HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, September 22, 1976

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

UNIONISM

Dr. TONKIN presented a petition signed by 776 electors of South Australia, praying that the House would reject any legislation which would deprive employees of the right to choose whether or not they wished to join a trade union or which would provide for compulsory unionism.

Petition received.

YATALA VALE SURFACE WATER STORAGE TANK

The SPEAKER laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on Yatala Vale Surface Water Storage Tank.

Ordered that report be printed.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: DROUGHT RELIEF

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Following questions in the House yesterday inquiring about Government drought relief measures, I conferred with the Minister of Lands, and I will make the following information available to the House dealing with drought relief measures that are currently operating:

Transport:

1. Subsidies by way of grants on a $1 for $1 basis.
   (*a*) Breeding stock to and from agistment.
   (*b*) Fodder to starving stock.
   Commenced July 1, 1976.

2. Subsidies by way of grants on a $1 for $1 basis, relating to dairy stock in the Adelaide milk supply and the Golden North milk supply areas.
   (*a*) Transport of dairy stock to and from agistment.
   (*b*) Fodder to dairy stock, being hay; this excludes supplements and prepared feed mixes. No subsidy payment will apply to the first 50 km of transport.
   Commenced September 6, 1976.

3. Cartage of water to drought areas—this will only apply to the Far West Coast. Action will be taken to provide essential supplies of stock water, without cost, to central distribution areas.

General measures:

4. General stock slaughter programme—sheep and cattle—Payment by way of grants to meet the full costs incurred by district councils for the destruction and disposal of surplus unmarketable sheep and cattle. This programme is under the control of district councils.
   Commenced August 10, 1976.

5. Cattle slaughter programme—grants at the rate of $10 a head will be made, being $9 to the stock owner and $1 to the district council. This programme will be operated in conjunction with, and in the same manner as, the general stock slaughter programme for sheep and cattle. The $1 payment to district councils will be offset against costs incurred in the general stock slaughter programme. Calves below weaning age (six months) are excluded. Councils will make payments to stock owners. This programme will apply from August 10, 1976.

6. Carry-on finance—primary producers affected by drought who are not able to obtain carry-on funds from normal lending sources are eligible to apply for assistance by way of repayable loans. Assistance may be given towards living expenses, seeds, fertiliser, fuel, and shearing expenses, etc.

Further negotiations are now in progress with the Commonwealth Government on the whole aspect of drought relief.

QUESTIONS

WHYALLA SHIPYARDS

Dr. TONKIN: I can hardly refrain from saying that there seems to be an air of lassitude on the Government benches today.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Try us out!

Dr. TONKIN: Nevertheless, we will try the matter. Can the Premier say how much of the $27 600 000 surplus the Government is willing to spend on stimulating industrial expansion and development to help the people of Whyalla, and what positive incentives the Government will offer to industry to come to South Australia? The Premier had intended giving $7 000 000 for the shipbuilding industry in Whyalla, when his officers prepared a report for the Industries Assistance Commission, but the future of the shipyard seems black, following the release of the I.A.C. report yesterday.

Mr. Jennings: Shame!

Dr. TONKIN: I do not think anyone on this side or the other side of the House is particularly pleased about it. Although the Premier has stated that the surplus $27 600 000 would be held to cushion the effects of what he says may be adverse Federal funding next year, a statement made by the Minister of Agriculture on Monday that certain of these funds will be used for drought relief indicates that money is available from this source. Whatever the result of the Federal Government's final decision on shipbuilding, it has become starkly apparent that Whyalla must become more, or as nearly, self-supporting as possible, and that additional and alternative industries must be attracted and established. South Australia has these funds as the result of selling the railways and the benefits from the Medibank agreement, and it is appropriate and essential that they be used to help Whyalla, and not kept for electioneering purposes later.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The degree to which the Leader continues to play politics with situations like Whyalla appals me.

Mr. Venning: Rubbish!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader has played all sorts of games with Whyalla: he has proclaimed that he is fighting for the shipbuilding industry, and he went

to Canberra and announced from there that there would be no more Federal money available, and that he accepted that position.

Dr. Tonkin: Have you accepted it yet?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, I have not accepted that position. When the South Australian Government proposed additional subsidies for shipbuilding in Whyalla, the Leader said that that was good, and I appreciated his support. However, immediately the Industries Assistance Commission announced its recommendations to the Federal Government, the Leader accepted them and accepted that we had to close down the shipbuilding industry in Whyalla. I do not accept that position: I do not believe it is right for Whyalla, for South Australia, or for Australia.

Dr. Tonkin: Don't you think you should be doing something, instead of—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The South Australian Government has made a whole series of proposals in relation to Whyalla that provide significant support to that city and its industries. Not only have we proposed that, in relation to the shipbuilding industry, there are to be special pay-roll tax concessions, special loans in relation to building ships, guarantees of loans for the building of larger ships, and provision for re-equipment in the shipyard but also the Government is willing to go to the length of proposing a $1 for $1 subsidy for the loss that may be sustained as against oversea shipyard contracts for the building of ships for the Australian National Line, which is a Commonwealth Government responsibility and instrumentality. The Leader suggests that these actions are inadequate. Also, we have announced that we will put the contract for any replacement of the *Troubridge* at Whyalla, but—

Dr. Tonkin: You are carefully keeping away from—

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: —that is only a small amount. The Leader then says that incentives should be offered for industry in Whyalla. In the growth centres of South Australia, we have the widest range of incentives for decentralised industry of any Government in this country.

Dr. Tonkin: You'll have to look it up again.

The SPEAKER: Order! This incessant questioning must cease. Each member is entitled to ask one question only.

Mr. Gunn: And the Premier should reply to the question.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The incentives available to industry in Whyalla are as follows: for any new industry or expansion of industry in Whyalla there can be a grant equal to a complete remission of pay-roll tax; any new industry in Whyalla can have a factory built for it on the most generous of lease-back terms; all the housing required for industry will be provided by the Housing Trust; the loans for the establishment of additional industry will be guaranteed for up to two-thirds of the investment; grants can be made for establishment, including relocation, by the South Australian Industries Assistance Corporation; deferred interest loans can be obtained; and the taking up of equity capital by the Government can be arranged. No other Australian Government gives that.

Dr. Tonkin: What's keeping industry away from there?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I can only suggest to the Leader that there are several cost problems for industry establishing in decentralised centres. The South Australian Government has provided more assistance to decentralise industry than not only any other Australian Government but also any other Government in the history of this State.

Mr. Mathwin: And you've lost more.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No; we have not. The honourable member does not know. He just comes out with these ignorant statements constantly.

Mr. Mathwin: It's true, though.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, it is not. The honourable member makes these interjections; it is the normal Hitlerism of honourable members opposite.

Dr. TONKIN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to sit in the House and be called "Hitler" by implication.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order. The honourable Premier did not name anyone, but made a generalised statement.

Dr. TONKIN: On a further point of order, Mr. Speaker, I take great exception to the description of "Hitlerism", which the Premier used in general terms as an adjective, applied to Opposition members either singly or generally, and I ask that it be withdrawn.

Mr. Wells: You are State knockers.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Mr. Speaker, I do not ask for your ruling on this matter; I am willing to withdraw the remark if it offends Opposition members. I will simply say that members opposite have a constant practice of making a series of bald statements which are untrue and which they hope, simply because they repeat them, members of this community will believe.

Mr. Mathwin: You've lost a lot of industry.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Glenelg is out of order.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: South Australia has constantly achieved an expansion of industrial jobs, and we have done this consistently more than either of the other two major industrial States.

Mr. Dean Brown: Facts don't show that for the past 12 months.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have consistently warned members on the honourable member's side that if this practice continues I shall be forced to take action. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader, if he is looking at assistance to industry in decentralised areas, must know the problems of establishing industry in decentralised areas because, in these circumstances, one needs a local resource base in order to establish industrial jobs. The provision of specific incentives (and we have had the widest range of incentives) does not, of itself, establish those industries unless we can show a specific reason for the industry in question to establish there. The Leader can go on with a whole series of generalised statements, as he normally does, but I challenge him to come up with a specific proposal for industry in Whyalla.

Dr. Tonkin: But that's your job.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the Leader proposes to lead an alternative Government, he must have an alternative policy, or resign. It is about time that he did it.

UNSAFE PRODUCTS

Mr. SLATER: Can the Minister of Prices and Consumer Affairs say whether consideration is being given to investigating unsafe products appearing on the market? The New South Wales and Western Australian Governments have set up special committees to report on unsafe products. In those States the products found to be defective included a shotgun with a variation of thickness of metal in the barrel that made it likely to disintegrate on use, a folding walking stick that could collapse under strain, and a telescope for sun viewing that could cause damage to eyesight. Is this State considering setting up a similar committee, or are investigations being carried out with regard to unsafe products that can cause physical injury to the user?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I understand that this matter is considered by officers under the Chief Secretary; a section in the Government examines this matter constantly. I think that what the honourable member is talking about when referring to the committees set up in other States is the fact that the standing committee of Ministers of Consumer Affairs has now decided to consider establishing consumer product standards on a nation-wide basis. One matter of vital concern in that area is the question of consumer product safety. I know that in other States, as part of this national effort, committees have been set up to look at specific products and standards that ought to be applied in certain cases. In South Australia we have not been called on by the standing committee to take any action, but this Government strongly supports (and, in fact, was one of the prime movers in promoting it) the idea that there should be consumer product standards throughout Australia. We are in contact with what is happening in other States and will continue to keep the matter under review. I will bring down a report for the honourable member about the work being done by the Government at present. It is the general intention of the Australian Government and the State Governments to have a national approach to this matter.

MATERNITY LEAVE

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Does the Premier or the Government consider that the introduction of maternity and paternity leave in the State Public Service this session will have any repercussions in the already hard-pressed private sector in South Australia? The Government has announced its intention of introducing maternity and paternity leave legislation this session, and conditions of employment in the Public Service have an impact on employment conditions in the private sector which is, in a sense, in competition with the Public Service in attracting and holding employees. As benefits are gained in the Public Service, pressures are applied for the implementation of similar conditions in commerce and industry. If this were not the case, the Public Service would soon become a privileged class in the community. We well know the disastrous effect the Government's workmen's compensation legislation has had in all areas of the private sector and commerce in South Australia. We also know the difficulty the Government is having in remedying that acknowledged wrong; the Government acknowledges that.

Mr. Langley: It's lucky you've never been sick.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: That interjection is completely inane and it is the sort of interjection one would expect from that quarter. Does the Premier foresee any further repercussions to the private sector in South Australia as a result of the introduction of maternity and paternity leave provisions in the Public Service?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No. The Government's proposal in relation to maternity and paternity leave is simply to provide the same conditions in the State Public Service as exist in the Commonwealth Public Service. One would have thought that, if the honourable member's fears about influence of the Public Service on the private sector were valid, then from the much wider Commonwealth Public Service we would have seen that pressure already evident, but we have not. Numbers of conditions that exist in the Public Services are more generous than those in the private sector, as against the fact that the private sector provides numbers of emoluments, over-award payments and conditions of pay that exceed those provided in the Public Service. Those conditions are quite different, and it has always been accepted that they occur. I do not see a difficulty for the private sector in South Australia arising out of this situation. If the honourable member can point to pressure arising from maternity and paternity leave in the Commonwealth Public Service, perhaps he will do so for me, but I have not seen it yet.

TERTIARY ALLOWANCES

Mr. WHITTEN: Can the Minister of Education provide any information concerning the proposed tertiary education students' strike in support of increases in tertiary education allowances? I am prompted to ask this question because of the report which appears on page 5 of today's *Australian*, under the heading "Strike over student 'pay' now certain", and which states:

It appears certain that a student strike called for tomorrow week will go ahead. The strike has been called in support of increases in the Tertiary Education Allowance Scheme.

The report further states:

The main issue in the strike is an increase in TEAS from the present maximum of $30·77 a week which has not been altered since January, 1975.

Has the Minister any information on the matter?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I am not aware whether students at our tertiary institutions will be staying away from lectures on that day. The honourable member referred to the *Australian*, so I suppose that it is a report that could have been generated in any of the Australian States. I have no doubt that it is a reaction to the rather unfortunate position in which tertiary students find themselves, a position that has come under criticism from me and, by implication, from the Leader of the Opposition, inasmuch as he supported the students' cause. As I understand it, the Commonwealth Government in its recent Budget appropriated money for certain aspects of Aboriginal education, certain matters dealing with the education of isolated children, and TEAS. That Government set up a committee or committees to investigate the relative needs of those areas with a view to making a recommendation. I understand from subsequent statements that it is expected that there will be an increase in TEAS that will date from the beginning of the next calendar year. Students are understandably disturbed about the situation. I have no doubt that they believe that it would have been possible for a decision to have been made before or at the time of the Budget, rather than the matter's being dragged out until now. It is a matter for the Commonwealth Government

to determine when payments will be made. A decision to make payments as from the beginning of next calendar year rather than as from the beginning of this financial year, the week following the Budget, or something like it, saves the Commonwealth Treasury a considerable amount of money. No doubt that factor was weighed along with other factors in making the decision that was made: it was probably the most considerable of the factors considered. Even a decision then that would have indicated to students what they could expect to receive at the beginning of next year may have gone a fair way towards heading off the possibly unfortunate situation that is now occurring. If anything happens, it will not be a strike in the normal sense of that word, because these people do not receive salaries or wages in the normal sense of that term, either. I can well understand the general feelings of the student population regarding this matter.

TOURIST BUREAU

Mr. BECKER: Can the Premier say whether employees of the South Australian Tourist Bureau have been directed not to speak to members of the Opposition and, if they have, can he say why?

Members interjecting:

Mr. BECKER: I would not laugh about this question, because it is serious. It has been brought to my attention that a verbal instruction was issued to bureau staff early last week not to speak to members of the Opposition. I understand and appreciate that no member of Parliament, Government or Opposition, has the right to seek confidential information from the bureau or any Government department. I for one would not do that and have never done so. I have been told that, following several questions in Parliament (some verbal and some on notice), a witch hunt has followed. Apparently someone has been seeking out the addresses of staff officers, the districts in which they live, and whether they have an association with any member of Parliament. This is a reflection on the staff of the bureau, who, in my opinion, do quite a good job in promoting South Australia. I have received outstanding co-operation from the bureau in obtaining pamphlets and literature to send overseas in relation to a service club of which I am a member. I have received help and consideration in relation to flags and decorations for national championships that have been held in Adelaide in the past year. In view of the directions of the Minister or his staff (and there are continuing statements regarding open government), I believe that Opposition members have been placed under a black ban in talking to bureau staff. What is the Government frightened of? Is it concerned about the questions we have been asking in relation to various positions that are vacant in the bureau, or is the Premier frightened that information about his personal travel bookings could become public, bookings about which we are not interested? We are interested—

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member's attention to the fact that he must ask one question and explain it. He must not debate it or add a series of questions.

Mr. BECKER: The reason for asking the question is this: why has the Opposition been placed under this black ban from the Minister's department?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I know absolutely nothing of this matter.

Mr. Venning: We'll tell you all about it, then.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member could, perhaps he would be a little more sensible than the member who asked this question. I will get a report from the Acting Director of the Tourist Bureau.

Mr. Venning: Get one from all the Ministers!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will get a report for the honourable member on the series of fantastic allegations he has made. It will be made public.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION

Mr. GROTH: Is the Minister of Labour and Industry aware of the practice of some employers who, once an employee is injured and has taken time off from work to recover on workmen's compensation, proceed to notify the employee that his services are no longer required? If he is able to do so, can the Minister say what can be done to protect the interests of employees faced with this situation? A local social worker brought to my attention the predicament of a young girl employed by Levi Strauss (Aust.) Proprietary Limited, a clothing manufacturing factory operating at Elizabeth. She had worked at the factory for 12 months and, over that time, had achieved a consistently high rate of production. Having received an injury on the job, she was subsequently absent for two weeks on workmen's compensation benefits. She then received notification that her employment with the company had been terminated. When her mother contacted Levi Strauss for a reference concerning the girl's period of employment, she was told that this policy was a way in which the company could save on pay-roll tax. Following this, the mother contacted the Clothing Trades Union, which met her inquiries with sympathy on one occasion and irritation on another. She then consulted the Labour and Industry Department, in South Australia, and the Commonwealth Department of Labour and Immigration. Both responded with the information that nothing could be done to help the girl, as these conditions were legally established under State and Federal industrial awards. However, the senior officer of the Amalgamated Metal Workers Union, whom the mother finally contacted in desperation, suggested that an amendment to the compensation legislation was needed to protect the right to work of people such as her daughter. This young girl is still without a job. I ask the Minister what can be done to protect the interests of people who, through no fault of their own, might find themselves in a similar situation.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I know nothing of the events that have occurred but, if they are true (and I have no reason to disbelieve the truthfulness of the statement), I would not hesitate in saying that it is probably one of the most despicable actions I have ever heard of for the company to take this attitude. I have not had specific cases drawn to my attention recently, although that did happen some years ago when this sort of thing did occur. We know that it does happen under workmen's compensation provisions, and the information the girl's mother has received from Federal and State departments is true; there is no control over such a situation. If this sort of thing is to continue, I believe we would need to examine the matter properly with a view to bringing in some protection under the Workmen's Compensation Act. Obviously, with the lack of any protection, the

employers are taking advantage of the situation and dismissing employees. I believe that no-one should be dismissed while on workmen's compensation if it is possible for that person to return to work. I would advise employers to try to rehabilitate employees as quickly as possible rather than to take such drastic action in dismissing them. Dr. Wyatt recently opened a new rehabilitation centre in Mile End and, from my discussions with him, I understand he is having a success rate of about 80 per cent; this is tremendously important to the rehabilitation of injured people.

I do not believe that any employee should be sacked in these circumstances. If the accusation is true, it is a despicable action by Levi Strauss or by any other employer who takes similar action. An employee should be dismissed only when he or she can no longer perform the duties required, or for the reason of misconduct, or some similar reason. If employees are capable of returning to the work place, the companies should have the responsibility, the integrity and the decency to keep jobs open for them. Now that this matter has been made public I intend to have it examined. I will get my officers to take it up with Levi Strauss. If the information is proved correct, we will have to consider amending the workmen's compensation legislation to protect workers from such activities.

SHIP PASSENGER TERMINAL

Mr. DEAN BROWN: How does the Premier relate his comments of 1973, when opening the Outer Harbor passenger ship terminal, to the fact that that terminal is now a white elephant and is to be used, according to an announcement by the Minister of Marine yesterday, as a recreation and teach-in area for schoolchildren? In October, 1973, when opening the terminal, the Premier said:

> The terminal will be a fine new gateway to South Australia. Passengers can't fail to be impressed by what they see or by the efficiency and range of facilities provided.

