Transport regarding bridges on the Peterborough Division was made in August, 1974. Unsafe conditions were not observed at that time, and the Chief Engineer stated in his final paragraph that work would be done as and when necessary to ensure the safety of the bridges. There have been numerous reports forwarded to the Minister and the State Transport Authority concerning the collapse of the bridge at Crystal Brook and the concrete poured by Mr. T. Egan under his contract with the South Australian Railways; however, the report of the Chief Engineer dated August 19, 1974, is the most recent general report prepared.

COPES REPORT

Mr. VANDEPEER (on notice):

1. What was the total cost of the Copes report?

2. How many copies of the report were printed?

3. Will there be a further report?

4. Is Professor Copes still in the employ of the South Australian Government?

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

1. Unknown at present, as accounts for printing of the report have not been rendered.

2. The number is 300.

3. See 4 below.

4. No. However, Professor Copes has been invited to return to South Australia to conduct a more detailed study of the rock lobster industry and pending the outcome of that study, a further report may be issued.

GOVERNMENT NURSERY

Mr. GUNN (on notice): Is it a fact that the Public Buildings Department has imported a landscape gardener to advise on setting up a new Government nursery?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No.

EAST END MARKET

Mr. GUNN (on notice): Has the Government fully accepted the recommendations of the East End Market Relocation Committee report and, if so, does it intend to implement the recommendations in accordance with the time scale laid down on pages 38 and 39 of that report?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As the honourable member has already been advised by letter, a final decision has not yet been made, and it is therefore impractical at present to indicate a time table.

MEAT CORPORATION

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. Who are the members of the committee set up to investigate the operations of the South Australian Meat Corporation?

2. When will the committee report to the Government?
3. Will the report be tabled in Parliament?

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

1. The investigation will be undertaken by a firm of consultants; P. A. Consulting Services Proprietary Limited.
2. June 30, 1976.
3. Yes.

MILK AUTHORITY

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. Does the Government intend to set up a State Milk Authority for South Australia?
2. Has it accepted the recommendations made by Mr. B. D. Hannaford in his report to the Minister of Agriculture in 1975?

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

1. No decision has yet been made on this matter.
2. *Vide* 1. above.

PAIRS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Is it the policy of the Government to offer pairs in divisions on votes of no-confidence?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Is it the policy of the Government to offer pairs in divisions other than those on motions of no-confidence and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes.

GOVERNMENT APPOINTMENTS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. To how many Government or semi-government bodies has Mr. E. H. Crimes been appointed since the last State general election, and what are they?
 2. Why has he been appointed to them?
- The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:
1. Three. Motor Fuel Licensing Board (member); Second-hand Vehicle Dealers Licensing Board (member); and the Savings Bank of South Australia (trustee).
 2. Because he can contribute ability and experience.

LIBERAL MOVEMENT

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Is it still intended to answer my letter of July 30, 1975, concerning assistance for Parliamentary members of the Liberal Movement and recognition of the Liberal Movement as a separate Party and, if so, when?
2. If not, why not?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In the letter dated July 30, 1975, the member for Mitcham requested that additional staff and "appropriate" office space be provided for use by the Liberal Movement in the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council, and it was pointed out that this would entail recognition of the Liberal Movement as a separate Party. The Government has decided not to accede to these requests.

MEMBERS' STAFF

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Have requests for staff to assist Parliamentary members yet been considered, and, if so:
 - (a) when; and
 - (b) with what result?
 2. If not, when is this consideration likely to be given?
- The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. (a) Last month; (b) arrangements are proceeding for the appointment of two graduate officers to the Parliamentary Library.

Following investigations and recommendations to the Government, it is not intended to appoint additional stenographers, but it is intended to supply dictating machines for the use of members.

INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Has a new head of the Unit for Industrial Democracy yet been appointed and, if so, who has been appointed?
2. If not, when is an appointment to be made?

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

1. No.
2. Hopefully, soon.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Has consultation on worker participation in the Housing Trust yet been completed and, if so:
 - (a) when; and
 - (b) with what result?
2. If not, when is it expected to be completed?

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

1. No.
2. Within a few weeks.

LAND SETTLEMENT COMMITTEE

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. When was a reference last made to the Land Settlement Committee?
2. Are any references at present being considered by it and, if so, how many?
3. Is it intended to refer any matter to it in the near future and, if so, when?

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

1. Although the present functions of the committee are limited as regards undeveloped lands, applications under the Rural Advances Guarantee Act are required to be considered by the committee, and in this respect the committee last received an application on February 5, 1976.
2. No.
3. There are two Rural Advances Guarantee Act applications that will be referred to the committee shortly. It is intended that within the next six months a proposal for a new drain within the South-Eastern drainage area will be referred to the committee. It is envisaged that the new drain will improve drainage conditions in the area, with a resultant improvement in production.

MONARTO

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Was a submission made late last year by the Government to the Commonwealth Government for funds for Monarto and, if so:
 - (a) what was the submission; and
 - (b) has a reply been received and to what effect?
2. If no reply has been received, what action is it intended to take and when?

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

1. (a) Yes; on November 3, 1975. The submission sought support of the Australian Government for a five-year programme for Monarto based on a first stage population target of 4 000 by 1980 and 15 000 by 1985.
- (b) No reply has been received.
2. I am endeavouring to arrange a meeting with Senator Greenwood.

HOUSING TRUST

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Does the Government intend to introduce legislation to amend section 7 of the South Australian Housing Trust Act and, if so, when and what amendment is proposed.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: No.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. When do the appointments of the present members of the Housing Trust expire?

2. Is it intended to reappoint any of the present members and, if so, which ones and for what term?

3. If it is not intended to reappoint any of the present members, why not?

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

1. The terms of Messrs. M. L. Liberman, H. Stretton, R. M. Glastonbury and J. H. McConnell expire on February, 17, 1976, while the terms of Messrs. P. B. Wells and C. D. J. Pugh and Mrs. W. A. Etherington expire on January 4, 1977.

2 and 3. In view of the proposed worker participation arrangements, the membership of the board is under review.

INCOME TAX

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What is the policy of the Government on the proposals by the present Commonwealth Government concerning income tax sharing?

2. Is it intended to suggest to the Commonwealth any alterations to its proposals and, if so, what alterations?

3. Is it expected that legislation by this Parliament will be necessary to put these proposals into operation and, if so, to what effect and when will it be introduced?

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

1. The policy of the South Australian Government is:

- (a) to recognise that the Commonwealth Government is able to introduce its proposals by legislation without the agreement of the States;
- (b) to accept the unavoidable situation of the Commonwealth Government being determined to implement its proposals;
- (c) to make such submissions as appear appropriate in order to protect first the overall positions of in six States; secondly, to protect the more vulnerable positions of the less populous States; and thirdly, to protect the particular position of South Australia.

As to (c), the Prime Minister has given certain assurances already about equalisation grants for the less populous States and about special grants to make good South Australia's lesser capacity to raise revenues by way of an income tax surcharge.

2. The Government intends to seek clarification of those parts of the proposals which have not yet been spelled out in sufficient detail. If it is considered appropriate in order to protect South Australia's interest, the Government will suggest alterations.

3. As stated under 1 above, State legislation will not be necessary for the introduction of the proposed new scheme. However, State legislation would be necessary to authorise any surcharge or rebate in aid of (or out of) State revenues. It is not possible to say when this right will be available to the States and, at this stage, it is not possible to say when the South Australian Government would wish to use such a right.

ABALONE

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Has there been a relief abalone divers scheme and, if so, how does it operate?

2. Is it still in operation and, if not—

- (a) why not;
- (b) when did it cease; and
- (c) will the Government consider allowing it to operate again, and when?

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

1. Yes. Regulation 35(1) of the managed fisheries regulations provides that:

"Where the Director is satisfied, by production of a medical certificate, that a permit holder is ill or incapacitated, he may authorise a person nominated by the permit holder to take abalone during the period of the permit holders illness or incapacity."

During the 1974-75 and 1975-76 seasons, members of the Abalone Divers Association were permitted to engage a relief diver for two hours a day for training purposes to establish a core of experienced relief divers.

2. Yes.

- (a) not applicable.
- (b) not applicable.
- (c) not applicable.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Is an economic survey into the abalone industry being made and, if so:

- (a) by whom;
- (b) has it yet begun;
- (c) when did it begin; and
- (d) has it been completed and, if not, when is it expected that it will be completed?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The reply is as follows: Yes.

- (a) The Fisheries Division of the Commonwealth Department of Primary Industry and the Fisheries Branch of the South Australian Department of Agriculture and Fisheries.
- (b) Yes.
- (c) 1974.
- (d) No. It is expected that a final report will be presented to the Minister of Fisheries within two months.

ASSURANCE PREMIUMS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Are deductions for life assurance premiums made from salaries of employees of the State Government?

2. Are such deductions made for all life assurance companies which request them and, if not, why not?

3. For what companies are such deductions made, and why?

4. Will the Government allow deductions to be made for other companies and, if so, when and if not, why not?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows: 1. Yes.

2. Deductions are not made for all life assurance companies. To extend approval to all companies would add to the complexities of paysheets resulting in additional work loadings in pay sections.

3. Deductions are made for the following companies:

- Aetna Life of Australia and New Zealand Limited.
- Australasian Temperance and General Mutual Life Assurance Society Limited.
- Australian Mutual Provident Society.
- A.P.A. Life Assurance Limited.
- City Mutual Life Assurance Society Limited.

Colonial Mutual Life Assurance Society Limited.
 Commonwealth General Assurance Corporation Limited.
 Equitable Life and General Insurance Company Limited.
 The Mercantile Mutual Life Insurance Company Limited.
 Mutual Life and Citizens Assurance Company Limited.
 The National Mutual Life Association of Australasia Limited.
 Phoenix Life Assurance Company of Australia Limited.
 Prudential Assurance Company Limited.
 South British United Life Assurance Company Limited.

It is considered that the above companies provide a reasonable degree of choice and provide an adequate range of cover for Government employees.

4. The list may be extended if a company is able to establish that it can offer benefits not available from those already listed. It may be possible to accept more companies at some future date when computerisation of salaries is operative on a larger scale.

PREMIERS' CONFERENCE

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Is the Government satisfied with the financial arrangements made between the States and the Commonwealth at the Premiers' Conference in Canberra last week and, if so, why and if not, why not?

2. What effect will these arrangements have on South Australia?

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

1. The South Australian Government is not satisfied with the financial arrangements proposed by the Commonwealth Government to the States last week, primarily because there is, as yet, no assurance that the total of funds to be available for distribution between the States in future years will be as great as would have been available under a continuation of the present formula. There is a distinct risk that, if in future less emphasis is to be placed on income tax and more emphasis on other forms of tax, the States' position could be eroded.

2. Until further conferences at Ministerial and Treasury officer level have been held and some parts of the proposals have been clarified, it will not be possible to say with confidence what effect the proposed arrangements will have on South Australia.

STATE'S FINANCES

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): What is now expected to be the financial position of the Government by June 30, 1976, on Revenue Account and Loan Account, respectively?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Supplementary Estimates will be presented to the House on Wednesday, February 11, 1976, and the explanation accompanying the Estimates will give information about the possible end of year position on Revenue and Loan Accounts.

INSTITUTIONS

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. How many residential care workers are employed at Brookway Park, McNally, and Vaughan House?

2. What are their qualifications, experience and salary ranges?

3. Are any unqualified residential care workers employed at any of the above and, if so, why?

4. Are the recommendations of the 1974 Residential Care Training Scheme being applied and, if not, why not?

5. How many acting senior residential care workers are employed in the above three institutions, why are they employed, and what are their ages and experience?

6. What is the amount of pocket money each inmate receives, is it expected that there will be an increase in the amount and, if so, what amount will be received?

7. What is the future of Windana, has a feasibility study been made on the cost of upgrading the premises, what is the estimated cost, and when will the refurbishing commence?

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

1. Brookway Park..... 44
 McNally..... 71
 Vaughan House..... 31

2. Qualifications:

24 have completed the child care certificate.

10 have completed the 1973 in-service residential care training course.

3 have completed the group work or residential care certificate of the South Australian Institute of Technology.

7 have completed a Bachelor of Arts or other tertiary qualification.

83 have undertaken at least part of the centre based residential care training programme.

7 are undertaking the Associate Diploma in Technology (Social Studies) at the South Australian Institute of Technology.

6 are undertaking tertiary studies other than the above.

The remainder are either full-time night staff or have applied for enrolment in this year's training courses.

Experience:

Under 1 year..... 56
 1 year to 3 years..... 35
 Over 3 years..... 55

Salary Range: \$6 476 to \$8 964 with a barrier at \$7 420 depending on qualification.

3. See 2 above.

4. The Residential Care Training Scheme was introduced in 1973. It was revised in 1975 and it is still being conducted by the department.

5. Pending appeals against nominations 3
 Pending advertising of vacancies..... 3
 Pending appointments..... 2
 Vice an officer on long service leave 1
 Vice an officer temporarily performing other duties..... 1

Total.....10

Ages: 23 years, 24 years, 26 years (2), 29 years, 30 years, 35 years, 36 years, 38 years, 47 years.

Experience: 1 year (2), 1½ years (2), 2 years (1), 2½ years (1), 3 years (3), 10 years (1).

6. Aged 10 years to 11 years inclusive . . \$0.75 aweek

Aged 12 years to 14 years inclusive . . \$1.50 aweek

Aged 15 years to 18 years inclusive . . \$2.00 aweek

There are no present proposals to increase the above rates.

7. Following detailed investigations, proposals for the future use of Windana as a welfare facility are being considered but no firm decisions have yet been made.

CHRISTIE DOWNS RAILWAY

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What materials and equipment have been ordered and received for the electrification of the Christie Downs railway line?

2. Where is the equipment stockpiled?

3. Cannot some of the equipment now be installed, thereby creating job opportunities on this project?

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

1. Steel work for the supporting structures for the overhead contact wire and catenaries. All signalling materials other than screened communication and signal cables, and modulated track circuits necessary for use with 25kV A.C. electric traction.

2. Islington workshops.

3. Part of the final signalling equipment has been used in the extension and duplication of the line between Brighton and Christie Downs. This does not include the final screened cables and track circuit equipment. The remainder of the signalling equipment for use between Brighton and Adelaide will be installed during financial year 1976-77, subject to availability of funds. Before any steel work can be erected, it is necessary to finalise a survey of the line in order that final levels be accurately obtained; also, the steel work requires fabrication. In addition, under the electrification proposal, it was intended that the maximum track speed be 70 m.p.h. This requires alterations to the permanent way.

CAMDEN PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What is the reason for the delay in the resiting of the Camden Primary School?

2. If the project and site works are not commenced this financial year, when is it expected they will commence and be completed?

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

1. The delay in the replacement of the Camden Primary School has been brought about by the financial restrictions imposed in the capital works programme for 1976-77. This has been as a result of lesser funding by the Australian Government and increased building costs.

2. It is expected that stage I of the Camden Primary School replacement will begin not later than July, 1976. The estimated completion date will be early in the new school year 1977.

GLENELG NORTH BEACH

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What has been the outcome of discussions between the West Beach Trust and the Coast Protection Board in relation to permitting the beach at Glenelg North adjacent to the treatment works to be used for race horse training?

2. What are the hours the beach can be used for this purpose?

3. If arrangements have not been finalised, why not?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The replies are as follows:

1. The present position on exercising horses remains unchanged. West Beach Trust is not enforcing the by-law that prohibits the exercising of horses on the beach under its control.

2. The hours permitting horses on to this beach are determined by the trust, taking into account the season. However, as a general rule, all horses must be off this beach by 9 a.m.

3. The alternative beach for exercising horses, at North Glenelg, is yet to be widened by sand replenishment. There has been a delay in commencing this work principally because of the difficulty of procuring sand from an acceptable source. This problem now seems to have been resolved and a contract to replenish this beach will be called soon.

HOLIDAY LAND

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Has the Companies Office received any complaints regarding the management and operations of Holiday Land at Port Lincoln?

2. What is the nature of the complaints, and is the Companies Office undertaking any investigations?

3. If investigations are not being made, why not?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

2. Complaints received by the Companies Office have been that purchasers of cabins on the holiday land site have not received the financial returns promised them in the company's advertisements.

3. See 2 above.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. How many workmen's compensation claims were lodged in South Australia during 1974-75 and how does this compare with the number lodged in each of the preceding five years?

2. What was the total value of the payments made for workmen's compensation claims within South Australia during 1974-75, and how does this compare with the number lodged in each of the preceding five years?

3. What was the average payment for each workmen's compensation claim within South Australia during 1974-75, and how does this compare with the number lodged in each of the preceding five years?

4. What are the details concerning the nature and location of injury caused by industrial accidents within South Australia during 1970-71 and 1974-75?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The replies are as follows: The information that the honourable member has requested is normally available in the Industrial Accidents Bulletin produced by the Australian Bureau of Statistics each year. However, to date no bulletin has been released for 1974-75 because of difficulties being experienced in collection of the data concerned. Wherever possible I have given figures estimated by my department in each of the replies given below. The figures for earlier years have been revised from those released previously.

1.	1969-70	58 300
	1970-71	56 600
	1971-72	61 300
	1972-73	75 000
	1973-74	87 000
	1974-75	84 000
		\$
2.	1969-70	6 800 000
	1970-71	7 700 000
	1971-72	10 600 000
	1972-73	15 400 000
	1973-74	21 300 000
	1974-75	36 200 000
		\$
3.	1969-70	117
	1970-71	136
	1971-72	173
	1972-73	205
	1973-74	245
	1974-75	431

4. These are not yet available for 1974-75. Details of the nature and location of injury caused by industrial accidents within South Australia during 1970-71 are set out in tables 6 and 7 of the *Industrial Accident Bulletin* of that year.

NO-CONFIDENCE MOTION: SAVINGS BANK

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move the following motion without notice:

That, in view of the circumstances surrounding the Government's appointment of certain people to the Board of Trustees of the Savings Bank of South Australia, this House no longer have confidence in the Premier and Government of this State, and call on them forthwith to resign.

The SPEAKER: Is the motion seconded?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes.
Motion carried.

Dr. TONKIN: I move:

That, in view of the circumstances surrounding the Government's appointment of certain people to the Board of Trustees of the Savings Bank of South Australia, this House no longer have confidence in the Premier and Government of this State, and call on them forthwith to resign.

I thank the House for its indulgence. Once again, within a week of the opening of this short sitting of the first session of the Forty-second Parliament, the Opposition finds it necessary to ventilate certain matters of urgent public importance, and to call for the resignation of the Premier and the Government of this State. Once again, this action is not taken lightly but the matters that have come to light following the appointment of Mr. R. D. Bakewell (Director of the Premier's Department) as Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Savings Bank of South Australia, and of Mr. E. H. Crimes, the former Labor member for Spence, as a trustee, are so serious that no lesser motion will suffice.

These appointments were announced by the Premier on December 18, 1975, and were immediately followed by expressions of public concern and the bringing forward of information to the Opposition. We hold that the appointments were most improper, and should never have been made. The Savings Bank of South Australia has been in operation since March 11, 1848, and has moved from humble beginnings to become one of the State's largest financial institutions. The basis for this growth has been confidence; confidence instilled in the people of South Australia by the fine record of the bank that in turn has been due to the independence and financial expertise of the trustees. The 1973 annual report of the bank states:

From its inception the bank has been particularly well served by its trustees. There is probably no institution in South Australia with which more of the State's most prominent men have been actively associated. Representing many walks of life they have brought to the bank's problems a diversity of thought which has been reflected in their balanced judgment through the years.

Throughout its history the Savings Bank of South Australia has been outside political influence and free from vested financial interests. The confidence which the people of South Australia have in their bank is exemplified by the support which they give to it. There are over 1 000 000 depositors' accounts with the Savings Bank, and assets as at June 30, 1975, were about \$750 000 000, a fine tribute to the trustees and officers of the bank, and an example of its high standing.

The appointments of Messrs. Bakewell and Crimes have now been revealed as part of a general overall scheme designed to bring the funds of the Savings Bank under the control of the Government, and possibly to pave the way for a future merchant banking venture. These appointments are significant steps in the scheme outlined in a secret report to the Government by Sir John Marks and Sir Walter Scott, a report which has never been made

public. The report points the way for the Government to gain control of the \$750 000 000 deposited by South Australians in the Savings Bank of South Australia and to achieve the amalgamation of the Savings Bank, the State Bank and the State Industries Assistance Corporation into a form of South Australian banking corporation.

The stakes for the Premier are high. Should he gain control of the previously independent Savings Bank, he will be able to control and channel the bank's funds to his own pet projects. Money could be directed into projects which, although furthering the ambitions of the Dunstan Government, would not in any way be termed in the best interests of depositors by the members of an independent Board of Trustees. Indeed, previous boards would probably not for a moment even have considered them.

The high standing of and the necessary confidence in the bank which has been engendered over the years are being threatened by the Premier's scheme for the amalgamation of the State Bank and the Savings Bank that has now been revealed. Let us first consider the immediate aspect: were the appointments right and proper. That of Mr. E. H. Crimes, the former member for Spence, is obviously a simple case of "jobs for the boys" but, in the light of the further information available, the appointment takes on far more sinister overtones. The Premier says it is only a temporary appointment until he is able to impose his particular plans for worker participation on the bank. But it remains that Mr. Crimes is a former Labor member of Parliament who was often outspoken in Parliament, has been outspoken as Editor of the Labor Party *Herald* and is a prolific writer of letters to the Editor of the daily press. In all these spheres he has constantly espoused the socialist cause and has promoted the Australian Labor Party policy of nationalisation. He has a fine record of total adherence to Caucus rulings while in Parliament, and may be said to have toed the Party line well. Is there any reason to suppose that he will not now continue to support the Party line? Has he resigned from the Australian Labor Party? Can he be impartial? Can he be relied upon when a decision between the welfare of the depositors and an advantage to the Labor Government is in the balance? Obviously there can be only one reply to these questions, and that is, "No".

Certainly, experience and special skills in financial matters have not been considered in Mr. Crimes's appointment. It is not the fact that this appointment is a case of "jobs for the boys" which is in issue, but the underlying and far more sinister connotations that apply. It is an appalling appointment. It is totally against the best interests of the bank and is certainly not in the best interests of the many people who make up the bank. In short, it is a certain vote on the board for any policy the Premier chooses to promote. How can he then justify such an appointment? How can the Government possibly question or blame those depositors who have expressed their concern because of it? Concern is heightened and compounded by the appointment of a senior public servant, who is intimately connected with the Premier's Department, as Chairman of the Board of Trustees. Mr. R. D. Bakewell has been in the Public Service of South Australia for some 10 years, having been Director of the Premier's Department for the past five years, that is since its inception.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That's not true.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: That's like the rest of the drive.

Dr. TONKIN: I am grateful for the Premier's help. In his initial announcement, the Premier said that Mr. Bakewell would undertake to relinquish his position as permanent head of the Premier's Department on taking up his position as Chairman of the Savings Bank, and that he would work full-time with the responsibility for expanding and improving the banking services of the State. Perhaps the report was a little premature, for at present I understand Mr. Bakewell is reported as having said that it is not his intention to resign from his present position, or from the Public Service. If this is so, the position becomes even more untenable.

The appointment of a senior officer of the Premier's Department to what should be, and has been in the past, an independent Board of Trustees of the people's bank is reprehensible enough but, when that officer retains his senior position and therefore his close association with the political direction of the Government of the day, it is doubly so. Some credit should be given to Mr. Bakewell for not wishing to hide his intention to remain head of the Premier's Department. Certainly the Premier, in urging his resignation from the Public Service and in attempting to force Mr. Bakewell into a full-time position, is patently anxious to conceal as soon as possible the close association that Mr. Bakewell will still have with him.

Of course, there are further complications relating to Mr. Bakewell's appointment as Chairman of the Savings Bank trustees. He faces a real conflict of interest as a director of Austral-Asia Developments Proprietary Limited, a position which he shares with Mr. Max Liberman (the Premier's appointee to the Chairmanship of the Housing Trust) and Mr. R. Cavill (Chairman of the South Australian Industries Assistance Corporation). As has been outlined in this House previously, D.P.F. Limited, one of Sir John Marks's network of companies, has a 20 per cent interest in Austral-Asia Developments Proprietary Limited.

Direct conflict of interest between Mr. Bakewell's position as a Director of Austral-Asia Developments Proprietary Limited and his position as Chairman of the Savings Bank of South Australia could well arise. Funds could be requested and made available through the Savings Bank's proposed association with the State Bank, and this second major factor has caused the greater concern. The Savings Bank of South Australia, by its long established policy, until now has been divorced from direct Government activities, quite unlike the State Bank. The Savings Bank, at the request of the Government, has lent money to the Monarto Development Commission, the Housing Trust, and other semi-governmental instrumentalities.