That would refer to the passengers who may have come to the terminal. Less than three years later, the terminal is found to be a complete white elephant.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: That's your version of it.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The Minister should listen. During the past 12 months only three ships have called at the passenger terminal, with fewer than 4 000 passengers. The terminal cost more than $1 000 000. I have here a copy of the announcement made yesterday by the Minister, who said that it is now intended to use the facility for schoolchildren for the purpose of recreation. I do not decry that action in any way, because I am sure that will provide at least one use for a terminal which at present is not being used. The Premier's statement in 1973 was an outrageous miscalculation of the facts. Earlier this afternoon, the Premier accused the Opposition of making misstatements about the true facts—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now debating. He must explain the question only, and not debate the issue.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I am pointing out that the Premier's statement in 1973 was an outrageous misrepresentation of the facts as we see them today, and therefore I ask this question of the Premier.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member is apparently not aware that his Party (before he was a member, of course, because he is only a comparatively recent addition to this House) subscribed to the necessity of the establishment of a proper passenger terminal at Outer Harbor and that in fact, before that terminal was established, the Government was bitterly criticised by the Opposition for the inadequacy of passenger terminal facilities at Outer Harbor. Members opposite said how disgraceful it was that this utterly inadequate gateway to South Australia existed in the old sheds that previously served as a passenger terminal at Outer Harbor. As a result, a reference was made to the Public Works Committee by the Government for the establishment of a proper passenger terminal at Outer Harbor. That committee, which is representative of both sides of this Parliament, reported in favour of establishing the terminal. The matter was then brought to this Parliament in the Estimates in order to have carried out the recommendations of the Public Works Committee, a bi-partisan committee of this Parliament, and the work was undertaken. When I opened the terminal, I said that it was an excellent gateway to South Australia, and it is.

Mr. Goldsworthy: And it's never used.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Opposition members previously demanded the establishment of such a terminal, subscribed to the report of the Public Works Committee for its establishment, and in this Parliament voted the money for its establishment.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: And if it wasn't there now, they would still be criticising.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They are now condemning the Government for undertaking work that they had previously advocated. The honourable member has the temerity to say, because the Government believes that where it has established a facility it must find a multiple use for it to obtain the full use of public moneys for the benefit of the public of this State, that this is somehow a condemnation of the Government. The honourable member should grow up, and he should also consult his predecessors about some of the things they have said. We do not expect consistency from the Opposition, but we expect it to do some research.

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT

Mr. EVANS: Can the Premier say whether a Bill to amend the Lottery and Gaming Act will be introduced in time to give racing clubs in this State the chance to arrange their meetings after October 31, and so remove at least some of the disquiet that prevails within that sporting industry at this stage? The three codes of racing believe that they are not allowed to conduct any meetings after October 31. At least some clubs have been told that, until the Act is amended, they will not be given permits for meetings after that date.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Do you believe this?

Mr. EVANS: I believe it, and I know it. They need time to organise meetings, call for nominations, and accept those that they wish to have participating in race meetings, and much work has to be done. Parliament will not be sitting next week, and it will then be into October. If the Act is to be amended, that legislation will have to be passed in time to allow clubs to organise their meetings. The racing industry is not happy with the present circumstances, and I ask the Premier whether a Bill is to be introduced to amend the Act before the end of October.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We expect to introduce early in this session a Bill which will relate to the racing

industry and which will amend the Lottery and Gaming Act. Whether it passes by October 31 will depend not only on the Government but also on the co-operation of Opposition members.

DROUGHT

Mr. VENNING: Can the Deputy Premier say whether councils throughout the State have been told of their responsibility in assisting the Government to undertake the present policy of drought relief administration or any matters pertaining thereto? In the newspaper today a report states that the Government last evening announced a scheme that will operate. In the House yesterday we were told that the Deputy Premier had made the announcement some days ago about the scheme, but it is difficult to obtain from this Government the true story of the present position and what it intends to do in order to give relief to drought areas in this State. We would like to hear more about one aspect of the matter. The Deputy Premier announced today that there would be a payment of $10 a head for the slaughter of the cattle and that $9 would go to the owner and $1 to the council. Does that mean that a representative from the council will go on to the property and act as a Government representative in order to ensure that stock is slaughtered, even if it is in creeks, or does stock have to be brought to a depot under the control of the council for it to be slaughtered?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member will be aware that this matter does not come within the ambit of my portfolio; it is a matter for the Minister of Lands. I will refer his question to my colleague and try to obtain a reply by tomorrow.

CHIEF SECRETARY'S DEPARTMENT

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Premier say why the Chief Secretary's Department has been recently abolished? I understand that this is an office that goes back to the early days of the State. I am not suggesting that we should always stay in the past. However, was this action a recommendation of the Corbett committee, and are the duties of this department now being undertaken by staff transferred to the Premier's Department? Also, as a result of the change, has there been a financial saving? Furthermore, as late as yesterday the Hon. Mr. Banfield had the title of Chief Secretary and Minister of Health: is this title to be altered?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not expect that the title will be altered. The duties of the Chief Secretary's Department that previously existed have been largely eroded by the transfer of activities to several other departments: for instance, the Cabinet Secretariat is now located in the Premier's Department. Several of the previous functions of the Chief Secretary's Department are now controlled by the Legal Services Department, the Consumer and Public Affairs Department, and the Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department. This situation has resulted from a general review of the activities of government on which the Corbett committee has made recommendations. It is part of the overall pattern of reducing the total number of Government departments. Before the reorganisation of the Public Service this State had far more public departments than did any other State in Australia. Consequently, this is simply a part of the total review in order to reduce the number of Government departments and to realign public service duties.

Mr. Coumbe: Will there be a saving?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, I am sure a saving will result: some of that saving will be long term. The honourable member will be aware of the effect of Parkinson's law within a proliferation of Government departments.

Mr. Coumbe: We have a lot more Ministers now.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We have more Ministers, but fewer departments.

Mr. Coumbe: That's to say, Parkinson's law.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It does not work in the same way. Both Parkinson's law and the Peter principle are constantly being studied by the Government.

ST. AGNES SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Education obtain for me a report on the Education Department's plans, if any, to erect a primary school on land reserved for such a school which is now being subdivided by the Land Commission and which faces Smart Road, St. Agnes?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I will obtain that information for the honourable member.

TRAWLING

Mr. VANDEPEER: Can the Premier say what are the results of the negotiations between the Government and the Polish Government to establish a joint venture in deep sea trawling, such venture to be conducted in waters off the South Australian coast? I understand that several parties were involved in the negotiations. Those parties were the Polish Dalmor Deep Sea Fishery and Fishing Service Enterprise and the South Australian Fishermen's Co-operative Limited. I also understand that the Premier wrote to the Acting Prime Minister on June 24 seeking the Commonwealth Government's reaction to such a proposal. Some exploratory work has been done by this Government on deep-sea trawling off our coast, and the local fishing industry has been greatly interested in this work. I am sure that our industry would be interested in the results of the negotiations the Government has had with the Polish Government on deep-sea trawling in waters off our coast.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Dalmor Deep Sea Fishery and Fishing Service Enterprise of Poland is willing to enter into an arrangement with Safcol for deep-sea trawling in areas beyond the continental shelf off the South Australian coast, with an initial period of exploration to establish the fisheries resource. That cost would be wholly the cost of Dalmor, which would seek to recoup some of that cost from its share of the processing of fish caught during the experimental period; the fish would be processed by Safcol. What we then looked to was a long-term development of deep-sea fishing for South Australian fishermen, through Safcol. Dalmor had undertaken to train our fishermen and partly to crew its vessel with South Australian fishermen so that training could be given for the future in deep-sea trawling. Dalmor then looked to a joint co-operative venture with Safcol, funded by both sides, that would build a deep-sea trawling fleet in South Australia.

In order to process this whole arrangement, we had to have the agreement of the Federal Government, which, in reply to my requests to it, raised a whole series of objections that no decisions could conceivably be made on a subject of this kind, because the law of the sea establishing a 200-mile limit of Australian control has not yet been established. In the meantime, exploration is going on in the area off the continental shelf by Governments that are not co-operating with Australia in the development of those resources, and it seems absurd that we should simply say that we will do nothing and make no decisions in that area, but leave it to foreign nations to exploit our fishery resources with no co-operation with us. Where we have the ability to obtain the expertise from one of the few nations that has full expertise in this area already established internationally, it seems extraordinary. I have approached the Federal Government again in this matter, because I believe that the co-operation of Dalmor with Safcol could give us a new fishing resource and employment base that is vital for South Australia. I assure the honourable member of my concern.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. RODDA: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say whether any correlation exists between unemployment figures and numbers of vacant jobs? I have been approached by several employers recently, mostly in the city area, who have advertised vacant positions but who have had no takers. I appreciate the Minister's interest in this matter. We have many unemployed persons on the Australian scene. Has the Minister's department considered the overall fact that, when unemployment figures are declared, the number of job vacancies should be made available?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The State labour departments are not responsible for compiling unemployment figures.

Mr. Gunn: But you—

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Does the honourable member want to answer the question?

Mr. Gunn: You really don't know.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Before I was rudely interrupted by the member for Eyre, I was trying to make a point to the member for Victoria, who, I think, has asked a sensible question. I want to give him a sensible reply, if the member for Eyre will allow me to do so. I was making the point that it is not the responsibility of State labour departments in this matter, but that of the Federal Government. A somewhat unique thing occurred in the last monthly figures. To the best of my memory, I think the situation was that, whilst unemployment figures rose dramatically, so did the number of job vacancies, but not as dramatically, in this period. I do not know how to correlate that fact or to answer the question. All I can give are the facts. Certain industries have complained to me recently that they have advertised for various types of employment, without getting any applicants for the jobs. Some employers wanted night-shift workers and process workers. I do not know whether the situation should be declared as being one of people with academic qualifications being unwilling to apply for that type of occupation, or whether that type of occupation is unappealing to all kinds of people. I believe that if a job exists, and if a person is able to do it, without upsetting the family life, the person should accept that position rather than stay on unemployment benefits. That belief is what makes our society function well. I will examine the honourable member's question in detail and see whether I can ascertain the facts.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

Mr. GUNN: Is the Minister of Labour and Industry willing to give to trade unions the same advice as he apparently gave to a section of employers today? Today's *News* contains a report under the heading "Open books to workers, firms are told", in which the Minister of Labour and Industry is reported as saying, when opening the Australian Associated Ice Industries annual conference, that he thought companies should open their books to their workers. Would he expect trade unions to make their books available to the public? Employers in no way have the same power to affect the daily lives of the people of this State and nation. They do not call strikes that affect the everyday affairs of people.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now commenting. He must ask the question, and give a brief explanation.

Mr. GUNN: I conclude my explanation by pointing out to the Minister that the effects that employers can have on the general welfare of the people of this State are only minimal, compared to the type of activities in which trade unions have engaged in holding the general community to ransom on many occasions by striking, imposing black bans, and intimidating the employers.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The member for Eyre never ceases to amaze me. That is the type of statement I would expect from him with his political background and philosophy. I do not know what is in the paper, because I have not seen it, but I know what I said to the employers' group this morning. I said that if good industrial relations were to survive in this country we needed to have much more communication than is now occurring. I also made the point that the road ahead, in my view, had to be made and paved by somebody. I said that I believed that, if worker participation was to work and industrial relations improve, employers ought to take the first step and lay on the table all the facts about their industry. I did not use the words "open books" at all: I referred to laying facts on the table and making information available to the trade unions and work force so that everyone could fully understand the situation. I have already said in print two weeks ago that I believe that communications and industrial relations are bad, and that in order to improve them there has to be a two-way communication; the matter could not be solved on the one hand. The rather unique thing that occurred this morning was that I was received very well by the employer group and thanked by the President for my comments. I notice the member for Davenport shaking his head: he must have had a spy there who said I was not thanked.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The fact is that the President thanked me for raising the matter. He shook hands firmly with me as well, and I thought that I was made very welcome. I do not see any advantage in following up the question the member for Eyre has asked by asking the trade unions to open their books. What does that prove? That does not prove anything in relation to the machinery

of the trade union: anyone can understand that. It is the business end of the situation that needs to be explained to the workers so that they will know whether or not the claims they are making are legitimate and whether the company can afford to pay those claims. In oversea countries where these things are occurring, one does not see massive lay-offs like one sees in the car industry in this State. When the car industry here is going defunct, a worker is likely to receive a notice in his pay envelope informing him he is to finish the next night. That does not happen in oversea countries. In all the oversea countries I visited, particularly in Europe, all of the advance information is available to trade unions and members so that they can discuss it, and they pull their socks up, put their heads down and see that the machinery gets into operation so that the company becomes buoyant again: that is the sort of situation I want to bring about in the industrial relations scene. If politicians such as the member for Eyre want to go around knocking that sort of communication, knocking that sort of industrial relations and telling the people he represents not to accept it, we will have a difficult job.

SAVINGS BANK

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Premier say whether the Savings Bank of South Australia has been approached to participate in the shareholding of a South Australian finance company and whether, if such an approach was made, the Government would support the proposal? I understand that the customers of the State Bank of South Australia will benefit from the bank's participation in Beneficial Finance Corporation Ltd., even though the State Treasury takes 50 per cent of the bank's profits. The Savings Bank of South Australia has 145 branches and 900 agencies throughout the State, giving a far wider banking coverage than is given by the State Bank. It is now the only bank in the State which is not affiliated to or associated with a finance company. Therefore, will the Premier say whether the Savings Bank of South Australia is seeking similar involvement or whether it will in fact act for the State Bank where that bank is not represented?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am not aware of any suggestion that the Savings Bank of South Australia should participate in the shareholding of Beneficial Finance. The State banks that have gone into this area include the Rural Bank of New South Wales, which, two years ago, under a Liberal Government took up a 5·6 per cent shareholding in Beneficial Finance. The Savings Bank is now an agent for the State Bank and its operations in all areas of South Australia. As stated in this House previously, we have attempted to integrate the services of the two banks in order to give a proper and effective banking service of a competitive nature by the Savings Bank and the State Bank. In representing the State Bank, the Savings Bank will be in a position to write business through Beneficial Finance where that is appropriate. That will be done on an agency basis, not through any shareholding by the Savings Bank in Beneficial Finance.

At 3.5 p.m. the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE: HON G. R. BROOMHILL

Mr. WHITTEN moved:

That two months leave of absence be granted to the honourable member for Henley Beach (Hon. G. R. Broomhill) on account of absence overseas on Commonwealth Parliamentary Association business.

Motion carried.

MEDIBANK STRIKE

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): I move:

That this House urge the State Government to supply free legal assistance to any person who has received notice of a fine by or expulsion from a union, or the threat thereof, for working during the Medibank strike on Monday July 12, 1976.

Before I debate this motion, I appeal to all union officials and executives to immediately drop the threats of fines or industrial action against persons who worked during the Medibank strike. The Medibank strike is finished and the unions have made their point. Only disunity, bitterness and resentment will result if unions continue to impose fines upon those who worked. I make this plea in the interests of industrial harmony and common sense. Continued threats by unions will cause more people to resign from unions. I know of many cases where people have already resigned. If this appeal is accepted, there is no need for this motion. However, I will proceed with the motion until all such threats and demands by unions are withdrawn.

Mr. Abbott: Would you like to list some of those threats?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I will do so soon. First, I would not deny the right of unions to participate in legal strikes, although I may criticise the way in which particular industrial disputes are conducted. A person is entitled to withdraw his labour in pursuit of legitimate industrial objectives. Also, I must state that I would encourage a strong industrially orientated union movement. Employees should have strong representation in any industrial negotiations. A strong responsible union is vital to a healthy economy. However, to use industrial muscle for exploitation and political ends as occurred in the case of the Medibank strike is industrial blackmail.

Secondly, the imposition of fines or other industrial action by unions upon persons who worked during the Medibank strike on July 12, was illegal: the reasons are as follows. The Medibank strike was an illegal strike under both Commonwealth and State conciliation and arbitration Acts. The Minister of Labour and Industry has already admitted (*Hansard*, page 650 of Tuesday, August 17, 1976) that no union executive gave written notice of the intention to strike, as is required under section 147 of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act. Section 147 (*b*), which is most pertinent, provides that a strike is illegal if:

(ii) the strike did not commence until after the expiration of fourteen days from the day on which the notice was given to the Minister;

As I have indicated, the Minister has clearly said in *Hansard* in reply to a question I asked that 14 days notice was not given. Therefore, the Medibank strike under State and Federal legislation was an illegal strike. Moreover, if that was an illegal strike, people who worked during the

Medibank strike worked according to the law and to their award, because they worked within the conditions of their award.

Section 132 (1) (b) of the Act states that the registration of a union can be cancelled if "the rules of a registered association or their administration . . . impose or imposes unreasonable conditions upon the continuance of membership, or are or is in any way tyrannical or oppressive." I refer to that provision because it points out that, if the actions of a union or the implications of some of the rules of that union are an unfair burden on an individual, they are classed as oppressive or tyrannical, and are illegal. In this case, people who worked according to the law and who are fined because they worked according to the law are being dealt with unfairly by the unions and the union actions are tyrannical and oppressive. The courts have already found that fines imposed against people working according to the award are tyrannical and oppressive.

In addition, section 134 of the Act allows the court to declare invalid any rule of a registered association which shall "prevent or hinder members of the registered association from observing the law or the provisions of an award." Again, that clearly indicates that no rule of any trade union or any other employee or employer association can prohibit anyone working within the law. The Medibank strike was illegal, and people who worked during the strike were working according to the law. Therefore, it is impossible and against the law for a union to take action against any person who has acted according to the law.

Even though the rules of a union may give power to the union executive to impose fines on members and even though those rules may have been approved by the Industrial Court (which would be the case), such rules can be declared invalid in the case of people who worked during the Medibank strike. The law grants to employees the right to work, irrespective of the action of unions. Therefore, people fined for working have acted within the law and should be legally defended by the Government from such tyrannical and oppressive actions by trade union officials trying to impose fines.

I have already referred to the State industrial law and now I refer to the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Act. Section 188 (1) provides:

If any organisation or if the committee or a branch of an organisation, or the committee of a branch of an organisation, imposes or declares that it imposes, or that it intends to impose, a penalty, forfeiture or disability of any kind upon a member of the organisation by reason of the fact that the member has worked, is working or intends to work in accordance with the terms of an award, the organisation shall be guilty of an offence.

Doubtless, all members have read page 3 of today's *Advertiser*, where it is clearly indicated that that position could be upheld in a court of law, and that any fine imposed by a union is an illegal fine. I am sure that I do not have to point out to any member the fact that that has been clearly established in court. I am pleased that the timing in this matter has been so perfect that this report should coincide with the moving of my motion. It is interesting because Government members in South Australia have continually claimed that the unions were acting within their power in imposing such fines on their membership. I also refer to Mr. John Scott who, with his head buried in the sand in his usual manner, continued to claim on the television programme *This Day Tonight* in a debate against me—

Mr. Wells: He thrashed you, too.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I will come to that in a moment.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DEAN BROWN: He claimed that because the union rules had been approved by the Industrial Court such fines could be legally imposed. However, the Full Bench decision of the Commonwealth Industrial Court yesterday completely gave the lie to the claims of Mr. Scott, and I point out to the member for Florey that the facts now show that Mr. Scott did not know what he was talking about, which is not unusual.

Mr. J. B. Dillon, Secretary, Federated Liquor and Allied Industries Employees Union of Australia (S.A. Branch), has conceded that fines imposed by unions would be illegal. This union secretary in South Australia has come out and said that fines imposed on union members for working during the Medibank strike could not be enforced in court. In a letter of July 26, 1976, Mr. Dillon states in part:

If the union attempts to fine those who did not stop, and they refuse to pay, as they have been told by employer organisations and we take them to court, the court will rule against us because it is classed as an illegal strike.

Those are the words of a South Australian union secretary, who has also stated in a private letter and admitted that any fines imposed on individuals for working during the Medibank strike would be illegal and that the court could uphold that view in favour of any union member who had been fined. Later, in the same letter Mr. Dillon also states:

Unfortunately, and it's cold comfort for those who obeyed the call, the committee of management has decided that no action can be taken in this episode, and are concerned to avoid embroiling the union in squabbles which might amount to futile gestures if we tried to apply penalties.

In conclusion, he states:

Once again, thank you for your support, and hope this letter does explain some of the unfortunate circumstances of this sorry episode.

I take the extra point from the letter that not only does Mr. Dillon admit that any action taken by the union would be illegal: but he also admits that the whole episode is rather sorry and that, if action is proceeded with by unions, the unions involved are likely to become embroiled in an unfortunate squabble, which would lead to divisions within unions. Therefore, the claims I made initially are correct, that any action would lead to disunity, bitterness and division in union ranks.

I reiterate my plea that unions do not proceed with their threats against or fines of members who worked during the Medibank strike. Obviously, Mr. Dillon's union backs my legal opinion, and I urge other unions to follow the example set by his union. My advice to individuals who have received letters imposing fines on them or threatening fines is to ignore the action of the union, as the law is on their side.

It would be both proper and reasonable for the State Government to protect people who have been threatened for upholding the law. The Premier claims to uphold and protect the principles of a democracy. However, on this occasion the Premier has been hypocritical in not taking action to protect employees against the oppressive and tyrannical actions and threats of unions. Obviously, the Premier's political principles are secondary to his political affiliations to the unions in this State.

The Labor Government paid the fines and costs of Mr. Jim Dunford and his union during the Kangaroo Island dispute, when the law was broken by Mr. Dunford and that union. The Premier defended Mr. Dunford and paid his court costs and fines. The same State Government is unwilling, from its previous statements, to supply the same legal assistance to people who obey the law but

who are now being threatened by those unions. Only one conclusion can be reached, and that is that the Premier acts by whether or not a union is involved rather than by any political principle that he may hold towards a democracy. There are two classes of people: those who are members of unions or are union officials, and those who are not.

On Thursday, September 16, the Attorney-General, in replying to a question about threats and intimidation from insurance companies stated:

No-one can be forced to pay a sum for which he or she is not responsible. Threatening letters from insurance companies that are sent, particularly after motor vehicle accidents, demanding money where there is no guilt on the part of the people concerned should be duly ignored by those people. I would suggest to people who receive such letters that they should reply in strong terms indicating that they do not intend to be intimidated in this fashion, ignore them or, if they are in any doubt, they should refer the matter to the Consumer Affairs Branch or to a private solicitor.

If we replace the words "insurance companies" with the word "unions", the reply would relate to letters of threats being received by unionists from unions trying to demand money from them for obeying the law. If the Attorney takes that attitude towards insurance companies, surely one would expect him to take exactly the same attitude to trade union officials who are imposing such fines on individuals. However, that is not the case, because we well know that union officials and their unions in this State elect members to the Government bench. We know that 86 per cent of votes in the preselection council are controlled by trade unions, which is the only reason why the Labor Party will not, unfortunately, protect individuals in this case. I believe that that action is despicable. The Government has two standards, as indicated by the Attorney's reply last week.

My motion simply asks the Attorney-General and his Government to give the same free legal assistance to people who are being threatened or fined by trade unions that they would give to someone who is threatened or fined by a private company or other body. The Opposition asks for consistency in Government policy. I doubt that we will get that consistency. I hope the Government will support the motion, because it is an important motion with an important principle at stake.

Last week the Attorney referred to an isolated case about which he had heard. Regarding this matter, I have had representations made to me by many more than 100 people who have been threatened or fined by trade unions. Other members on this side have received requests about the action people should take. They seek assistance from this Parliament to protect them against such intimidation and threats. I look forward to support from all members so that the principles of democracy in this State can be upheld.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I second and support the motion. It refers to action that has occurred and is, of course, history—the Medibank strike of July, 12, However, it could cause future concern, because it sets a precedent. The motion, however, relates to matters that are flowing or could flow from the Medibank strike. As the member for Davenport pointed out so cogently by quoting from the Act, the Medibank strike was an illegal strike. The motion also relates to actions that could flow from that strike, because union members have received or could receive notice of a fine or expulsion or the threat of a fine or expulsion.

I emphasise that the motion does not interfere with the internal affairs of a union, which is the cry or rebuttal from members opposite when similar motions are moved. The motion simply provides the means by which assistance can be given to individual unionists to meet legal costs that may be caused by a union decision to impose or threaten to impose fines or expulsion. The principle enunciated in the motion should attract support from all Government members. It is the principle of justice. It does not interfere with the internal rights of a union or what a union should do about its own affairs.

If members scrutinise carefully the motion they will see that what I am saying is perfectly true. If members opposite oppose the motion, I would suggest that they do not believe that unionists should have the right of access to legal assistance as set out in the motion. Members opposite must face that dilemma. The motion, in effect, sets out a matter of fundamental justice for the people involved in this case. It does not seek to break new ground in South Australia but simply seeks to involve or attract, which has not been done before, some of the rights and privileges that ordinary citizens have now. I remind members that, in certain areas in the legal system of the State, legal assistance is given today either under the auspices or through the aegis of the Law Society of South Australia or, in some cases, by Government departments. The motion seeks to bring forward that type of assistance and to make it available in this case. To my knowledge, this has not occurred in the past and to that extent perhaps it is breaking new ground, but it is not breaking new ground in relation to the ordinary citizen of this State. The member for Davenport made some very cogent quotations.

Mr. Gunn: I am sure the member for Florey will agree.

Mr. COUMBE: They were most cogent, and I shall not repeat them except to emphasise their application to and their importance in industrial matters. In reply to a question earlier today, the Minister of Labour and Industry made a plea for greater communication between employer and employee. The implementation of this motion would go a long way towards achieving that state of affairs, because the ability would be given to an individual, who otherwise could be caused some hardship, to appeal, if he wished, against action taken to fine him or to expel him. The motion merely seeks to provide legal assistance for the person who believes that he has been disadvantaged.

I am not canvassing, and neither is the member for Davenport, the rights or wrongs of the industrial action on July 12. That is not the purpose of the motion. However, I want to bring to the attention of the House the sort of thing the mover has in mind. This type of advice is given, for instance, by the Attorney-General, under the Public and Consumer Affairs Department, where persons are given legal assistance and legal advice. Surely, no-one could object to such assistance being given in this case. The motion in no way impinges on the internal affairs of a union; it simply seeks to give an individual the opportunity to state his case, if he wishes, without being involved in heavy legal costs. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

DAYLIGHT SAVING

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I move:

That, in the opinion of this House, a referendum should be held in conjunction with the next State election to decide the future of daylight saving in this State.

I do not intend to make a lengthy contribution to the debate on this motion. I have spoken on this matter and moved similar motions on several other occasions, but I think it is important that the people of South Australia should have an opportunity to decide, once and for all, whether or not they wish daylight saving to continue. Ministers would be aware that a referendum was held in Western Australia, resulting in daylight saving being thrown out in that State. A similar referendum held in New South Wales resulted in daylight saving being continued there. A referendum in conjunction with a State election would not be a costly exercise. I realise that a referendum held alone would be out of the question, because it would probably cost more than $1 000 000. Many people feel strongly about this matter, and they should be given an opportunity to voice their opinion.

I could explain at length the problems of people in the western parts of the State, especially mothers with young children. Small children must catch school buses before daylight and, when they return home, the mothers have trouble getting them to go to bed before dark. Mothers of some children in grades 1, 2, and 3 must keep children home for one day a fortnight so that they can catch up on their rest. Many people believe that daylight saving is a good thing, and they appreciate having more leisure time in the evening, but other people feel strongly in the opposite way. So that the matter can be rectified, we should hold a referendum in conjunction with the next State election. Two States have already done this, so I see no reason why South Australia should not carry out the same democratic process. I hope the Government will support the motion, and I commend it to the House.

Mr. KENEALLY secured the adjournment of the debate.

ABALONE FISHING

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I move:

That in the opinion of this House:

(*a*) the South Australian Government should immediately set up an Abalone Advisory Committee, to include representatives of the Abalone Divers Association and the Agriculture and Fisheries Department, with an independent Chairman;

(*b*) that abalone divers be permitted to sell their permits with their boats; and

(*c*) that abalone divers be permitted to employ relief divers.

The subject of this motion has been widely discussed recently in the South Australian fishing industry by the people involved in it, and the effects spread to those who process and market the product. Hardship is being experienced by people in this industry who have been discriminated against in terms of other fisheries. The final part of the motion brings to the notice of the Government the need for abalone fishermen to have relief divers. The Premier, in replying to a question yesterday, and the Minister of Fisheries have taken it upon themselves to interpret this as meaning that the Opposition is suggesting that such a course would double the number of divers operating in the State.

It is not an unqualified motion from the Opposition: the motion is specific, and sets out three points of concern. I understand that the South Australian abalone industry is worth about $2 000 000 a year to the State, and that about 32 licensed operators are in the industry. In that case, these people return about $60 000 a head. This matter should be considered, because there are considerable costs and risks involved in this industry. The Opposition is suggesting that there should be an advisory committee with a door open to the Minister and the department, to enable round-table dialogue on issues that have caused much concern to the management of the industry. The economic report, which recommends an increase in permits for the industry, emphasises matters that are amiss.

The Opposition believes that the authority should be placed on the vessel: this seems to be one of the main points of conflict between the Minister and abalone fishermen. I have a letter from the Hon. Lloyd Costello (the Tasmanian Minister for Fisheries) who refers to the changed view that has taken place in the abalone industry in Tasmania. Recently, there has been a requirement for a CZ18 medical test, which emphasises the physical hazards on the human body and the predisposing conditions that are alleged to bring on bone necrosis, and this has also caused much debate in the industry. The late Terry Manuel lost his life when taken by a shark, and his widow was not able to dispose—

Mr. Gunn: That was a scurrilous act by the Government

Mr. RODDA: —of the vessel and gear that was worth many thousands of dollars, because the permit was not with the vessel. These assets are therefore virtually worthless, and the widow had to sell her house and go to work, and is now living in a rented house. She was told that, if she wished to remain in the business, she would have to dive herself. As the member for Eyre has said, that was scurrilous treatment of a girl who lost her husband. Naturally, there will be high turnover of personnel in the abalone industry, and surely the Minister can acknowledge this fact; it has been acknowledged in Tasmania.

The motion refers to relief divers. It is all very well for the Premier to say yesterday that we want to double the number of divers from 32 to 64, when replying to a question from the member for Alexandra, who was raising an issue on behalf of his constituents. It was announced in May of this year that there would be an increase in the number of divers, and people who wish to get into the industry are pressing their member for advice. The Premier chose to criticise the shadow Minister for not communicating with his colleagues on the issue, but we have had many communications. The Minister has suggested that the Opposition wants to double the number of divers. Both the Minister and the Premier know that the commonsense interpretation of this proposal is all that is meant by the Opposition when it refers to relief divers. It will enable the person holding the permit to make full and effective use of equipment, and will enable the taking of the minimum quantity of this resource. It will also enable divers to operate in deeper water in which there still remain stocks of abalone. The endurance of divers is reduced considerably as the water becomes deeper. It could be as low as 25 minutes safe diving in deep water, and that is why the motion asks the Government to consider relief divers.

The essence of the motion recognises the preservation of the resource and the maintenance of an industry that will regenerate itself and continue to be economically viable. This is a responsible suggestion from the Opposition. We deplore the cunning use of debate that tends to denigrate the question asked by the member for Alexandra. Did not the widow Manuel have a case for a relief diver? The Government stands condemned for its treatment of this poor soul.

Abalone divers are not arguing that the industry should be a closed shop. They want the industry, the fishing grounds, and conditions under which they work to be researched properly, and they are willing to co-operate with the department and to take a marine biologist to the scene of the operations. They will give the department and the Minister all the assistance that may be required. The department should have an expert who will go with the fishermen, and go over the side in order to examine first-hand what is contained in this vast expanse of ocean.

From discussions I have had with abalone divers I know that they are reasonable people, well versed in this specialised industry and willing to co-operate with the Minister and his department. Secondly, there should be a conservation of the resource, as happens in all fisheries, and this is a function of government. The economic report seems to assume that the sea is full of abalone and that a full effort is not being made by the divers. There seems to be no regard for the reproduction of the resource, and an assumption that all is well. The report also states that there shall be a minimum catch limit of 3 000 kilograms annually, and there must be an increase in competition amongst the divers.

Thirdly, in the matter of stocks of abalone in the deeper waters of the western area, I understand that there are abalone there. However, to take them involves facing up to the question of the relief diver, and this means a transfer of effort. That is a serious problem facing the industry. The economic report caused much concern among the abalone fishermen. On the production of this report, the decision was taken to increase the number of abalone permits. I was given this morning a set of figures which I intend to table and which were prepared by Mr. Polacco, an abalone diver, and I will quote some of the statistics he prepared. The statistics deal with Kangaroo Island. Mr. Polacco has listed 24 sites around the island and has indicated the catches over a period. At site No. 1, which is the North Cape and Cape Marsden area of Kangaroo Island, in 1967, when abalone diving was started there in virgin waters, the average catch on a six-hour day was 300 kilogrammes, taken by diver D. Hunter.

In 1970, on the second time around, when Mr. Polacco dived there, on an average of six hours diving, the catch was reduced to 150 kg. On the third time around, in 1972, in a period averaging three hours of diving, the catch was reduced to 50 kg. In 1975, on the fourth time around and with two hours of diving, the divers could pick up only 15 kg. The situation in the whole 24 listings stresses the quantity taken. The Minister must consider these statistics which have been clearly set out by Mr. Polacco and which clearly underline in a tangible form what the industry is concerned about. Indeed, it has gone to the Ombudsman about this matter, and sought discussions with the Minister and with Cabinet. When one looks at a summary on the second sheet and at each of the sitings, one will see that sites Nos. 1 and 2 have no commercial value. Site No. 3 will support one diver for two days and site No. 4 will support one diver for five days. So, in the total summary of the 24 sites, it is estimated that they will stand 109 working days and will, in the long term, support two divers.

Furthermore, Mr. Polacco gives a summary on the site at Tipara Reef and says that the reef, in 1967, had about 40 divers, who depleted the stocks almost to the point of no recovery. It took seven years before fishing could start again. According to the five divers in the zone, Tipara Reef will last only to the end of next summer and will need a rest of one or two years in order to recover. The remaining abalone, he says, is scattered on the bottom of Yorke Peninsula, Cape Jervis and Victor Harbor, and is of commercial value for only one diver who is not hard working. Cape Jervis would have a small commercial value if poaching could be stopped. I table these documents.

The SPEAKER: Are they statistical information?

Mr. RODDA: Yes, dealing with the industry.

The SPEAKER: Does the honourable member want them incorporated in *Hansard* without reading them?

Mr. RODDA: I have read only a part of them. I want them incorporated in *Hansard,* and I also want to table them.

The SPEAKER: There can be no tabling by the honourable member—only a Minister can table documents. The honourable member seeks leave to have the statistical information incorporated in *Hansard.*

Leave granted.

ABALONE DIVING

Location	Year	Kilograms	Hours	Diver	Depth (feet)
North Cape	1966-67	300	6	D. Hunter	35
	1970	150	6	M. Polacco	35
	1972	50	3	M. Polacco	35
	1975	15	2	M. Polacco	35
Penneshaw	1966-67	350	6	D. Hunter	60
	1970	100	4	D. Morrison	60
	1971	50	3	J. Kroezen	60
	1975	15	2	M. Polacco	60
Cape St. Albans	1966-67	300	5	V. Murphy	30
	1970	150	5	C. Andrews	30
	1971	100	4	M. Polacco	30
	1972	100	4	K. Royans	30
	1975	20	2	M. Polacco	30
Cape Willoughby	1971	150	6	K. Royans	35
	1973	100	6	K. Royans	35
	1975	80	6	K. Royans	35
Cape Hart	1971	200	6	D. Black	60
	1972	150	4	K. Royans	60
	1973	100	4	K. Royans	60
	1974	100	5	K. Royans	60

ABALONE DIVING—*continued*

Location	Year	Kilograms	Hours	Diver	Depth (feet)
Pennington Bay East	1970	300	6	M. Polacco	45
	1971	250	6	M. Polacco	45
	1972	150	5	M. Polacco	45
	1973	150	6	M. Polacco	45
	1974	60	4	G. Chapman	45
Pennington Bay West	1966-67	400	6	D. Hunter	40
	1970	250	6	D. Black	40
	1971	100	4	M. Polacco	40
	1974	50	4	M. Polacco	40
	1975	15	2	M. Polacco	40
Point Tinline	1966-67	400	6	D. Hunter	25
	1970	200	6	D. Black	25
	1971	150	5	D. Black	25
	1973	100	4	G. Chapman	25
	1976	50	4	M. Polacco	25
Cape Linois and Cape Gantheaume	1970	300	6	D. Black	45
	1971	100	4	M. Polacco	45
	1972	100	4	F. Alexander	45
	1973	100	4	G. Chapman	45
	1974	130	4	G. Chapman	45
	1976	150	6	M. Polacco	45
Black Point	1970	250	6	P. Thompson	35
	1971	150	6	P. Thompson	35
	1974	200	8	M. Polacco	35
	1975	100	6	M. Polacco	35
Seal Bay	1971	300	7	M. Polacco	45
	1972	200	7	M. Polacco	45
	1973	150	7	M. Polacco	45
	1974	150	7	M. Polacco	45
	1975	150	8	M. Polacco	45
Point Ellen	1966-67	200	?	D. Hunter	50
	1971	100	4	M. Polacco	50
	1973	100	4	M. Polacco	50
	1974	20	3	M. Polacco	50
Cape Kersaint	1971	200	7	M. Polacco	50
	1972	50	4	M. Polacco	50
	1973	20	4	M. Polacco	50
Stunsail Boom East	1971	150	6	M. Polacco	50
	1972	100	6	M. Polacco	50
	1973	50	4	M. Polacco	50
	1974	15	2	M. Polacco	50
Stunsail Boom West	1972	200	8	M. Polacco	30
	1973	150	7	M. Polacco	30
	1974	150	7	M. Polacco	30
	1975	120	7	M. Polacco	30
Hanson Bay	1971	200	5	M. Polacco	20
	1972	150	5	M. Polacco	20
	1973	20	3	M. Polacco	20
Weir Cove	1972	200	8	M. Polacco	40
	1973	150	6	M. Polacco	40
	1974	100	6	M. Polacco	40
Cape De Couedie North	1974	200	7	M. Polacco	
	1975	100	6	M. Polacco	
Cape De Couedie South	1973	200	6	M. Polacco	
	1974	200	6	M. Polacco	
	1975	150	6	M. Polacco	
Rocky River North	1972	350	6	M. Polacco	40
	1973	250	7	M. Polacco	40
	1974	200	8	M. Polacco	40
	1975	150	7	M. Polacco	40
Rocky River South	1973	150	6	M. Polacco	30
	1974	80	6	M. Polacco	30
West Bay	1972	350	8	M. Polacco	35
	1973	200	8	M. Polacco	35
	1974	200	8	M. Polacco	35
	1975	130	7	M. Polacco	35
Vennachar Bay	1972	100	6	M. Polacco	50
	1973	50	4	M. Polacco	50
	1974	20	4	M. Polacco	50
The Reef	1970	150	6	M. Polacco	45
	1975	15	3	M. Polacco	45

North Cape	Non commercially viable
Penneshaw	Non commercially viable
Cape St. Albans	1 Diver, 2 days
Cape Willoughby	1 Diver, 5 days
Cape Hart	1 Diver, 10 days
Pennington Bay East	1 Diver, 5 days
Pennington Bay West	Non commercially viable
Point Tinline	Non commercially viable
Cape Linois and Cape Gantheaume	5 Divers, 4 days
Black Point	1 Diver, 3 days
Seal Bay	5 Divers, 2 days
Point Ellen	Non commercially viable
Cape Kersaint	1 Diver, 1 day
Stunsail Boom East	1 Diver, 3 days
Stunsail Boom West	1 Diver, 4 days
Hanson Bay	Non commercially viable
Weir Cove	1 Diver, 2 days
Cape De Couedie North	1 Diver, 2 days
Cape De Couedie South	1 Diver, 4 days
Rocky River North	5 Divers, 3 days
Rocky River South	1 Diver, 3 days
West Bay	5 Divers, 4 days
Vennachar Bay	Non commercially viable
The Reef	Non commercially viable

Total Working Days—109 estimated.