The close association of Mr. Liberman and the Housing Trust, the Monarto Development Commission, the new Chairman of the Savings Bank of South Australia (Mr. Bakewell), and Austral-Asia Development Proprietary Limited, D.P.F., and Panelex, is far too wide-ranging and significant a combination to be passed over. The Opposition does not consider the appointments of Mr. Bakewell and Mr. Crimes to the Board of Trustees of the Savings Bank of South Australia as fit and proper, and the Premier must take the full responsibility for the situation.

However, the position in which the Premier has placed Mr. Bakewell is even more difficult when one considers that, by so doing, the Premier is advancing his plans for the conversion of the Savings Bank of South Australia, together with the State Bank and the Industries Assistance Corporation, into a combined banking group. This proposal has been planned for a considerable time, and gives a clear answer to the second question which inevitably arises: why has the Premier made these appointments? The answer is

now obvious—so that he may further the implementation of the master plan for the amalgamation of the two banks and the Industries Assistance Corporation, a project which has been drawn up and which has been hidden from the public for some time.

The Premier's overwhelming and longstanding desire to take control of the Savings Bank's funds came to a head when he induced Cabinet to approve an inquiry into the possibility of achieving an amalgamation of the two banks. On January 13, 1975, Cabinet approved his proposal to ask Sir John Marks, (the Chairman of D.F.C.) and Sir Walter Scott (or possibly his son, Dr. Brian Scott) of W. D. Scott & Company Limited to examine the operations of both the Savings Bank of South Australia and the State Bank and to recommend how they might be integrated. Obviously, the assets of the many small depositors of the Savings Bank of South Australia, amounting (as I have said before) to about \$750 000 000, when added to the unrestricted charter enjoyed by the State Bank, represent for the Premier an attractive and compulsive stimulus for him to achieve his long-standing ambition to take control of banking in South Australia.

Sir Walter Scott is a director of D.F.C. and, of course, of W. D. Scott & Company Limited, management consultants. Sir John Marks, whose wide business interests have been summarised in this House recently, is Chairman of D.F.C. He has successfully extended his influence from Sydney to South Australia by way of D.F.C., and thus through D.P.F. and Panelex and the West Lakes projects. He has also advised the Premier and the Government of South Australia on a number of matters. Indeed, he advised the Premier on a replacement for Mr. L. Barrett, a former trustee of the Savings Bank.

Mr. E. R. Howells, a former director of D.F.C., was appointed by the Premier to the board of the State Bank on September 1, 1973, while he was still resident in Sydney. He later became a trustee of the Savings Bank of South Australia on January 1, 1974. He retained close connections with the Marks organisation until he moved to Adelaide, and at that time he had severed those connections. As a comment in passing, one is obliged to say that residence in Sydney is apparently no bar to being appointed by the Dunstan Government to serve on its boards or trusts in South Australia.

It was not surprising, then, that Sir John Marks should be asked to prepare the report as commissioned by Cabinet on January 13, 1975. However, it is interesting to note that Cabinet approval was given without any prior reference to the existing trustees of the Savings Bank of South Australia. When informed, the Savings Bank trustees agreed to the inquiry going ahead, on condition that the terms of reference could be mutually agreed on and provided no action to implement the recommendations of the report was taken until it had been studied in detail.

The trustees, as always, very properly continued to put the interests of the depositors before all other considerations, in spite of the Government's attitude, and it has been suggested that it was as a result of this attitude that they were not consulted before the inquiry was instituted and before other matters of policy were decided upon by the Government. For instance, the decision to legislate for 50 per cent of the Savings Bank's profits to pass to the Government was taken by the Premier and the Government without any prior reference to the board. Even after the Marks report had been commissioned, its terms of reference were altered in the Premier's Department, without the knowledge of the Board of Trustees. The final terms

included the requirement to study the charters of both banks and to report on new or expanded areas of operations.

The Marks report was received by the Premier's Department and accepted as a first phase report by Cabinet on September 19, 1975, without informing the trustees. It proposed an expansion of banking facilities and suggested that a second phase report should be prepared and a co-ordination committee appointed. On October 2, 1975, the bank acknowledged receipt of the report and indicated its disappointment with the first phase. Several contradictions in the report were obvious to the trustees. There was a disagreement as to who was responsible for meeting the fee payable for the preparation of the report—about \$14 000—and eventually it was paid for by the Premier's Department. An estimate of the probable cost of the recommended second phase of the report was given as about \$45 000, and the report was again to be conducted by Marks and Scott.

In effect, the first report recommended an integration of savings bank, trading bank, and Industries Assistance Corporation activities, with funds being able to transfer freely between each section of the one organisation. The trading bank aspect would spring from the State Bank; the savings bank operation would continue; and the present State Industries Assistance Corporation would be grouped into the organisation and become the development wing of the operation. What was not mentioned in the report was that effectively the Government would have absolute control of the funds of the depositors of the Savings Bank of South Australia—the savings of the people of South Australia—through the board of the new organisation.

The recommendation for the progressive integration of the three organisations involved the following stages: first, the progressive appointment of the same people to the boards of the Savings Bank and the State Bank, so that, ultimately both boards would have a common membership; and secondly, the establishment of a new position for an executive officer who would rank above the General Managers of the State Bank and the Savings Bank; the present General Managers of those bodies would become General Managers of the trading and savings bank operations. At the same time the boards with their common membership would then merge and a new Chairman would be appointed to preside over the new banking structure.

Sir John Marks sent the report to the Premier, I understand, under his own hand and, as has been outlined, he regarded the report as an interim one. He stressed the importance of confidentiality if the amalgamation were to be achieved successfully, and it is obvious that the Premier has taken this advice and has gone to great pains to keep these far-reaching and important proposals secret and hidden from the general public and from this Parliament. The key recommendation, in relation to the present appointments, is that the Government should pursue the amalgamation of the two banks by initially appointing the same people to the boards of those banks, and Mr. Bakewell's appointment certainly takes on a far greater significance in the light of these disclosures.

If the Premier has been guilty of unwise and injudicious appointments in the circumstances originally outlined (that is, because of the conflict of interests and the extent of potential Government control over the bank's activities), it is obvious he has been guilty of the most blatant and devious manipulation in relation to the overall Marks-Dunstan plan. We must now examine just how far the

Premier has been able to proceed with his plan for the amalgamation of the two banks and the Industries Assistance Corporation. Certainly, until this time, he has given the general public no inkling of his intentions towards their Savings Bank, but the appointments themselves have already caused some speculation. There are five members of the board of the State Bank. The Chairman is Mr. G. F. Seaman, and the other members are Messrs. J. R. Dunsford, E. R. Howells, A. B. Thompson, and R. D. Bakewell.

There are six trustees of the Savings Bank of South Australia. Presently, these are the Chairman (Mr. R. D. Bakewell) and Messrs. E. H. Crimes, E. R. Howells, G. F. Seaman, L. A. Braddock, and G. H. Huntley (who was at the time of this appointment an executive of the Labor Party's advertising agency, Hansen Rubensohn-McCann Erickson). In 1972, none of the directors or trustees of one bank held positions on the board of the other bank. From 1973, appointments have been made that have now resulted in three people holding positions on the boards of both banks.

The extra position on the Board of Trustees of the Savings Bank of South Australia has now been filled by Mr. Ernest Crimes. It is obvious, therefore, that the master plan is well under way. Is it any wonder that people in the community are beginning to question the Premier's true motives? Mr. Paul McGuire, a former Australian Ambassador to Italy and a prominent citizen of South Australia, has stated in a letter to the *Advertiser*, "Mr. Dunstan's views (and Mr. Crimes's) are antipathetic to the principles and purposes of the founders of the bank and to the custom and practice which have earned it the confidence of the many thousands who have entrusted their savings to it." Mr. McGuire privately recalls the attempts that Mr. Chifley made to take over the banking system of this country as Prime Minister in 1949. It is this long-term implication that causes him grave concern about the present appointments. This concern is shared by many. As outlined previously in this House, the Premier is on record as saying that nationalisation can be achieved only on an individual State level.

The people have every right to show their concern. It is their money; it is their bank; and having entrusted nearly \$800 000 000 of their hard-earned savings to that bank they certainly will not stand for politicians who seek to use their money for Government ends. The Savings Bank of South Australia has been securely guarded from Government interference in the past. It is protected from interference from the Commonwealth Government by the Australian Constitution, and it has been protected from interference by the State Government by its own Act of Parliament.

However, as common appointments to the boards proceed according to the Marks plan, it seems there is nothing to stop money being lent by the Savings Bank to the State Bank which, with its unlimited charter, could then put these funds out into the trading bank area. The eventual amalgamation of the banks could result in a banking operation under the direct control of the Government, and could lead to funds being used on projects not in the best interests of the depositors.

Let us consider, then, the present Government's obsessional insistence on the progression of the Monarto project, against all reason and advice. Who is to develop Monarto? Will Mr. Liberman's Housing Trust be involved? What form of housing will be used? Will it be D.P.F.'s Panalex? Who will finance it? Will it be Mr. Bakewell's banks, directed by the Premier's Department? Why are the Premier and the Government so obviously and desperately determined to press on with Monarto? Just as

significant from the depositor's point of view is the Premier's attitude towards the proposed "Banking Corporation", moving to enter the merchant banking field, an action that is inherent in the Marks plan and covered in the Australian Labor Party platform.

Merchant banking operations would certainly add to the Premier's prestige overseas and may even provide a position for someone like Sir John Marks to head its operations, with Mr. Bakewell as its Chief Executive Officer. However, the ventures in which a merchant bank is involved are far removed from those indulged in by the Savings Bank of South Australia. The simple fact is that the people have entrusted their money to their bank, the Savings Bank of South Australia, because they have confidence in trustees of proven impartiality and independence. It is clear that the Premier and the Government have designs on the people's bank, and therefore on the people's money in the long term. Let the Premier prove otherwise.

The Liberal Party is totally opposed to the take-over and amalgamation of the banks, and is appalled at the secretive and underhand way in which the Government is seeking to bring this about. Let me emphasise that Savings Bank depositors may be quite certain that their money is safe at present. I venture to hope it will always be safe, but it is up to the Premier to demonstrate to them that their money will be free from Government control in the future. This is what it is all about, and this is what they want to know. They want security for their savings, and independence, and they are entitled to have it. The Liberal Party is pledged to preserve that security, and the independence of the Savings Bank of South Australia.

The Premier and the Government have been guilty, for the reasons outlined, of making grossly improper appointments against the best interests of the many depositors of the Savings Bank of South Australia and therefore of the people of this State. By their own actions, they have lost the confidence of the people, and I repeat my call on them to resign.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): The comic performances seem to be compounding. The Leader of the Opposition has attacked the Government on two appointments to the Savings Bank Board of Trustees. He has said these appointments are unusual and improper in themselves, and later he has said they are part of some dastardly plan secretly conceived by the Government. That is a fair summary of the Leader's tirade, so let me deal with these points one by one.

First, the Leader has referred to the appointment of the Director of the Premier's Department, an extremely highly respected public servant who is the envy of every other Premier in Australia, because he is acknowledged throughout Australia to be one of the most effective public servants this country has, a man of independence who is not committed to political view, a man who has carried out his duties as a public servant to the advantage of the Government and people of South Australia and to the Opposition in this State. He is a man on whose behalf I bitterly resent the disgraceful attacks that the Leader of the Opposition has made today on his probity and integrity.

The Leader does not care whom he smears in this place, and he will do it to a public servant whose right of reply, the Leader knows, is limited. The man is unable to defend himself in this place, and his position as a reliable and proper public servant of integrity has been

assailed by the Leader under privilege in this House as a man who will not do his public duty. That is a disgraceful imputation, and the Leader brings his own office into disgrace by making it here. The Leader has said that it is unusual to appoint senior public servants to the Board of Trustees of the Savings Bank. I remind him that Sir William Bishop was appointed by the Playford Government in 1946, and that Mr. McCann, who was the Prices Commissioner, directly under the Premier of this State, in the Premier's Department at the time, was appointed by Sir Thomas Playford in 1947. Mr. Jeffery was appointed by Sir Thomas Playford in 1963, and I appointed Mr. Gilbert Seaman to the board when he was already Chairman of the board of the State Bank. That was in 1973. He was then Under Treasurer of this State, directly under me as Treasurer.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: There was nothing said about that one.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, there was not. Mr. Seaman also is a man of great integrity and probity who has given outstanding service to this State. His appointment to the board while he was a member of the State Bank board also has been assailed by the Leader of the Opposition here this afternoon, without Mr. Seaman's having been mentioned by name. On Mr. Seaman's behalf, I also resent that imputation.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Mr. Seaman is still there.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, and he is doing a ruddy good job. The Leader then turned his attention to Mr. E. H. Crimes and said that his appointment was disgraceful. He said that the Labor Party had appointed a former member of this House, one wedded to its political philosophy, to the board of the Savings Bank. How extraordinary! How disgraceful! How against the independence of that bank from the views of the Government!

Apparently, the Leader has not researched the history of the Board of Trustees. Sir Shirley Jeffries, who had been Attorney-General under Butler-Playford Administrations from 1933 to 1944, was, on his defeat as member for Torrens, appointed by Sir Thomas Playford to the board of the Savings Bank of South Australia. Sir Shirley Jeffries had not only been a former Liberal member of the Parliament: he had been a senior Minister in the Government. I will deal soon with what Sir Thomas Playford did in relation to the Savings Bank.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Do you know whether Sir Shirley was a member of the Liberal Party?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, he certainly was. He resigned as a trustee of the Savings Bank to contest an election. He was re-elected to this House and, when he left the House, he was reappointed to the Savings Bank board. I do not know how the Leader can suggest that what the Government has done is unusual.

Let me turn my attention to what has been done about Savings Bank boards by Liberal Governments in Australia, because that is a matter of some interest. In our neighbouring State of Victoria appointments to that board include Mr. A. Hocking, the Chief President of the United Country Party; Mr. W. L. Moss, who was also Chief President of the Country Party; Sir J. M. Anderson, President of the Liberal Country Party of Victoria, appointed by Sir Henry Bolte; Mr. W. Kirkhope, Treasurer of the Victorian Branch of the Liberal Party, appointed by Sir Henry Bolte, and then appointed by him as Chairman of

the Savings Bank. He was not an independent public servant but the Treasurer of the Victorian Branch of the L.C.P. Some senior public servants were appointed; Sir Arthur Smithers, who was Director of Finance (which is the equivalent in Victoria of Under Treasurer) as a public servant was appointed by Sir Henry Bolte to be the Chairman of the Savings Bank Board in Victoria directly under the Treasurer and Premier of the State. Sir Ernest Coates, now Director of Finance in Victoria, the Under Treasurer and the architect of the plan for income tax sharing now under debate, was appointed by Sir Henry Bolte as a member of the Savings Bank Board in Victoria, and he still is a member of that board. Do I understand that the Leader of the Opposition will now assail the Liberal Government of Victoria for its interference with the independence of the bank board and its interference with the interests of depositors of that State?

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Or Sir Thomas Playford, for what he did?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Let me now refer to the actions of Sir Thomas Playford in relation to the Board of the Savings Bank, because the Leader of the Opposition has said that Sir Thomas Playford never interfered with the independence of the Savings Bank of South Australia. He has not read his history.

Mr. Wells: He wishes you hadn't, too.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Whoever wrote that brief and gave it to the Leader, did not tell him some of the essential background, and that is unfortunate for the Leader. The Savings Bank of South Australia became the property of the State of South Australia under Sir Thomas Playford.

Mr. Millhouse: In 1945.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, in 1945. Before then it was a private trustee bank incorporated by legislation, but in 1945 the trustees asked Sir Thomas Playford to take action to see to it that they were not subject to the special deposit account provisions of the 1945 Commonwealth Banking Act. An Act was passed through this House by Sir Thomas Playford, supported by the Liberal Country Party Government, nationalising the Savings Bank and making its assets assets of the State in right of the Crown in this State, and thereby making the Minister responsible for that Act (the Treasurer of the State) responsible to the public for the Savings Bank. That was a nationalisation of the bank, but it was not an action of the Labor Party: it was an action of the Liberal Party Government. However, a price was exacted.

In all the time I have been Treasurer of the State I have never made any direction under the terms of the Savings Bank Act as to the direction of investment by the Savings Bank: not a single one. Never did I ask or direct the trustees; under the terms of the Act, which apparently the Leader has not read, I could have done so, but I have not. Sir Thomas Playford, at the time he passed the nationalisation measure, exacted £8 000 000 at 1 per cent (less than the interest rate being paid to depositors) from the trustees of the Savings Bank in order to finance the Housing Trust. I have never done that. At no time have I given a single direction to the Board of Trustees of the Savings Bank on where their investments should go. The Under Treasurer has made his usual approaches to the Savings Bank for the support of semi-governmental loans, as he does to other financial institutions in South Australia.

I have discussed with the Chairman of the Savings Bank the amount that could be made available for home loans,

but that was merely a discussion: there was no direction from the Treasurer. The only specific request I have made to the Savings Bank trustees concerned an alteration in their procedures, and it was on a request by the Savings Bank Officers Association that similar provisions as those which existed in relation to the State Bank should be made for a classification and appeals tribunal. I will confess that in that case there was a certain amount of reluctance by the trustees, but they eventually agreed to what I had suggested, because I had suggested that it was a matter of simple industrial sense. The classification and appeals tribunal has been working excellently to the satisfaction of the board and of the officers of the bank. That is the only case. So much for the impropriety of these appointments or my interfering with the Savings Bank. I refer now to the sinister plot to which the Leader has referred.

Last year it was announced by the Government that it was having an investigation made into the use by the State Bank and Savings Bank of the constitutional charter they have to operate banking facilities in order to see whether there were any new initiatives that ought sensibly to be taken to improve banking services through those two banks. The terms of reference did not include amalgamation of the banks: that was not asked for. I published at the time the fact that appointments had been made to conduct the investigation. Before we had consulted the boards of the two banks we decided to hold the investigation but, before the terms of reference were agreed on, the Chairman of each bank discussed them with me. The inquiry then proceeded. We received a first-phase report, which I found unsatisfactory. It did not cover the terms of reference and, after consulting with the bank Chairmen I asked for further work to be done to complete the assignment that had been made.

Further material was sent to me, and that was discussed with the Chairmen of the two banks, who both pointed to several errors in the report, and some unsatisfactory features of it, in their view. I accepted their advice, and told Sir John Marks and Sir Walter Scott that we did not intend to proceed further. I certainly did not accept any of the recommendations contained in the measure. The Chairmen of the banks were able to point out to me several unsatisfactory features in the material that was provided to support some of the recommendations that were made. In no circumstances would I contemplate integrating the Industries Assistance Corporation with the two banks. I believed it was most inappropriate, and I did not see it as being a function of the two banks to enter into merchant banking operations.

In consequence, no further action is being taken in relation to those reports. The Government has said, "We do not want phase II, thank you very much." What will happen is that, if the bank boards recommend specific areas of investigation to improve their banking services, we shall undertake specific investigations. We will not have an overall investigation, because the recent investigation has not met what we aimed at in providing this material and in showing us how we could improve the banking operations of the two banks.

There is no question of secrecy about what happened. Why should I issue material that the Government has not accepted? There is absolutely nothing in the Leader's contention, but there is something much more sinister in what has happened here this afternoon, because what is happening is not just an attack on the people concerned (Messrs. Bakewell and Crimes) or the State Government: as well, the Leader is part of a deliberate conspiracy to damage the Savings Bank of South Australia. It is a

conspiracy we know about, because a prominent member of the Liberal Party, Sir Arthur Rymill (Chairman of the Bank of Adelaide), has informed banking officials in other States that there is a danger of the Government's expanding in South Australia the services of the Savings Bank and the State Bank to the people of the State.

There is a danger to the private banking system in that competition and, therefore, they must stop it. There has therefore been a deliberate campaign by the Liberal Party, deliberately organised, to try to harm the Savings Bank. Mr. Paul McGuire is part of it. When did he ever believe in State Government services for the people of South Australia? He is a gentleman who, in the whole of his history of political support in this State, has been known for his extreme conservatism and for his taking the part of the Franco regime at the time of the Spanish Civil War.

Mr. Paul McGuire is quoted with respect by the Leader. These are the people who have got together in order to further the interests of the private banking system to prevent an integrated service being given by the two banks concerned. We do not want an integration of the two banks: it is unnecessary. However, we want to see a full banking service given by the two banks. The Government has made that clear on many occasions. A series of moves was made by the private banking system to give a different kind of service from that available from the two separate Government banks in South Australia. The way in which the private banking system operated at one stage was to say, "Look, we will do all your wage sheets for you. All you need do is pay in the amount of your wages for a week, open savings bank accounts in our branch for all your workers, and we will do your wages checkout for you and simply pay the money into the savings bank accounts of your workers."

That service could not be given by separate banking organisations in South Australia. A series of investigations has been undertaken by the boards of the State Bank and the Savings Bank to see how to counter this competition. Make no mistake, the State Bank of South Australia and the Savings Bank of South Australia are properly cherished institutions of this State whose viability and propriety must be and will be maintained by this Government. We will do it in the face not only of fair competition from the private banking system but also from any of the lackeys used by that system to try in this place to smear improperly our State Bank and Savings Bank, as the Leader has seen fit to do this afternoon.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I support the motion and immediately give the lie to the Premier's statements that the Opposition is acting as the agent for the private banks in this State.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader has the floor.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Premier has not a shred of evidence, nor can he produce a shred of evidence to give any substance to that allegation. Many matters have been raised by the Leader this afternoon that have not been satisfactorily cleared up by the rantings of the Premier. He talks about a comic performance. When we talk about appointments to the highest public offices in this State, where hundreds of millions of dollars of taxpayers' money is invested, we are not talking about a comic performance: we are talking about serious matters. Last week we raised a matter which the Premier and his Government have swept under the carpet and into which

they have not seen fit to instigate an investigation into the wheeling and dealing of one of their recent appointees.

It is not a comic performance but a matter of grave importance to the people of this State. Mr. Bakewell (remaining as he does as Director, Premier's Department and under the Premier's wing) cannot independently perform his duties as Chairman. The Premier refers to the appointment of Mr. George Jeffery and Sir William Bishop. The Auditor-General in South Australia is in a somewhat different position from other officers of the Public Service. The Auditor-General is an officer of Parliament and enjoys an independence not enjoyed by other public servants. He can be dismissed only by a joint resolution of the two Houses. Let us not therefore draw false comparisons between a former Chairman and a recent Government appointee. Mr. Crimes has been defended by the Premier as being a suitable person for the position.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: And he is.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The excuse for his appointment late in life (and it will be remembered he was retired compulsorily by the Labor Party because of his age) is that he is to help usher in worker participation in the bank. Let me point out to the Government that the Savings Bank of South Australia Act precludes worker participation as foreseen by the Government. To make that abundantly clear, I will quote section 17 of the Act, which provides:

No person being a trustee of the bank, shall be allowed, save as is herein provided, to borrow money from, or to receive directly or indirectly, any salary, allowance, profit, or benefit (except the fees before mentioned) whatsoever from the funds of the bank, or to act in the capacity of secretary, solicitor, manager, valuator, or clerk of the bank: . . .

That means, in effect, that no officer of the bank can be appointed to the board, so Mr. Crimes has been appointed allegedly to bring about a change specifically prohibited by law. So much for the alleged reason for Mr. Crimes's appointment, which is for six years. The Premier can say that it is a short-term appointment, but an appointment by Statute must be for six years.

Far more serious matters have been raised by the Leader. For the Premier's information, I point out that Sir Thomas Playford was not mentioned in the Leader's speech, although the Premier attributed to the Leader in relation to Sir Thomas Playford some statements that were not made. I will pursue that argument to its logical conclusion. In stating that Sir Thomas Playford nationalised the Savings Bank, he was saying that that was done to ensure that the funds of that bank would not be channelled to the Commonwealth. In 1945 an amendment to the Act was made so that the Savings Bank would not come under the provisions of the Commonwealth Banking Act and so that there would not be statutory necessity for funds to be channelled to the Commonwealth.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: The Premier explained why it was done.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Premier sought to make a major point that Sir Thomas Playford was meddling with the Savings Bank for some Party-political purpose, when in fact what he was seeking to do was ensure that the funds of the Savings Bank remained within the State and that they could be disbursed by the trustees within the State. That was done in 1945 to escape some of the things that some of the Labor politicians in Canberra were seeking to do, and for no other purpose. The statement

that the State owns the bank is not a true statement. If ever the bank is wound up, any residual assets after the depositors are paid out will reside in the Crown. That puts a different complexion on the matter from that which was placed on it by the Premier. There has been grave disquiet in the community as a result of these two appointments.

Mr. Langley: How many have spoken to you? None have spoken to me.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Premier does not deny that a report was commissioned. Why have the terms of reference not been made public? Why has the report not been made public? The Premier has not sought to hide or deny that the trustees of the bank were not happy about the commissioning of the report. They were not consulted on the alteration to the terms of reference of the report. Nothing of that series of events has been refuted by the Premier. He says, in vague terms, "We have some intentions not for amalgamation but for integration." This is a serious matter. We know what Labor Party policy is. In relation to the Savings Bank of South Australia, the policy states:

Expansion of the State banking system to provide for the amalgamation of the State Bank and the Savings Bank of South Australia and placed under the control of a governor to be developed along the following lines.

- (a) A State-wide trading bank handling the ordinary business of the community.
- (b) A savings bank performing the ordinary functions of such a bank.
- (c) A hire-purchase department, providing finance for the purchase of farm implements, industrial equipment, motor cars, and domestic appliances at reasonable rates of interest. Interest to be payable only on balance of loan outstanding at the end of each month.
- (d) A credit foncier system for the purpose of providing advances to home builders and primary producers.
- (e) All public instrumentalities to bank with the State banking system.

It is amazing that the public knows nothing of this report. I challenge the Government to make this report public. If it is to lay to rest the justified fears of the public, let it make this report public and say what Cabinet has decided. It is all right for the Premier to hedge around this business of amalgamation, there it is in black and white, and it is in the Marks report to Cabinet. What does the Government propose to do? Does it intend to interfere with the operations of the Savings Bank? It is abundantly clear to us, from the Premier's reply, that it does.

Dr. Tonkin: It would certainly like to.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It certainly would: there it is in black and white. On very strong evidence, it seems that the Government is well on the way to achieving its ends. Is it not significant that the Marks recommendations are being implemented? Is this another one of these operations by stealth?

Dr. Tonkin: It could be a coincidence.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It's a great coincidence! It is all very well for the Premier to say that we are maligning public servants. We are not doing that: we are exposing Government policy and its implementation. We know that this is its socialist policy; it wants to amalgamate and control the banks. The Government knows the public will not accept this, so it does it by stealth. We know what happened to Federal colleagues of members opposite when they sought to implement socialist policies. The electorate gave a resounding answer to that on December 13. Let the Government come out in the open. Let us

have done with secret reports. If the Premier has the report and rejects it, let him say so. He should not hedge on this matter and say that there will not be amalgamation, but use another word that means the same thing. Many many doubts and questions of fact have been raised this afternoon by the Leader of the Opposition, but they have not been satisfactorily answered by the Premier.

We know that the Savings Bank does invest in semi-Government and Government enterprises. We know the Savings Bank, at the request of the Government, has made available \$1 200 000 for the Monarto Commission, but we also know the decision was made by the board of trustees in conjunction with other decisions of the board of trustees. We know that the board of trustees acts in the interests of the depositors. The money in the Savings Bank is the people's money.

The bank is the people's bank. The depositors and people of South Australia are perfectly satisfied with the current operations of the Savings Bank. Let the Premier have done with his fancy plans which were enunciated in the Labor Party policy and which I believe are being stealthily but surely being brought about. I have pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): For the second time within a week, we in the Liberal Movement are put in the position of having to make up our minds without any warning or notice of any kind.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: We didn't have any, either.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not suppose the Deputy Premier did, but it is rather easier for him to decide what to do when a motion of no confidence is moved than it is for my partner from Goyder and me. We have to make a decision having heard a speech by the Leader of the Opposition and a reply by the Premier. I have no regrets whatever about the attitude we took last week, when the Liberal Party launched an attack on the Government by besmirching, entirely unjustly and without foundation, I believe, an individual. My colleague and I, because of that, supported the Government in defeating the motion of no confidence that the Leader had so unwisely moved. I admit our support of the Government has been widely misinterpreted. It was given merely because we did not agree with the tactics of the Liberal Party. On reflection, I think we might have done better to abstain from voting. However, that is water under the bridge. I do not regret what we did; I believe we did the right thing, because I believe the Liberal Party did very badly indeed with that motion.

I come now to the present motion. I entirely disassociate myself from any possible criticism of Mr. Robert Bakewell; I agree completely with what the Premier said about him. I know Mr. Bakewell well. I have known him ever since he came back to South Australia in his present capacity, and in my opinion he is an outstanding public servant. He is, I believe, completely detached from any allegiance to any political Party. He is a most professional public servant who is there to serve whichever Party happens to be in office at any time. In fact, I look forward to the day when he serves a Government of which I am a member with just as much effectiveness and efficiency as he serves the present Government. I do not believe that the Liberal Party should have attacked Mr. Bakewell personally because of his appointment as a trustee of the Savings Bank of South Australia. I want to make that entirely clear. I do not support the Liberal Party in any criticism of Mr. Bakewell.

I come now to the other appointment that has apparently caused this motion to be moved, the appointment of Mr. Ernie Crimes as a trustee of the Savings Bank. Knowing Mr. Crimes as I have for nearly six years, I cannot see anything sinister in his appointment, sinister in any deeper sense of trying to socialise the Savings Bank of South Australia. Members who know him (I know him and like him very much) can surely not believe that Mr. Crimes has the capacity, apart from anything else, to have such a profound influence on the Savings Bank of South Australia. Let us be quite frank about this matter now that it has been raised. The facts relating to Mr. Crimes are that for him the last election was called too soon. Under the rules of his Party (which were not necessarily made to cover him) he had to retire at the election because he could not get Party endorsement owing to his age. If the election had been called next March, under the present Parliamentary Superannuation Act he would have been eligible for a pension. However, the election was held last July and Mr. Crimes did not get a Parliamentary pension.

I have no doubt that because of that the Government is doing its best to make up to him as best it can for the loss of that pension, and that type of thing is not new. I do not support it, but it is not new and, in fact, I had a Question on Notice today asking about the appointment of Mr. Crimes to various Government and semi-government bodies. He has not only been made a trustee of the Savings Bank of South Australia but he has also been made a member of the Motor Fuel Licensing Board and a member of the Secondhand Vehicle Dealers Licensing Board. It is perfectly obvious what the Government is doing: it is, in fact, a case of "jobs for the boys". Although I do not support that practice, it is not unexpected or surprising in all the circumstances. That is the position regarding Mr. Crimes, but I do not see the sinister political undercurrents that the Leader of the Opposition has tried to weave around this. However, standing behind this motion of no confidence in the Government is something that has made the community deeply uneasy, namely, the widespread belief in the community that the Government intends, if not to amalgamate the two institutions (the State Bank and the Savings Bank of South Australia), at least to integrate them as a State socialist banking enterprise.

The Labor Party went to the 1965 election on that avowed policy. That was one of the things that the late Frank Walsh put up in 1965 as the policy of his Government and, although it has never been admitted publicly (this has been admitted to me privately), following that election there was a significant run, of what proportions I do not know, on the Savings Bank of South Australia such that the Walsh Government abandoned the idea of amalgamating the two banks and having as its platform would dictate, and as its policy had proposed, one socialist banking organisation. However, I have no doubt at all, as the member for Kavel reminded us a while ago, that that thought is not far from the minds of members of the Labor Party, but that is up to them. If that is their belief, good luck to them, but I bitterly oppose such a proposal. If that is what they want to do, they are entitled to try to do it, but I will oppose it as strongly as I can because I do not believe that that would be in the best interests of this State.

Only last Saturday morning a constituent came to see me asking me whether he should remove his deposit from the Savings Bank because of the fear that he and others of his acquaintance have about the plans of the Government.

I told him that I believed that there was no danger to his savings but that, if he had any worry at all, or if his wife was worried about this, why not put the savings in a savings account with one of the trading banks, where admittedly it would earn a little less interest but so little less that it was not worth the worry of keeping it in the Savings Bank. I told him that in my view he was running no risk whatever in leaving his savings in the Savings Bank of South Australia.

There is a deep fear in the community at the moment about the plans of the Government regarding the two banking institutions. I think there are far more effective ways, if the Government went flat out to do this, to amalgamate the two institutions than simply to put the same people on the two boards. I think that practice is undesirable. I have already handed in to the Clerk at the table a question asking about the personnel of the trustees of the Savings Bank and the board of the State Bank. In fact, the Leader of the Opposition has this afternoon given the names of the persons who are on those two bodies. I asked my question because of the fear in the community.

What the Premier has said about the legal position of the Savings Bank of South Australia is perfectly correct. I had already got out the volume before he spoke. Whatever the reasons for it, the following is the amendment introduced in 1945 by Sir Thomas Playford as Premier of this State:

4a (1) Notwithstanding anything contained in this Act the bank shall hold all real and personal property whatsoever which is at any time vested in it for and on account of the Crown as representing the State of South Australia. There is no doubt about the legal position: by that amendment, the Savings Bank of South Australia became a Government bank. Not much was made of that, because the Savings Bank had always prided itself on its independence. Incidentally, it had boasted for many years that it was guaranteed by the State Government, but that was not true in the early days (it is now, but it was not when the boast was originally made). We know why that amendment was put in. As the Premier has said, it was put in to beat the 1945 Banking Act, and many of us were jolly glad a couple of months later, when the Chifley Government tried to nationalise all the banks, that it could not get at the Savings Bank of South Australia because it was a State bank. Let there, therefore, be no doubt whatever that in law the Premier is perfectly correct in what he says: the Government now has power to control the Savings Bank if it wants to use that power; that is nothing new, and the Leader of the Opposition is in error in stressing that matter in his speech. However, because there is an underlying fear in the community about the amalgamation of the banks, I believe that the motion is just justified, but I do not see in it the most unjust elements that were present in the—

Mr. Goldsworthy: Did you get a kick in the neck last week?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, but I do not see in the motion the most unjust personal attack we had on Mr. Liberman last week, and I do not regret for a moment repelling that attack by not supporting the Opposition (although our action in supporting the Government on that occasion has been misinterpreted). I do not on this occasion align myself at all with the attack that has been made on Mr. Bakewell as an individual or in his capacity as head of the Premier's Department. However, I believe that the appointment of Mr. Crimes, as a trustee of the Savings Bank, is reprehensible, but not for the reasons that the Leader has given. He has blown them up out

of all proportion for his own purposes, but standing behind them is a far greater principle, and that is why I believe that we are justified in supporting the Opposition, despite the clumsiness with which the motion has been moved. There is a fear in the community (I believe well-founded) of an attempt by the present Government to run the two institutions together and to make them, in effect (whether one uses the word "integration" or "amalgamation"), into one socialist banking undertaking. I oppose that and, for that reason, I support the motion.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Deputy Premier): I shall be brief, because there is really not much for me to reply to following the Premier's speech. The member for Mitcham has given a remarkable performance. I know that he said last week that he would take every opportunity he could take to kick the Government in the guts, but luckily it has a big guts and there is plenty to kick.

Mr. Millhouse: There's much to kick, I know.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member's speech today clearly demonstrated to me that he did not really support the motion in any way, because he knows that it does not have any substance. I believe that he, as a matter of judgment, believes that he cannot be seen, as the Leader of the Liberal Movement, to be supporting the Government for two weeks straight. I believe that that is it in a nutshell. I am disappointed to have to say that about the member for Mitcham, because I hold him and his integrity in high regard. However, I think that he is cheating a little in this matter. The only other matter I will raise is that he said that, only by the faintest of margins, could he support the motion. I point out that it calls on the Government to resign: it is a no-confidence motion. Although the honourable member would like that to happen, surely he must treat the matter more seriously than he has done today. The final matter I raise is the motive behind the motion. It must be clear to every member and to the public at large that it was not moved because Mr. Bakewell or Mr. Crimes had been appointed to the bank's board: it has been clearly demonstrated that what I say is correct, and I am sure that the Opposition accepts that we have not created any precedent by making these appointments. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition spoke of Mr. Bakewell as though he was a monster directly under the Premier's control. Mr. Seaman, who was the Under Treasurer, was directly under the Treasurer's control. It is not for the Leader and Deputy Leader of the Opposition to talk in the way in which they have talked this afternoon.

The real facts of the case are that the Establishment has wielded the whip and said to the Opposition, "Get off your dings and do something about it in the House," and that is what the Opposition has tried to do this afternoon. The Premier has referred to Sir Arthur Rymill and to some of his trips to other States. As Chairman of the board of the Bank of Adelaide he is afraid that this move may have some effect on that bank's operations, and so is every other private bank. What the Leader and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition have said this afternoon is, "Take your money out of the Savings Bank of South Australia and put it into a private bank." The Leader has by innuendo and by mentioning the name Liberman and other names put into the depositors who bank with the Savings Bank the fear to which the member for Mitcham has referred. He sensibly told an inquirer that there was no need for that fear but that he had the right to do what he wanted to do.

That was the correct advice, if a man was upset emotionally and worried, but that is not the advice the Leader of the Opposition is offering this afternoon. He has attempted deliberately to create a run on this bank's savings, knowing that that money will go into the private banking organisation, which he supports. He will not support or give any quarter to fair competition from Government banks. The Premier has effectively answered the arguments put by the Leader of the Opposition. I merely wanted to make a few comments about the speech of the member for Mitcham and about several matters the Leader has raised. There is no need to say any more than that, because clearly the Leader of the Opposition was soundly thrashed by the Premier this afternoon, and he knows it.

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I do not feel in any way thrashed, certainly not by the Premier. I have not heard him in the House for some considerable time at his previous best and, although he tried to do the best he could this afternoon, he still did not come up to the performances we came to expect of him when I first became a member. He really used to pull out all the stops, and one could really believe in what he was saying, but today he said very little. The Premier and the Deputy Premier will find it difficult in the speech I made this afternoon to find any personal attack on Mr. Bakewell: indeed, in parts of it I paid a tribute to him. He is indeed a good public servant, and we realise that, but for the Premier to turn my comments about the appointments (which is what we are really criticising and for which the Premier must take responsibility) around to personal criticism of Mr. Bakewell is despicable, and the Opposition will have no part of it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. TONKIN: We have not criticised the people involved. We have made a passing reference (as did the Deputy Premier) to jobs for the boys with regard to Mr. Crimes. The Premier spent most of his time going through all the other people who have been appointed. These are not unusual appointments: they occur under any Administration at any time.

Mr. Keneally: Why did you bring it up?

Dr. TONKIN: Normally, I would accept that that is what it was, but the Premier has not answered the underlying problem, which is why these two people and another person have been appointed to the boards of those banks. He has deliberately ignored the major factor that people have been appointed to the boards of both banks. In the case of the State Bank, half the members of the board are now on the board of trustees, and Mr. Crimes makes up the fourth on the Savings Bank board.

Mr. Mathwin: That's what it's all about.

Dr. TONKIN: That is what it is all about, and we have heard nothing about it from the Premier. He has tried to twist the attack on him away on to Mr. Bakewell, on to me, or on to anyone else he can. He will not accept any of the blame himself. I repeat that it is despicable that he should do this. The criticism is of the appointments made in the present circumstances, and I make it knowing what are the Premier's aims for the banking system of this State, and he has not denied it.

The motives that he has been asked to explain in making these appointments have not been explained. He has said (and he was careful in his use of words) that he was not contemplating an amalgamation of the two banks.

Later he slipped a little and talked about integration, but he quickly corrected it back to amalgamation. He is very pedantic at times. He uses words well, but the meaning is the same, and he will not fool anyone. He then takes his personal attack one step further. The Premier not only switched the attack on to Mr. Bakewell, who does not deserve it and who has been forced into an almost untenable position, but also attacked Sir Arthur Rymill, and the least that is said about that the better. Sir Arthur Rymill has made his point about worker participation very clearly indeed, and this has hurt the Government. Indeed, I go further and say that the current backing down by the Government on worker participation that has been spectacular over the past week or so almost certainly is directly attributable to the work that Sir Arthur Rymill has been putting into the whole public attitude to worker participation.

This man who accuses the Opposition of making personal attacks (wherever he is now, and he has been out of the Chamber since he finished his speech) goes further to attack Mr. Paul McGuire, a citizen of this State who has written a letter to the Editor of a newspaper and who has been kind enough to pass on some thoughts to me. Who else would the Premier like to attack and drag down if he could?

It is always a measure of the Premier's embarrassment to total the amount of personal attack and personal comment that he indulges in, and on this basis he stands high on the list. He is obviously highly embarrassed. It is absolute rubbish to say that these matters have been ventilated today to help the private sector of the banking industry. That is poppycock, and I think that suggestion will attract the contempt that it should attract. The Premier has given us no reassurance whatever that the Savings Bank will retain its independence.

Indeed, the Deputy Premier has gone further and imputed to the Opposition a desire to put the Savings Bank of South Australia in some difficulty. It is only because we have such a high regard for the Savings Bank of South Australia, for the officers who administer it so well, and for its standing and the service it provides to the people of this State that we wish to see the bank preserved in its independent form. We are not saying what the Deputy Premier suggests we are saying, namely, "Take your money out of the Savings Bank of South Australia and put it into a private bank."

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: That's what you are doing.

Dr. TONKIN: The Deputy Premier said that: we did not. We believe that the Savings Bank is one of the finest institutions of its kind in the world, and we will support it to the hilt, to the extent of ventilating matters in this House so as to protect its existence, and, if it means that we attract the personal criticism that has been thrown across this House this afternoon, we will do it regardless.

We firmly believe that people should leave their money in the Savings Bank and that the Savings Bank should go on looking after their money as it has done in the past. It is the advice I give to anyone who has asked, but the people depositing money with the Savings Bank should know the Premier's intentions, and, when they know them, the people can act through the electoral system and the ballot box, if necessary, to make absolutely certain about the motives which have been imputed to him and which are very well based.

I believe they will take the action necessary to ensure that he can at no time change his mind and perhaps accept the Marks report in its entirety and publicly. I have no doubt

that he has personally accepted that report. It is too much of a coincidence that there are common members on the boards of both banks and, until the Premier can explain away that cardinal factor, my motion stands, and I call on the Premier and the Government to resign.

The House divided on the motion:

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

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

Pair—Aye—Mr. Arnold. No—Mrs. Byrne.

The SPEAKER: There are 22 Ayes and 22 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I give my casting vote in favour of the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL (OPTIONAL PREFERENCES)

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

INDUSTRIES DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

WATER RESOURCES BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 5. Page 2144.)

Mr. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): I support the Bill with some pleasure. It was in 1955 that I first came to South Australia, and immediately I took an interest in the declining water table in the South-East. I had been anxious to see the Leg of Mutton Lake, because photographs of it had been sent to me several times. However, on my arrival I was told that the Leg of Mutton Lake in Mount Gambier had dried up, but, as the water table had fluctuated considerably for the previous 100 years, no doubt the lake would return. However, after about 21 years the lake is still very much as it was then: in fact, it is drier, and the water table has declined between three and four metres in the South-East of South Australia. In 1962, we invited the then member of Parliament at Mount Gambier, who was in Opposition, to come into the classrooms and to listen to the result of our conclusions, but he said that it was a matter that concerned experts and we should not be involved in it.

It was not until late in the mid-1960's that the Hall Government initiated research into the water tables of the South-East, and I am delighted that the present Minister of Works has decided to continue that research. In 1969, I expressed thanks to the Minister of Works for his interest in correspondence addressed to him and for the lengthy reports that he and engineers of the Engineering and Water Supply Department had sent back to me in the South-East. It was evidence of tremendous interest in the water supply not only in the South-East but also throughout the State that a lengthy research programme was to be continued by this Government. I have always believed that control of water in Australia is absolutely necessary, particularly after viewing the map from about 15 000 kilometres away and seeing Lakes Torrens, Frome, Eyre and Gairdner being shown as vast expanses of water when, in fact, they were huge dry lakes.

Another disappointment I had on my arrival was to learn that only 2 per cent of Australia's water resources was potable, and when I realised that there were vast arid areas in this country my concern was more acute. I am convinced that in South Australia rainfall is the sole recharge agent for artesian basins. We expressed concern in 1969 when Mr. Warren Bonython, an esteemed expert on many matters, declared that there was every possibility that Mount Gambier would have sufficient water to supply the whole of Australia. However, we in the South-East were more doubtful, because with a falling water table the picture could be misleading, and that water could be taken from this area when we were using fossil water.

In 1969, the South-East Water Protection League was formed, and we discovered that the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation had given three separate estimates, each one diminishing from the previous one, with the last estimate tying in closely with the Engineering and Water Supply Department estimate that the South-East had enough water to support only about 250 000 people. That was a much different estimate from that made 10 years earlier that suggested we had sufficient water to support the whole of Australia. The fact that no research had been conducted and that many people were willing to guess what lay under the South-East artesian basin was adequate testimony to the fact that research was desperately needed.

From the South-East we predicted that the Virginia and Two Wells area was using fossil water with a higher evaporation rate than rainfall rate, and we expected that market gardeners on the fringe of that basin would receive a declining water supply. We also considered that the Padthaway and Bordertown region was similarly situated, with a rainfall of about 457 mm and an evaporation rate of about 1 420 mm, with the main recharge capacity coming from rainfall. The possibility there was that the uncapped artesian bores, which were discharging water indiscriminately on pasture surfaces, would have to be controlled and capped. The Government has since taken action to control irresponsible drilling and irresponsible release of water from artesian bores. I am convinced that, if we keep on using this "capital in the bank", this fossil water, artesian basins throughout South Australia will diminish. There is just not enough rainfall to allow people to continue indiscriminately to take away this water.

The moves initiated in several different directions by the Government in the past few years have been wise. The co-ordination of various bodies that have control of both surface and artesian water is an equally sound move. There is every possibility that the indiscriminate irresponsible drilling could release water from a confined aquifer. We have an aquifer in the South-East known as Knight Sands that could release confined water under pressure into an unconfined area—the limestone above—with possible dire results for people further inland who use water from the Knight Sands aquifer.

We are equally conscious in the South-East of the pollution problem, because we are literally living on our water supply. Everything that goes into the water table slowly percolates downwards and could move at a steady rate away from the various inland areas to the coast. The Engineering and Water Supply Department and Professor Holmes of the university have done considerable research to show the estimated flow lines. We are concerned that anything that goes into the water table

could be a potential short-term and, more importantly, a long-term pollutant. We could well have done damage in this respect over the past 15, 20 or more years that could eventually cause trouble in the bores, tanks, and our critical Blue Lake water supply. Present research by the Engineering and Water Supply Department is of extreme importance in determining just whence the pollution is coming and where it is going.

We are conscious of pollution from wineries, cheese factories, creosote manufacturers, paper mills, and sanitary effluent, as well as a variety of other sources, such as farmers putting dead sheep that have died as a result of bushfires or disease into limestone caverns on their properties. There are many possibilities of underground water supply pollution in the South-East. We are therefore grateful to any Government (and Liberal and Labor Governments would have shown irresponsibility in ignoring such a problem) for any work done in this direction. The people of Mount Gambier bring to the Minister's attention the special problem that will be created if this legislation is passed in its present form, because of the massive stormwater disposal system in the area whereby bores are sunk in the city and stormwaters cascade down into the limestone caverns and are slowly absorbed by the artesian water supply.

The immediate cessation of that method of stormwater disposal could create immediate problems, one being the expenditure of \$1 000 000 or more to create an alternative drainage system. In the South-East we are also concerned that, following the report by Mr. Bonython about there being a limitless water supply in the South-East, an immediate threat has been posed to our water supply, because there were strong rumours that it could be used to supply Adelaide, or the proposed city of Monarto.

Murray River water is increasingly saline and is not as reliable as it would have been had there not been so many more irrigation projects along its length that are taking water out and putting back saline water. The most recent estimate I heard was that the Murray River was committed as a water supply until 2000 and that after that Adelaide's water supply as well from that source would be in jeopardy. We in the South-East point out the fears we hold for the safety of the South-East water supply. By "safety" I mean the retention of the supply in the South-East for the development of the South-East. Those fears are still strong.

About six or seven years ago the Premier and the Minister of Works made commitments that the South-East water supply was for the development of the South-East. They reiterated that commitment about two or three years ago. The potential for the development of up to about 120 000 ha of pine plantation, the irrigation of up to about 120 000 ha of pasture land, and the development of vegetable gardens throughout the South-East will increase the demand for water and steadily deplete the reserves in the South-East. The water table in the area has continued to fall since 1955 and has fallen about 4 metres in 20 years.

Not only has the water table continued to fall during that time but the average rainfall over 20 years has been almost as high, as it was in 1912 when the Jakes reached the highest level ever and Browne's and Valley Lakes were joined. Many factors probably indicate that the decline of water levels in the South-East is part of a continuous cycle. With so many more water users in the South-East than there were 75 years ago, we believe that the problem to maintain water levels will increase.