At present stock situation—on long terms—Kangaroo Island commercially viable for two divers.

Mr. RODDA: I emphasise to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the Minister on the front bench the importance of these papers. This is a subject of considerable dimension and, in the discussions and arguments that have taken place about this vexed question, it has been pointed out that the processors had said nothing, although Safcol has been mentioned. I will quote from a letter from the General Manager of Safcol in response to a deputation to Safcol by Messrs. Polacco and John McGovern, abalone divers, who have a vested interest in this matter and who have made a considerable contribution to research, on which I commend them. Mr. Fowler's letter to the Premier states:

Safcol have been asked by the South Australian Abalone Divers Association to support a submission advocating additional research by Government into the extent and potential of the South Australian abalone stocks prior to allocation of the recently announced 10 additional abalone divers permits. It is no secret that for some time now Safcol have been registering concern over the diminishing effort in the abalone industry. What is not so well known is that Safcol have been advocating rectifying the decreased effort by:

(*a*) Allowing the present abalone divers to sell out as a going concern, this way there would be a tendency for those divers who are reaching the end of their diving life to sell out; there would be a steady and continuous injection of new divers into the industry. This would give a more steady rate of effort and allow for the infusion of new recruits into the industry.

(*b*) Establish the abalone permit on the boat (consistent with the other South Australian fisheries) rather than attaching it to the diver. This, of course, would allow for the maximum economic operation of the vessel.

Safcol have advocated increased effort in the abalone industry on economic grounds—our critics have claimed that biologically the resource cannot stand the increased effort. At present this statement seems to be based more on conjecture or based on abalone divers' practical knowledge rather than based on properly documented scientific data. That the abalone divers are now advocating the establishment of a properly co-ordinated and continuous research programme which if established will provide the basis of the scientific knowledge necessary for decisions on the future fishing effort in the abalone fishing industry to be made with a maximum of confidence and invite a minimum of contradiction is commendable. Safcol have long believed that there is an urgent need for increased research into South Australian fisheries, including the abalone fishery. Safcol must support the aspect of the abalone divers' submission calling for additional research.

I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 18. Page 726.)

Mr. JENNINGS (Ross Smith): I do not know whether members recall that, when I asked for leave to continue my remarks some time ago, there was some by-play, which had gone on right through my speech, which I appreciated then but which I do not know whether I would appreciate today, for obvious reasons. I will continue quoting the report of an inspector who attended a coursing meeting at Murray Bridge on June 27, 1974, as follows:

During the course of my conversation with Mr. P. Alsop (President of the National Coursing Association), he naturally supported the sport of live hare coursing, asserting that the hares had a reasonably good chance of escaping dogs, and, if by chance they were caught, were usually killed very quickly with a minimum of suffering. Because of the lack of evidence to the contrary, I had previously been inclined to agree with him but, after witnessing at reasonably close quarters the last heat of the meeting at Murray Bridge, it would seem that not every hare is killed instantly by the dogs and that, on occasions, unnecessary pain and suffering is inflicted on the unfortunate quarry.

I now read the following letter I received recently from the secretary of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals that includes reports received from his inspector:

I enclose the following reports on coursing

1. Kenderleigh 26/7/76.
2. Riverton 17/7/76.
3. Mintaro 24/6/76.

At the meeting at Kenderleigh, two hares were believed to have been killed. At Riverton one hare was killed. During 1975, the coursing authorities closed the Murray Bridge Plumpton coursing ground, stopped the boxing of hares, withdrew the points award for the kill and issued a ruling that all dogs coursing must be muzzled. A specimen muzzle is forwarded herewith.

A specimen muzzle was forwarded to me, which, obviously, I cannot show in the House. It was a very flimsy kind of muzzle that could easily be broken in the kill. The letter continues:

It would appear that the muzzle does not, in fact, totally prevent the dogs seizing the hare, and I believe that is is reasonable to assume that considerable damage can be done to the hare from the mauling it would receive from the claws and forelegs of the dogs and the buffeting of the dog's muzzle, should the hare be unfortunate enough to be caught by the dogs.

That fact has been denied by some of the opponents of this Bill. While all of those allegations may not be strictly true, I think many of them obviously are. The letter continues with some reports:

Kenderleigh report:

On Monday, July 26, 1976, I attended the Licensed Victuallers Coursing Club of South Australia 32 dog stake meeting at Kenderleigh situated 4½ miles north of Bowmans. I watched most of the hares in the second round, near the gate where the dogs are taken on to the course prior to being taken to the start. During the day I saw two hares caught by dogs and brought to ground and mauled. From what I could see both hares were killed.

When the first hare was brought down, the handler of the dog grabbed hold of the dog and the hare then ran towards the scrub but the handler was unable to restrain the dog, which broke away and within 15 metres approximately had caught the hare again and commenced to maul the hare before the handler was able to contain the dog. In the second instance, where the dogs Invercoe Gay and Apsley Chief were involved, they caught the hare inside the scrub and commenced to maul the hares before the handlers could pull them off. At the completion of the second round on the program I left the course, the time then being 1505 hours, and returned home.

Riverton report:

On Saturday, July 17, 1976, I attended a live hare coursing meeting sponsored by the Riverton Coursing Club. The coursing grounds are located on the outskirts of Mintaro, S.A. I attended the meeting in my own car, dressed in plain clothes and accompanied by my wife.

We arrived at the course at 1145 hours just in time to see the second course of the day being run. All dogs competing were muzzled in the approved fashion. In the twelfth race of the day, which was the fourth in the first round between Irish Eyes and Abelene Rose, the dogs managed to catch the hare and somehow managed to hold it between them. I was unable, even with the aid of field glasses, to ascertain how the dogs were managing to hold the hare. The handlers ran forward and pulled the dogs from the carcass of the hare.

No-one other than coursing club officials were allowed onto the course itself. Not wishing to draw attention to the fact that I was an Inspector with the R.S.P.C.A., I did not attempt to cross the course to view the worried hare. That particular hare had appeared to be very reluctant to run from the start. After having been released it loped very slowly on to the course and then turned and attempted to retrace its steps back along the race but was prevented and turned by a man on horseback.

This may have been one of those hares, about which we have heard from the proponents of this practice, that enjoys this chase. We have been told that the hare really enjoys it—he has great fun! The report continues:

Apart from this one incident all the hares eventually managed to run through the escape fence. The meeting was attended by approximately 100 people. Food was available, as was alcoholic liquor. A bookmaker was also operating.

Obviously, alcohol was available, as this was a licensed victuallers meeting. Another report of an inspector of the R.S.P.C.A. states:

I have to report that at Mintaro in South Australia on June 27, 1976, between 1204 hours and 1515 hours I attended a live hare coursing meeting, This was at Mintaro. During that period nine courses were run and at no time was the hare caught by the dog. Each hare got to the safe area well in front of the dogs. I estimate that between 35 and 40 persons attended the meeting, which appeared to be well run. Dogs were all muzzled before leaving the starting point and the muzzles were removed after the event—

I suppose that was so the muzzles could be used again—and no entrance fee or car parking fee was asked for during the meeting. I left about 1520 hours arriving back at 1750 hours.

Obviously, I am a very honourable man, as I refer to a report that does not support my own case, just as I refer to reports that suit my case.

Mr. Allison: Are you like Brutus?

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes. Brutus was an honourable man, but look how he finished up. An argument was put to a reporter of the *National Times* on July 17, 1974, and he begins his article thus:

Hares are funny creatures. They actually enjoy being chased through a paddock by two trained greyhounds intent on killing them. At least, that is the claim of the men who organise the sport of live hare coursing which flourishes legally in South Australia.

The article continues:

Sometimes when the hare looks like escaping, it will slow down to give the dogs a sporting chance of catching it.

Mr. Venning: What are you complaining about?

Mr. JENNINGS: I would complain about the member for Rocky River, if it were not against Standing Orders. The article continues:

What's more, coursing fans say that the sport actually helps preserve the hare species. When they are not being killed by the dogs the hares are carefully looked after and well fed by the people who run the coursing tracks.

Mr. Coumbe: I seem to have heard this before.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, but many honourable members were not here on the previous occasion. Much of this information the honourable member has not heard before. The members who were not here when the Bill was last introduced are entitled to be as fully informed on this matter as were members who were here previously, and who heard my wit and wisdom in this matter.

Mr. Coumbe: There were some here then who are not here now.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, and I will send a message to them on asbestos. The article continues:

The R.S.P.C.A. takes a different view. They find it hard to believe that any creature can really enjoy running for its life.

The *National Times* reporter adds:

It is a paradox that South Australia, which has some claims to be the most civilised State in Australia, should be the only State to permit Australia's most barbaric sport.

The House will be aware that a petition on this matter has been presented by me signed by about 87 000 citizens of this State supporting this legislation. As many petitions arrived after this matter was disposed of, one could fairly say that about 90 000 signatures were received in support of this matter. Once again, the supporters of this so-called sport try to camouflage the matter. They say that the abolition of the sport would mean that the specially bred dogs would have to be destroyed. If there is any veracity in the statement, the sooner they are destroyed the better. The Bill contains only a simple amendment to the principal Act; there is scarcely any need for me to further pursue the matter. In my reply I believe I can answer any objections that might arise during the debate. I understand that during the Committee stage certain amendments will be moved in an attempt to render this measure less effective in many ways. I hope I shall be able to answer those attempted amendments as they arise. Moreover, I hope that they do not arise, because I want the Bill to leave the House as it now stands.

Let it be perfectly clear that I do not wish to prejudge the Committee stage, but any such amendments would be unacceptable, as matters relating to whether the practice is cruel or whether muzzling would lessen that cruelty would be much better considered when the Bill is returned from another place. Another important issue to consider is whether there would be any psychological cruelty. After all, we have no way of knowing whether a hare is capable of realising that a dog chasing it is muzzled.

This is the third time I have introduced the Bill. On the former occasions it was overwhelmingly passed. Conceivably, this will be the last time I will have an opportunity to introduce this measure. Members will realise that, naturally, I want some finality on it. If there is to be a conference, let us have it and let the managers make their respective submissions. I am not adamant about having all the clauses of the Bill passed, as much as I would like that to happen. I hope the Bill will not be opposed in this House. It faces its real danger in the Upper House. Any trouble between the Houses should be dealt with by the managers of the Houses at a conference. I am anxious to get the Bill to the Upper House, where it will be handled on my behalf by the Hon. Cec Creedon, whereas, previously it was handled by the Hon. Mr. Chatterton, but I did not think it would be fair to ask a Minister to handle it for me this time.

The Hon. Mr. Burdett has shown great interest in this measure. When the Bill was introduced previously last year he moved an amendment that rather altered the general effect of the Bill. I now believe there are sufficient members of the Labor Party and the Liberal

Party in the Upper House who will support the Bill, irrespective of the Hon. Mr. Burdett. However, I would be willing to consider certain amendments if he insists on his amendments so that I can assure the passage of the Bill, which could be amended later if the matter should result in a conference. After that, if anything is achieved, the measure could be reconsidered when a consolidation, which is long overdue, is considered.

I know that many members on both sides would be willing to handle this Bill in future. I was tremendously unimpressed by the speech made in the second reading debate by the Hon. Mr. Burdett last year when he said he believed he had the killer instinct developed in him to a large degree. To me it does not seem that he has the killer instinct. I should like to see his killer instinct if he was cornered and charged by a raging rhinoceros. If one considers such a situation, one feels some sympathy for the hare. I do not want to restrict the debate, but I am sure that what I have said about the situation in the Upper House should restrict the debate in this House. I know that I cannot insist on that happening. In fact, I realise that many members will support the Bill and that probably some will oppose it.

I hope that the Bill will be supported overwhelmingly so that this odious feature of our legislation will be removed by this simple amendment. I remind the House that we are properly judged by our attitude to people who are less fortunate than ourselves and by our attitude to helpless creatures. When judgment is passed on us, let us not be found wanting. I commend the Bill to honourable members.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I support the Bill, as I did previously. I admire the honourable member for sticking persistently to his guns to see that a measure in which he believes is passed, which I hope it will be this time. I can see no reason to amend the Bill. As far as the hare is concerned, there is fear and, because fear exists, cruelty must also exist because even in human society we see people suffering from fear. The community goes to great lengths and expense and takes other action to try to eliminate such fear. That has been a trend in our society in recent times. For a long time, we have heard the saying that there are only the quick and the dead. In the case of the hare in this exercise, it should be said that there are only the very quick and the dead. It is a fast sport, one animal chasing another with the objective, on the part of the pursuing animal, of catching the hare that is being pursued. The dog is not chasing the hare to win the race. If it could be assessed, the dog's mental approach would be that it wanted to catch the hare. The hare's mental approach would be that it did not wish the dog to catch it. If that is so, fear and cruelty are involved.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: We have had people who have told us that the hare enjoys being chased.

Mr. EVANS: I know some people say that. The logical conclusion, then, would be that it enjoyed being caught, so it should perhaps stop every so often to be caught by the dog, just to make the situation more interesting. In my early life, I had some greyhounds. As a youth I hunted hares, rabbits, and foxes. We hunted as crudely as hunters could hunt. In the environment of those times, this was considered a form of sport. We had more than one type of dog, but, if the dogs had been muzzled, I am sure the animals hunted still would have been frightened. However, we would not have achieved our objective, because we hunted to kill.

In this instance, however, we are talking of a sport in which the objective is not hunting to kill. That point is made by those responsible for the conduct of coursing. They are doing all in their power to reduce the fear of the hare, but they cannot eliminate that fear and cruelty while the hare is used in this way. In supporting the Bill, I think that is the difference.

Mr. Arnold: What about horse-racing?

Mr. EVANS: The member for Chaffey raises the matter of horse-racing. I do not think one horse is chasing the other to catch it, knock it to the ground, and put it out of the race, although I have heard of all sorts of things going on in horse-racing.

Mr. Arnold: In steeplechasing horses break legs.

Mr. EVANS: Yes, and human beings break legs while playing football and other sports. In this industry, with sport as a base, the hare is being hunted. The Government should take a keen interest in one aspect of this matter other than the passage of this Bill. I hope that the member who has introduced the Bill will note what I am about to say. The people participating in this sport and in this industry have a liquidity problem, but they wish to continue running their dogs. That can be done with a mechanical lure, as is done in Victoria. The purpose of the sport is still achieved. People can bet on the dogs if they wish, and the best hunting dog or the fastest dog could still win. The skill of the dog is developed and the opportunity for punting remains.

Obviously, this would involve a Cabinet decision, but the Government should say (either here or in the other place, where the Minister for Tourism, Recreation and Sport sits) that it is willing to make money available to help the clubs obtain mechanical devices to use the trailing lure. I do not think that is an unreasonable request. The law has allowed the conduct of the sport with a live hare. If this legislation stops that practice, it would be fair to say that grants should be made available to help with the acquisition of mechanical trailing lures. I hope the Government will accept that as part of the deal in getting the legislation changed.

The Bill is not associated with any political philosophy. It is a decision on whether or not the use of greyhounds to chase a hare is a humane approach. I do not believe it is. I believe it is an area of cruelty, even if only of mental cruelty, that could be eliminated without causing the complete collapse or the cancellation of the sporting activity that human beings and greyhounds are supposed to enjoy. I ask the Government to accept some responsibility by making money available. I hope the Bill will go through. I admire the member for Ross Smith for persisting in his efforts. We know why he is determined that it must go through now. He has admitted that it is not to his personal liking to withdraw from politics, but other factors have forced this decision. I hope members see the matter in that light, and accept the Bill. I support it strongly, and I hope the Government will support this sport in the manner I have suggested.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Minister of Community Welfare): Paradoxically, I am happy to support the Bill, although I am unhappy that it is still a necessity, when I look back to what transpired in this House in 1974, when a similar measure was introduced and received almost unqualified support. Some persons, as was their right, failed to agree to the contents of the Bill. However, everyone who was present during the previous debates would agree that the contributions to them were reasonable, sensible, and without undue heat. The arguments of the

proponents of the measure (and I include myself, as well as the member for Tea Tree Gully, the member for Light, and the member for Fisher) were put forward calmly in relation to this practice (I will not dignify it by calling it a sport) of cruelty to these small animals and why it should not be allowed to continue. The Bill sets out to repeal section 7 of the principal Act. That section clearly shows that certain things were likely to happen through coursing, and therefore an exclusion was necessary in the Bill to allow the practice to occur. The wording of the relevant section is worth noting. It states:

Nothing contained in this Act shall apply to, or make unlawful, the hunting or coursing of hares which have not been liberated in a mutilated or injured state in order to facilitate their capture or destruction.

It is fair to ask why an exclusion is necessary in legislation designed to prevent cruelty to animals. Section 4, the operative part of the principal Act, provides that it is an offence to ill-treat an animal, and "ill-treat" is defined, in part, as follows:

to wound, mutilate, overdrive, override, overwork, abuse, worry, torment, or torture.

That is a horrendous list of things which can be done to animals and which is grouped under the definition of ill-treatment and made an offence. Obviously some kind of rider had to be inserted in the principal Act (section 7) in order to allow coursing to occur. Many arguments and explanations have been advanced in the past concerning the kind of thing that happens when a hare is chased by dogs, especially greyhounds.

I had hoped that the member for Fisher would advert to his earlier speech, which, for me as a city dweller who has not had much to do with coursing, reinforced what I thought happened when hares were being coursed by greyhounds. He said previously that when a hare was coursed or hunted by dogs there must be cruelty. He did not say that there was cruelty only sometimes. To support his statement, he said that he had been brought up with a country background and had had much to do with hares, the hunting of them, and the use of dogs in this connection. He reminded us that, where known physical cruelty had occurred, he had seen hares die from shock. This was a personal testimony to what the honourable member had seen when hares were chased by dogs.

He also said that no-one could deny that it was cruelty. His argument sounded well to anyone who had not had experience of this activity, and he referred succinctly to his personal experiences and his evidence of what had occurred. His statements reinforced any minor doubt that I might have had about whether cruelty occurred. I had suspected that it did occur. The member for Ross Smith said that about 90 000 people had signed a petition asking that this activity should cease in South Australia. It is not easy to collect such a great number of signatures, unless people feel strongly about the matter, and a total of 90 000 signatures reflects a strong feeling of revulsion in the community about the continuance of coursing.