The South-East is indeed fortunate since it has a higher rainfall rate (Mount Gambier has a rainfall of about 700 millimetres annually, and Mount Burr has up to 760 mm.) than evaporation rate, so that in three or four regions in the South-East we compare favourably with anywhere else in South Australia. We point out that the fears of 1969 and back to 1955 are still strong fears and do not diminish as the figures are released year by year with the level falling to a record low last year. We are conscious that the South-East is a favoured area. Water is the most precious commodity anywhere in the world, because without water people would not survive, and there would be no mineral or agricultural development. Water is more precious than gold, so for that reason alone we commend any Government that takes steps to ensure that meagre water supplies such as those in South Australia are protected and placed in the hands of a co-ordinating body. This matter transcends politics and is of the utmost importance to the future development of our State.

We in the South-East would like to believe that the South-East will continue to be regarded as a major growth area and that water will not be taken away indiscriminately. We are well aware of the Eight Mile creek area where 227 megalitres of water is estimated each day to flow out to sea. It is a wastage, but the McMillan, Bloedell and Powell River company some years ago decided to invest in the South-East and set up a paper mill at Yahl to use this volume of water for its own use and to empty the effluent back at Eight Mile Creek via a parallel pipeline. That scheme fell through because of a *Sirex* wasp scare. It seems to be a massive volume of water to be wasted. Perhaps it would be possible for one or two industries to use that water without further reducing the South-East reservoir.

There is little point in my prolonging this part of the debate. I have stated that the South-East is still concerned about its water supply. Many responsible people are conscious of the events that could happen to the South-East water supply, so I am therefore pleased about the provision in the Bill to set up advisory committees. I hope that the Minister will favourably consider such a committee's being set up to represent the South-East and to tender advice to the commission.

Mr. WOTTON (Heysen): I support this Bill. As the honourable member for Mount Gambier has said, South Australians are particularly aware of the importance to conserve and control the water resources we have. We have been waiting for some time for the South Australian Water Resources Council, which is to be set up under this Act. It can do nothing but help efforts to preserve the quality of water and to control the use of water in South Australia. This council is to be made up of people who understand the problems of water research, control, and quality, and have a deep knowledge of these matters. I am pleased to see that in this Bill the Government has seen fit to bind the Crown. I believe this will make it much easier for people, generally, to accept the Bill. I support its objectives and welcome the consolidation of this legislation.

In the past there have been many difficulties because of the various pieces of legislation dealing with surface and underground waters and their control. The consolidation of the legislation will make it easier for the average person to understand. The council will be made up of persons who are vitally concerned and have special knowledge about water resources. I suggest that there should be wider representation on this council than is provided. Clause 9 (2) states:

(2) The Council shall consist of twelve members appointed by the Governor being:—

- (a) two persons nominated by the Local Government Association of South Australia Incorporated;
- (b) one person nominated by the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, South Australia Incorporated;
- (c) one person nominated by the United Farmers & Graziers of S.A. Incorporated;
- (d) one person nominated by the governing body of the prescribed conservation body;
- (e) one person nominated by the Minister as being a person experienced in irrigated horticulture or viticulture;

I would like the Minister to give consideration to adding two further associations—the Fruitgrowers and Market Gardeners Association and the National Waterwell Association of Australia. I am concerned at the non-inclusion on the council of a representative of the South Australian Fruitgrowers and Market Gardeners Association, because the members of that association represent a vast area of the State and those areas are particularly concerned with water conservation.

The membership of this association stretches from Port Germein to Renmark and down the Murray River to Goolwa. Many members are to be found in the northern Adelaide plains, an area that we know is greatly concerned with the water problem. The Adelaide Hills area is also involved. Having been brought up on a property in the Adelaide Hills and knowing the vital importance of water to production (particularly underground water), I have a special interest in the matter. As the member for Mount Gambier has said the South-East is also concerned, as is the Coonalpyn area. All of these people are primary producer irrigators who draw water from the Murray River, other streams, or from underground resources. Members of this association on the council would represent several thousand growers of fruit and vegetables on whom Adelaide depends wholly for its supply of fresh food.

The privilege of membership has been extended to the United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia Incorporated and I ask that the privilege be also extended to the Fruitgrowers and Market Gardeners Association, because the U.F. and G. would represent mostly dry farming areas. The other association that I am particularly interested to see represented on this council, although not very well known should be represented. The National Waterwell Association of Australia is possibly the only association that specifically deals with underground water in this State. It is naturally vitally concerned with underground waters and its members carry out about 90 per cent of the well drilling undertaken in this State.

This association forwarded submissions to the department before this Bill was drafted. Although comments were made on the submission by departmental officers, I express on the association's behalf its concern that further negotiations were not carried out on this matter. I believe it would have been only good manners for further contact to have been made with this association in relation to the legislation. I believe it is most important that a hydro-geologist should be included amongst the members of the council referred to in clause 9 (2) (f). A hydro-geologist, as we all know, is a specialist in matters relating to water, so it is important that such a person should be included in that group. I am delighted with this Bill which I support and which I am sure all members will support. I ask the Minister to consider the points I have made.

Mr. VANDEPEER (Millicent): I support this Bill, which has been needed for some time. The existing

legislation has required overhauling. However, I reserve the right to criticise the Bill on one or two points. We are going to deal widely with the research that has gone into underground waters and waters in general in South Australia. Being a South-Easterner, I refer to past research in the South-East conducted by engineers and scientists who had few means of knowing the underground rock strata, when we consider the instruments and machinery available today. They studied the waters of the South-East, made recommendations, and put forward theories about where the water came from, and which way it ran underground. I believe it has been proved in later years that many of their theories were not quite correct.

In some respects there has been a deterioration in the water quality. We thought we knew what happened, but later technology has shown us that we did not know the true position. I commend the Government for its action in the past 10 years in continuing and advancing research and getting down to a proper knowledge of underground waters in the South-East. This work has been necessary, and I am sure the Government will continue with this research during its term of office. This will enable our underground water resources to be preserved. The earlier engineers and researchers to whom I have referred did their work to the best of their ability considering the machinery available and, even though they were proved wrong, I think some mention should be made of their efforts.

I believe the council of 12 is representative and will be accepted by the organisations involved; I think it should meet with general approval. The people of the South-East will be represented through their farmer organisation. I think it will be necessary to proclaim areas because of the different types of water resource, and it will be up to the people in the various areas to see that their areas are proclaimed correctly and that they have fair representation on the bodies controlling such areas. Clause 48 provides:

(1) A person shall not, unless he is authorised by or under this Act or any other Act, cause, suffer or permit—

(a) a well to be drilled, constructed, plugged, back-filled or sealed off;

However, subclause (3) states four cases in which work on a bore can be carried out without notification or application for a permit. I am surprised that the case of thirsty stock is not included, as it was raised some time ago. The clause perhaps allows a farmer to work on his bore if the stock are thirsty, because subclause (3) (b) provides:

that having regard to the foregoing it was not reasonably practicable to apply for a permit under section 49 of this Act;

That means that if it is not reasonably practicable to apply for a permit a farmer can go ahead and work on the bore. I think the minds of farmers would be put at rest if the case of thirsty stock could be included in the reasons for working on a bore. The Minister may be able to explain satisfactorily later why this was not included.

I endorse the remarks of the member for Mount Gambier about water quality and pollution and the actions that can affect our water quality. We now know that many things we did in the past were wrong. I do not wish to repeat what the member for Mount Gambier has said.

Mr. Rodda: Do you think there should be some weirs in these drains?

Mr. VANDEPEER: I was wondering whether someone would bring up the question of weirs in drains, which would probably come under the powers of the council. It would be a good idea to investigate the question of weirs in drains in the South-East in order to slow down

excess drainage. While that matter is being examined, the possibility of returning some of the water to our underground basins, if it is of sufficient quality, should also be investigated. I wonder whether, despite what is said at present, it might not be possible to preserve this water in years to come. Given all the means we have to preserve it and the information that is being collected now, scientists in the future may be able to do something about preserving the water that runs into the sea through our drains.

The member for Mount Gambier has already expressed his concern about the outflow from points in the lower South-East. This water comes from underlying water strata in the Mount Gambier area and, as the member for Mount Gambier said, 227 megalitres a day runs to waste. I am surprised that more research has not gone into this problem. We are spending much money in watching the water table to ensure that it is not lowered too far. We are concerned about much of the intake area for this water being covered with pines, which apparently use more water than the previous vegetation, and the future intake may be lessened. As yet we do not know what will happen to these waters. We do not know whether they will retain their present level or whether the level will fall. We are spending much money on this type of research and yet megalitres of water are running into the sea. If a proper dam could be placed just above high tide, we could use this water immediately, but at the moment it is wasted.

It would be more expensive because it would have to be pumped. It could also be said that much of the water would be used for irrigation, that it would have to be pumped all over the South-East, and that it would not be possible to distribute this water by a reticulated system. That is fair enough, but the city of Mount Gambier uses a considerable amount of water and we could supply that city immediately from these outflows if we considered the cost was not too high, and this would save a considerable amount of water now being pumped out of the Blue Lake. There are four or five outflows that I believe will be used in the future. It is even thought that some flow points are under the sea, but we do not know how significant they are. All this water goes to waste.

I can see that in the future if South Australia is really short of water we will be tapping this resource and doing absolutely nothing to upset the level of our underground waters. The point I make is that this water is all going to waste, whereas in the future I think it can and will be used, and that its use will make no difference to the level of the water in the area. This is an extremely important point. Clause 70 provides:

The Minister may construct, operate, and maintain such works as he considers necessary or desirable for—

(a) the observation, measurement or assessment of any water resources;

Under that provision, I refer back to my previous remarks about water going to waste, and this may be the right time to bring to the Government's attention that it may be useful to measure, observe and assess how much water is involved.

I support the Bill, some clauses of which I will watch carefully in Committee. I commend the Government for introducing the Bill to preserve our water resources, especially those in the South-East. We must be rid of the saying that is developing, namely, "The Murray River is becoming the biggest sewer in Australia." The Murray is our biggest and most valuable river, and to have people say that it is becoming the sewer of Australia

is indeed derogatory to the community and to our civilization. It is high time that something was done about it; perhaps the Bill will go some way in that direction.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): Although I congratulate it on accepting Liberal Party policy, I am disappointed that it has taken the Government six years to put it into operation. At the end of the term 1968-70, the Liberal Party promoted strongly that it was necessary to bring all our water resources under one control. That is the main purpose of the Bill, but it has taken the present Government six years to put into practice what we intended putting into practice in 1970-71. Undoubtedly, South Australians are encouraged to waste water. South Australia, as is claimed, is the driest State in one of the driest continents on earth, yet the system under which we operate encourages people to waste water. No encouragement is given to the person who owns a factory and who uses a large quantity of water (if only for washing down or cooling purposes) to reuse the water. Our system, mainly because of the rating method, encourages people to waste water and pour it out to sea, where it is lost forever.

No Government (whether Liberal or Labor) can claim that in years gone by it has been genuinely concerned about the waste of water or about our water resources. The member for Mount Gambier and other members have made the point that our underground supplies are limited, and that our ability to replenish them is uncertain. There is no guarantee that they are being replenished at the same rate as they are being used. The Northern Adelaide Plains area is a typical example. Since I first became a member I have said that we must adopt a system whereby people pay the average cost of taking water to their property, with some equalising factor for those people who are difficult to service and those who are easy to service. Until we adopt that system, we cannot really say that we are concerned about the State's water resources. I remember an old-timer saying that water was more valuable to South Australia than gold. I think that he was right. We can live without gold, whereas we cannot survive as a State without water. Yet, we go on day in and day out charging people a water rate based on the value of the property. Much of this water is poured out to sea, because some people take the attitude, "If I am paying for so much water, I'll use it."

I believe that in 1967 we saw an example of how the Premier of the day encouraged people to save water, and they responded. They did it voluntarily, with no financial reward. I reiterate that we waste water in this State and that we are encouraged to do so by the system under which we operate. The members for Mount Gambier and Millicent have said that the drains in the South-East have, in the main, tended to waste a good resource of valuable fresh water. One could make the same claim regarding areas nearer to Adelaide and instance the south-western suburbs drainage scheme through the Sturt Creek. People have chosen (and Governments have allowed them to do so) to develop the flatter areas of the plain nearer the watercourse, the Sturt Creek in particular. Governments set out to solve the problem of flooding by installing a massive concrete drain to pour all of what was considered waste water out to sea. At no time did we experiment with water meadows to give the water the opportunity to reticulate back underground.

I know the arguments used by those who have studied in this field that the water soaks back underground through the coral strata, in particular, slowly. However,

we should have experimented more in this field before deciding on massive concrete drains and pouring this valuable resource into the ocean. At the same time that we are doing this, we are setting out to build new reservoirs and pumping stations in the Hills or on the other side of the Hills to pump water from the Murray to the metropolitan area. Undoubtedly, much of the water that pours out of that drain could be used for industrial and agricultural purposes. There is the case of the Bolivar treatment works. Other countries have been able to use their water from treatment works for some agricultural purposes, but what happens here? The department, the Minister, the Government or someone in authority finds every possible excuse to delay the use of that water for agricultural purposes. This is a deliberate waste of a resource we are setting out to preserve and conserve by means of the Bill.

Many primary producers in the area near the treatment works are rightly annoyed at the bureaucratic procedures and humbug that are thwarting their attempts to get what they consider to be something reasonable: the use of this water at a reasonable rate. When we look at the subsidy given to the cost of water in certain other areas of primary production, it is surely arguable that, in justice, it should be possible for people in that area to get some form of subsidy for water made available to them for primary production. We have heard the argument about beef measles and so on, but the Government and the department know that the producers in that area, actually planted a 8-hectare plot of vegetables. They experimented and proved that the water was useful for that purpose and that the crop was not harmful to those who consumed the produce. I am not saying that that applies in relation to salad crops. That matter has still to be proved.

I know that the Minister is conscious of the point I will now make about the Northern Adelaide Plains area, but I believe that I should make the point again while we are discussing the Water Resources Council and this Bill. When it was decided to meter bores in that area and limit the amount of water that a producer could use, the producer who was honest and stated correctly the area that he had had under production for the previous five years ended up being unfairly treated compared to the producers who were dishonest and exaggerated the area under crop for the previous five years.

There has never been any equalisation in that area. Now that this authority is being set up, I believe that we should take a step further and guarantee that effective use is made of the water that is used. At present the department's attitude is that, if a person grows 8 hectares a year, he is allowed so much water for that area. There is no proof that one grower produces more or a better quality product from that area. If we are to be fair and honest about the use of water, we must make sure that the water is used effectively and that the grower who gets the best result from a specified quantity of water in that area is given the opportunity to get that result.

Merely because one person uses 24 ha a year and another uses 16 ha a year does not necessarily mean that the person with the 24 ha will produce the same amount as the other person. The man with 16 ha may be a better grower. He may understand soils and the use of water better, and he may be a better manager. For that reason, he should be given some consideration. The allowance should not be decided only on the basis of area, particularly in the Northern Adelaide Plains area. It should also be determined on the quantity and quality of crop produced from the allocation of water that is made.

I understand that some bores in that area tend to pump sand at times. Meters are jammed and people do not bother to refer the matter to the department, so when the departmental officer comes around the man who is operating a little dishonestly is using a large amount of water that is not metered, and he gets away with it. I understand that a person can jam a meter if he wants to be dishonest enough to do so. Unless a more honest approach is made to the genuine grower in that area, I consider that there will always be more dissatisfaction than there need be. I come back to the point that we must encourage better use of water and not say that, because a person has a certain area, he can have so much water, regardless of how much crop he produces from that area. That is the present approach, and it is wrong.

I refer now to the Hills area and will show how one can lose faith in human nature regarding the departmental approach to problems such as water problems, and I will show how, in trying to control the water resource or the quality of water, that sort of policy can be implemented unfairly and unjustly to an individual. A young man named Peter Grigg decided to buy a block of land in Aldgate, on the edge of the Aldgate creek. All Government instrumentalities and the council allowed him to do this. He paid to the Engineering and Water Supply Department a water rate for that allotment as a building allotment. He applied to have a house built on the property, which is no nearer to the creek than the blocks on which many other houses have been built, and built in recent times, and which would have nowhere near the pollution potential from a septic tank or from that area as the Hahndorf caravan park would have.

The council agreed that he could go ahead, but the Engineering and Water Supply Department said, "No, there is a potential that you will pollute the creek." If a person stands alongside the creek, there is a potential that he will pollute it. We all know that, and that argument is difficult to fight. The department asked him to put in a sealed unit so that he would have to pump out his septic tank effluent whenever the tank was of full capacity. That was a financial burden on him. At the same time as the department is making that sort of decision, it is taking easements and planning the overall sewerage of the area, telling other people near the area that within two or three years the area will be seweraged.

In other words, the department is saying to that young man, "You cannot build a house on the area. You have paid for it and paid us water rates, but we will not let you build a house there. We will not buy the land from you. The Minister says that the Government is not willing to buy the land, but if you sit for two to three years and wait for inflation to catch up and price you out of a house-buying bracket, sewers will go past the door, and you can build a house on it. Otherwise, you will spend the extra money to put in a sealed unit."

I submit that the amount of pollution that that block is likely to create, with one house on it, for the next three years would not be as much as the amount of pollution that is caused when the next fox is born in the catchment area. That is the stupidity of this instance. The number of blocks along that creek that could be built on is so few that the matter is not worth considering if the area will be seweraged in two to three years. If what I have said is doubted, I point out that another person near that block received a notice in 1974 saying that he could connect sewerage. He was rated from April, 1974, for sewerage, and signed a contract in June, 1975, to have sewerage connected. In January, 1976,

he was told that he could not connect there, because the department intended to put an easement through the property and his property would be connected to that easement.

What happens to the amount of about \$200 that that person has paid in sewerage rates in the past two years? He paid at the country rate, not at the city rate, even though he lived in the metropolitan area. That sort of thing makes one suspicious about and afraid of bureaucracy if one is John Citizen. I submit that what has happened in relation to Peter Grigg is unjust and unfair. Having set out to own a house, he bought a block of land with good intentions and then said to the Minister, "If you will not allow me to go ahead, buy the block and sell it through the Land Commission or some other authority, and at the end of three years, when sewerage comes through the area, you capitalise on it." That young man is faced with a burden because of bureaucracy. No statement is necessary from the land agent, because this sort of case had never arisen previously.

I support the Bill. Since the 1970 State election, the Liberal Party has believed strongly that our water resources should all be under one authority. I hope that, when we have a department, regardless of who may make the decisions down the line, there will be a humane, understanding and commonsense approach, and that the hard line will not have to be drawn always. If the Minister or anyone in the department wants to walk through the area I have mentioned, I will be able to show him where every day more pollution potential is created than ever would have been caused by Peter Grigg's house. The person concerned was willing to sell the block if someone would buy it from him, but who in the private sector would buy it when the person buying could not build a house on it unless he provided a sealed unit?

In two or three years, when sewerage comes past the door, the owner will be rated for sewerage, and the unit that he has provided will be a waste of material and money. I invited the officer concerned to go to the block and, with Peter Grigg, I drilled a hole by hand, when the officer admitted that the soil was better than he had thought it would be. I appreciate the officer's experience, ability, and knowledge, but I hope that, before such a drastic decision is made, a humane approach will be considered and a more thorough investigation made. I trust the provisions of this Bill will be accepted and implemented, and support strongly the submission of the member for Heysen that, of the six personnel appointed, the Well-driller's Association and Market Gardeners and Fruit-growers Association will have direct representation on the council. That is essential. I hope that when this legislation operates the council will work with an understanding of common sense with firmness, and consider individuals and their difficulties and problems, rather than adopting the attitude that the departmental approach must be accepted, John Citizen being pushed aside.

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): I support the Bill and, like the Labor and Liberal Parties, we have a water resources policy. I believe the fundamental philosophy of all these policies is basically the same. It should be the objective of all political Parties to provide for a water resources authority to administer and control our limited water resources. It has been pointed out more than once that our water resources are limited, and often it is not until we travel to another State or overseas that we realise the difficulties under which we try to farm and to administer the water resources of this State. Previous speakers have referred

to matters affecting their districts and, although this legislation does not affect the Flinders District to the same extent, I emphasise that our interest in a water resources policy is in relation not so much to irrigation or intensive horticulture areas as to the supply of water for stock and normal household use.

The member for Fisher made a valid comment when he referred to consumer wastage. We have grown up in a State that is constantly looking for supplies of water, but people do not seem to be educated enough in that they tend to waste water. I do not think they are conversant with the effort required to harvest the water and to reticulate it, and some form of consumer education campaign will be necessary to bring about an awareness of the need to conserve water. The member for Fisher said that a consumer should be charged at a rate commensurate with the cost of connecting the supply of water. I could argue with that point of view, and no doubt many people will, but the resources we have are a public asset and each person should be entitled to reasonable access to it without being caused undue financial hardship.

The Lower Eyre Peninsula, an area with which I am concerned, has reticulated water basically from a supply of underground water from the Uley-Wanilla Basin, the Lincoln and Lincoln South Basin, and further north from the Poldia Basin. We have hundreds of kilometres of primary mains and thousands of kilometres of secondary mains. This Bill should promote a consciousness in landholders and others who supply and use water of the need to conserve water. Whilst this legislation seems to be a Bill of "don't's", it could be more effective if it contained a few more incentives that would encourage the conservation of water by individual landholders. People residing in undulating areas could be encouraged to provide water storages on their farms so that there would not be such a heavy drain on the reticulated supply, as is now experienced. In several areas on Lower Eyre Peninsula served by reticulated services, the supply runs dry on a hot day, because it cannot cope with the demand.

Farmers have to base their farming judgment and decisions on the availability of water provided by the department. With the advent of many more cattle and the intensive housing of pigs, water supply is of primary concern, and in most advertisements for the sale of properties the fact that it has an assured and unlimited water supply suitable for cattle is now referred to. The council is to advise the Minister in relation to the assessment, development and conservation, management and protection of the water resources of the State, and I am most concerned about the aspect of protection. Too often we see potential water catchment areas spoiled, not because of deliberate action but because of inappropriate action by a landholder pursuing his farming activities, when perhaps guidance, encouragement, and advice could have prevented potential water supplies from being lost.

In advising the Minister the council must consider many factors, but it seems to me that one aspect that has been omitted (perhaps not intentionally, as it may be incorporated elsewhere to a lesser extent) concerns watershed areas. The Bill should provide for jurisdiction over the whole of the watershed and catchment areas and, as this is not spelled out specifically, I believe the Bill should contain broader references to that aspect. Clause 16 provides that the Minister may establish a water resources advisory committee in any area, and I think it is logical that we should consider setting up many such committees. Obviously, such committees should be established on Lower Eyre Peninsula

and in the South-East, but the provisions of the Bill do not bind the Minister to establish such committees. I believe the basic idea of the legislation is good and, unless this provision can be amended, it will be up to individual areas to lobby the Minister to ensure that they are represented on regional advisory committees. The South Australian Water Resources Council will consist of 12 members. My only criticism of the council is that it could well create another large department, and in times when everyone is trying to cut costs, that concerns me. However, it is important that we have available on the council the most qualified members to advise the Minister in the best interests of the State.

"Proclaimed watercourse" will cause much public consternation, and there will be controversy about what will be and what will not be a proclaimed watercourse. Although I appreciate the necessity for the council, it must have power to recommend to the Governor that certain watercourses be proclaimed. I can see friction developing between landholders and advisory councils on this matter. The purpose of the Bill is to control the quantity and quality of water. I do not believe that sufficient people fully understand the necessity for water quality of bores and wells that have been sunk on farms by farmers with the best of intentions looking for water, little knowing that he is probably passing through a saline stream into a fresh water stream and consequently polluting what was otherwise a good, fresh underground water basin.

Only experts can answer these problems, so advisory committees must control this aspect in order to act accordingly. Water quantity is equally important. Port Lincoln recently lost a potential industry because water quality in the area was not good enough to attract that industry. Although water quality can be improved it is an expensive process, and industry will look elsewhere for a better supply. The quantity of water determines all stock judgments in primary production. It is fundamental that the carrying capacity of land is limited to the ability of that land to grow feed. Of secondary importance is the available water supply.

I support the remarks made by previous speakers. I believe the Bill and its basic philosophy are good. However, I hope that a few minor matters will be explained by the Minister when the Bill goes into Committee. Water resources are the lifeline of the State. Regrettably, our water resources having been abused in the past makes the Bill necessary.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): This measure requires and, indeed, has received the commendation of members from both sides. The Minister, the various levels of his department, the Parliamentary Counsel and especially the member for Chaffey (who has stated publicly several times the real need for many aspects of this measure) should be commended and their efforts recorded in the history of this Parliament. The Bill is long overdue. That is not a criticism of the Minister, because it is important that, in a measure such as this, it be researched thoroughly before being introduced. As the member for Flinders has said, there are one or two difficulties associated with the Bill, but they will be dealt with in Committee. Basically, the Bill has been well researched. One has only to look at the interpretation clause to see how particular one can become in framing definitions. "Underground waters" means:

All waters below the surface of the ground other than waters contained in works, not being a well, for the distribution, reticulation, transport, storage or treatment of waters or wastes and includes waters contained in a well and waters beneath the surface of the ground that

are exposed in natural openings or depressions not being waters comprising a spring contributing to the flow of a watercourse:

One can find many other similar examples. The only issue I have with the interpretation relates to the term "spring" and its relationship to the definition of "watercourse". In part of the interpretation "spring" seems to be included in one category and, in another part, in another category. I have no doubt that, in the months or years ahead, the exact definition of "spring" will be challenged in court. I should like to believe that it has been well researched and that what I have said will not be the case. In part, the definition of "underground waters" states:

beneath the surface of the ground that are exposed in natural openings or depressions not being waters comprising a spring contributing to the flow of a watercourse: A spring is a natural opening, so one gets into all sorts of difficulties of definition. What I have said is not a criticism, but it is an area where a final definition will be difficult to frame. It could well be one of the first matters under this measure to be determined by a court.

No matter what legislation is passed by Parliament, someone in the community is always out to beat it and find a loophole. That could well be the case with some aspects of this legislation. Legislation relating to the Licensing Act is now before the House to correct a loophole that has been exploited by several people for some time. We may have to legislate to overcome some minor loopholes that may arise in this measure. I hope that the farce relating to arguments about the use of water on the Northern Adelaide Plains will be overcome quickly by the passage of this Bill. I hope I have not made that statement with my tongue in my cheek, because this is an area where much work should be done. Several previous actions of a questionable nature need to be answered for in this area, and I hope they will be dealt with properly by this measure. That the Bolivar effluent continues to flow out to sea after so many years is a tragedy. I recall the late Mr. Harry Kemp some three years ago making statements in the other place about the situation as he saw it and causing the present Minister much wrath and upset. Many of the claims made by Mr. Kemp are still unanswered. Many of the decisions made have been made too late, and many of the decisions that should have been made are yet to be made.

I relate my next comment to the northern Adelaide Plains area, because it involves not only part of my own electorate but also adjacent electorates, I have had a continuing interest in the distribution and use of water in these areas. I recently wrote to the Minister and asked him whether he had given full consideration to the agreement by the Engineering and Water Supply Department to increase the water supplies from what is known as the Womma Road extension—to an extension along Heaslip Road. I received a letter from the Minister on, I think, January 6 in which he said that the extension of the water main located along Womma Road had been considered and that it was being used to update the services available. In a letter dated June 30, 1970, Mr. N. C. Cox, the mains extension officer, writing to people who were involved in this project in relation to a request for an improved service and permission to extend the service to a second house on a property off the Womma Road extension, stated:

Consideration has been given to each of these requests, and I advise it has been necessary to cease further extensions from the present water supply system in the area because of the heavy demand being made on the existing system. This limitation also applies to the granting of indirect water services.

In other words, the system was not adequate in 1970 to provide a service, yet in 1975 a service has been extended to people along the line of that same main trunk. That extension must seriously affect the distribution of water to the Virginia township area, which has been denied a proper service for a long time.

There have been extensions in that area for MacDonald Park and Angle Vale. A considerable sum of money was given to the Government by Sir Ellerton Becker. That money was supplemented by other Government funds, and an extension of water was put into the Angle Vale area, yet established farmers and market gardeners who were established in houses in the Virginia township, were denied the opportunity of having a proper water supply. In about 1971 a major water supply extension was made available to the Virginia Raceway. Nobody is denying the raceway provides a community service in the sense that it provides entertainment for a large number of people. It is very difficult for those who are seeking to obtain an existence off of the land to be consistently denied water, not only for stock purposes but also for their homes, and to see water go past and be provided for an entertainment centre such as the Virginia Raceway.

These are only some of the difficulties that have existed: I have only attempted to scratch the surface. The member for Fisher earlier referred to the many problems that exist in relation to underground waters. As has previously been documented in this House by questions I have asked, he correctly said that many people, who had falsified their returns when a decision was made about their licences, had quotas and are still obtaining more water than is required by them. Some people have applied for permission to construct a bore for test purposes, and the test bore does not have a meter on it. Nobody seems to bother about the volume of water being taken out of the test bore, but the water is being used in vast quantities from that bore on a property that is the subject of a quota. The quota having been used, the person involved is able to by-pass the provisions of the Act and receive a return for his vegetable enterprise by using this dodge. I am not suggesting the passage of this Bill will necessarily correct all of those matters overnight, but I hope that there is a greater resolve on the part of those responsible for the administration of this measure that there will be an equality of representation, an equality for all persons who seek a supply, and that it is not fish for one and flesh for another.

I recall (and it is mentioned in *Hansard*) the situation where a 1¼ in. main was made available to a person for garden purposes when it was clearly stated in all other documents issuing from the appropriate authority that a ¾ in. main was the maximum that would be provided. Almost simultaneously with the obtaining of the 1¼ in. main the person put the property up for sale, and the major feature of the advertisement associated with the sale of this property was that it had this 1¼ in. main extension. When it was aired in this House I am pleased to say the main was very quickly removed and did not become (I am led to believe) a transferable asset on the particular property. As the late Mr. Kemp said, there had been a number of instances of people in the same area receiving different treatment because of a misunderstanding, because of a change of personnel within the system, or because of pure luck.

Members opposite will probably better understand the concern that members on this side have expressed regarding the naming of the United Farmers and Graziers: that what has been created, if the Bill proceeds in its present form, is in effect a demarcation dispute. The U.F. and G. rightly

applies for assistance and consideration in very many matters. I do not denigrate its actions or its position in providing advice in various matters, but I believe that in relation to water usage, it is not necessarily the body that has the most to contribute. I believe it has already been stated by the member for Heysen that amendments will be put to the Committee, and I hope that the Government will accept the validity of the argument my colleague has put and that adequate protection will be available for a proper representation of all the parties involved in the use of water. Clause 16 (1) provides:

The Minister may by notice in the *Gazette* in relation to any area of the State establish a Water Resources Advisory Committee.

Members on this side of the House have often referred to the benefits that will accrue to the Government by making use of such committees. The member for Chaffey highlighted a meeting held between a Minister and people from the Renmark to Waikerie area about the Murray River salinity problem. The information the local people were able to supply about the degree of salinity was of considerable benefit to the State as a whole. Other members have quoted examples of similar meetings held between Ministers and people from different areas of the State.

The only problem I can see in relation to this matter is that the Bill states, "The Minister may". Because of the compulsory aspect, it may seem strange for me to be talking of "shall" rather than "may", but I believe it could be possible under the Bill for the bureaucracy to by-pass completely the creation of the advisory committees. I believe the committees are essential, and I want nothing less from the Minister than a firm assurance that advisory committees will be created so that their points of view can be put forward. I do not think anyone is naive enough to believe that information provided by committees will always be accepted; such a situation would be Utopian. However, I believe it is essential that advisory committees be set up. Otherwise, over a period of time many people would have to open and close the same doors because different personnel had failed to have put into effect the experience of people with knowledge of circumstances in an area. People in a local area or industry seem to know inevitably what will happen in a given set of circumstances. They know if something is done differently it will prevent something happening, or it will reduce the use of water or improve the quality of the water. I believe the formation of committees comprising people with local knowledge is the important part of this Bill. I commend it and hope the points made in all sincerity by members on this side of the House are given due consideration before it passes further.

Mr. ALLEN (Frome): I support the Bill. So far, members have dealt with the areas of the State commonly known as the high rainfall areas, which are the problem areas in relation to the Bill. This afternoon I wish to say a few words about the water situation in the Far North and North-East of South Australia, the area commonly referred to as the Great Artesian Basin. This huge artesian basin in the North of the State extends about 500 kilometres from south to north and about 400 km from east to west. I do not know how far the artesian basin extends into Queensland, because my Lands Department map does not go beyond the Northern Territory border. I venture to say that this huge basin will in many years to come be a great asset to this State. It covers the areas of Marree and Oodnadatta, and on the western edge of the artesian basin the water level rises

close to the earth's surface, while the centre of the basin is deep.

In the latter part of the last century, when the track commonly known as the Birdsville track was a stock route, the Government of the State saw fit to put down artesian bores about every 80 km along the route. The need has long since passed to travel stock by road, and the artesian bores are now used by the various station owners. These free-flowing bores have been free-flowing for about 80 years so one can imagine how much water has flowed from them. They are in poor condition, since casings have rusted out in many of them and water is coming to the surface on the outside of the casings and much corrosion has formed at the top of the bore, with the result that if these bores are eventually to be harnessed and their flow stopped much money will have to be spent to put them in order. I am sure the Government is well aware of that fact.

Many private artesian bores have been sunk in the area. Ironically, after the rains of last weekend we are wondering whether there is an artesian basin on top of the ground as well as underground. Another curious aspect of this matter is that Lake Eyre, which will more than fill after the recent rains, is situated right in the centre of the artesian basin. However, we are told that the refilling of the artesian basin comes from the Northern Territory, although I imagine that the rains of two years ago and of last weekend will do much to supplement the reserves in this artesian basin. The high cost of sinking artesian bores in this area makes it almost prohibitive for private enterprise to put down bores. About three years ago, the cost of sinking a bore was quoted at \$30 000, so I believe the cost today would be nearer \$40 000 than \$30 000. It may well be that in years to come this area may be proclaimed as a water resource district, although I cannot see this happening for some time. Although we heard a few years ago that in Queensland in the northern part of this basin the water level had dropped, there was no indication of a falling level at the southern end, which is situated in South Australia. We are in the fortunate situation that if the water in the artesian basin does recede we will not be affected to the great extent that Queensland will be affected. The time may come when an advisory committee will have to be formed in this area, and I sincerely hope that when the Government forms such a committee it will ensure that people in this area of the State are represented on the board. I support the Bill.

Mr. WARDLE (Murray): I will not canvass the areas of the Bill that have already been canvassed, except to make several brief comments. I am obliged, as a representative of the River areas, to make this brief contribution to the debate because, as we have been reminded in the Minister's second reading explanation, the Murray is our most important source of water. Probably it is largely a matter of development. If one looks at the history of this State, until 10 years ago there was less production, population and industry, and there was sufficient water to cope with all situations. It just happens that we are now developing to the stage where we must take a new and thorough look at our water resources, both in quantity and quality, because our population, irrigation, towns and industries have increased to a stage where all require more and more water from our limited water resources. Therefore, it has been necessary to introduce legislation to control the quantity and quality of our water.

I, too, express appreciation to the member for Chaffey for the research he has done and the lead he has given to the Liberal Party, in particular, on the matter of water

management in this State. I am satisfied that the Opposition, and the Government, too, appreciate the work he has done and the attitudes he has put forward. I think that every member is pleased that the Bill consolidates previous legislation, namely, the Control of Waters Act and the Underground Waters Preservation Act. As has been said in the debate, the matter will now be clarified and dealt with in one Bill, which will be simpler to interpret. I believe that the provisions in the new legislation are more democratic from the point of view of users of water, in particular. I think that, rather than decisions being made by a Government department, it is better to have the proposed council and the regional advisory committees, which will be made up of people with a definite interest in the use of water.

I particularly like the provision for regional advisory committees. I think that the Government will discover that there are, among those who use large quantities of water for many reasons, people who, through experimenting over the years, have made certain discoveries and have certain reasons why certain methods are useful in water conservation. Considerable democracy is involved in the new processes contained in the Bill. After a few years of using the methods envisaged in the Bill, undoubtedly they will be seen to be of a distinct advantage. The various clauses of the Bill have been canvassed in the debate and various points of view have been placed before the House.

I refer now to a meeting which was held in the Murray Bridge Town Hall last Friday and which was attended by more than 100 divertees who assembled for almost three hours. The meeting, which was attended by two representatives from the Engineering and Water Supply Department, was convened by the Lower Murray irrigators, a brand new organisation which, I believe, is essential and which will do much good. The meeting was organised primarily to talk about water licences, metering and diversion, but that was only part of the greater topic of water conservation. Mr. Ligertwood made a valuable contribution in outlining South Australia's major water supply, its past uses, its present uses and its possible future uses. The council to be set up under the legislation will have a responsibility to look at water conservation in the Murray system in the future, and the lake system of the Murray supply will also have to be considered. When one considers the enormous evaporation from the lake system, one is staggered to realise how much water the State loses in that way. Far be it from me to suggest what the immediate remedies are, but I think that some drastic steps will probably have to be taken in order to conserve the probable 1.5 metres or 1.8 m of water a year that evaporates from those large areas of lakes.

Mr. Nankivell: Don't touch my lakes!

Mr. WARDLE: Part of the honourable member's lakes are my lakes, too. I have perhaps one-fifth of the amount of authority that he has over the lakes. I am sure that he, too, realises as well as I do that there must be some conservation in the Lower Murray region of the water now lost through evaporation, not only from the lakes themselves but also from the many areas of backwaters around the lakes. I am pleased to see that the Bill provides for the conservation of certain wetland areas, as referred to by the member for Chaffey. It would be a shame to see all of the backwaters of the Murray dried out and used perhaps for dairying or vegetable growing. It is necessary to conserve some of these areas to enable the preservation of fish and birds. I was pleased to see the Bill introduced, and I support its every aspect.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I support the second reading of the Bill. My district suffers greatly from the lack of adequate water supplies, even though last weekend in certain areas we had more rain than was required, but that happens only rarely. The provisions of the Bill that concern me relate to underground water supplies. As the Minister and other members would be well aware, there is little surface water in my district. In fact, I have some areas which, unfortunately, must rely on dams. As there are only limited supplies of underground water, farmers are concerned that restrictions may be placed on those who carry out their own drilling operations. The reasons are simple. The extremely high cost of putting down bores in many cases makes it essential that landholders do their own work.

I should like the Minister to clarify whether he will favourably consider licensing any person who wishes to put down his own wells on his property. I have had discussions, and I understand that this probably will be the case, but it would be reassuring if the Minister clarified the matter, if not in the second reading stage then in the Committee stage. I have been approached by constituents over the weekend who are concerned at the high cost involved. I have been told that in one case the cost was \$1 100 to put down one bore whereas, if the farmer could have carried out the work, the cost would have been only \$500 or \$600 for casing, although that is expensive enough.

Other members have spoken of the water position in their districts. As my district virtually relies on the Poldia pumping scheme for most of the water reticulated to Eyre Peninsula, I am keen to support any action that will protect those facilities. I have, in the north of my district, what I think are the only desalination plants of any significance in South Australia, and my constituents in that area hope that the Government will in future be able to find adequate supplies of underground water in the Coober Pedy area so that they will not have to rely on water from the desalination plants, because the cost of the water is high and the standard is not as high as people desire. I support the Bill and I hope that the Minister will clarify clauses 43, 46, 48, 49 and 52 when we reach the Committee stage.

Mr. BOUNDY (Goyder): I will speak only briefly on the measure, and I express my agreement with the sentiments embodied in the Bill and my support for the second reading. We all agree that water is our most important resource and our most valuable commodity. However, our underground water supplies are finite. We would also agree that water is a community resource, since its quality is a community responsibility.

As our underground waters are being depleted at three times their replenishment rate, responsible stewardship is needed, and the provisions of this Bill that establish a council are important in that respect. Other members who have spoken have said much about the need to consolidate the authority for water and its quality, and my reading of the Bill shows that that is largely provided for. The member for Fisher has explained very well what happens on the Northern Adelaide Plains regarding water quantity and quality. He pointed out that those who were honest and responsible in stating their water usage when quotas were imposed were penalised by those quotas, and this has caused a crisis of confidence in Government policy.

If the Bill can ensure a return to confidence and equity regarding water usage, that certainly will be worth having. Constituents in that area have complained to me about the inequalities in the system, and the member for Fisher has

also referred to the fact that quotas on some farms are entirely erroneous in relation to other quotas. Much work can be done to see that the quantity of water so provided is related to the effective use made of it. There is a need to protect the quantity of all surface and underground water and to prevent the unscrupulous from polluting that water, but I also refer to the need to use the effluent water in our State.

Other members have spoken of the effluent water that flows into the sea daily from Bolivar. I urge the Government to proceed with all speed to have that water used for the benefit of growers in the Northern Adelaide Plains district. Having said that, I recognise that the quantity of water available from that source is limited, and therefore it is necessary to consider other measures to ensure an adequate supply of water to that area. I agree with the points that the member for Light has made about the need for improved reticulation at Virginia, for the township area and the surrounding farming and development areas there. Bolivar water alone will not solve the problems of the Virginia area. More reservoirs and catchments, a more responsible use of our water, and the prevention of wastage are required.

Regarding wastage and the best use of our resources, I refer to two things. The first is personal. When our area was reticulated, which I think was in 1958, it was a punishable offence to continue to use our dams. Where the water main was laid, we were not able to continue with our intake points into our dams. Therefore, the water has from then until the present time run down the road and has been wasted. Many landholders had storage schemes of about 800 000 litres, in concrete tanks, to preserve that resource that ran along the road, and they were able to harness it by running it off the road. Government policy at that time prevented us from continuing that practice and now we have a shortage of water that we need not have.

Further, throughout our State we had considerable oil exploration activity and several wells were sunk to a depth of about 120 metres or more, and quantities of potable water were found, I understand. However, the wells were sealed up and left. That attitude seems irresponsible and we are all guilty. The fault is not with this Government. It has been a policy that has been pursued for many years, and in future we must look to the use of every water resource available to us. If the Bill promotes this, it will be worth while. I hope that the measure will be implemented for the benefit of all users of water.

I refer again to the irrigators on the Northern Adelaide Plains and to clause 9 of the Bill regarding the membership of the council. That council will be the governing body regarding the water resource policy. Therefore, it must adequately represent every interest. I repeat that water is a community resource, but it ensures the livelihood and profit of those who use it. Therefore, those persons must be represented adequately, and I hope that the council will have effective representation of all interested groups through the six persons to be nominated by the Minister. Also, I suggest that the Agriculture Department should be directly represented. The secondment of an officer from this department to the Bolivar treatment works was of great assistance, and this department has a proud record of being involved in water resources management. The Minister may establish water resources advisory committees, and they will be of great benefit because they will protect and promote the interests of local groups.

In my district, the only water we use at present belongs to other people, so we are conscious of the need for the appointment of such a committee in areas that provide this resource. We hope that the local knowledge that members of these committees could bring to the problems will be embodied and implemented by the council so that everyone who uses water is adequately protected and the community has the benefit of as much good quality water as is available and can be produced. I support the sentiments of Opposition speakers in this matter and will watch the passage of the Bill through Committee.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): I support the Bill, because it is most appropriate for a State such as South Australia that this sort of legislation should be introduced. It has been said often that South Australia is the driest State in the driest continent in the world, and for that reason this legislation should receive (and I believe it will) the full support of all members. Some time ago when I was in Queensland people there told me that whilst much rain fell in Queensland it gradually found its way to South Australia where it was stored and then reticulated throughout the State, but that water restrictions often had been imposed in parts of Queensland. These people were envious of our system of storing and reticulating water. A great many kilometres of water mains have been laid throughout this State. But I was surprised this afternoon to hear the member for Goyder say that when the mains were laid down Yorke Peninsula a few years ago people were not permitted to continue to use their underground storages built over the years to store run-off water from the roads.

In my district (and I believe it applied throughout the State) when a water main was laid along the road the property owner was rated and, consequently, stopped using his windmill. It was not worth his while to retain his own facility as he had to pay rates because the water passed his property, and he decided that he would use the service provided. Today, many windmills in the North do not operate and perhaps the attitude adopted was a mistaken attitude, because the wells could have been maintained and might still have been operating. It has not yet been suggested why people in the metropolitan area have not been urged to install water tank storages. I understand that if every householder had a 9 000 litre tank the water stored would be the equivalent of what could be contained in two large reservoirs.

The water from the tanks could be used for many purposes, and the need to have these tanks should be considered when we are referring to the supply of water in such a dry State. The setting up of a council and of advisory committees is a good move, because local committees have worked well at various times, including war time. These people are familiar with local conditions, and the establishment of such committees in different areas will be of great benefit to the council. I shall be interested to see what areas are proclaimed, and how these provisions of the Bill will operate, and I shall also be interested to hear any comments referring to the Chowilla scheme, which was to be a reality at one stage. When this Bill is implemented the whole State will benefit, as we shall always have to conserve our water. Two or three years ago, when we were short of water, the Government, probably at great cost, sent a team around to replace leaking tap washers, in an effort to prevent the wasting of water.

It would be a commonsense move if all sections of the community were represented on the council so that a true picture would be given of the situation throughout the State, and the many activities associated with water

use could be considered. It has been said, with disappointment, that effluent from the Bolivar treatment works has not been used properly. At West Beach lawns are irrigated with treated water, and I believe that greater use could be made of water from such schemes, particularly from Bolivar. Last year in farming areas the season looked like being a wash-out because of lack of rain, but the moisture came later in the season to the benefit of everyone. However, the provision of good seasons is beyond the control of this House, but what I have said indicates how essential water is to everyone in this State. I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

BUILDING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from February 5. Page 2147.)

Clauses 3 to 12 passed.

Clause 13—"Enactment of Part VA of principal Act."

Mr. EVANS: During the second reading debate I raised the matter of the Chairman virtually having power to decide what work must be carried out. The Minister said that that power was necessary. That is getting back to a one-man committee. The Minister also said that he believed the right of entry to inspect buildings would be used properly and that reasonable notice would be given if it could be given. I should like that point clarified so that, if an argument should arise about an inspector or a member of the committee not having acted in a proper manner, there is some recourse back to the debate on this matter so that it can be seen that Parliament expected them to act in a certain way.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (14 to 19) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

BUILDING SOCIETIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

[Sitting suspended from 5.57 to 7.30 p.m.]

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1) (1976)

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended the House of Assembly to make appropriation of such amounts of the general revenue of the State as were required for all the purposes set forth in the Supplementary Estimates of Expenditure for the financial year 1975-76 and the Appropriation Bill (No. 1), 1976.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act for the further appropriation of the revenue of the State for the financial year ending on June 30, 1976, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

In moving the second reading of Appropriation Bill (No. 1) (1976) and in presenting these Supplementary Estimates to the House, I point out to members that South Australia faces a disturbing number of economic unknowns in the rest of this financial year. The consequences of some of those problems will greatly influence the State's budgetary situation in ensuing years. This State does not know in detail the provisions of the new Federal-State relations proposals that were outlined in the sketchiest of manners by the Prime

Minister at the recent Premiers' Conference. The impact of a major change in the financial agreements covering South Australia must be carefully analysed and the implications for future revenues thoroughly appreciated.

On the information given to the South Australian Government by the Federal Government so far, such a detailed examination is not possible and for that reason my Government is concerned that our favourable financial situation at the moment must be viewed against the possibility of future Commonwealth-State arrangements that could seriously disadvantage the State. The Prime Minister has already indicated publicly and repeatedly that the States must work on the basis of there being no extra money for State needs in the foreseeable future, and that Commonwealth funds for a number of specific projects will be cut back.

The South Australian Government is particularly concerned at the implications of these statements and has sought assurances from the Federal Treasurer that projects such as the purification of Adelaide's water supply (a \$100 000 000 project being financed through Commonwealth assistance) will be maintained. No such assurance has been given, and the unfortunate economic facts are that should Commonwealth funds be curtailed it would be impossible for the State's revenues to finance such a large project within the 10-year programme originally envisaged. Other projects requiring Federal funds can be viewed only in similarly uncertain light.

As an example of the further calls that will be made on the State's finances because of the Federal Government's cost-cutting programme (a programme which I believe to be the product of an economically simplistic assessment and which I believe will add to the problems facing the economy), I last week received a telex from the Prime Minister regarding the Government's request for extra funds for the Dartmouth dam project. The South Australian, Victorian and New South Wales Governments made a joint approach to the Commonwealth early last year for extra funds and, as a result of the change of Government, no additional money will be provided. The three States must therefore carry the burden of cost increases in labour and materials for this project wholly themselves.

Dr. Eastick: Who held the project up?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You aren't serious with that interjection, are you?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know where Rip Van Winkle has been. I referred earlier to the Commonwealth Government's economic policy, and I repeat that I believe it is misguided, simplistic, and likely to add to inflation and unemployment. In particular, the Federal Cabinet's decision to oppose the full passing of the cost-of-living increases has jeopardised one of the main stabilising influences in the economy at the moment. There is no doubt that spiralling wage costs fuelled the inflationary spiral of 1974-75, as workers through their union organisations tried to catch up with rising costs and at the same time increase their claims as a forward cover against future price rises.