I recall that excellent arguments were advanced by the member for Frome to allow the activity to continue. I also recall meeting the then President of the association (Mr. Alsop), who was frank when answering my questions. I have been told that he has since died, but his memory will not suffer from my remarks, because I found him completely open, and he answered every question I asked of him. I think his view was that he saw a long traditional history of coursing, that his interest in the sport (as he called it) was that he could get out in the open with his dogs, that he had the companionship of other persons, and that there was a tie from time immemorial of a man and his dog. He believed that it was a good activity, and he regarded it as a recreational pursuit. I suspect that he did not study closely some of the things that occurred during coursing that I and other members maintain were cruel and caused considerable pain and suffering to hares. I believe that my arguments will support those of the member from Ross Smith, who has shown considerable tenacity in this matter and who deserves to be commended.

Mr. Arnold: Do you believe that hunting horses over jumps is a similar activity?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: That is a common argument used by many people. However, if the analogy is taken further, the same logic could demonstrate that, if people in another country in a minority group are subjected to suffering, torture, and murder, why should we not do it here? That is the same dopey logic: that is, we do it because it has been done somewhere else. The honourable member is suggesting that, because cruelty occurs in other sporting or recreational pursuits, why should not cruelty occur in coursing?

Mr. Arnold: I am saying that you and your Government support the horse-racing industry (and I don't object to that), but oppose coursing.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I thought it had been explained properly by the member for Fisher. We are speaking not about politics or taking sides but about individual feelings.

Mr. Arnold: I'm drawing a comparison.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: If the honourable member wants to know my feelings on the matter, I will set them forth as we go along.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: This kind of behaviour, over a matter as important as this, by the Opposition does not do it any credit. There are people who read *Hansard* and who note these things, despite what Opposition members might think—they usually ignore everyone. We are here to talk about this matter sensibly and, if an honourable member wishes to interject and ask about my feelings, I am willing to give him an answer. Because of the possibility of cruelty in one sport, should we say that it is all right for that possibility to occur in another sport? That would be wrong. We are considering a measure which was introduced by the member for Ross Smith and which raises the question whether cruelty should continue in this sport. That is the only question we are considering. The Bill would prevent this cruelty.

Mr. Arnold: I asked a simple question.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The honourable member is taking a flippant attitude in this matter, and it does him little credit. I suspect that it is partly to sidetrack me.

Mr. Arnold: All I want you to do is convince me.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Some members can never be convinced because they do not start with an open mind, but approach every matter with their biases and prejudices showing. That is not necessarily so in the case of the honourable member who interjected but, if he wishes to wear that cap, I am willing for him to do so. The honourable member should not prejudge the issue; he and his colleagues should look at the proposition in the terms I have set out. The member for Ross Smith has shown where cruelty exists and the way in which to prevent it, and that is all we are being asked to consider. It seems to me that, from evidence which we have had in a previous debate (and which was put forward again today by the member for Fisher), the other aspects of coursing can

continue without interfering with its open-air aspects and the camaraderie in the field. The dog-man combination can continue. The hares will no longer be involved.

I do not believe that any member has shown us with any reliability that the hares enjoy what goes on, despite the rubbish about their trotting along, accelerating, and slowing down to keep the dogs coming on. People outside the House with less responsibility might say that, but not many members would say that the hares enjoy the sport. If that is the case, we do not need to involve the hares. We can have all the other aspects, as the member for Fisher pointed out: there can be betting and the outdoor recreational aspects. The dogs can enjoy their day by running and chasing mechanical devices, which presumably interest them enough. In organised track racing they seem to be able to chase mechanical lures, although some of them lose sight of the lure, but that is another story.

The proponents of the continuation of the sport have no answers to this kind of proposal, because it does not harm the sport in any way and because it will diminish the enjoyment only for those people who enjoy the kill. Anyone closely associated with this sport becomes easily hardened. Those who were in service during the war can vouch for the fact that, regrettably, they became hardened to sights and happenings which they did not enjoy seeing initially.

Mr. Olson: Callousness develops.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Yes. I will quote from a short section of a report of an inspector, as follows:

I could hear the hare squealing as both dogs held it. It was not a dead hare. If it was squealing, it was alive. The dogs would have been holding it not with their feet or paws but with their teeth.

Mr. Arnold: Aren't they muzzled?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: We are to hear that argument now. Apparently the two dogs were so well trained that they rushed up to a hare, got it to jump up in the air and held it muzzle to muzzle, immobile!

Mr. Gunn: How could they hold it with their teeth through a muzzle? Let us not be nonsensical.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: It is possible that they were released without a muzzle.

Mr. Allen: That was in 1974 *Hansard*.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Yes, I am reminding members of the horrible cruelty in this sport. People at the same distance from the animal as the inspector was could also hear the squealing of that frightened animal. The Opposition knows that muzzling is not compulsory, and that will be put forward once again as a sop. It would be a great consolation to a badly injured hare to know that it got that way by being buffeted rather than being bitten. The hares will all be pleased about that. What kind of arguments are being put forward in this matter? No member can justify why it is necessary to catch the hares and mangle them, whether by buffeting or whether by their tripping from running too fast and breaking a leg. Is that analogous to horse-racing? During the previous debate, the member for Alexandra said, "What about when you go fishing, don't you catch a fish?" However, fish are in a free element and can go anywhere they want to go. The usual reply is, "Well, but". One cannot maintain that the kill, whichever way it happens, is necessary.

Mr. Wotton: What about rabbit trapping?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I think rabbit traps are dastardly devices. The honourable member will ask next what I think about shotguns.

Mr. Wotton: When did you last live in the country?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: One of the arguments put forward in this matter previously was that it was not just a country pursuit but that a whole range of persons throughout South Australia followed this sport, so let us not try to divide people up and say how long it is since they have lived in the country or where did they come from; that is not relevant to the issue. Every member knows that cruelty is being committed, and that there is a way to stop it. If members do not support the Bill they do not care that cruelty is being committed and are prepared to let it continue.

Mr. Venning: Don't take away from the country the bit of sport they've got.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Some of the honourable members opposite would make one think that they are sad that bear baiting was outlawed some years ago.

Mr. Wotton: Is the Minister going to use his full time?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I would not have needed so much time if I were not sidetracked by honourable members opposite. I put forward similar views before on this matter and supported my view with my vote, and I intend to do the same on this occasion. The member for Ross Simth has asked us to support this Bill. Everybody in this place, irrespective of whether he comes from the city or the country, should now fully understand the problem. I trust that if I have been remiss in any way and have not put the matter clearly that will not matter greatly, because the member for Fisher and the member for Ross Smith have also dealt with the situation, and it was dealt with before in 1974, and on earlier occasions. We ask members to support the Bill and allow it to go through to the other place with more support than was obtained last time, because last time it was, unfortunately, sent back in a mutilated condition and there was no time left to do anything about it. I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Mr WOTTON (Heysen): I have listened to the debate today with a great deal of interest. I have read the 1974 *Hansard* report of debates in this House and in the Upper House. I have listened today to the way in which members have attempted to express their individual feeling, and to the reasons some members have given to try to justify the case they have presented. I will support the second reading of this Bill, and move amendments during the Committee stage. The important point that needs to be made is that the effect of this Bill will not be to ban live coursing. All this Bill does is put live coursing back within the ambit of the Act. It means that prosecutions can be undertaken if any of the offences created under section 5 of the Act in relation to live coursing can be proved.

I have never been a fan of live coursing, but I have watched this activity on a number of occasions, both overseas and closer to home on the course at Hartley at the running of the Waterloo Cup. I have noticed and have had it pointed out to me on coursing days that representatives of the R.S.P.C.A. have had free access to the area whenever they have required it and have often been invited. I am not sure whether that offer has been taken up. I know for sure that officers have access at any time to the public enclosure on coursing tracks. Much has been said about coursing and its effect on hares, but nothing has been said about the fact that the entire coursing season lasts only four months, and that during that time a period is excluded when female hares are carrying young.

On any occasion when there is evidence of young hares in the coursing area the events have been cancelled. The

hares are coursed only a few times a year. The hares in the enclosure will probably not be coursed at every meeting. Live coursing or hunting are age-old sports, and I refer to them as "sports", because on most occasions the hunted beast is meant to escape. On most occasions, those involved in the hunt would not know what to do with the hare if it was caught.

Mr. Slater: Why do they chase them?

Mr. WOTTON: The Minister has said in the House this afternoon that the sport has lasted for so long because most people who take part in hunting or coursing do so because they enjoy the environment, the fresh air, horses and dogs. I do not believe the people I know (and I have known many people involved in hunting and have very close friends involved in hunting clubs) would hunt or carry out this activity for the blood lust or the love of the kill at the end of the hunt.

Mr. Keneally: Why do the dogs chase the hare?

Mr. WOTTON: I would not imagine that the riders would get off their horses and chase them themselves. The hares live for most of the year in protected surroundings. In all of the examples of which I know the enclosures are specially planted and the animals are fully protected. I believe the rules in relation to coursing are perfectly fair. To say that they favour the hare would be a minor statement. Have any members opposite actually seen live hare coursing in action? I would be interested to know if any have, especially those who have spoken on this matter. I am sure they have read about it; that seems to be the general pattern. If members are told about something, or if they read a letter on it or if they read an article in the *Womans Weekly*, they automatically are experts on the subject.

Do Government members realise how fair are the rules of coursing? When a hare is put up, the slipper, or the experienced officer, is not permitted to slip the hounds until he is satisfied that the hare is a reasonable distance away and is freely moving. This requirement is important. Some officials are located away from the actual course and, even with the aid of binoculars, they may not see clearly exactly what is going on. However, on all the occasions that I have visited coursing activities and as I understand the position, there is always an experienced official near the actual course to see at close hand what is happening.

The incidence of killing or mutilating hares in open coursing is absolutely nil, and this has been the case in the past two years. This fact has been proved. It is not merely a matter of the National Coursing Association saying that it will do something or that it promises to do something: it has proved its point in the past two years. Indeed, I suggest that the examples given to this House and to another place in 1974 are completely different from any examples that can be given today. The National Coursing Association has bent over backwards in this matter, especially in the past two years, to solve the problems existing in the past regarding live coursing. The association can do no more than has been done. I believe that all members have received a letter from the Secretary of the association, and I refer to that letter, as follows:

In support of our views I list briefly the following points: Since the previous Bill was introduced in 1974, the N.C.A. has taken positive steps to eliminate any factors which may have contributed towards what opponents of coursing may call cruelty.

Mr. Keneally: They denied any cruelty in 1974.

Mr. WOTTON: We are debating this Bill now, in 1976, and I am not particularly interested in what happened in 1974. I am talking about the current position regarding live coursing.

Mr. Wells: You're using the same arguments.

Mr. WOTTON: Members opposite are using the same examples, as has been pointed out by the member for Rocky River. Indeed, most of the second reading explanation given by the member for Ross Smith was a replica of what he said in this place in 1974, about two years ago. The letter continues:

During the past season at Mintaro, a total of 300 courses were run without loss of hares. We consider our efforts to prevent cruelty are practical and successful and that coursing stands up well when compared with animals or humans killed or maimed with greater frequency in gun club hunting, fishing, football, spotlight shooting, etc.

Much has been said about this, and I will have more to say about it later. I point out that 300 courses were run without the loss of hares. All of the reports we have had in this House have referred to the cruelty of killing hares.

Mr. Wells: I wouldn't accept those figures.

Mr. WOTTON: I have much pleasure in accepting them. For the information of members opposite, the coursing meeting that was to be held at Mintaro next Saturday has been cancelled because two young hares were found near the course. How can members opposite say that people involved in coursing are cruel? The letter continues:

The type of coursing known as Plumpton coursing was completely outlawed, with the ground at Murray Bridge (to which Mr. Jennings refers) being closed, while Mt. Gambier ceased operation as a Plumpton.

Plumpton coursing was referred to in 1974 both in this Chamber and in another place. I am the first to agree that at that time such coursing was cruel. I am making a comparison between what we saw in 1974 and what we are seeing now, in 1976. In Plumpton coursing hares were released in much smaller enclosures, which gave rise to a much higher proportion of kills. Now there is no open coursing as such, as was referred to in 1974. When we reach the Committee stage, I will introduce an amendment designed to clarify the position and bring it within the ambit of the principal Act. The letter continues:

muzzling of greyhounds was introduced—

We have heard a lot from members opposite this afternoon about the muzzling of greyhounds—

and despite some doubts about this operation it was found to be completely successful. All muzzles worn are of the plastic variety (not spring wire as worn by most track dogs).

I refer to the comments by the Minister of Community Welfare, who referred to a report quoted by the member for Ross Smith in relation to hares being pulled asunder by two dogs. I suggest that at this time that could not happen and, if it did happen, I would like to be the first to hear about it. I suggest that in no way—

The Hon. R. G. Payne: I think the hare would like to know, too.

Mr. WOTTON: I would be just as interested as the hare. The letter continues:

Scoring points—

and this has also been an important part of hunting—

dating back some 80 years were revised and it is no longer possible for higher scores being won by the dog catching or maiming the hare. All clubs have stewards and these in turn are supervised by a chief steward, and rules are very strictly enforced. To our knowledge the R.S.P.C.A., since 1974, has not attended a coursing meeting. While we realise the R.S.P.C.A. opposes coursing, the lack of attendance

by that organisation at coursing meetings indicates that it is satisfied coursing is conducted in accordance with our own strict rules.

Most people imagine a course to consist of many hectares of land, whereas the average length of a course is only about 300 to 400 metres, and the race is virtually nothing more than a dog race.

Mr. Wells: A dog race!

Mr. WOTTON: That is what it is.

Mr. Wells: Someone should tell the hare.

Mr. WOTTON: I suggest that the honourable member does it at his first opportunity. Live coursing involving open enclosures can only be as cruel as many of the practices tolerated in the community today. The member for Ross Smith has referred to members who oppose the Bill as being cruel and barbaric and not being aware of the pain that is inflicted on innocent animals. Much of what has been said about this Bill both inside and outside the House is purely emotional and has been brought about because most people do not understand what live coursing is all about. No-one in this House loves animals more than I do. I have always loved them and always will.

The member for Ross Smith referred to the differences between vermin control and blood sports. I can see no difference between live coursing and horse-racing, particularly where the whip is used. In an emotional state of mind, the member for Ross Smith stated that he believed that, by introducing this legislation, we would be helping to stop wars and hunger. I should like to believe that, by passing this legislation, we could alleviate the threat of a third world war, but I doubt that that will be the case.

The Minister of Community Welfare referred to the large number of signatures on a petition that was circulated in the community. I believe that that was an emotional issue where people did not really understand the true facts. On a lighter note, I was interested in the remarks made by the member for Ross Smith in his second reading speech where, in quoting from a report, he stated:

The injured animal was breathing: its eyes were open and it was obviously conscious although immobile.

The honourable member does not know much about coursing or about hares: if he did, he would know that a hare does not have an eyelid and that it does not close its eyes whether it is alive or dead.

In conclusion, I believe that this measure attacks live coursing unfairly, because it tries to ban in isolation a practice that is much less objectionable than many other practices that could have been attacked. I will in Committee move an amendment to the principal Act to ensure that open enclosure coursing will not be banned. Part of the amendment confines the objection to cases where reasonable steps have been taken to ensure that animals (in this case, hares) are not killed or maimed. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

LAND TAX

Adjourned debate on motion of Dr. Eastick:

That in the opinion of this House the Land Tax Act, 1936-1974, should be immediately amended to provide a formula for rating which gives due regard to current land use and not possible or potential use as reflected by present assessed value.

(Continued from September 8. Page 892.)

Mr. WOTTON (Heysen): Previously I tried to concentrate more on metropolitan land tax than on rural land tax, because the Premier had indicated that legislation might be introduced to alleviate the land tax problem in rural areas. Not much of my district is in the metropolitan area. I am aware, as I believe all members on this side are aware, of the many problems faced by people in the metropolitan area because of land tax. I imagine that many people will continue to be concerned about this impost.

When moving this motion, the member for Light stated that there must be reality between various valuations. Although two valuations may be wrong, they must be relative to each other. However, I believe that that practice is necessary as far as valuations are concerned. Whether valuations relate to the area of land, the use of land, its geographical location, etc., relativity is the important issue. Grave mistakes have been made in valuations in rural and urban areas. The member for Hanson brought before the House examples that have arisen in his district. Examples have arisen in my district and, I believe, they have arisen in other districts, too.

The mistakes are not the fault of those working under the Valuer-General. Most of those people (although some of them could be confused at times) have made the mistakes only because of legislation that was passed after being introduced by this Government. Anomalies have arisen in valuations where land valued on one side of a road is completely different from land valued on the other side of the road. We have the situation where we are told that land is valued on its potential, when we know full well that that potential could never be reached.

In my area in the Adelaide Hills, pressure has been experienced as a result of competition between land usage for traditional rural pursuits and for residential purposes. The land is more valuable on the open market at this stage for the latter use than for the former. People using land for agricultural purposes in the face of such competition are experiencing continually rising land values, resulting in escalating rates and taxes, with the consequent temptation to sell. We have had recent examples of land being valued at an exorbitant amount when it has been proved that the Valuer-General's officers have not set foot on it. Land in the Hahndorf area, for example, has been valued at a tremendously high figure when the block does not have access, the access having been completely cut off with the construction of the South-Eastern Freeway. Such things are happening purely because the Valuer-General's officers, through legislation passed in this House, are completely confused.

Land values in residential areas in the metropolitan area are changed if a block of flats or a school is built next door and decreases the value of the land. Variations and discrepancies in valuations are not helped by the inflationary situation in which we find ourselves. The escalation of prices and values of unimproved land is not related in any way to actual land usage. If something is not done soon to provide a formula for rating that pays due regard to current land use, the result will be a complete breakdown of valuations in this State. That is why I urge all members to support the motion.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I appreciate the opportunity to speak briefly to this motion, which I unreservedly support. It is quite straightforward. I repeat what has been said by previous speakers: in no way should this be construed as any criticism of officers of the Government, the valuers who carry out the valuations. All areas of capital taxation are affected by these valuations which have been carried out, in the first instance perhaps for the assessment of land tax. However, they are then adopted in

many cases by local government authorities. My own area was recently transferred from the Tea Tree Gully council to the Gumeracha council. Valuations made by the department were immediately adopted by the Gumeracha District Council for the purpose of council ratings. The flow-over from these valuations is not limited solely to the impact on land tax.

Although it is not immediately germane to this argument, I should like to comment briefly on the equalisation scheme adopted by the Government, mainly to stem the tide of criticism coming its way as a result of tremendous increases in land tax and other bills associated with capital taxation because of the five-yearly cycle of valuations. The equalisation scheme has been proved far from accurate in cases that have come to my notice. In one case I will mention, a valuation has just been made. The unimproved value of this rural holding of average size in our area was $19 000, and the owner assumed that, as there was a statutory rebate of $40 000 for rural producing land, he would not receive a land tax bill last year.

When he did receive it, he rang the department and pointed out that, as the valuation of his property was $19 000 on unimproved value, he should not be getting a bill. He was told, however, that the equalisation factor had been applied to his property; in his area it was more than two. I am not sure of the precise figure, but the unimproved value was taken to more than $40 000, and he received a land tax bill. Since that has occurred, the land in the area has been valued. The five-yearly period has fallen due, and as the Gumeracha District Council was waiting for valuations the Government valuers got cracking. The current valuation on this property, received about three weeks ago, was $26 000. The equalisation factor was such that it has increased by about half, or ·5, indicating the gross inaccuracy of settling on an equalisation factor and applying it to a whole area.