The indexation agreement that was worked out between the trade union movement, the Federal Labor Government and some (eventually all) the State Governments removed the need for those actual and anticipatory wage claims by guaranteeing the work force that it would be compensated for price movements. Indexation has worked; a look at the figures in these Estimates will show that. The level of wage rises is much lower than was estimated, and certainly much lower than for the same time a year earlier. Mr. Fraser has jeopardised that agreement by

trying to break the indexation guidelines, and should indexation be hobbled the wages push of 1974 will start again, and the inflationary consequences will be severe.

In keeping with so many of his other shortsighted policies, Mr. Fraser has tried to avoid the impact of a 6.4 per cent wage increase that has accrued in the last two quarters, but is risking a boost to inflation far in excess of that figure. If indexation is not maintained, the State's finances will be called on to meet higher demands for wages and the cost of goods and services. Additionally, the impact of the Federal Government's policies is clearly that it is indifferent to the prospect of creating further unemployment, and in fact many of its actions will clearly throw more people out of work. Firms that depend on Federal Government contracts will be affected by this campaign of false economy, there will be no improvement in unemployment, the economic uncertainty that is being created by these policies will in no way lead to a restoration of consumer confidence, we cannot expect any significant increase in demand, and, from that, we cannot expect any great improvement in the labour market.

My Government has therefore made provision for further money to provide unemployment relief in South Australia; \$2 000 000 has been set aside for this for the next three months, and I will release details of this assistance shortly. As well, the Government intends to give further concessions in pay-roll tax to assist small business, and the cost of these concessions will be around \$2 500 000. The detail of these concessions will be announced tomorrow. The uncertain Commonwealth-State financial relations situation, the uncertain economic prospects while the Fraser Government continues its present policies, and the further calls on State finances for unemployment and pay-roll tax relief mean that, while we have an apparently favourable budgetary situation for the rest of this year, the prospects do not appear as optimistic as the figures by themselves suggest. The Revenue Budget presented to the House on August 28 last forecast the possibility of a balance on the operations for the year 1975-76. This forecast took into account an estimated increase in the level of average wages of about 21 per cent, as advised by the Commonwealth Treasury for the purposes of Financial Assistance Grants. After taking into account the provisions built into departmental estimates of payments as a result of the carry-over effect of wage and salary awards that became operative in 1974-75, it was calculated that a further round sum allowance of \$82 000 000 would be required to give safe cover against new awards that could come into effect during 1975-76. Because increased salary and wage rates could be expected to be accompanied by higher prices for supplies and services (and this was a situation we faced in 1974-75, when the prices of goods and services went up to the Government, and we had to make supplementary provision for that), it was desirable for a round sum allowance to be provided for this purpose also and, accordingly, the Budget included a provision of \$16 000 000.

By the time the overall financial result to the end of October, 1975, had become available, departments had conducted a complete review of their estimated receipts and payments having regard to their actual results for the first quarter of the year. The review showed that a careful control was being maintained on payments, and it seemed then that there were some prospects of improved receipts. It was also clear that indexation was working well and that the continuing restraint in the area of wages and salaries would have a favourable net impact on the Budget. The

net benefit would arise because the savings to the Budget would be greater than the corresponding fall in revenues from Financial Assistance Grants under the formula, State pay-roll tax, etc. By this time the Commonwealth Treasury had suggested that for purposes of Financial Assistance Grants it might be appropriate to assume an increase of only 16 per cent in the level of average wages instead of the earlier 21 per cent, which the Commonwealth Treasury had advised.

As a result of these favourable factors I was able to announce early in November the possibility of a surplus of the order of \$10 000 000 for 1975-76, instead of the previously expected balance on the year's accounts. Now, the situation is even more favourable, and the overall results to the end of January reveal a surplus on Revenue Account for the seven months of \$31 600 000. Now that departments have completed a review of their probable receipts and payments for 1975-76 in the light of their actual results for the first half of the year, I am able to report to the House the possibility of a surplus for the total year of \$25 000 000. I must stress that this figure should be looked at only in the light of the expenditure commitments announced a few minutes ago, and of the uncertain economic situation outlined at the beginning of my remarks.

There are four main reasons for this situation. First, indexation has continued to work well, and there has been a continuing responsible and restrained approach in the community in the area of wages and salaries. The net benefit of this factor to the Revenue Budget (that is, the excess of savings in cost over reductions in revenues from formula grants, pay roll tax, etc.) will probably be about \$4 000 000. Secondly, movements in average wages in State Government employment are not consistent with those in the Australian community as a whole. In each of the past two years and again in 1975-76, in the absence of better information, the State Revenue Budget has assumed that the wage movements are fairly consistent throughout Government and private employment. That is to say, whatever estimated percentage increase in average wages is used for purposes of Financial Assistance Grants is used also for the purpose of estimating pay-roll tax receipts and the costs of increased wages to the Government. In both 1973-74 and 1974-75 the actual costs to the State Budget for wage awards were considerably higher than had been estimated on the "consistency" approach. For 1975-76 it seems now that this factor is moving in the opposite direction, and the costs to the Government for wage awards will be considerably less than estimated by the "consistency" approach. This factor could have a favourable effect of about \$10 000 000 this year.

In the uncertain climate of wage fixation at the beginning of the year, it would not have been prudent for a Treasurer to assume a possible favourable situation and a complete reversal of the situation we had known in the previous two years. Thirdly, the special allowance for increased prices seems likely to be called on now only to a small extent. This is due partly to the favourable effect of wage restraint, which in turn is moderating the rises in prices for goods and services used by departments. However, it is due in larger part to the responsible attitude of officers in departments who are controlling payments very firmly and who seem to be making every effort to avoid calling on the special allowance. The favourable effect here could be about \$10 000 000. Fourthly, a number of State revenues are showing some upward trend, and there are prospects now that, in total, these improvements could lead to receipts some \$5 000 000 above estimate.

The major area of this extra recovery is in stamp duties. Members will recall that in the previous financial year we estimated stamp duties on the best information that we then had available but, in the latter part of the year, stamp duty revenue declined quite markedly, and special supplementary provisions in the Budget had to be made. This year stamp duty revenues have now exceeded our estimate, and in consequence we expect to get extra moneys of the kind I have outlined.

The four favourable factors, taken together, could lead to an improvement, in aggregate, of about \$29 000 000. On the other hand, there have been a number of unexpected increases in payments. The Supplementary Estimates before honourable members provide for additional appropriations of just over \$15 000 000. However, this should not be regarded as a net additional impact on the Budget to the extent of \$15 000 000. Some of it consists of increased wages and prices that are really applicable to the round sum allowances for new wage rate increases and further increases in prices. For various reasons, this part of the call on the allowances does not attract automatic appropriation (as does the bulk of new wage awards) and, accordingly, it is necessary to use other means of appropriation for it. Further, there will be savings in some areas to offset against the items included in the Supplementary Estimates. After allowing for these two points, it seems that the net additional impact of increased payments may be about \$4 000 000. That accounts for the difference between the \$29 000 000 extra "in" and my Budget estimate at this stage of a surplus of about \$25 000 000.

It is appropriate that I mention at this stage that for the year 1975-76 there could be a deficit of about \$7 000 000 on Loan Account, so that the opening balance of a small surplus of just under \$2 000 000 is expected to be converted to a deficit of about \$5 000 000 on Loan Account by June 30, 1976.

APPROPRIATION

I turn now to the question of appropriation. Members will be aware that early in each financial year Parliament grants the Government of the day appropriation by means of the principal Appropriation Act supported by Estimates of Expenditure. If these allocations prove insufficient, there are three other sources of authority which provide for supplementary expenditure; namely, a special section of the same Appropriation Act, the Governor's Appropriation Fund and a further Appropriation Bill supported by Supplementary Estimates.

Appropriation Act—Special section 3 (2) and (3): The main Appropriation Act contains a section which gives additional authority to meet increased costs resulting from any award, order or determination of a wage-fixing body, and to meet any unforeseen upward movement in the costs of electricity for pumping water. This special authority is being called upon this year to cover part of the cost to the Revenue Budget of a number of salary and wage determinations with the remainder being met from within the original appropriations. It is not available, however, to provide for the costs of leave loadings and other special decisions of that nature. Where these cannot be met from the Governor's Appropriation Fund, Supplementary Estimates must be presented.

Governor's Appropriation Fund: Another source of appropriation authority is the Governor's Appropriation Fund which, in terms of the Public Finance Act, may cover additional expenditure up to the equivalent of 1 per cent of the amount provided in the Appropriation Acts of a particular year. Of this amount, one-third is available,

if required, for purposes not previously authorised either by inclusion in the Estimates or by other specific legislation. As the amount appropriated by the main Appropriation Act rises from year to year, so the extra authority provided by the Governor's Appropriation Fund rises but, even after allowing for the automatic increase inherent in this provision, it is still to be expected that there will be the necessity for Supplementary Estimates from time to time to cover the larger departmental excesses.

Supplementary Estimates: The main explanation for this recurring requirement lies in the fact that, whilst additional expenditures may be financed out of additional revenues with no net adverse impact on the Budget, authority is required nonetheless to appropriate these revenues. Also, the appropriation procedures do not permit variations in payments above and below departmental estimates to be offset against one another. If one department appears likely to spend more than the amount provided at the beginning of the year, the Government must rely on other sources of appropriation authority irrespective of the fact that another department may be underspent by the same or a greater amount.

Further, although two block figures were included in the August Budget as allowances for salary and wage rate and price increases, these amounts were not included in the schedule to the main Appropriation Act. Where these are the reasons for seeking further appropriation, the House is being asked to make specific allocations for part of a figure shown as a general allowance in the original Budget for the year.

The appropriation available in the Governor's Appropriation Fund is being used this year to cover a number of individual excesses above departmental allocations, and this is the reason why some of the smaller departments do not appear on Supplementary Estimates, even though their expenditure levels may be affected by the same factors as those departments which do appear. It is usual to seek appropriation only for larger amounts of excess expenditure by way of an Appropriation Bill supported by Supplementary Estimates, the remainder being met from the Governor's Appropriation Fund.

DETAILS OF THE SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES

With these authorities in mind, the Government has decided to introduce Supplementary Estimates totalling \$15 058 000. The reasons for this additional expenditure are detailed in the explanations which follow. It should be noted that these estimates are based on known increases in salary and wage rates and prices to date. Should further increases occur which cannot be covered by the special provisions of the Appropriation Act and the Governor's Appropriation Fund, it may be necessary to introduce further Supplementary Estimates later in the year.

Police—Salaries and wages payable by the Police Department are expected to exceed the estimate made in August last by more than \$1 200 000. The majority of this excess falls within the provisions of section 3 (2) of Appropriation Act (No. 2) 1975, which, as I explained earlier, gives appropriation authority for certain wage and salary increases. However, bonus payments to members of the Police Force for additional duty over the Christmas period, flow-on payments to Women Police Auxiliaries and some other payments of a more minor nature are not covered by this section. The sum of \$200 000 has been provided in the Supplementary Estimates for these purposes.

Price increases affecting many of the operational items of the department necessitate the provision of a further \$200 000 for administration expenses, and a revision of the motor vehicle replacement programme indicates that a

further \$100 000 will be required to enable the department to comply with replacement policy. The total provision in Supplementary Estimates for the Police Department is therefore \$500 000.

Treasurer—Miscellaneous: In the August Budget a provision of \$836 000 was made for payments to the Electricity Trust to subsidise the supply of electricity to country areas. The trust's latest estimate of expenditure on these subsidies is \$380 000 higher than the Budget figure, because such costs as workmen's compensation insurance premiums and debt servicing charges are higher, and fuel costs have increased. Appropriation is also required to cover transfers to the Government Insurance Fund to provide fire insurance cover on Government buildings. Claims on the fund as a result of Government and school buildings destroyed or damaged by fire have already exceeded the estimate made for this purpose in August last, and the indications are that a further \$150 000 may be required during the remainder of this year. The total provision in Supplementary Estimates for Treasurer-Miscellaneous is therefore \$530 000.

Lands—Miscellaneous: Members will be aware that, during the latter part of 1975, the Commonwealth Government began to scale down its Regional Employment Development Scheme. The proposed time table would have resulted in several worthwhile projects remaining incomplete, and for this and other reasons the phase-out period was considered to be too short. Therefore, Cabinet decided that the State's metropolitan unemployment relief programme, for which a provision of \$800 000 had been made in the August Budget, should be extended to include both metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas. A further \$2 000 000 was allocated for expenditure on the extended programme.

Members are aware of the difficulties confronting school-leavers in the present economic climate and of the programmes announced by the Government to help to alleviate this problem. The cost of these programmes is estimated to be a little over \$200 000. In addition, the Government decided this week that the continuing unemployment situation required, and the improved Budget situation permitted, a further allocation of \$2 000 000. These three amounts, totalling \$4 200 000, are included in Supplementary Estimates under a line now shown as advances and grants for unemployment relief. As I mentioned earlier, the qualification in the August Budget, restricting the programme to metropolitan areas, is now inappropriate.

Public Buildings: An additional appropriation of \$500 000 is required by this department to provide for increased costs of salaries (\$300 000) and contingencies (\$200 000). The appropriation for salaries is required for additional long service leave payments, greater involvement by design staff on Revenue rather than Loan Account projects, and some smaller adjustments. The higher cost in contingencies is again a reflection of the effects of inflation.

Works—Miscellaneous: A further step has been taken in pursuance of the Government's policy to improve the control of environmental pollution through the construction of a toxic waste disposal plant at Bolivar. This plant is designed to receive waste, which is not acceptable in the sewerage system, from industrial waste disposal contractors. A fee will be charged for the provision of this service to cover the establishment and operating costs involved. The sum of \$150 000 is provided in Supplementary Estimates to cover the installation and operating expenses for the remainder of this financial year.

Expenditures on preliminary research and investigations into water supplies are charged initially to the Loan

Account, and the cost of those projects not expected to result in future capital works is transferred to Revenue Account annually. An allocation of \$440 000 was made in the Budget to absorb these transfers. It has been established now that the number of projects that are expected to proceed to the stage at which the transfer should take place will be greater this year than was estimated in August. A further \$1 000 000 is included in Supplementary Estimates for this purpose. The total amount provided in Supplementary Estimates under Minister of Works—Miscellaneous is therefore \$1 150 000.

Education: On present indications the original Budget figure for education is likely to be exceeded by about \$11 200 000, of which about \$5 500 000 is covered by the salary and wage rate provisions of the main Appropriation Act. Additional salaries and wages amounting to \$4 900 000 are included in Supplementary Estimates to provide for further staff appointments (\$600 000), temporary relieving assistants (\$800 000), special language studies and migrant education (\$331 000), wage adjustments for ancillary staff, laboratory assistants, release-time scholars and other departmental employees (\$945 000), increases in contract cleaning costs as a result of the Cleaners' Award (\$2 018 000), and other minor adjustments including pay-roll tax (\$206 000). In common with other departments inflation has contributed to the higher cost of contingency items in education, and a total of \$800 000 has been provided in the Supplementary Estimates as follows:

	\$
Primary education.....	200 000
Secondary education.....	250 000
Buses—running expenses.....	100 000
Further education.....	250 000
	<hr/>
	\$800 000

The total amount provided in the Supplementary Estimates for the Education Department is therefore \$5 700 000.

Agriculture—Miscellaneous: It has become necessary to make funds available to the Dairy Cattle Fund to enable herd testing associations to continue their recording programmes in relation to butterfat and milk production. The Government shares equal liability with the associations for these programmes. Increased testing costs have impacted on the fund, and an advance is required until contributions have been collected from dairymen for the 1976-77 financial year. Repayment of the amount of \$88 000 provided in Supplementary Estimates is expected in about August, 1976.

Railways: The Budget Estimates presented to the House in August included a provision of \$81 300 000 for the operation of the State's rail services. Of this amount \$62 905 000 refers to salaries that will be exceeded by about \$1 700 000. All of this will be covered by the salary and wage rate provisions of the main Appropriation Act or from within the original estimates. However, the effects of inflation on operating expenses, which are not affected by the special provisions, have been substantial. For example, fuel costs have risen by 27 per cent and steel prices 15 per cent since July, 1975. For the department as a whole, contingencies are now expected to cost 12 per cent more than originally planned, and \$2 200 000 has been included in Supplementary Estimates to defray these additional costs.

Transport—Miscellaneous: The Highways Act provides for annual losses incurred in the operation of the m.v. *Troubridge* to be met from the Highways Fund. In August, Cabinet reviewed cargo freight rates and a 10 per cent increase was approved. After this adjustment, operating losses in 1975-76 are expected to total \$860 000 compared to \$560 000 in 1974-75. This cost to the

Highways Fund reduces the availability of funds for road purposes, and Cabinet has decided that a contribution should be made from the Revenue Account, recognising that, in some respects, the *Troubridge* is comparable with other unprofitable transport links. An amount of \$190 000 is provided in Supplementary Estimates for this purpose.

The clauses of the Bill give the same kinds of authority as in the past. Clause 2 authorises the issue of a further \$15 058 000 from general revenue. Clause 3 appropriates that sum for the purposes set out in the schedule. Clause 4 provides that the Treasurer shall have available to spend only such amounts as are authorised by a warrant from His Excellency the Governor, and that the receipts of the payees shall be accepted as evidence that the payments have been duly made. Clause 5 gives power to issue money out of Loan funds, other public funds, or bank overdraft, if the moneys received from the Australian Government and the general revenue of the State are insufficient to meet the payments authorised by this Bill. Clause 6 gives authority to make payments in respect of a period prior to July 1, 1975. Clause 7 provides that amounts appropriated by this Bill are in addition to other amounts properly appropriated. I commend the Bill for the consideration of members.

Dr. TONKIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

FIRE BRIGADES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 3. Page 2027.)

Mr. CUMBE (Torrens): This is a very short but important Bill, and is subject to and was contingent on the passing of the Building Act Amendment Bill, which was discussed this afternoon. The Bill deals with two disparate subjects: first, following the passing of the Building Act Amendment Bill relating to fire safety of buildings, it extends the powers of fire brigades relating to the prevention of fires and the regulation of fire safety and, secondly, it provides the Fire Brigades Board with a borrowing power of the kind usually provided to statutory corporations. If we first consider the borrowing powers (and this provision has obviously been put into the Bill in addition to the provisions relating to fire safety) the opportunity has been taken to extend and modernise them.

I invite members to compare the provisions of the old Act with those now introduced and they will realise how cumbersome were the borrowing powers of the board: they were archaic. When the original legislation was introduced I am sure that it would have been considered as conservative, but today we have different ideas about, and use different verbiage to describe powers of statutory authorities. I support the provision in relation to borrowing powers, as these powers are being brought into line with modern practice. The Bill empowers the board to borrow from the Treasurer or, with the consent of the Treasurer, from any person, in which case the liability is guaranteed by the Treasurer. It also deals with the important subject of fire safety. Clause 3 amends the principal Act by extending the power of officers of the Fire Brigade to police fire safety. Clause 4 empowers the making of regulations relating to fire safety and increases the penalties for breaches of the regulations.

When I spoke on the Building Act Amendment Bill, I made the plea that the Bill be administered with common sense, and I was pleased to hear the Minister's assurance that that was how it would be administered. There are wide powers in clause 3 of this Bill. We find that an officer may enter into or upon or inspect any place or thing for the purpose of ascertaining whether the provisions of this

Act, or any other Act relating to the prevention, extinction or containment of a fire or the safety of persons or property in the event of fire are being complied with or contravened. The important phrase in the clause is that they "may enter into or upon and inspect".

I hope that this power, which we are now granting and which is similar in many aspects to the provision in the original Act, will be handled with common sense. We must maintain a balance and ensure that, where the safety of life is concerned, adequate provisions are provided for officers of the brigade and perhaps police to enter into buildings to make an inspection. It is also important to see that the law of the land is being carried out, but I draw attention to the sweeping powers provided in the Bill.

Clause 4 contains penalties for the non-observance of regulations provided under this Act and, if the regulations are not complied with, the penalty imposed has been increased. The penalty is increased from \$40 to \$200. However, as the sum of \$40 was fixed in 1936 (40 years ago), the increase is not unreasonable. I again make the plea that the legislation be administered with common sense. The Opposition supports the provisions of the Bill, especially as it will lead to the avoidance of fire traps, especially where life is endangered. Accordingly, I support the passage of this measure.

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

GOVERNORS' PENSIONS BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from February 5. Page 2148.)

Clause 2—"Definitions."

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): When this Bill was previously before the Committee the question was raised as to the date from which this provision would operate. It was suggested that this was discriminatory in some way in relation to previous incumbents of the office who might conceivably at some future stage want to have some provision made for them. The Government has considered this matter but does not believe that there is any reason to make some retrospective provision. The provision that we are making now arises in the particular circumstances of the present case. We have not had any submissions at all to suggest that in any way previous incumbents or their dependants were in a position which was not properly catered for. In these circumstances, after giving consideration to an amendment, I do not believe it is appropriate to make provision other than for the present and future cases. Therefore, I do not intend to move an amendment to the measure.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am disappointed to hear the Premier say this. When I put up a suggestion last week the Premier was out of the State and the Deputy Premier received the suggestion most sympathetically. I believe that was and is the Deputy Premier's personal view. What the Premier has said is really self-defeating because, if there has been no request to the Government (and I accept that there has been no request from anyone else who could possibly be affected), it is highly unlikely that there ever will be and, therefore, there is no need to have a cut-off period in the Bill. On the other hand, it is possible that one of these ladies or gentlemen could at some future time be in circumstances in which we would like to be able to help them. Why should they not be able to approach the Government, whichever Government it may be (whoever may be in office at that time), with a request for help that can be no more than a request for help? If it were

regarded as deserving, why should they not be able to get the same assistance as we are properly able to give Sir Mark Oliphant or any future incumbent of that office?

It is I suppose putting it too high to say it is insulting to those who have held the office before to put the cut-off date in the Bill, but it is certainly unnecessary to do so, yet it does close the door without an amendment, without the matter having to be ventilated in Parliament, ever to help anyone who has held this office before in South Australia. It is a delicate matter and it is one which I am sorry we have had to raise and argue about at such length. All I can say, because I do not have the amendment here to move, is that I expected until I was summoned into the Committee a moment ago that the amendment would be before us, and I am unable now to move it to test the House. I wish I were. If I had it, I would do so. It is rather mean of the Premier not to be prepared to go on with this, and I ask whether, in any circumstances, he would reconsider the matter because of the points I have now been able to put to him which I could not put to him in his absence the other day, although I am sure the Deputy Premier put them to him as forcibly and as clearly as he could. It seems an unnecessary provision in the Bill, and that is why I made the proposal.

Dr. EASTICK: This is completely consistent with the point of view put on Thursday last, when we believed that the matter would receive further consideration, and that information would be given to the Committee by the Government of its intention so that, if the Government was not prepared to proceed, Opposition members would be in a position to put an amendment to fulfil what we believe is an obligation of this State. Because we have been denied this opportunity by the lateness of the report by the Premier, I ask that progress be reported and that the Committee have leave to sit again.

The CHAIRMAN: The question is, "That progress be reported and the Committee have leave to sit again". Those in favour say "Aye"; those against "No". I think the Noes have it.

Dr. Eastick: Divide!

The Committee divided on the question:

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

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

Pair—Aye—Mr. Arnold. No—Mrs. Byrne.

The CHAIRMAN: There are 22 Ayes and 22 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I give my casting vote in favour of the Noes.

Question thus negatived.

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

Page 1, lines 6 and 7—Leave out "on or after the first day of December, 1971."

I am prepared to listen to the reasons of honourable members and to be accommodating.

Dr. EASTICK: While someone has an opportunity to look at the implications of the amendment, I shall say, and I think the Premier will accept, that he earlier said that the Government had received no application and had no knowledge of any person, a previous Governor or his wife, who was in need of assistance. I suggest that there

is a certain pride with many people, and rightly so, and to suggest to this Committee that these people should necessarily come forward to make their position known to the Government is totally wrong. If I use the term in the widest possible sense, they have been in the employment of the State, and there is some knowledge among members of the persons who have occupied these posts. On Thursday last we identified the only persons likely to be involved in retrospectivity of this nature as Lady George, Lady Harrison, Lord Norrie, Sir Edric Bastyan or Lady Bastyan—certainly not a long list, and all people who had given of their best in the interest of this State. It ill behoves the Government, through the mouth of the Premier, to suggest that these people should have been the ones to make the approach to the Government. Now that the ramifications of the amendment can be considered I believe that it could be supported, but whilst I check to see whether it is totally adequate, some other member may care to address the Committee.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: With one slight amendment of the date, the amendment of the Premier is the amendment which I had had prepared to move had he not done so. I appreciate his being willing to reconsider this matter. Neither he nor any of us, I am sure, will regret taking this time limit out of the Bill. It is a gracious act which will probably never have any practical effect at all. However, the ability to assist, should assistance be needed, will now exist.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN moved:

Page 1—

Line 16—Leave out "but does not include any".