The grave anomaly is that no appeal provision exists against an equalisation factor. It is set by someone in a Government department, applied to the valuations for the area, and then people are taxed on the valuation, without even the normal right of appeal that exists against the valuation. How ludicrous for a property with an unimproved value of $19 000 to be carried, because of the equalisation factor, beyond $40 000 and then to be valued at $26 500. I am well acquainted with the facts of that case.

Several factors seem anomalous in the potential use criterion used in valuation. One which is causing difficulty, particularly in the areas with which I am familiar, is that the way in which the owner holds his property is significant. A man may own about 200 hectares on several titles, while his neighbour may have a similar area of land on one title. Because one holds the land in smaller blocks, it is considered more likely to be sold for higher values, and therefore the valuations are higher although the farmers are probably earning similar incomes. One is penalised because he holds his land in several titles. I know that the member for Light is aware of such cases in the Kersbrook area. This situation applies not only in relation to land tax, which has been alleviated in rural areas, but also in regard to council rates. I know that councils are concerned about the high rates, although they have adopted the Government valuations, and as a result many people are now having to pay increased council rates. I agree that the emphasis should be on present use. In Eden Valley some areas are planted to vineyards, but there are dairies and other forms of primary production. I know of producers in that area who graze sheep and cattle. Some of their land is rough, but their land has been assessed as vineyard country, which is generally at a higher price. Many landholders in that area do not intend to go into viticulture, but, because the country has been partially developed by some wineries, this development has prejudiced the future of other landholders because the valuations apply to their properties.

Many ramifications of this potential use system are causing difficulties and inequalities in rural areas. No-one would object to the retrospective provisions applying in some of our legislation, especially when a property is eventually sold for subdivisional purposes. However, people object to paying excessive rates when they do not intend to alter their mode of operation. Of course, higher rates will force many people off their properties, and I know of farmers in Forreston and Gumeracha who have been forced to subdivide and sell their properties to North Terrace farmers, because rates have escalated. This situation applies not only to the rural sector but also in small towns like Hahndorf in which people have lived in small cottages along the main street for many years but whose rates and taxes have now escalated because of the activities of people buying properties in the main street. The local people face hardship as a result of this potential use valuation.

I read of the LeMessurier family on Greenhill Road whose stately home has to be sold because of the impact of council rates, land tax, and other capital taxes. This is a shame, because these people are forced to leave their home, which has been in the family for generations, because of the impact of this system of valuation caused by the sort of development in the area. When one is lumbered with a water rate charge of nearly $1 000, it would be unrealistic to say that one could charge it to the estate. That action would decimate the asset, so that there would be nothing left to be inherited. I support the motion, because I know from experience in my district of the inequalities and sheer inaccuracies of the operation of these valuations and of the new equalisation scheme.

Mr. SLATER secured the adjournment of the debate.

IMPOUNDING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 8. Page 900.)

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General): I support the Bill.

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

SPORT AND RECREATION EXPENDITURE

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Slater:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Federal Government is to be condemned for reducing expenditure for sport and recreation and the House call on the Federal Government to restore financial support for sporting and recreational facilities.

(Continued from September 15. Page 1035.)

Mr. LANGLEY (Unley): During the Playford era, many times I asked questions in the House about the appointment of a Minister of Sport, but my questions had no effect on that Liberal Government. Since then, the member for Hanson has also asked several questions in

the House about this matter. When the Labor Government had the opportunity to do something in this regard, the wheels started to turn, and the Hon. Glen Broomhill was appointed the first Minister of Sport. In October, 1973, the Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department was created, and I will quote from a personal message that the then Minister gave to the people of South Australia, which was excellent news for the State. His message was as follows:

With the creation of the department in October, 1973, a new era has commenced in recreation and sport. Our Government has recognised the need to assist in the costly business of providing recreation and sporting facilities. In addition, departmental officers are deeply involved in State-wide planning, in advisory activities, and working with the Australian Government on South Australian projects. I should like to emphasise that our officers are freely available to the public. Our constant aim is to assist in providing recreational opportunities for the whole community. Therefore, the housewife, the young marrieds, the older members of the community and the very young are all as important to us as the active sportsman.

Since the Minister's message, the Sports Advisory Council, on which I am pleased to be the Government's representative, has made many inroads. Although I have been unable to attend all of the council's meetings, I have attended as many of them as I could. One aspect in which the council has involved itself is sports coaching, which many associations have approved. The sports most in need are amateur sports, in which connection we use the term "park lands sportsmen and women". A considerable change has taken place in financing sporting projects, and the cost of sports material has increased considerably. I said in the House only last week that sports were changing all the time. I referred to the sum a Sheffield Shield cricketer received 20 years ago, whereas only recently a State cricketer who would not necessarily be a member of the State team and who played every game could receive $3 200 a year from funds provided by a certain cigarette firm. In addition, he would receive about $600 for playing in every Sheffield Shield game played in the State. The composition of the sporting fraternity and changing times have led to these increased costs.

I visited Clare to open a project on behalf of the sports council (I told the member for the district about my visit). It was good of the Minister to make money available for the new clubhouse at Clare, and I am sure that it has proved to be a great asset to the area. Projects in other members' districts have also received Government funds. Sport grants approvals for last May and June totalled $15 177, which has been a great help to many sporting associations, and I am sure that members have been pleased to receive financial assistance for sporting associations in their districts. The South Australian Country Table Tennis Association received $2 416 of the $15 177.

Mr. Chapman: What about grants for the district down south?

Mr. LANGLEY: These grants were for May and June only. The honourable member's district may have received certain grants for sporting clubs. He could ascertain from the Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department what grants his district has received.

Mr. Chapman: I couldn't find anything.

Mr. LANGLEY: The Government spends money in different districts. I hope that the honourable member does not think that clubs in my district have received more than the clubs in any other honourable member's district have received. The Unley Amateur Swimming Club, the Sturt Cricket Club and the Adelaide Basketball and Soccer Club have received grants. So, I do not think that I have received a large share of the cake and, if Opposition members were to investigate, I think they would find that clubs in their own districts had received grants. The Opposition has been somewhat vocal about what has happened since the Australian Labor Government appointed its first Minister for Sport. I have figures that I will use on another occasion, but I can assure members that what has been said by certain members regarding the present Federal Government is correct, because, in 1976-77, no new approvals were given. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 3)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 21. Page 1125.)

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): What I shall say tonight in this debate will not be the conventional speech on the first line of the Budget. After a full week and more of trying by the Opposition, I do not think there is much more that can possibly be said about this document, especially as the wind must have been taken out of the sails of the Liberal Party members by the praise that the Prime Minister bestowed on the State Budget in the Federal House about a fortnight ago. Therefore, I intend to deal with one topic that I believe to be of overwhelming importance to us and to mankind—the question of the mining and, in our case, the possible enrichment of uranium.

I do so, relying on the answer that I received yesterday to a Question on Notice. The reply stated that there is in South Australia a uranium enrichment study committee comprising departmental officers and outside specialists, and that committee has utilised the services of the Trade and Development Division of the Premier's Department, the Environment Department, Amdel, and the Atomic Energy Commission. That answer shows clearly that there has been expenditure of money on this topic and, if it is necessary to link my remarks in any way to the Budget, I do so through this question. It is perhaps appropriate that I should speak on this topic at this time, just after the news of the defeat, after 44 years in office, of the Swedish socialist Government on this issue. Members of the Labor Party here are fond of referring to that Government. I suggest that they read the article on page 7 of yesterday's *Australian* if they want to know a bit more about it. That aside, the most significant point to be made is that this issue cuts across normal Party politics; it is not a question of the Conservatives wanting to mine and the radicals not wanting to mine. What has happened in Sweden is clearly the reverse.

Recently, I was present in Sydney at the final sittings of the Ranger Uranium Environmental Committee, and that experience made up my mind on this topic. I must emphasise that I do not speak for my Party in this matter; I am expressing my own personal opinion when I speak tonight. I believe that we must first be satisfied that there are proper and safe methods of disposing of radio-active wastes, that proliferation of nuclear weapons can be

contained, and that we have overcome the risks of terrorism (and I cannot see our being satisfied on any of those three matters in the foreseeable future), before we do anything that will encourage the use of uranium, except for medical purposes, and that is a very small exception. Undeniably a chain of events can lead from the mining of uranium to the manufacture of nuclear weapons. That chain of events is the mining of uranium; the export of uranium; enrichment of uranium; the building of nuclear power stations to use enriched uranium and provide power for enrichment; and fuel reprocessing leading to the manufacture of nuclear weapons. I do not believe that we should in any way contribute to that chain.

I intend to quote from what is a public document, the evidence given at the inquiry. One part of the evidence that sums up the situation perfectly for me is at page 6865 of the transcript, where Sir Macfarlane Burnett states:

I have only a remote hope that anything can forestall the ultimate calamity, and even less than what is here suggested as correct Australian policy will even be considered. My feeling is that the Australian Government should state its conviction that the prevention of nuclear war is the over-riding social necessity of our time and that, human nature being what it is, the use of "peaceful" nuclear power with its continuous production of large amounts of fissile plutonium will make it impossible to prevent or limit the production of nuclear weapons, either for "official" genocide or for a variety of terroristic and criminal uses. Under the circumstances, the Government, on behalf of the people of Australia, should make a unilateral and self-denying undertaking to allow no mining of uranium ore nor any production of fissile material from any source under Australian control. Such action will have no material effect on the continuation of nuclear power plant construction overseas, but it could have an unprecedented and perhaps extremely powerful moral effect on world opinion.

Therefore, I do not believe that the South Australian Government should be spending any time or money on thinking about an enrichment plant in this State. The small concession that I got in my answer yesterday, that the Government intends to take no further action until after the report of the Ranger inquiry is made public, is almost meaningless, because the whisper is that the report of the inquiry will be out within a day or two.

I do not intend to go over all the arguments. They have been canvassed many times and they are available in all sorts of publications for members to see, but I shall canvass, even if I only scratch the surface, the facts that have persuaded me to my present view. The Ranger inquiry lasted for many months, and has taken many thousands of pages of evidence from all over Australia. The commission then invited what were termed the principal parties to make concluding submissions in writing, based on the evidence. The submissions were circulated to the other principal parties and the next step was for replies to be made by each of those parties to points made in the concluding submissions. Finally, the principal parties were to appear before the commission to answer orally questions arising out of those written submissions. The questions were to be either from the six advisers or from the three Commissioners.

One of the proponents of the mining of uranium in Australia is the Australian Atomic Energy Commission. It seemed to me that, if anyone had the answer to those three questions that I posed (the question of waste disposal, prevention of proliferation, and terrorism), it should be the A.E.C. Therefore, having heard what was said during the final session of the inquiry, I have looked through the A.E.C.'s concluding submission, its reply to the concluding submissions of other parties, the evidence that was given, and the oral submissions that were made during that last week. I intend to refer to all three of those stages from the evidence and the submissions of the A.E.C. Heaven knows, if anyone should be able to give answers to these questions, it should. I do not believe it has been able to give the answers. Let us first deal with the question of waste disposal. Plutonium is a product of uranium. I am not at ease on this subject because I know little chemistry or physics, but I believe I know enough about those subjects to explain what I mean. When plutonium is used, waste products are produced. Either high level waste, which is plutonium, or the low level waste, which is contaminated equipment that cannot be used again.

The half life of plutonium (the period during which it is radioactive) is 24 400 years. After that time it is only half as radioactive as it was at the beginning. That does not mean that its radioactivity is finished, because it goes on and on. What is to be done with that waste? How can it be made safe?

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Why is it described as a half life? Surely it should be 48 800 years.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, it is longer than that because it continues halving and that could amount to hundreds of thousands of years. Anyway, to the human mind that does not matter, because those figures are far beyond us.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: No-one really knows, because that is only a theory.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Attorney is right. In the A.E.C.'s final submission, at page 100 on the question of waste disposal, it is stated:

There is evidence—

nothing else—

that reprocessing of spent fuel and vitrification of wastes—

that is putting it in glass—

is economically viable and will be carried out. First, disposal sites remote from centres of population are being investigated and selected on their likelihood of remaining dry for several hundred thousand years.

That is as much as the commission could say in its final submission. Naturally, comments were made by the other principal parties, too, who defended themselves in their reply to the final submissions at page 13, where it was stated, referring to the evidence:

There was a variety of options for ultimate disposal which appeared technically feasible and that these options must be thoroughly assessed before commitment to particular methods can be made and their acceptability to society determined.

That is as far as the A.E.C. could go. In other words, it says, "Look, it will be all right; there are feasible methods; we will be able to work it out; don't worry." It has never been worked out. No way is now known to man of dealing successfully by a foolproof method with wastes. I remind members of the dangers of wastes through radioactivity. Next let us consider the question of proliferation of weapons, which was considered in the final submission at page 91, where it was stated:

Trends of development over the years have reflected an increasing concern by suppliers for proper safeguards. While current indications are encouraging, it would be imprudent to assume that no problems remain.

Well that, in a world that cannot even run the bloody Olympic games, is really playing down the problem. The topic was again referred to in the final submission when it was taken up by some of the other parties, as follows:

The Friends of the Earth, the Australian Conservation Foundation, and the Conservation Council of South Australia's submissions point to various alleged weaknesses in international safeguards. The A.E.C. does not see these alleged weaknesses, many of which it considers the submissions exaggerate, as necessarily making safeguards ineffective in preventing diversion. It is not necessary that a safeguard system provided an absolute guarantee of detecting diversion in order to prevent it.

That was certainly taken up in the oral submissions, first, by Professor Greig, who was an adviser to the commission, where he said at page 12 315, dealing with the passage to which I have referred:

The question that arises out of that statement is: what are the possibilities of international control of reprocessing facilities, perhaps on a regional basis?

The answer given by Mr. Bett, an officer of the commission, was:

The prospect for regional control, I believe, is your question Professor. This is being examined at the moment primarily by the International Atomic Energy Agency who are looking into the practicality of such an arrangement.

That was all that Mr. Bett could say about that problem. Of course, the real problem about international control is (and it is all very well to talk about it) that it has to be exercised by nationals from one country or another who will eventually return to their own countries with the knowledge and experience they have had. It is therefore impossible to isolate control through knowledge and experience in an international body.

There is another problem, too, that, although producer countries may lay down safeguards before selling to customers, in the nature of the market place we in Australia, say, may be so anxious to sell our product that we will be willing to reduce the safeguards on which we insist. That matter was canvassed at page 12 318, where Professor Greig asked:

You don't think there's a danger that if you get into a production cycle, the pressures on continuing to export would overcome the need for safeguards?

Mr. Bett replied:

Not as presently seen, no. The general attitude in the supply community is to look for stringent safeguards.

That would not satisfy me. Mr. Bett could say no more than that about the problem. Again the matter was taken up by the Presiding Commissioner, Mr. Justice Fox, at page 12 424, where he asked the following question:

Now is anyone, so far as your commission is concerned, any—so far as you know, any proposals about how one might achieve some better international control than currently exists?

Mr. Fry, another of the A.E.C. chaps, replied:

Within the commission, no, Sir, we don't have any positive proposals. It is under active consideration by the International Atomic Energy Agency however.

"Active consideration" is a phrase I used to use myself when I was a Minister. Although it did not suggest anything in particular, it was a good phrase to use in reply to a question. The Presiding Commissioner then said:

Yes. But you see a great part of the argument against you is that nuclear energy shouldn't be allowed to spread because adequate controls are missing and I understand your answer to be that there is a system of controls, it's as good as anyone's been able to achieve . . .

In answer, Mr. Fry said:

I believe that is our attitude, it's something which has been set up. It's probably the best that could be done at this present time, it's capable of improvement and Australia is wishing to work towards improving the system.

They are orderly sentences which mean asolutely nothing, as we know. That is how the inquiry continued. The stark answer is that the non-proliferation treaty is not a safeguard if one considers it, because countries can opt out of it at a few months' notice. No way is known to man to stop the proliferation of weapons once the material is circulating in the world. Let us leave that topic, because as I see it now there is no answer to the problem.

Mr. Keneally: The R.S.L. wants to proliferate.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not care who wants to do it. Let us now consider the final problem that I see—the question of terrorism, what the A.E.C. called "illegal diversion" in its final submission. At page 85, the following appears:

The most vulnerable stages in the fuel cycle are production of highly enriched uranium and recovery of plutonium from fuel reprocessing plants, fabrication, storage and transport of these materials. Measures to deter diversion are consequently intensified at these stages in the fuel cycle.

I should hope so. At page 86, it is stated:

However, they—

that is, some of the witnesses who gave evidence—

did not suggest that nuclear blackmail could be ignored. Certainly, it cannot be. They were taken up on this by Professor Greig at page 12 316. Having referred to those passages, Professor Greig asked:

If the commission accepts blackmail as a possibility, does this imply that the commission also accepts that the prevention by non-Governmental bodies cannot be guaranteed, or were you referring to some other form of blackmail?

In reply, Mr. Bett said:

We accept the fact that it is possible that there will be blackmail threats.

Later, he said:

Diversion is a possibility, as we've said in a number of statements in relation to the actual practicality of safeguards. I think in writing that, that we had more in mind that a fairly large proportion of the threats you might receive would be more likely to be hoax than backed by actual material. Nevertheless, having got such a threat, you would have to be quite sure that your accounting system was adequate before you decided to ignore the threat.

We have only to think of the terrorism which is rife in the world now with aircraft, and so on, to see the appalling possibilities of terrorism using plutonium as the weapon of terror. The Presiding Commissioner dealt with the same matter at page 12 422 of the transcript, although I will not quote what he said, because it is along the same lines. However, Mr. Fry admitted that it would be possible to build a small-scale clandestine plant, which would be hard to detect. I refer now to page 12 426, where the commissioner referred to the question of terrorism, in reply to which Mr. Bett said:

Mr. Presiding Commissioner, I think you've really put your finger right on the central point of the central problem in the whole proliferation business, that is, to actually control the disposition of plutonium.

He went on to say that at the moment the problem is not a real one because there is not enough of it, but he admitted that, once the world goes nuclear (and that was the phrase used), it would certainly be a real problem. That was the A.E.C. man himself speaking about this matter. There is no answer, at the moment anyway, to the question of terrorism and nuclear energy.

For those three reasons, I could not at the moment support any activity at all in this field. I know that, in speaking as I have for 22 minutes, I have only just scratched the surface of this matter. I may not have done justice to the case for uranium use, because (and I say it with due charity, I hope) scientists may be good in their specialist fields, but they are not very articulate and they have great difficulty in expressing themselves with clarity and in non-technical jargon. I also say, "The Lord help us if ever we were to be ruled by scientists."

I am willing to listen to any counter argument that may be advanced, but I have heard none. I heard none during the four days I was at that commission—the very place and time when the answers should have been given. I heard none on any of those three matters, although there are plenty of others that one could argue as well. I do not base my opinion on them; I base it simply on those three grounds.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: What do you think the outcome of the Ranger inquiry will be?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know; we will know in due course. The Presiding Commissioner, Mr. Justice Fox, was absolutely scrupulous, and it was impossible to tell, as one can sometimes tell in court, which way the judge was thinking. He was absolutely scrupulous, as were the other commissioners, and did not disclose a bias one way or the other. I hope fervently (and I did my best when I addressed the commission to persuade it to this point of view) that the commission will come down against the mining of uranium at all. Whether it will or not, I believe we shall know within a few days. Whether it does or does not, again, I do not believe that we in this State should take any part in increasing the threat to the world.

As Sir Macfarlane Burnett said, it may already be too late to do anything about it but, at the very least, we should do nothing to increase the risks that there already are in the world, and that is the point of view I put. If I may tie this in (and I hope I will not give offence to any member of the House by saying this), I know that the Government in this State is strongly committed, as we all have been in the past, to industrial development here. The idea of a uranium plant at Redcliff is a very attractive one if one ignores the problems to which I have referred and thinks only of the development it would bring to this State.

However, it would in my view be folly for us, for a short-term advantage to this State, to contribute in any way to the appalling threat which confronts mankind through the use of uranium and nuclear power. I do not believe we should do it, even though it appears to be against our advantage in the short term. I believe that too many dangers are involved and that this is a consideration which should transcend all others. I have finished what I had to say. It may have seemed a strange Budget speech, and I suppose it was. I apologise to members if I have disappointed or bored them.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: It has been very interesting.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I thank the Minister. I thought this was the proper opportunity to take to ventilate this question, because of its great importance to us.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Mallee): I should like, in following the member for Mitcham in the debate, to compliment him on the speech that he has just made. It was a very well thought-out, documented speech on a subject that is of considerable interest to most thinking people. It is certainly an issue that involves thinking people such as members of Parliament.

I do not intend to speak on abstruse subjects such as that, but wish to devote a few minutes, probably not my full 30 minutes, to looking more specifically at the Budget with which we are presented. When referring to the Budget, I refer also to the accompanying papers, because I believe we are presented not only with the Budget but also the facts that are contained in Parliamentary Paper 18, which are comprehensive and informative if one has the time to study them.

If one looks at page 13 of Parliamentary Paper 18, one will see in Appendix 7 a list of the cumulative results for the end of each financial year from 1951 to 1975-76. If we take the more relevant period from 1964-65 to 1974-75, it is interesting to note that in that 10-year period debits totalled $44 800 000. It has taken only two years, 1974-75 and 1975-76, to produce a surplus of $52 900 000. It is almost a line ball over the 10-year period, when one considers that we are also carrying forward this year a deficit of $8 900 000 on the Loan Estimates.

I should like now to refer more specifically to certain proposals presented in the Budget. My first comment is that it is a prudent Budget, with built-in safeguards this year, in the same way as last year, to cover possible increases in wages and prices. However, although last year $98 000 000 was provided to cover these contingencies, only $54 000 000 is being provided this year. Presumably, the Government believes that the prudent Budget recently brought down by the Commonwealth Government in its own area of responsibility will slow down inflation and return the economy to a stable basis. This was borne out by the statement this morning of the Chairman of the Commonwealth Banking Corporation, Professor Crisp. If this is the Professor Crisp I have in mind, he is a person who has always espoused socialist philosophies, and for a person of that disposition to say that he believed that by 1977 the economy would be back on a stable basis was a significant comment.

In the Supplementary Estimates in July, we distributed unappropriated surpluses of revenue for 1976 amounting to $63 600 000, largely as a result of the provision of $98 000 000 for contingencies. It is unlikely that this year, when we are providing only $54 000 000, we will do more than break even, unless the income from State taxation exceeds the budgetary estimate, as well it might. The sum of $27 600 000 has been set aside in reserve, and we have finished the financial year with a $63 600 000 surplus to be disbursed. These amounts have been disbursed, as shown in the Auditor-General's Report, into a number of accounts. The surplus of $56 400 000 appropriated in July of this year was distributed as follows: $20 000 000 was transferred to Loan Account to supplement capital programmes. This amount was allocated equally between the Housing Trust and the State Bank for housing purposes. The sum of $20 000 000 was transferred to the State Transport Authority for expenditure on urban public transport projects. An amount of $11 000 000 was allocated for advances and grants for unemployment relief projects, a transfer to Deposit Account of funds to be used for such purposes in the future. A contribution of $3 000 000 was made to the Electricity Trust of South Australia for capital works in western areas of Eyre Peninsula, including Streaky Bay and Ceduna, while a contribution of $2 400 000 went to the Highways Fund for expenditure in connection with the Strzelecki track.

That is how we appropriated the surpluses at June 30, 1976. With about $53 000 000 or $54 000 000 unappropriated, and with a carry-over of $27 600 000 in total reserves, the Government is in a most affluent position. No wonder it is in no hurry to pass this Budget. I think I am to be the last speaker in this debate, which is one of the longest Budget debates and one of the least pressured that I can recall in nearly 18 years in this House. Generally, it is the wish of the Government to get the Budget through as quickly as possible, to appropriate the funds, and to get on with the business of government. One reason why we do not have to be in any hurry is that there is no problem with funding. The Loan Estimates have been passed through both Houses, so substantial funds are available for the Government to carry on its works programme. In this affluent situation, it is not surprising that the Government has decided to give some concessions in what I regard as electorally emotive areas, such as land tax and succession duties.

Notwithstanding those concessions, it is still expected that revenue collected from taxation this year will amount

to $134 000 000 more than was collected in the previous financial year. It is interesting to consider the figures at page 18 of the Estimates of Revenue. Under the heading of "Commonwealth" the figures show an expected additional recovery from the Commonwealth of $90 000 000, together with an increase in the recovery on the railways, as well as from taxation reimbursement. Last year we recovered $23 800 000 from the Commonwealth in connection with the railways, and this year we are expecting to recover $38 500 000 from the Australian National Railways Commission. Last year, we recovered about $363 000 000 from tax-sharing entitlements, and this year we are to collect $438 300 000, which is $10 000 000 more than we would have collected under the old financial assistance grant formula, as the Treasurer informs us in his Financial Statement.

Looking more closely, we do not have to worry any longer about the non-urban railways. Obviously, the deficit in that area was about $38 500 000, but, bearing in mind that we have finished the year with a revenue surplus of $63 600 000, we could have carried the loss of the South Australian Railways in the non-urban area and, notwithstanding those substantial losses, come out on the profit side. I mentioned earlier that an additional amount of $134 000 000 would be coming to South Australia this year from taxation and that, of this, an additional $90 000 000 is coming from the tax-sharing arrangements we enjoy with the Commonwealth. Therefore, we have a budgetary increase in taxation of about $44 000 000.

Notwithstanding all the talk about tax concessions, and the additional funds coming to South Australia from the Commonwealth, and bearing in mind that the Australian National Railways Commission will be picking up the tab for our railways, the people of South Australia will pay an additional amount in taxes and charges of about $42 000 000. This takes into account that we expect to collect an additional sum of $1 300 000 from statutory corporations, such as the State Bank, the Electricity Trust, and so on, and we have a reduced return from the Woods and Forests Department this year of $100 000. It leads me to say that, when one considers closely the Woods and Forests Department undertaking and recognises that it was set up initially as a department through Loan Estimates funding and as a developing project, we must now realise that, after nearly 90 years since the first forest lands were handed over to the forestry board, we are still treating this organisation as a Government department instead of as a statutory commission, which I think it should be.

This is an extremely interesting Budget, because the more one studies it the more one finds how much has been salted away because of the substantial increases in taxation that have occurred in the past four years. Figures concerning State taxation (and using totals only) show the following escalation: in 1972-73 the amount was $115 600 000; in 1974-75 it was $224 900 000, of which about $47 000 000 was the result of increases in pay-roll tax; in 1975-76 it was $281 300 000; and in 1976-77 it is to be $316 500 000, including $45 000 000 for motor vehicle registration and licence fees. That means that in that period State taxation has doubled. I believe that people have not realised that taxation has doubled, because we have heard so much about the tremendous advantages and benefits to the State from the railways agreement. Most people think that additional Revenue Account funds are the result of negotiations between this Government and the previous Australian Government concerning the transfer of the railways. I emphasise that this situation is not strictly so, as most of the additional funds that have caused the State Budget to seem so affluent have come from the pockets of the people of this State.

I refer now to various items of taxation for the past three years. For motor vehicle registrations the total was $29 000 000 in 1974-75; it was $32 000 000 for 1975-76, and it is estimated it will be $45 000 000 in 1976-77. A total of $13 000 000 was received for land tax in 1974-75; it was $20 000 000 in 1975-76; and it has now tapered off this year to an estimated $19 000 000. For stamp duty, excluding betting tax, the sum of $42 000 000 was received in 1974-75; it was $46 000 000 in 1975-76, and it is estimated at $65 000 000 for 1976-77. Succession duties have moved from $15 000 000 in 1974-75 to $19 000 000 in 1975-76.

Despite concessions in succession duties that are to be made to spouses for the transfer of properties, it is expected that $19 500 000 will be received this year. The Treasurer said that concessions to the value of about $5 000 000 would be made, so that initially it was expected that $24 000 000 would be received this year. I do not believe that the saving will be for a long period. The transfer of properties between spouses is an emotional matter, but people interested in transferring private properties, such as farms, shops, buildings, and other family enterprises from which a livelihood is obtained, will realise that this concession is of little, if any, help.

The transferring of property between spouses is an emotional argument, and I suggest that, by duping people into believing that there will be no duty, the estates that ultimately pass to the next of kin will be bigger and, because of the relationship in blood that will be more remote, the rates applicable will be higher so that, despite any concessions, the return from succession duties in the long term will be much higher than has been budgeted for this year. Last year there was much play on succession duties concessions, and the Treasurer, saying that there would be a moratorium for those who made gifts of a half-interest in a house, indicated that the Government would forgo State duties and taxes on conveyancing. He persuaded people that they would pay only part of the duties, together with the gift tax applicable to the Commonwealth. Now, these peoples' estates will be caught for duties when the property is assessed finally for State taxation purposes. I believe that that was bad advice from someone who should have known better. Had the Treasurer told people to put their property into common tenancy (which they should be doing now), then any additional taxation would have been saved on the estate on the death of a spouse.

Pay-roll tax during a three-year period has increased from $101 000 000 to $136 000 000 in 1976-77, and it is interesting to note that this tax yielded $54 300 000 in 1973-74. For recoveries, which are other areas of financial revenue to the State, there has not been much movement. However, water supply and sewerage charges have increased from $47 000 000 in 1974-75 to an estimated $68 800 000 this year. I believe, with new valuations and rates that will apply to many areas, the estimated increase of $7 000 000 should be considered as conservative. The other point to which I refer is the increase in recoveries now shown in the Budget under social services, relating to medical, health and recreation. This amount has increased from $65 000 000 in 1974-75 to an estimated $134 700 000 for 1976-77. This latter figure includes a $12 500 000 contribution from the Hospitals Fund. These figures indicate the dramatic escalation in the cost of hospital administration and the charges being levied on hospital patients. Costs have doubled in this period, and it is no wonder that people are now finding that contributions to

a national health scheme or Medibank combinations have dramatically increased from what they were paying before Medibank began to operate. For several years the Auditor-General has drawn attention to the need for accountability in budgeting, and he does so again this year. Page 1 of his report states:

It is essential that the nature and extent of this responsibility be properly defined so that accountability can be determined; however first-class financial management procedures are a pre-requisite to accountability. Such procedures, which I have advocated in this report for several years, should, wherever possible, incorporate information on planned objectives and actual operational results, together with financial reporting that compares actual with planned expenditures.

I understand that a number of departments are moving in this direction, and that the Treasury is in agreement with this approach and is currently reviewing its accounting procedures to assist in achieving improved control of expenditures. If in some cases additional staff may be required, the savings that would result should far outweigh any additional cost involved.

The Treasurer referred to this new approach to prudent budgeting in his statement on page vi of Parliamentary Paper 18, and I could not agree more with the Treasurer's statements there. He makes only one omission: he overlooks commenting on a committee that is part and parcel of this House, a committee appointed by this House to follow up those matters raised by the Auditor-General. After his statement at the top of page vii, where he says:

Members will recall that this approach to financial management was supported by the Committee of Inquiry into the Public Service and has been the subject of comment in recent reports of the Auditor-General,

he might also have said that some considerable contribution had been made to drawing attention to the need for accountability by the Public Accounts Committee. At present, the system of budgeting seems to be largely empirical; there seems to be little check, if any, to establish whether or not it is prudent budgeting. A budget is submitted and, because a Government department cannot go broke if it exceeds its estimates, it is possible to get additional funds through various channels in the Treasury. Perhaps in some ways it is unfortunate that departments do not go broke because, if they did, it might mean that the reaction would be such that we would get far more efficiency and concern expressed by people in Government departments about the way in which money is handled and distributed, and accountability for the way in which it is spent. The efficiency of Government departments is supposed to be the responsibility of the Public Service Board but, so far as I am aware, apart from establishing the Financial Management Committee (F.I.M.A.C.), a purely advisory committee consisting of experts from the Public Service Board, the Treasury, and the Auditor-General's Department to provide a consultancy service, it has not done anything positive to devise a system of efficient and effective accountability.

I understand, from what the Treasurer has said, that the Government is considering changing the format of our budgetary papers. I hope this means that Parliament will be provided with more lines and more information on lines so that it can more closely scrutinise the ways in which the taxpayers' money is being spent either wisely or wastefully. Private enterprise has to produce departmental budgets, which are kept under close scrutiny by the management, and those people responsible for making decisions and estimates of associated costs are held accountable and answerable for any major discrepancies between the estimated budget and the actual budget achievements. That is the point the Auditor-General is making when he says there should be some planned objectives, and actual operational costs, together with financial reporting that compares actual with planned expenditure.

In other words, what we want in budgeting is estimates not "guesstimates" and, if this is to require more management expertise and more people in departments employed in budgeting and internal auditing, surely we should employ them because, in my view anyway, these people are more important now in the Public Service than any other category of personnel if we are to achieve efficient and accountable budgeting. The Auditor-General has been saying this for years, but he can do no more than say it.

We are now dealing with a Budget of $1 100 000 000, and a 1 per cent saving in that Budget amounts to $11 000 000. This would go a long way towards paying the additional salaries, and it would certainly pay more than the additional salaries and expenses incurred in this sort of analytical work that needs to be done. From what I have seen of the internal workings of many Government departments, it would be easy to save this amount of 1 per cent without much effort, especially in the big spending departments—the Public Buildings Department and the Works, Highways (which, incidentally, cannot even tell us what it costs to build a mile of a certain type of road), Education, and Hospitals Departments. Those are all big spending departments where there is not an adequate degree of accountability.

In conclusion, may I say that, as members of Parliament representing electors, we are equal and, within certain parameters such as policy-making, we are equally responsible to the people for the way in which their taxes are handled. The Public Service is the servant and not the master of Parliament, although I sometimes wonder whether it is not the master judging by the way in which some Ministers react to any criticism of their departments. They appear more concerned about their relationship with their senior officers than about the accountability of their departments. As a Parliament, we should expect proper, responsible and accountable budgeting of the people's money by those who are appointed to spend it. The Auditor-General is the servant of Parliament; perhaps he should be given wider powers, as suggested in the Royal Commission on Australian Government Administration, to see whether or not budgeting expenditure was wasteful or non-productive. This, in turn, would provide for a closer scrutiny of departmental financial administration.

As I have said, this is a prudent Budget and one that is hard to fault, but it is a Budget that has raped the taxpayer in the last three years of $130 000 000 extra. I do not think this part of the Budget has been obvious to people; it is not obvious unless we forget about the railways deal and look strictly at the figures shown here of what money is collected in the various areas of State taxation. I support the first line.

Bill read a second time.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS (Minister for the Environment) moved:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for consideration of the Bill.

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): As is customary on occasions such as this, the Opposition has a chance to air grievances of a serious nature in this Chamber. I have an extremely serious complaint to make, and I intend to make it tonight. The Government, during this session, has been most evasive. It is becoming more and more arrogant. It is not bothering to answer questions

and is becoming blatantly more secretive. May I just quote a question asked on notice on August 3, as follows:

What was the most recent valuation of the South Australian Superannuation Fund? When was that valuation made?

The answers were:

As at June 30, 1970. Report issued to Superannuation Fund Board on September 19, 1972.

What sort of an answer is that? It is deliberately and clumsily designed to mislead. Then, on August 17, a question was asked on notice regarding Government contracts with advertising agencies and public relations firms. The answer was:

The considerable amount of work involved in extracting this information is unwarranted.

What rubbish, what poppycock! Then, on September 14, again on notice, the member for Fisher asked a question about sport and recreation—and he referred to it in some detail in his Budget speech yesterday—and it is as well that he did, because it is about time these things were brought out. On September 14, on notice, the member for Hanson asked about the entertainment expenses spent by the office of the Premier in 1975-76; he asked what proportion was spent at restaurants and hotels respectively, and at which restaurants and hotels. As a sum of $13 000 was involved, this is important. The reply was, "It is not practical to provide this information." Latterly, on September 14, the member for Davenport asked a Question on Notice about the number of press secretaries. This matter may hurt the member for Unley, but he will be squirming much more by the time I have finished.

Mr. Langley: You won't make me squirm.

Dr. TONKIN: The member for Davenport also asked about the number of public relations persons currently working for the Government, together with their salaries and allowance entitlements. However, the Premier would not provide the information about the public relations persons employed by the Government or about the salary and allowance entitlements of these people. An apocryphal story has been going around to the effect that a previous Premier (Sir Thomas Playford) was able to manage the Premier's Department with a secretary, a steno-secretary and two typistes. I believe that he could have done it very well.

Mr. Langley: But—

Dr. TONKIN: The member for Unley can try to stifle free speech, if he wants to; that is his form. Because of the considerable concern shown by the public at the staffing of the Premier's Department over the past few years, I thought it appropriate to take out some figures. My own research assistants got no help from a direct approach to the Premier's Department (the department that is supposed to be heading Australia's open government, this honest government that will disclose all!). We got the wipe off completely, so we went to the Parliamentary Library Research Service.

I pay a tribute to those young men and women who work in that service for their tenacity. The reply I received was dated September 17, 1976, to my request to obtain figures on the total number of employees in all categories in the Premier's Department during the past five years. The reply was as follows:

An officer of the Premier's Department has informed me today, September 17, that the information, although compiled, will not be released to the member who requested it. The stated reason for withholding the figures was that many sections of the Public Service had entered and left the responsibility of the Premier in the past five years and that the figures would, therefore, be erratic and meaningless.

Neither of those statements is correct: they are in no way erratic or meaningless.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. TONKIN: The Parliamentary Research Officer, because he was most concerned about this matter, reported to me that he had faithfully reported, as he would do for any member of this Parliament, including the Premier, what he was told by the Premier's Department. He was told that it was the Premier personally who had vetoed the release of this information.

Mr. Dean Brown: Shame!

Dr. TONKIN: Shame indeed, to a member of Parliament. I have examined the Public Service lists dated 1966, 1968, 1970, 1972 and 1974, and have found that there has been quite a change. In 1966, in the Premier's Department there were seven permanent officers and one temporary officer. In the Industrial Assistance Department there were nine permanent officers and one temporary officer, making a total of 18 people. In 1968, the number of permanent staff was seven and 11 respectively, making 18; temporary staff, five and four, totalling nine, making a sum total of 27. In 1970, there were 21 permanent staff and five temporary officers, a drop to 26. It was noticeable that there were two unfilled vacancies, because I assume that the work was not there. In 1965, 1968, and 1970 respectively there were 18, 27 and 26 members of the Premier's Department. In 1972, the Premier and this Government had had a chance to get their hooks in for two years.

Mr. Becker: Spend a quid.

Dr. TONKIN: In 1972, the total number of permanent officers was 123 and the number of temporaries was 25, making a total of 148; that is nothing for the Government to be proud of or to shout about; it should be ashamed of itself.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The honourable Leader has the floor, but it seems as though every member on both sides wants to take over.