Lines 17 and 18—Leave out all words in these lines.

Dr. EASTICK: I believe the action now being taken by the Committee will never be regretted by the Parliament or the people of this State.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (3 to 6) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

PUBLIC AUTHORITIES (INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 5. Page 2150.)

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): Last Thursday, when the debate on this Bill was interrupted by the adjournment of the House, I was stating the Liberal Party's policy in this area. I should like briefly to reiterate that policy: the Liberal Party does not oppose the appointment by the Minister of an employee to the board, provided that that employee has exceptional skills and qualities that will greatly aid the board in its deliberations and decisions. However, we in the Liberal Party certainly oppose the appointment of employees to the board on the basis of the Government's industrial democracy policy as outlined by the Labor Party. I also pointed out to the House on Thursday exactly what that policy was. I covered particularly the Government's private sector policy, pointing out that, although the Premier had restated that policy a week ago yesterday, it had not basically changed at all.

All the Premier did in his further statement was to make it somewhat less specific but still with the same basic intent and also to omit any mention whatsoever of the introduction of legislation. I point out that the Premier did not say in his statement that legislation would not be introduced. Likewise, he did not say if, or when, it would be introduced. We must therefore take his only statements on this subject regarding legislation for the introduction of industrial

democracy to be his 1975 election policy speech, in which the Premier said, "After the next State election (that is, three years from 1975) I shall legislate for the introduction of our industrial democracy policy on the boards of private companies."

I point out to the House the Government's revised policy regarding the public sector. It concerns me greatly to see the tremendous conflict in approach within that policy. In the speech delivered by the Premier a week ago, it was clearly indicated that the Government would not introduce worker participation or industrial democracy with worker directors on boards for the Public Service departments. However, it would introduce this in public authorities, and that is, of course, what this Bill is all about. The Premier said it should not be implemented in the Public Service or Government departments because those departments are answerable to the entire State, to the voters, and to the Government of the day, and therefore they are answerable to policies over which those employees have no control.

I should have thought the same principle would apply to people in a private company, as such people are answerable to shareholders. If they are not shareholders, the employees obviously have no say in the specific long-term policy of the company. Of course, they should have some say in the areas that directly concern them, and obviously any progressive company in this State has already implemented such procedures to ensure that the views of employees are known and considered by management.

It should be pointed out that the Government's policy on industrial democracy is that the Premier suddenly throws up the fag as if, for the first time, the trade unions have realised that management exists and may perhaps listen to their policies, so that the Government is to force management to do so. That is ridiculous. In any worthwhile company, management has been trying to listen to the problems of employees. Equally, in those companies employees have listened and have taken heed of the problems being faced by management and, together, they work out a mutual policy for the benefit of both employees and shareholders. However, the Government's industrial democracy policy is an attempt to push shareholders completely aside and is, in effect, a policy of worker control for the private companies in this State.

I view with some concern the Premier's pending visit to Yugoslavia to examine that country's industrial democracy policy or, as it is more commonly known there, the "worker control" policy. Yugoslavia would be one of the worst countries the Premier could visit to examine such a policy, because that is not the type of policy that business enterprises would like to see adopted in Australia or, indeed, South Australia. In fact, companies have already expressed their opinion on that matter. The Premier is trying to forestall their concern by coming out with some sort of shady whitewash of the problem and making out that he has radically altered his policy, when he has done no such thing. Although the Government has altered the time table for trying to implement its policy, the Labor Party has not changed its policy which, after all, is the policy that really counts.

I see a conflict of interest existing if an employee also becomes a board member. Even though the Bill states that if an employee is a board member there shall not be a conflict of interest because he is an employee, I maintain that there always will be such a conflict, and such a Bill will not remove the reality of the situation.

Sir Thomas Playford's example (and I refer to him because the Premier, when it is convenient, uses him, as he did this afternoon, as an example of the sort of person one

should follow) should be followed by the Premier himself, because Sir Thomas had a deliberate and clearly understood policy that employees could not and must not serve as members on the board of public authorities. Sir Thomas had that view because he saw the real conflict that must exist for any employee in that situation. In a television interview the Premier stated that this was a rather innocuous sort of Bill which simply allowed any employee to sit on the board and which removed any conflict of interest because the person concerned was an employee receiving a salary.

The Bill is not innocuous because, through it, the Government plans to introduce its industrial democracy policy for at least some of the public authorities in this State. My assessment, after reading various constituting Acts proclaiming certain public authorities, is that it is not necessary to change the constituting Act concerned if this Bill is passed. Section 5 of the South Australian Housing Trust Act provides:

The trust shall consist of a chairman and five other members, all of whom shall be appointed by the Governor. That is on the Minister's recommendation. Because it is not stipulated where the Chairman or the other five members should come from, it is clear that the Minister could ask employees to elect two board members. Although this measure seems to be rather trivial, I am sure the Premier would agree that this is the Bill with which he intends to introduce industrial democracy to the public authorities of this State. It is for that reason that the Liberal Party will try radically to amend the Bill. If the amendments are unacceptable, we shall vote against the measure on the third reading, so let there be no misunderstanding about that.

The Opposition has no objection to an employee being on the board if he is appointed by the Minister and is a member of the board in his own right because of a special expertise, not simply because he is an employee's representative. He should not be there simply because the Premier would like to have an employee on the board for the sake of having an employee there. The amendments to be moved will be debated during the Committee stage. Section 11 of the State Bank Act provides that the board should consist of five members who should be appointed from time to time by the Governor. Therefore the Premier could also implement the Government's industrial democracy policy in that organisation without changing the constituting Act.

For those reasons, the Opposition strongly opposes the Bill in its original form and urges all members to support the proposed amendments. We ask all members to consider again the Government's industrial democracy policy, a policy rejected by companies, business people and managers in this State and also rejected, I understand, when put forward by the Housing Trust, by what seems on the surface to be a majority of employees in that public authority. It is interesting to note that late last year the Premier indicated in this House that the policy for the trust would be adopted, I think, by the beginning of November. However, the State Government still has not adopted its industrial democracy plan for the trust. On the same occasion the Premier also indicated that it would be unnecessary to introduce legislation to give effect to that policy. However, the measure we are considering has been found necessary. I am therefore pleased that the Government had to introduce legislation to implement its plan, because it has given Parliament a chance to debate the overall principle involved, and it will also give Parliament the opportunity of rejecting that policy as it deserves to be rejected.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): The Bill could be termed the "workers of the board" Bill. I should have thought the Premier would examine the situation during his oversea visit last year. West Germany has certain statutory requirements involving employee directors on limited companies employing more than 500 employees, whereas this Bill relates to many fewer employees. In Holland the situation is similar to that which applies in West Germany. In France, two employee delegates are elected to the board as advisers but not as full directors. In France and other parts of Europe the situation is much different from what I imagined the Premier intends to do with this legislation. France has works councils, but what is the situation in South Australia? Last year the Government issued a glossy booklet entitled *Make Life Work*, containing among other things a photograph of the Premier. The booklet was intended for the workers of the State so that they could see what worker participation was all about and could be given some encouragement. The booklet contains an extract of a speech made by the Premier on September 25, 1973, in which he states, in part:

... worker participation generally and job enrichment in particular—is one of the greatest challenges facing governments, trade unions and employers this decade and perhaps for the remainder of the century . . . Job enrichment is not a sop to the peasantry; it is, perhaps, the next necessary consequence of the Industrial Revolution.

South Australia has several worker participation schemes; workers are represented on shop steward committees, safety committees and on certain employee councils.

We have job rotation and works councils, and there are many other ways in which worker participation already operates in this State. I wonder what the main object is of having workers on the board. Worker participation is really one step to having workers on the board. How would the representatives be chosen, and what would their terms of reference be? That is something we ought to know. What period would their appointment cover, and what would their remuneration be? The Donovan report, which is often quoted in the House by the Government when it suits its purpose, clearly deals in paragraph 998 on page 257 (chapter 15) with worker participation in management. This report is the bible which the Government on several occasions has said is the only real book that has been written in detail on trade unions, the situation of management and worker participation, and workers on the board, etc.; in fact, it covers the whole area of workers and trade unions. It states:

The Trade Union Council have made proposals to us for securing increased participation by workers in management. They propose its introduction at three levels. First, at plant level they would like a work people's representative, e.g., a shop steward, to sit on "whatever is the normal body which regularly meets at plant level to take decisions on the running of that plant". Secondly, they suggest that there should be trade union representation at intermediate levels, for example, at regional level or "at a level which represents the functional authority for the particular product within the enterprise". Thirdly, at top level there should be legislation to allow companies, if they wish to make provision for trade union representation on boards of directors.

Earlier, the Premier said that the Government was willing to legislate on this matter (and I will refer to this matter later), whereas recently he doubled back on his undertaking. The Donovan report, which is a lengthy report, was published in the United Kingdom at the high cost of about \$227 000. It is a report of which we must take some cognisance. Paragraph 998, on page 257 of the report, concludes:

The Trade Union Council seek no compulsory powers, and wish progress on a voluntary basis. If progress is to be substantial, they believe that the CBI must take a strong lead in encouraging its members to follow the spirit of their proposals.

The report states that there is much to lose by having workers on the board, because such workers could be criticised by their fellow workers for being the boss's man. Further, workers on the board would find it difficult, for instance, to decide when it was necessary to make some of their colleagues redundant. In such circumstances, they would be split in their allegiance, either to the floor workers or to management at executive level.

West Germany has two kinds of board, namely, supervisory boards and executive boards. Members on the supervisory boards decide the major questions of policy, whereas the executive board of management actively manages the whole enterprise. The Premier, who visited West Germany last year or the year before in order to obtain information about its schemes, came back with some bright ideas and said that he thought that legislation ought to be introduced to get this matter going. It is interesting to find that supervisory boards in West Germany comprise two-thirds of the representatives as shareholders and one-third as workers. It is also interesting to note that the coal and steel industry has had workers on the board since the 1920's; this is nothing new there, but the boards there do not appear to function any better than do boards in other countries that have equal representation or no worker representation at all. Paragraph 1002, on page 258 of the Donovan report, states:

A majority of us feel unable to recommend the appointment of "workers' directors" to the boards of companies; and have reached this conclusion for a number of reasons. One is that such an office might expose its holder at times to an almost intolerable strain when decisions unfavourable to workers (for example on redundancy) had to be taken because they were in the interests of the company as a whole. A concurring vote by the workers' director might be unavoidable if he is to do his duty as a director; and yet could easily be misunderstood or misrepresented. The result might be to open a gap between the workers and the workers' director which it would be extremely difficult thereafter to bridge. In effect he would cease to represent them. Another reason is the difficulty of finding an equitable definition of the extent to which a workers' director should bear personal responsibility jointly with the other members of the board for their decisions or for any misfeasances on their part. A third reason is that the appointment of workers' directors in the near future would divert attention from the urgent task of reconstructing company and factory collective bargaining.

Of course, that would not apply here, because we are not under a system of collective bargaining. The report continues:

Finally the majority of us cannot see that the appointment of a small number of workers' directors would be likely to give workers a real share in or control over the work of the boards they joined.

So, the situation in the Donovan report is plain. The Government has taken notice of this report only when it has suited the Government to do so. The following is an extract from a seminar on worker participation held in Oslo between August 20 and August 30, 1974:

Parties are usually reluctant to get participation going. This reluctance is rarely assisted by the use of legislation, which often brings additional problems. Joint agreement is the best climate for success, and compulsion is usually resented by all parties.

Yet we see that the first worker environment report of the Australian Labor Party is not suitable. An article in the *Advertiser* of February 2, 1976, referring to the Premier, says:

He said he did not expect any legislation now or after the next State election. "I think this process of introducing industrial democracy is going to be a 20 to 50 year job," he said. "You cannot legislate for it—it has to happen."

I remember saying something very similar to that statement some years ago. The Premier did not change his mind immediately he returned from studying the matter in Sweden, West Germany and Holland. What he has said this month is a far cry from what he said in 1974. An article in the *Advertiser* of September 27, 1974, says:

If South Australian industries and unions refuse to co-operate with the Government's worker participation policy, legislation may be introduced to make them. The Premier (Mr. Dunstan) made this clear last night in an extended outline of his objectives to the Institute of Directors. But if necessary he would legislate for it. Such a move almost certainly would force companies to accept workers on their boards.

At the same time, he received backing from the then Commonwealth Minister for Labour and Industry, Mr. Cameron. An article in the *Advertiser* of November 5, 1974, states:

The Minister for Labour and Industry (Mr. Cameron) said yesterday he hoped the South Australian Government would legislate for worker participation if the need arose. "The Australian Government has no power to legislate, but the States can," he told a seminar at the Hotel Australia on job enrichment.

So, in this case both the Premier and the then Commonwealth Minister for Labour and Industry were interested in making private enterprise do something about worker participation. Previously, some unions made public statements about the matter. It would be interesting to know what the unions think about it today. An article, headed "Worklife unit survives union attack", in the *Advertiser* of June 18, 1974, states:

The State Government's worker participation unit survived a spirited challenge from trade unions at the 71st State A.L.P. convention which ended yesterday.

There was a call for disbanding the unit; the call was supported by several union officials, including Mr. Cavanagh, then Secretary of the Miscellaneous Workers Union. This was saved by Mr. Sandilands, an organiser of the Vehicle Builders Union. Mr. Scott, the South Australian Branch Secretary of the Amalgamated Metal Workers Union, was reported as saying:

The South Australian Government's worker participation unit had become discredited because the trade union movement "would not have a bar of it".

Another newspaper article in 1974 states:

The State Government's three-month-old Worker Participation Branch was described yesterday as "a rip-off, a sell-out and a public relations show". These were the remarks of the Australian Workers Union industrial advocate, Mr. L. Wright, who is the author of two motions concerning the Worker Participation Branch to be put before the South Australian Labor Party convention from June 14 to 17.

We know that that survived to what it is now. We have seen a distinct change in the Premier's attitude. This Bill is the thin end of the wedge. It will be interesting to see what happens from now on. The Premier is planning to visit Yugoslavia in connection with worker participation.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I do not know who mentioned only that country. I shall be going to a heck of a lot of countries.

Mr. MATHWIN: I understood that the Premier would study worker participation. He has already been to Sweden, Holland and West Germany.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I have not been to Holland.

Mr. MATHWIN: But the Premier has been to several European countries on this matter, and now he is going to Yugoslavia.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: And to Austria.

Mr. MATHWIN: Yugoslavia would be a better place for a holiday than for an investigation into worker participation, because there they do not call it worker participation: they call it worker co-operatives. They have an extreme type of socialism; one wonders where the pink ends and the red starts. One may wonder whether the idea behind the Premier's visit to Yugoslavia is to study worker co-operatives in that country. If that is the type of State in which the Premier believes, and if he thinks that workers there have advantages compared to workers in South Australia, perhaps he will have his eyes opened, if he is willing to have them opened. I shall be interested to hear what the Premier has to say on his return from Yugoslavia, because people in that country are extremists. Heaven forbid that we adopt their policies. I have read about some of them. I am surprised that the Premier has not done so, because if he had perhaps he would have changed his itinerary. I hope that members of the Government will read the Donovan report and take some notice of it; they always take notice of a report that suits them. This report has been read by the Minister of Labour and Industry, who quoted it when we debated secret ballots. The member for Playford quotes it when doing so gives an advantage to the Labor Party, and I will be interested to hear whether he or the Premier have read that part of the report referring to workers on boards, and how much notice the Premier will take of it.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I think the Premier is embarking on a course of action that may have serious implications for the future of management in this State. It is interesting to read and hear the comments of leading industrialists in this State concerning the stated policy of the Australian Labor Party. It seems from recent statements of the Premier that he is having second thoughts about this proposal. In his excellent contribution, the member for Davenport outlined the Liberal Party policy and showed where it differed from the policy of the Labor Party. I understand that the policy now adopted by the Labor Party was drawn up by the Premier and Mr. John Scott, an extreme left-wing member of the Labor Party who would like to nationalise most industries in this State. I understand that he once advocated nationalising Chrysler Australia Ltd.

If the Premier intends to implement that policy no wonder he is to visit Yugoslavia, because its policies would be in line with those espoused by Mr. John Scott. A report presented to the 1975 State A.L.P. convention, which was held from June 13 to 16, under the heading of "Worker involvement" stated that 75 per cent of the economy of this State was in private hands. It is fortunate that it is: otherwise, many more people would be unemployed. A frightening aspect of the recommendations in that report is that it is the policy of this Government to deny shareholders the right to control their funds. How do the Premier and Government members expect people to invest money in organisations if they cannot control the capital? If this part of the Labor Party programme is put into effect, overseas investors will be frightened away, and many South Australian companies will be forced to move to other States, thus draining this State of valuable resources in manpower and expertise.

I cannot understand why the Labor Party should implement these proposals, if it wishes industry to prosper and develop, and bring new capital into this State. I wonder whether the Premier, when overseas, will tell

potential investors that, if they establish a public company in South Australia, they will have to comply with these proposals. If he did, I would not expect them to consider coming here, and I am sure they would be lost to other States, where there are far more responsible Governments.

Mr. Dean Brown: I understand we have lost one already.

Mr. GUNN: I would be surprised if it was only one. How could directors of large overseas companies tell their shareholders that they intended to invest so many dollars in South Australia but that they could not control the asset? The recommendation of the convention states:

Workers in the organisation should have at board level equal representation with representatives of investors.

It also states:

We should train and appoint public experts in company management who will be public officers.

Obviously, the Labor Party will train them: perhaps the person responsible will be the ex-member for Spence, Mr. Ernest Crimes, who has been appointed to a board and who has espoused opposition to the profit motive. Will these persons be trained in socialism and taught to destroy efficiency and not to make profits? I believe that the Premier has an obligation to say what he and his Government plan, because they must have accepted this stated policy. Surely the Premier will say publicly to industry and commerce what he intends to do. It would be bad enough if the policy of giving workers the right to sit on boards was put into effect, although I am not opposed to the idea if it operates on a commonsense basis. However, as the Labor Party believes in compulsory unionism under the guise of preference to unionists, there will be union representation on boards, and union representation and Labor Party stooges will be used to nationalise all public companies in this State in order to implement this socialist policy.

I believe that the Government should reconsider this sort of policy. It has completely ignored a responsible and logical report which it commissioned a few years ago, and has accepted the dictates of left-wing members of the Labor Party, like Mr. John Scott, and obviously has worked in co-operation with Mr. Halfpenny and Mr. Carmichael. I am confident the people of this State will not accept this sort of policy.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I do not imagine that honourable members expect me to reply to the Party-political ravings of the honourable member who has just resumed his seat, because what he said was not serious and, as usual, I am sure he did not intend it to be. I refer to one or two things he said: he repeated a statement misquoting the policy of the Labor Party which has been repeatedly denied by this Party: that is, that the Labor Party will train community directors for appointment to boards. The honourable member knows that is not in the policy, and that there is no statement that the Labor Party will do anything of that kind.

Mr. Dean Brown: It states "we".

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, and that refers to the community, as is clear from the context. That has been clearly stated time and time again, and I have made a full statement in the newspapers explaining it. However, the honourable member chooses to quote statements from newspapers when he thinks they are of advantage and chooses to ignore statements asked of and given by me in explanation of the policy when he does not find that those statements suit what he has to say for the kind of Party-political speech that he makes. Let

me turn to the reasons for introducing this measure, because that seems to have evaded members who have spoken on this measure this evening.

Already in some statutory institutions in South Australia there are directors on the boards who have been elected by the employees of the organisations. That has been recognised by this Parliament specifically in the case of the South Australian Theatre Company, where specific provision was made for such representation. It has been in effect in the South Australian Meat Corporation for some time; in fact, it was recognised in the old Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board. When the Act was changed, no specific provision was made for an employee representative but, in fact, the same employee representative who had been on the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board was appointed to the Samcor board. He is the President of the Meat and Allied Trades Employees Union, and he has the commendation of the Chairman and every other member of the board, who would all say from their experience on the board, that the board could not do without him and that he is an invaluable member of it. He is elected by the employees of the board.

In only one statutory authority in South Australia is there a specific disqualification against employees sitting on the board, and that is the Electricity Trust. There is no other specific disqualification of employees in any of our Statutes and, in consequence, the Government previously, as in the case of the Samcor board, made an appointment where that was the appropriate course. The Samcor operation was the first experiment conducted by the Government following the receipt of reports, to which the honourable member has referred, of the committees established to examine worker participation. It has conducted experiments over some period which has given us valuable lessons in the development of on-going policy. However, the Government has received a suggestion from the Crown Solicitor that there may be some conflict as to the fiduciary nature of board membership in an employee's being a member of the board. This is not a statutory provision but something that may be assumed at common law. There are no specific cases to which he referred, and there is no case for establishing that view.

I respectfully disagreed with the view of the Crown Solicitor on this matter. However, just in case there should be any qualms on the part of people who might be appointed after an employee election, this Bill was introduced. I point out to honourable members that, although in law there is no specific disqualification except in one specific statutory authority, this measure is introduced to put the matter beyond doubt. It does not specifically provide for the appointment of employees. That would be done in due course by arrangement after adoption of models that will require the agreement of the boards of the authorities and of the employees within the authorities themselves. The provision, I believe, is sensible. It is being sought by the employees in the Housing Trust and in the State Savings Bank. We can expect that the models in these areas will be completed this year and that valuable experience will be derived from the experiments in those areas.

That policy is gaining wide acceptance amongst the people concerned in the area of public authorities of this State. It is a much more sensible procedure to appoint employee representatives to the board in that way than to appoint union representatives from outside the employment of the authority, as has been done by custom previously. Members would be aware, if they bother to

do their history, that the Playford Government appointed widely union representatives to boards of statutory authorities. The urging of industry itself has been that employee representatives on the boards of statutory authorities should actually be from the employees themselves. This Bill puts beyond any doubt that there is no problem about fiduciary capacity in this regard. It is a perfectly simple Bill. It does no more than establish that, where it is appropriate in due season, an employee of the authority concerned can be appointed, and that that can be done without any possible question of common law arising.

Bill read a second time.

Clause 1—"Short title."

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I move:

Page 1, line 3—Leave out "(Industrial Democracy)" and insert "(Employee Appointments)".

The purpose of this amendment is to bring the short title into line with the other amendments to be moved later. The Liberal Party is opposed to the Government's policy of industrial democracy. Therefore, some other suitable short title is necessary to this Bill, if it is to be passed. We are not opposed to employees being on the boards of public authorities. Therefore, I believe that the short title should read "Public Authorities (Employee Appointments) Act, 1976."

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I do not object to this amendment, but I do not want the honourable member to think that by approving this amendment I approve any consequent amendments in relation to subsequent clauses.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 2—"Definitions."

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I seek information about the training of employees. Will employees be trained? In the industrial democracy policy of the Australian Labor Party it is pointed out that employees will be trained. The Premier disputes that the word "we" in the policy document refers to the Labor Party, and says that it refers to the public. In all other places where "we" is used in the Working Environment Committee report it refers to the Labor Party and not to the public. I certainly cannot accept the explanation he gave simply to cover himself for the sake of the press, particularly Max Harris.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Where is the reference to this matter in the Bill?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I am referring to the definition of "employee" and asking the Premier whether the Government intends to train these employees, whether it be the Labor Party or the public that will train them. I think the policy of the Labor Government—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have to rule that that does not appear in this clause.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. For what reason can I not seek information on whether or not the Government intends to train these employees? There is a definition of "employee".

The CHAIRMAN: That definition does not contain anything concerning the employer. It concerns the management of the affairs of the public authority.

Dr. EASTICK: The definition of "proclaimed public authority" refers to any public authority for the time being declared by proclamation under section 3 of the Act to be a proclaimed public authority for the purposes of the Act. Clause 3 contains authority not only to

proclaim but also to revoke. It seems that a degree of selectivity is associated with the proclamation of some authorities and not of others. If one public authority was functioning contrary to the whim of the Government of the day, under clause 3 the opportunity for that authority to involve itself in the type of action provided by this measure could be revoked or the authority disfranchised. If the Government believes that the measure is advantageous, why is it not advantageous to the whole or to all public authorities, as contained within the broader meaning of "public authority"?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Public authorities change, and in some of them are different provisions. If the honourable member reads the South Australian Theatre Company Act, for instance, he will see that it is not necessary for us to proclaim that authority, although it is within the definition, because there are specific statutory provisions within that Act. Therefore, it is necessary for us to proclaim the authorities to which this Act should properly apply.

Dr. Eastick: You could still revoke that.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There are at times changes in the nature of authorities. If we change, for instance, the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board to the South Australian Meat Corporation, we need to revoke the proclamation in respect of the former and proceed to proclaim the latter. That is all it is there for.

Clause passed.

Clause 3—"Proclaimed Public Authority."

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Can the Premier state what public authorities the Government has in mind in which to introduce its industrial democracy policy within the coming 12 months? We have been informed that the South Australian Housing Trust will have the policy implemented some time this year, apparently. The Premier did not give the reason for the delay, as he gave an undertaking in this Chamber that it would be implemented in November of last year. Perhaps he can state what other public authorities will have the industrial democracy policy of the Labor Government imposed on them.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The position with the Housing Trust is that the model has not been completed, because the employees of the trust asked for further time to discuss the model and to suggest amendments to it. They asked that final consideration be delayed until about March of this year. That is why there has been a delay. It is part of the industrial democracy process. As to other corporations for which it is expected that programmes will be written during this year, we expect that that will occur in relation to the State Bank and the Savings Bank of South Australia. We have been approached by employees in those organisations and asked to proceed to prepare models and to have discussions with them and the boards concerning models.

We expect that a programme will be written in relation to the South Australian Government Insurance Corporation. It would seem at this stage that that is probably as far as we are able to achieve programmes this year. It may be that we are able to do more, but the writing of programmes and discussions in relation to them are necessarily detailed and lengthy processes. The modes of management in different corporations are different one from another, and the modes of management at times in different sections of organisations are different. Consequently, the appropriate measures need to be taken to see that the programmes are adapted to the continued efficient working of those organisations. While that is what I expect the programme

to be, I do not want the honourable member to say at some stage, if that alters, that I gave an undertaking that that would be the case. I am simply saying that, at this stage of proceedings, that is what the Government foresees. It may alter.

Dr. EASTICK: Perhaps the Premier, having been unable to give that undertaking to the member for Davenport, may be able to give me an undertaking that the only purpose for which the Government, while he is Premier, will use the terms of clause 3 is for revocation where a public authority receives the authority to function, according to the provisions of this Act, within its own Act. The Premier has said that the purpose of the revocation provision was that situations alter and, as in the South Australian Theatre Company, provision has been made that it may enter into this field—

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It must enter.

Dr. EASTICK: Very well. There is a variation to the legislation whereby the same provisions as those applying to the South Australian Theatre Company are incorporated into other Acts of other bodies, so that they do not need specific proclamation; the only revocations we will see during his term as Premier are revocations where the authority is vested in the organisation by other legislative measures. I believed the Premier earlier to be saying that the purposes of clause 3 is so that revocation can take place where the authority is provided with its own legislative authority to work within this scheme, and that the revocation will not be used in any circumstances to prevent a public authority from enjoying the same benefits as all other public authorities enjoy.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We are providing the revocation provision to cover the case where there is some alteration in the constitution of the authority.

Dr. Eastick: And that is the only reason for it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is so. However, I am not suggesting that in changing the nature of the authority we will have necessarily to provide in the amended legislation a provision similar to that in the South Australian Theatre Company Act. It may be necessary to revoke it in relation to a previously existing corporate entity and provide a new proclamation for an entity that takes its place.

Dr. Eastick: And that is the only purpose of the revocation provision?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is the only one that I can see; I cannot conceive of any other circumstances. We are not intending suddenly to say to an authority, "You cannot have any employees on your board any more."

Clause passed.

Clause 4—"Employees appointed members of Proclaimed Public Authority."

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Will the Premier say whether under this clause employees will be given any specific training before taking up their position as members of boards on these public authorities and, if they will, what type of training they will undergo, the length of it, and whether it will vary depending on the public authority concerned? Also, the Premier said that two banks would implement industrial democracy plans, probably during the next 12 months. Will the Premier give an undertaking that any employee on the boards of those banks (we hope as separate banks) will be subject to the same degree of confidentiality and conform to any other conditions that obviously must exist if the banks are to function as genuine banks without the risks of leaking information that may benefit other employees or the public?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Regarding confidentiality on the board of any corporation, be it a statutory corporation or a corporation under the Companies Act, the provision will apply equally to all directors. There is no suggestion that there will be an exception regarding confidentiality for representatives who may be elected by employees and, in consequence, be appointed to the boards. It is obviously necessary that confidentiality be maintained. In fact, this was a specific area of query and investigation by me in the countries that I visited; although they did not include Holland, they did include Sweden, Great Britain, France and West Germany. I was told by the non-worker directors that confidentiality had always been maintained. There was no question that it could not be.

Regarding training programmes, at this stage they have not been set up publicly. As the honourable member may realise, many private organisations have run seminars in Adelaide, and the Industrial Democracy Unit, with the assistance of bodies of employers and employees, has run many seminars. It is intended that training programmes shall be established at the School of Business Administration at the Institute of Technology. A submission regarding this matter was prepared by the Australian Institute of Management, which hopes to promote a school of business management at the institute to be named after the late Elton Mayo. Programmes are intended to be written for such a school, in which specific training will be available for persons such as those who take part in employee representation in industrial democracy programmes within corporations. In the meantime, the Australian Institute of Management has suggested that it could prepare interim programmes that would be available for such work. The Government was pleased to accept an offer of this kind for programmes to be prepared. At this stage, courses are not available, although I hope they soon will be.

Mr. COUMBE: Clause 4 refers to the obligation and duties of board members. Subclause (1) (b) contains the passive "may" instead of the mandatory "shall". Although I think I know what is the correct intent of this provision, I should like the Premier to spell it out so that it cannot be misconstrued. Although it may perhaps be a matter of semantics, it is important that we realise what is intended. I should therefore appreciate an undertaking that my understanding is correct, that is, that an employee appointed to a public authority board would be expected to carry out his duties faithfully.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: He would be expected to carry out those duties faithfully under the Act, regardless of this provision, which is intended not to require him to carry out the duties but to remove any legal disqualification. Paragraph (b) is an amplification of paragraph (a). The Crown Solicitor raised the question whether, at common law, there was perhaps not some conflict of interest. This therefore makes clear that no Statute or common law rules to the contrary will prevent a member from acting as a member in all respects, in the same way as he could have acted if he were not an employee.

Mr. Coumbe: Why does it start with "may"?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Because it is permissive, in the light of what the Crown Solicitor viewed as possibly affecting a common law rule. It must allow him to do it, and that is why "may" is used.

Clause passed.

New clause 5—"Non application of Act."

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I move:

After clause 4, page 2, insert new clause as follows:

5. Except as is provided in this section, nothing in this Act contained shall apply to or in relation to a Proclaimed Public Authority—

- (a) that has two or more employees as members, unless the constituting Act of that proclaimed Public Authority expressly provides for the appointment of two or more employees as members; or
- (b) that has an employee elected, as a representative of employees, as a member, unless the constituting Act of that proclaimed Public Authority expressly provides for the election of such an employee.

The first part of the amendment ensures that not more than one employee will be appointed to a board unless the Act is so amended to allow for more than one employee. We have outlined the conditions on which the Liberal Party will accept an employee being appointed to the board. It would take exceptional circumstances and, therefore, an amendment to the constituting Act would be necessary, to allow more than one employee to be appointed. The second part of the amendment provides that no employee shall take up his position on a public authority as a representative of other employees unless the constituting Act is so amended or unless that Act already specifies that power. Two Acts do specify such a power; the South Australian Theatre Company Act and the South Australian Meat Corporation Act.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: The Samcor Act does not provide for it. This would prevent the present representative from acting on the Samcor board.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I am sure the Government could introduce an amendment relating to the Samcor board if the Premier wished the person concerned to remain on the board. I would urge that the person concerned should remain on the board because, as I said during the second reading debate, he has proved to be an asset to the board because he is an exceptional person. It would be easy to amend the enabling Act. Parliament could consider each amendment to such an Act to see what sort of purpose the Government has in mind in electing those employees.

The recommendations of the Government committee set up to investigate worker directors in the public sector was set up by the Premier in 1972 and reported to him in 1973. I refer to those recommendations because they relate to my amendment. The committee recommended:

... In light of the current thinking and experience, appointments to public boards, trusts and corporations should not include representation (by nomination or election of employees)—

in other words, the recommendation obviously rejects the sort of policy the Government has in mind about industrial democracy for public authorities—

the committee does, however, support the appointment of persons who have experience and understanding in employee problems and affairs.

That is the very condition that I have covered in the amendment. Under this provision we have not excluded employees from being appointed to the board if they have a certain expertise in employee problems and affairs. We have adopted that recommendation and have been consistent in doing so. It is rather strange that the Government, having set up an expert committee and having asked it to make recommendations, has thrown the recommendations out of the door. One can only conclude that that has happened because the trade union movement and Labor Government did not like the recommendations because they did not give them the sort of worker control they were after.

I am also concerned about the Premier's announcement that employees on a nominated or elected basis will possibly soon be serving on bank boards. That is against the interests of depositors in those banks. It is not right for employees elected by other employees to look after the security of depositors' investments.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I cannot think of better people to do it. Do you include your colleague (the member for Hanson) as an unsuitable person to look after the trusts of banks?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The Premier is now claiming there will be no possible conflict between the security of investments and the interests of employees. That is absolute rubbish! He is putting in jeopardy the security of the deposits concerned, which would be against the interests of the depositors, and I am sure they will react accordingly. Because the Premier has accepted the earlier amendment I moved, and because this amendment is fully in line with that amendment, I hope he will accept this new clause. If he rejects it I can only suspect he is again trying to implement his industrial democracy policy under another name and that is why he was so willing to accept the earlier amendment. If that is the case the Premier should explain why he accepted the first amendment but rejects this amendment. I hope he will accept this amendment despite its being against Labor Party policy.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I can dispose of the honourable member's hopes rapidly, because I do not accept the amendment because it negates the whole purpose of the Bill. If the amendment were to take effect there would be no point in passing the measure, because what would have to happen in relation to every separate statutory authority is that a separate enabling Act would have to be introduced to allow employee representatives to be nominated and appointed to a board. What would be the purpose of proclaiming authorities that we have just agreed we should be able to do? There would be no purpose in a proclamation until a separate enabling Act were introduced in relation to each statutory authority. The proposal is absurd, and I do not accept it.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I am pleased that the Premier has given the true reason for introducing the Bill. He has not given it before nor has he said it publicly or in this place that the purpose of implementing the measure was to allow the Government to implement its industrial democracy policy. On television the Premier stated that the Bill was an innocuous one introduced simply to remove any conflict of interest. It seems that the real purpose is to introduce the Government's industrial democracy policy for all public authorities or for those in which it wishes to introduce it in South Australia. It is because the Premier intends to reject this new clause that we in the Liberal Party will reject the Bill. I ask the Premier to reconsider his opinion and support the amendment.

The Committee divided on the new clause:

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

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

Pair—Aye—Mr. Arnold. No—Mrs. Byrne.

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

New clause thus negatived.

Title.

Mr. DEAN BROWN moved:

Leave out "of representatives".

Amendment carried; title as amended passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. WHITTEN (Price): I rise not to grieve or to grizzle (as has been the custom recently, particularly by some Opposition members), but to pay a tribute to the Public Buildings Department and to the great job it is doing, particularly in the building of solid-construction schools. I am prompted to do this as a result of a Headmaster's report, which I received from a major high school in my district just before Christmas. The Headmaster also pays a great tribute to the department. The Headmaster reports:

Last year I reported that the magnificent new two-storey building would be ready for occupation in 1975. Early this term most of the ground floor was ready and the first floor is now ready too.

He compliments the people connected with the Public Buildings Department. I think that in the past there has been too much criticism of the department and too much praise of private enterprise. The Headmaster, who is the principal of one of the largest high schools in South Australia, says how proud he is of the buildings that have been built at the school. The buildings are much better than those that have been built by private enterprise, and he pays a compliment to the department. His report further states:

Those who have been involved include ... the design and supervising architects of the Public Buildings Department and the staff of the Construction Division of the Public Buildings Department, and such people deserve the highest praise.

The Headmaster was speaking about a new building that contains a large resource centre which accommodates all the books from the former two libraries in the school, together with the language laboratory. During the past two years, 58 buildings have been constructed by the department for the Education Department alone, many of which have been built in the country. At Lamerook, there have been replacements, and work has been carried out at Naracoorte and in the Gouger, Flinders, Frome, Pirie, Eyre, Fisher, Chaffey, Mount Gambier, Murray and Kavel Districts. The Headmaster's report continues:

We have been grateful for the ready co-operation at all times of the officers of the Public Buildings Department ... particularly the foreman, who has been on the site for so long.

All the buildings to which I have referred are of solid construction. A major project consisting of an open unit has been undertaken at the Blackwood High School, in the Fisher District, so I believe that the member for Fisher must also be proud of the department. An open unit has been constructed at the Gawler High School, also one (a new addition) at the Glen Osmond Primary School, and we are proud of these projects, too.

There has been too much knocking in grievance debates (or, as they are called, grizzle sessions). Some of these things should be left to those who have the name of Ocker or the Knocker. I was surprised to hear the Leader of the Opposition only last Thursday say how proud he

was to be known as a knocker of this State. It is a disgrace, a slur, and a blot on the Leader that he should say such a thing. During the no-confidence debate last week, there was much knocking of the Chairman of the South Australian Housing Trust, Mr. Liberman; it was a downright, dastardly attack which was totally unwarranted. Today we have heard criticisms of the previous member for Spence, Mr. Ernie Crimes. One could never find a more upright, more sincere and more honourable man. Of course, he is unable to reply to the dastardly attack made on him. Misquoting and misrepresenting are disgraceful. Tonight the Premier told Opposition members just what was meant by the industrial democracy platform of the Australian Labor Party. Members opposite accused me the other day of not knowing what was in the Bill but, actually, I was present during every committee meeting on industrial democracy. So, I certainly do know.

Mr. Dean Brown: Did you claim that the word "we" was not used in the document?

Mr. WHITTEN: I said that the honourable member put a wrong interpretation on it. My interjection was, "You are incorrect." I was talking about the honourable member's interpretation. I did not say that "we" was not there. Now, let us do some knocking of the Australian Liberal Government. What downright dastardly things it is trying to do to pensioners. It seems that "pensions" and "pensioners" are dirty words to the new Commonwealth Government. Although the new Commonwealth Parliament has not yet met, pension increases have been deferred for two months. In effect, the Commonwealth Liberal Government is taking \$20.80 off every pensioner in the next six months. Then, Mr. Fraser wants to deny surviving spouses the \$40 that has previously been available for funeral benefits. Further, Mr. Fraser wants to add \$10 to the cost of every hearing aid for pensioners; hearing aids were always free under the Commonwealth Labor Government.

In order to save \$270 000, Mr. Fraser will charge pensioners \$10 for hearing aids, and he will use it to modify his Mystere jet aeroplane so that it can land at Hamilton. To save \$400 000, Mr. Fraser intends to take transport away from disabled and infirm people who need to go to hospitals. People who served in theatres of war and who cannot find their own transport to repatriation hospitals will be charged for transport, whereas previously they received free transport. The main enjoyment of pensioners is watching television at night, but Mr. Fraser intends to take away that enjoyment. His attitude is: "We have kicked them hard in the guts, and we will kick them again, by charging them at least \$50 for a television licence."

Mr. Chapman: How do you know that pensioners will have to pay a fee?

Mr. WHITTEN: There has been no denial that Mr. Fraser will charge pensioners a fee.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. WHITTEN: I will knock the Liberals every chance I get, because what they are doing is knocking the poor unfortunate pensioners. You seem to want them to die and that is how callous and ghoulish you are, and I do not apologise for what I say.

Members interjecting:

Mr. WHITTEN: Tell me this: is the television licence fee to pay for the superphosphate subsidy for cockies?

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): This time is often taken up by having a slam at the Party on the other side, but I do not intend to fall for the trap and react to the

previous speaker. I have a matter to bring forward on behalf of people throughout the State who are in a desperate position. I bring the matter to the attention of the House (and particularly of the Premier) to show the concern we should have for those people. I refer to rural landholders who are faced with land tax accounts under the present valuation and taxation system that in many cases are causing much hardship and embarrassment. I appreciate that on January 22 a deputation from the Stockowners Association and United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia representing these growers presented to the Premier an appeal on behalf of their members to try to arrange a system by which an applicant could claim a remission of part or whole of this destructive tax.

Before referring to details of properties, I point out that a mere \$1 050 000 is expected to be recovered from rural land tax in this State. It is difficult to compare funds with depression or with distress, but in these circumstances, I believe that this amount is a miserable sum compared to the distress being caused to many people. The Premier has assured the grower organisations that arrangements will be made to hear cases of hardship, and where those cases can be demonstrated and upheld some remissions will be extended. In the meantime the period in which these people are required to meet their commitments is running out and there is a desperate concern in the community.

I believe that it is time the Premier made a clear public announcement that those involved will not be prosecuted whilst waiting for their applications to be heard. I believe several cases of hardship have occurred in the ordinary course of meeting this commitment. The burden placed on these people in recent times was never forecast or expected, and it has come as a great shock to those involved. I draw to the attention of the House a few examples that I believe have not been ventilated, in order to reinforce and support members who have raised this matter in the past. The first example is of a property at Balaklava which in 1974-75 was valued, and attracted a tax of \$200. The tax applying to this property with the same land usage is now \$1 800.

At Smithfield a relatively small property attracted a tax of \$246 in 1974-75, but in 1975-76 the sum of \$5 876 is now due and payable. This land is under notice of acquisition by the State Land Commission. As a result of its potential subdivision value, that land has attracted this high valuation and the high tax that has been placed on it.

In my district at McLaren Vale there is a wine-grape property on which some barley is grown, and there is a minimum amount of stock-grazing country. The property qualifies for the section 11b benefits of the Act, that is, for the \$40 000 exemption. Whilst in 1974-75 the tax on that property was \$2 900, in 1975-76 the tax is \$14 300. That is a valuable property, but I assure the House that, after the basic running commitments are met, there is no provision at all to meet such accounts from rural holdings generally or from this property specifically. At Willunga, on a property of 45 hectares, last year the tax was \$136.83, yet this year the tax is \$1 163.10.

Mr. Venning: How big is the property?

Mr. CHAPMAN: That is on a 45 ha property, attracting \$10.63 for each .4 ha. Another example involves a property at Auburn of about 146 ha. Last year the tax was \$328, yet this year it has increased to \$4 785. At Langhorne Creek there is a 486 ha property which now attracts a tax account of \$6 600, and so on.

Mr. Whitten: What are those properties used for?

Mr. CHAPMAN: They are farming properties. They are classified as rural properties under the Land Tax Act. They qualify for the \$40 000 exemption under section 11b of the Act but, despite those benefits, they are still attracting these ridiculously high figures. I could continue *ad infinitum* giving examples from all over the State. It is not difficult to find examples where such steep increases have occurred. I appeal to the Premier to make clear to these people that now there is an opportunity for them to apply and be recognised as experiencing hardship. Such people should be clearly informed of the position by the widest possible media coverage.

Another serious anomaly exists in relation to rural properties and the land tax burden where the property owner cannot recover a satisfactory income from his farm. I know of cases, and I have examples in correspondence, where people have gone out and got a job on the council, or wherever they can in the nearby district; but, as a result of their obtaining a separate income, which is often more than the income derived from the property, they have disqualified themselves from the rural rebate previously applicable to their rural land. On the one hand, they are going out and having a go, shearing or taking a job on the roads to supplement their income but, on the other hand, they are being penalised back on the farm, because they are then removed from the protection of section 11b of the Act, their holdings attracting a metropolitan area tax rate on what is clearly defined as rural land. I am not sure of the Government's objective, but it seems in these areas I have cited that the Government is hell bent on driving people off the land and denying them the opportunity to continue in their rural practice.

Mr. Venning: Grinding them into the dirt.

Mr. CHAPMAN: They are being ground into the dirt. This is not so much a grievance as an appeal to the Government to be realistic and to consider seriously the removal of this cruel rural land tax, in the meantime clearly demonstrating to the people that they should not panic and that they have an opportunity now to have their cases heard individually. I hope that every reasonable discretion will be exercised—

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

Mr. LANGLEY (Unley): It gives me great pleasure to speak on the adjournment motion. For many years, during the term of the Labor Government in South Australia, there has been no doubt that the Opposition at all times has tried to upset the Labor Government that has performed so well for the people in this country. Since the Liberal Government has taken control in the Australian sphere, it has hit the public strongly. The people in my district are mostly older people who will now, it has been strongly rumoured, be required to pay television licences. From 40 per cent to 50 per cent of the people in my area are aged people. Before licences were abolished, the fee was \$26. The Australian Labor Party abolished the fee, giving a great fillip to television, especially since colour television has arrived in this country. It gives a fine picture, I might say. Pensioners, invalids, and other people who have no real control over their means, simply living on pensions, will have to pay possibly \$90 for a colour television licence and \$50 for a black and white set. The people in my district mostly would have black and white television, because that is all they can afford. Three weeks of their pensions will be taken up with the licence fee

for a colour television set, and almost two weeks of their pensions for a black and white set.

Mr. Abbott: They will pay as much for the licence as they would pay for the set.

Mr. LANGLEY: There is no doubt of that. Not many workers receive more than \$120 a week, and few receive \$100 clear.

Mr. Gunn: That was because of the Whitlam Government.

Mr. LANGLEY: Indexation was to come into force and the Commonwealth Government opposed it. The member for Eyre knows that as well as I do. One week's pay will go for a colour television licence. For the person on \$300 a week income, the proportion would not be so high as for the pensioners and the average worker. If licences are reintroduced, that will be a bad thing for the people of Australia. I thought we were going to improve, but I am afraid—

Mr. Gunn: Why don't you look at the economic mess your Prime Minister got this country into?

Mr. LANGLEY: Look at the mess your Government is going to make of unemployment in Australia.

Mr. Gunn: No-one will get—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Eyre. I call the honourable member for Unley back to the grievance debate.

Mr. LANGLEY: The people employed in the television industry will also be concerned, the people selling television sets.

Mr. Gunn: It is a pity that Whitlam—

Mr. Mathwin: You put the embargo on.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. LANGLEY: I am not too proud to admit that the Government was not given the chance it deserved. Members opposite were the first people to knock it all the time. The Opposition in this House has been doing this all the time, and it is knocking our own State. Of that, there is no doubt. I have listened to the debates emanating from both sides, and I am sorry to say that members opposite have always knocked the Labor Party. In their opinion, it has never done anything right, and never will.

Mr. Mathwin: It hasn't done much.

Mr. LANGLEY: It has done plenty in this State. You have merely to go to the pensioners in your district and see what the Government of your political complexion did to help them in relation to land taxes and rates: it did nothing at all.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I remind the honourable member for Unley that he must refer to honourable members opposite not as "you" but as "the honourable member".

Mr. LANGLEY: I am sorry, Sir. Can the member for Glenelg tell me what a Liberal Government in this State did for pensioners during its term of office?

Mr. Mathwin: It never put their water rates up 200 per cent to 500 per cent.

Mr. LANGLEY: It is part and parcel of everyday living these days. Have not the honourable member's wages risen a certain amount?

Mr. Mathwin: Not 500 per cent.

Mr. LANGLEY: We have looked after them. If that is so, what about most pensioners in my district?

Mr. Gunn: They are poorly represented.

Mr. LANGLEY: That is the honourable member's opinion. He will be one who will be worrying about it next time. I am sure that I will not be doing so. He is so clever now that he has purchased a house right alongside that occupied by the member for Flinders. He is there all the time now and knows everyone that walks through his door. He has an office right alongside that of the member for Flinders, too. The member for Eyre can get an office alongside me in my district. If he wants to do that sort of thing, it is his business. If he did it, I am sure that the Minister of Works would not worry about it. I am sure that what the Government has done for pensioners is hurting members opposite. Regarding television licences and employment in these different spheres, I am sure the Commonwealth Government will wreck the country if it is not careful. Members opposite cannot say that I am not interested in the matter, because I am. I am sure the Commonwealth Government will cause more trouble than it ever thought it could. I am at present experiencing repercussions as a result of the present Australian Government's doing the opposite from what it said it was going to do. That Government is wrecking the country. At least under the former Australian Government people could make a living. However, before long they will be unable to live as they did under the former Australian Government. I am proud to be a member of the Australian Labor Party, which has done more for workers and pensioners than has any other Government of which I am aware.

Motion carried.

At 10.23 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, February 11, at 2 p.m.