Dr. TONKIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am sorry if this is hurting Government members, but it is time some of them realised what is going on. Let us look at the 1974 figures. They show another interesting picture, because there was one less permanent officer: only 122. However, the number of temporary officers in 1974 went from 25 to 60, making a sum total of 182. Look at the progress: from 18 in 1966 to 182 in 1974, and we have not yet seen this year's Public Service list. I have no doubt that the two years would have been well spent on that, too, It must break the 200 mark, and whether we will get the list on time for the Budget debate, I do not know. In the past, these documents have been released late, once very late. The 1966 list was not released until February 20, 1967. So, I cannot say that the Premier is deliberately concealing these matters, because that would be a slur on the Public Service Board, and I do not intend any slur on the board.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Are you including the office of the Minister of Development and Mines?

Dr. TONKIN: I have not done so, but, if the Minister wants me to do so, I will do so; that will add to the numbers, but I should be amazed if the Minister wanted me to add them on.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! All honourable members will have an opportunity of refuting anything the honourable Leader has said.

Dr. TONKIN: In the 1974 list, under the Premier's Department one sees a whole swag of staff. Certainly, the Planning Appeal Board is there.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Oh, you counted it?

Dr. TONKIN: Yes, indeed.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: And the office of Minister of Development and Mines?

Dr. TONKIN: It was first included in the Industrial Assistance Department, as it was called in 1966.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What was in there in 1966?

Dr. TONKIN: Nine permanent and one temporary staff.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: The office of Minister of Development and Mines wasn't there.

Dr. TONKIN: The Minister can fiddle, twist and shuffle all he wants.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You're forging the figures.

Dr. TONKIN: The Minister cannot escape the fact that the total of those categories as appearing in the lists adds up to those figures.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What about Immigration? In 1966, it was in Lands.

Dr. TONKIN: I am sorry if the Minister is upset.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I'm upset because you're not being honest.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections from both sides and, if it continues, I shall certainly take action. The honourable Leader.

Dr. TONKIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Davenport seems to like to taunt me. I shall show the honourable member, and set a lesson. I trust that the honourable member is listening, and not laughing and sneering at the honourable member next to him. The honourable Leader.

Dr. TONKIN: The Minister of Mines and Energy has absolutely hit the nail on the head. I have no doubt that there has been a gross and wasteful increase in the numbers of staff in the Premier's Department. Exactly what that increase is I am not able to say without looking through the Public Service list. The answer given to the Library Research Service referred to the fact that the Government Garage and various departments had entered or left the Premier's Department. The list of those departments is as follows:

Government Garage, Builders Licensing Board, Minister for the Environment, Publicity Branch, State Migration Office, Ombudsman, Planning Appeal Board, Minister of Development and Mines, Parliamentary Counsel, Industrial Democracy Unit, Agent-General's Office, Magistrates, and Mining Wardens.

As the Minister well knows, departments have left the Premier's Department and others have joined it.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Work it out on an honest basis instead of fiddling the figures.

Dr. TONKIN: The point I am making (and the Minister has fallen right in, feet first) is that, if the Premier had wanted to, he could have given the Opposition the detailed figures which were on his desk and which he chose—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: If you wanted to, you could work them out, but you are too lazy, that's your trouble.

Dr. TONKIN: The Minister cannot have it both ways.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. TONKIN: Either the Minister accepts that we cannot tell, as he has been telling me by interjection for the past nine minutes, or else he is honest and says that the Premier should have made the matter clear.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I am saying that you are lazy and incompetent and you cannot work them out, and you have enough information there to work it out.

Mr. Coumbe: Why do you want to hide it?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I don't want to hide it.

Mr. Coumbe: This is the Parliament of South Australia.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Torrens and the honourable Minister of Mines and Energy: I must warn you and others that this cross-examination by each and every member of the House must cease. The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

Dr. TONKIN: I do not pretend that this is a palatable exercise. The figures are unpleasant, but the point I make is that the Premier had those figures on his desk; they were presented to him, and I am informed that he specifically vetoed their release. Why did he veto the release of those figures? The Minister has said that they can be misleading as read in the Public Service list. Why has the Premier not straightened out the position? Why has he not put the matter fairly and squarely on the line? This Government is not honest. This is not an open Government.

Mr. Venning: It's shonky.

Dr. TONKIN: True, it is a shonky Government. I look forward with great interest, first, to the debate on the lines and the examination of the Premier's Department; and I assure Government members that those lines will be examined with a fine tooth comb. Also, I look forward with great pleasure to the release of the Public Service list for 1976, because it will provide us with much information. It will not be easy information to get, however, for the reasons outlined by the Minister of Mines and Energy.

Let us have a bit of honesty from the Government. So, the Government has splurged and employed masses and masses of temporary staff, contract workers; so, it has an economic intelligence unit and a policy secretariat: so, it has press officers and it is concentrating power in the Premier's Department. Obviously, the Ministers do not understand just how much power is being taken away from Ministerial departments and concentrated in the hands of their Leader, whose main object in life seems now to draw upon himself more and more publicity. The Premier is not running this State: his public servants and the contract employees in the Premier's Department are running the State and the Ministers.

Mr. Chapman: The Minister of Fisheries admitted that.

Dr. TONKIN: True, the Minister of Fisheries fully agreed with that the other day. This is a deplorable state of affairs. It cannot possibly be justified, and I would like to hear the Premier try to justify it. All I can say is that the people of South Australia are not being well served by the situation and it is up to, and incumbent upon, the Premier to clarify the situation as soon as possible. In 1966 there were 18 temporary officers, and in 1974 there were 182. How many will be there in 1976? There are two other minor matters that I wish to raise. The first concerns the Government's attitude towards voluntary organisations.

Mr. Chapman: I thought you would go on and tell us of the massive costs of public servant contract workers.

Dr. TONKIN: If anyone could determine the cost of the mass of public servants and contract workers, including the cost of terminating agreements and lump-sum payments in the Premier's Department, he would be something of a wizard, because that is impossible to determine: the figure could be anything. I refer to the Multiple Sclerosis Society, which has existed for about 12 years. Recently, the society opened rehabilitation rooms in the Memorial Hospital basement. Since its inception, the society has been given an establishment grant of $1 000, which was given in the financial year ended June 30, 1976. The society has been raising money in the past 12 months to equip these basement premises, which will now become its rehabilitation headquarters.

The society has raised a large sum of money. The rehabiltation facilities opened on September 16 cost $20 000, and the ultimate cost will be $110 000, including $70 000 for a hydrotherapy pool. The Government was kind enough to give this society $1 000 last year, but no allocation whatever has been made this year. However, the society has just paid $4 913 to the Government as lottery licence fees at a rate of 2 per cent and at a rate of 4 per cent over the sum of $2 000 gross. What is the good of giving $1 000 with one hand and taking $4 913 with the other?

Mr. Becker: It's typical of that mob.

Dr. TONKIN: True, that is exactly the sort of conjuring trick at which this Government is so good. I have great admiration for that society and for many other societies and voluntary organisations that perform much work in the community that Governments will never be able to perform. The cost is beyond it and, more particularly, the spirit and the sense of voluntary service that is so important to those societies cannot be created by Government legislation or by Government grants.

Mr. Wotton: That spirit is being removed by the Government.

Dr. TONKIN: I could not agree more. Here is a perfect example of what voluntary workers can achieve but, having raised all this money and having made such an effort, the society received $1 000 and then had to pay about $4 900 back to the Government. There needs to be a hard look at the situation of voluntary organisations in South Australia and the rip-off that this Government is taking by way of its licensing fees on fund-raising activities. It is disgraceful that this should happen. It is a great credit to the Multiple Sclerosis Society, and to every other voluntary organisation raising money, that they are able to do what they can with the funds they raise.

Mr. Mathwin: They get little encouragement.

Dr. TONKIN: True, they get little encouragement. This is a matter at which the Government could well take a good look. Certainly, the Opposition will. Because it is our policy to look after voluntary organisations, we will do everything possible to remove what I believe is an unfair burden on approved voluntary and charitable organisations. I wish to put the record straight regarding industrial development in South Australia, because the Treasurer states frequently that we are the envy of all other States or that our services are the best offered by the States.

Mr. Dean Brown: He tried today to make a false accusation. It's typical of him.

Dr. TONKIN: It is typical, and it is beginning to wear a little thin. I am distressed when I go to other States and hear about the industrial development that is occurring there, knowing all the time that South Australia has nothing comparable because nothing significant in the way of new industry is coming to South Australia. The number of new industries that have set up operations in South Australia since June, 1973, is 14.

Mr. Keneally: Where is private industry expanding in Australia at the moment?

Dr. TONKIN: If the honourable member would be a little patient—

Mr. Keneally: Give me some figures.

Dr. TONKIN: —and not interrupt so that I can read the list for him—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. TONKIN: I will not take the tenor of my speech from interjections. The majority of these new industries that have come to South Australia has been small. The total capital value of 13 industries is only about $11 000 000. The only truly large industry established in South Australia was the expansion at the Port Stanvac lube refinery. That is the deplorable state of industrial development in South Australia in the past three years of the Dunstan Government. The Treasurer has attempted to conceal the situation by the selective use of statistics; he deliberately misleads people. He does not deliberately tell untruths, but he deliberately misleads by telling half-truths. The Treasurer uses statistics for the past 10 years because, over the 10 years to September, 1975, South Australia has increased its industrial employment by 12 per cent, whereas New South Wales and Victoria are far behind. The Treasurer uses 10 years because the figures suit him.

However, he forgets to say that Western Australia in the same time increased its industrial employment by 26·5 per cent and that Queensland's percentage increase was even greater. The member for Stuart wanted to know what industrial developments had occurred. About $1 000 000 000 will be spent on investment plans for Western Australia, which was announced in September. A $50 000 000 polypropylene plant will be established at Geelong, Victoria. We have heard the announcement about the Ford factory to be expanded at Geelong, too. Alcoa is to expand its alumina factory at Pinjarra, Western Australia. In January and February, 1975, a $15 000 000 project was announced for South Australia by General Motors-Holden's. That expansion has been necessary to keep the factory going: it was not a new development. Toyota will spend $30 000 000 on an engine assemply plant in Melbourne, as part of a $40 000 000 expansion by A.M.I. and Toyota. Nissan-Datsun will invest $40 000 000 on an engine assembly plant at Clayton, Victoria.

Possible mining projects are lining up for Western Australia and Queensland, with coal development at Norwich Park that will amount to $240 000 000, Hall Creek of $700 000 000, and at Nebo of $600 000 000. Iron ore development at Area C of $600 000 000, Marandoo of $500 000 000, and Deepdale of $300 000 000. Hamersley will spend $200 000 000 on plant to upgrade low-grade iron ore. Those figures are in keeping with today's figures, allowing for inflation. They relate to major projects that are not yet positive developments, but they are well on the way. They are far more on the way than a petro-chemical plant at Redcliff has even been.

Mr. Vandepeer: Or the Chrysler engine plant.

Dr. TONKIN: Yes. The Treasurer can do nothing but make a show. Before each election he makes pie in the sky promises. How galling and disappointing it is when one visits other States and hears about the sorts of

development that are coming to almost every other State of Australia, but not to South Australia. A $92 000 000 expansion will be made by B.H.P. on a new battery of coke ovens at Port Kembla, New South Wales. Already a $90 000 000 slab-caster is being built at Port Kembla. B.H.P. is certainly extending its coke ovens at Whyalla, which is good, at a value of $21 000 000.

Mr. Keneally: Tell us about Whyalla shipyards.

Dr. TONKIN: I would have thought that the member for Stuart would not want to hear about that, because it is a tragic story resulting from Labor's mismanagement of that industry over the past four years. If the Labor Party and this State Government had been fair dinkum about saving the shipbuilding industry it would have moved to increase the subsidy to that industry about three years ago, when it was within the Federal Labor Government's power to do so; instead, it reduced the subsidy and continued to reduce it. Remarks of protest from members opposite ring hollow, because their Party had it in their power for three years to save the shipbuilding industry, yet did nothing about it.

In fact, the Government let seven contracts go to oversea countries in that time. Members opposite do not like that sort of information, but that is what happened. The Australian Labor Government wrecked Whyalla—no-one else. It was Whitlam and his friends in the Dunstan Government who did it. Let me hear members opposite give the lie to that. Even I could not help fix the mess that the Labor Party has made at Whyalla. If we consider industrial employment State by State, we see that, comparing June, 1971, with April, 1976, in South Australia we have gone back by 5 900 employees. In other words, the best industrial performance at that time was put in by Western Australia, and the worst by New South Wales. South Australia was fourth down the list. If we compare April, 1975, with April, 1976, we see that the best industrial performance was by Queensland, followed by Western Australia. South Australia had slipped to fifth on the list. This Government's record is appalling yet, by making a show and covering up, it believes it can get away with almost anything, but the figures do not show that that is the case. The South Australian Government is not an open Government: it is not efficient, and certainly can not attract industrial development of any size or note to South Australia. It is time that the people of South Australia woke up to what this Government is doing to them.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I can take this opportunity to grieve in a similar vein to that of my Leader when it comes to the secrecy of this Government. I am still concerned about the lack of information coming from the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport. I should like to draw some comparisons between this State Government and its Minister and Ministers and departments in other States, whether they are Liberal or Labor. It is on record that the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport in this State has stated that his department is 20 years behind the times. He is reported as saying:

The South Australian bureau is living 20 years in the past.

I have referred to that report before. I will draw a comparison between the effectiveness of this State's Minister and his department with departments in other States to see whether the South Australian department is effective. When the Hon. Mr. Broomhill controlled this portfolio he said that the Tourist Bureau in South Australia had encouraged more people per capita to come to the State than had been achieved by any other State Government, and that it was a credit to our bureau. The Treasurer has stated that South Australia is better than any other State in getting people to come to its State. However, under what conditions? I could not get information about that by asking questions of the Minister. I know that our bureau employs 98 people, 16 of whom work in Sydney and Melbourne.

South Australia does not have an office in Queensland. When our films, advertising South Australia, are shown in Queensland (and they are good films), the Victorian Tourist Bureau acts as our agent. When the film has finished, the message "For further inquiries, contact Victorian Tourist Bureau" appears on the screen. That is a wonderful advertisement for South Australia! That is how the advertisements appear in Queensland. When I asked the Minister what money we paid the Victorian Tourist Bureau in this regard, I was told that in 1972-73 we paid it commission amounting to $121·58; in 1973-74 we paid $225·52; in 1974-75, $284·98; and in 1975-76, we paid $972·09. What sort of operation is that? We are the only State, except Western Australia, without a branch in Queensland. Even Tasmania, which has Mr. Barnard as Minister and which has a population of 350 000 people compared to our population of 1 300 000, has an office in Queensland.

In Tasmania, the State bureau employs 241 persons. I draw the comparison that, with 241 employees, that State cannot achieve the same result, according to our Treasurer and the former Minister, as our Tourist Bureau achieves with its 98 employees. How can our department be 20 years behind the times? That is the accusation that the Minister made against the department, yet with 98 employees, it can achieve a better result, according to the Treasurer and former Minister, than can the Tasmanian bureau with its 241 employees.

The Victorian bureau employs 173 persons. Queensland, which employs 249 persons, has 67 persons working outside of Queensland and promoting that State. If there is one industry that has the opportunity for expansion, it is the tourist industry. If one examines the Eastern States' figures, one sees that they will put more people in their branch offices in Adelaide than South Australia has put in its branch offices in Sydney and Melbourne. One can therefore understand why we are not attracting to South Australia all the tourists that we should be getting here. There is a potential market in New South Wales and Victoria of nearly 9 000 000 people. Yet, we do not put as many people over there looking for that business as the Eastern States' bureaux have put in South Australia looking for potential clientele amongst our population of about 1 300 000 people.

This is absolute stupidity. No modern marketing firm would do that. However, this is not the bureau's fault. The Minister has admitted that the Government has not appointed all the people that the bureau needs in the Eastern States. Imagine a State like South Australia, the central State geographically, not having a branch office in Western Australia. What is the most logical place to which Western Australian tourists would go other than to the Asian countries? The nearest place is, of course, South Australia, yet we do not even have a tourist office in that State. We rely instead on travel agents and, if they do not have the required information, they go to the Western Australian Tourist Bureau. If it does not have the information, it inquires of the office in South Australia. How stupid can we be? We have a potential market there.

The Treasurer talks about looking for customers and business, but we do not even look for them in Western Australia. We give it to another group which has a similar

interest to us but which in business is not necessarily concerned with South Australia. I asked some questions of the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport but found that it was difficult to get answers from him. Mr. Barnard in Tasmania has been willing to give me information about his department, and to answer correspondence quickly, and he has not hedged on any general question.

Mr. Slater: He isn't a wake-up to you like we are.

Mr. EVANS: I think he is a principled man, who understands that certain information should be made available to the public. The Opposition Party in that State gets the information from him easily, and his press secretary is co-operative, too. In 1975-76, Tasmania, with only 350 000 people, made available $3 453 287 for tourism, whereas we in this State are operating on a budget of $1 500 000, in a field in which there is a potential market to create more employment in this State. However, we cannot get information from the Minister. It is not just available: it is a closed shop. He tells me now that, if I write to him, he will answer some of the questions I have been asking him. It will be an interesting exercise to see whether that eventuates.

I should like to refer to one other point. A report in the *Hotel Gazette* refers to the Australian National Travel Association *News*, and the States' realisation that wage awards have hit tourism. It states:

Recognition by Governments that penalty rates in industrial awards are lowering Australia's competitiveness as a travel destination by raising travel costs emerged at crucial talks in June and July.

It continues:

Tourist Ministers from the Australian and State Governments, meeting as the Tourist Ministers Council, agreed to establish a Ministerial task force to examine the issue, reports A.N.T.A. *News*.

There is no doubt that award and penalty rates are killing tourism and, whether or not the Australian Labor Party is backed by the trade union movement, it must realise, if it wants to save tourism, and the accommodation and catering fields, that it must get back to a system of shift working and cut out penalty rates. Otherwise we will price ourselves out of even further tourist potential in South Australia and Australia. I hope the Minister will increase the department's staff and set up an office in Queensland and Western Australia. There is a benefit in increasing that sort of staff, when there is a potential market there that we have not yet exploited.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): There are three matters with which I should like to deal, although I will probably not have time to get through the third one. Some of these matters have previously been aired in the House. A couple of union matters have raised their ugly head in my district. Not long ago, I attended a function, at which I was approached by a young fellow who works in a Government department. He had received from the Australian Workers Union a letter stating that he was to be fined $40 for presenting himself for work on the day that the Medibank strike had been called. There were 13 workers in his gang, 11 of whom turned up for work. For some reason or another, not all of the 11 who turned up for work received a letter from the union. However, nine of them had, and this was a cause of some concern to this chap, and, I should say, to his colleagues. He asked me, "What can we do?". I said, "If I were you, I would not do anything."

Mr. Slater: Is that the advice you give all your constituents?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: In a situation like that, that is certainly the advice that I gave. From what I knew of the situation, it was an illegal strike, and the union had no authority whatever in those circumstances to demand money from its members. One of his colleagues, who happened to live in Gawler (this was in my district, although Gawler is not) was heard to observe, "This is a free country, if you do what you're bloody well told." I thought that summed up the situation in fairly colourful Australian language.

Dr. Tonkin: It was exactly right, though, wasn't it?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I thought it summed up the situation. We pride ourselves that this is a free country, but in his view it was free as long as he did what he was told, in this case by the union. However, as a result of yesterday's court hearing, I doubt whether they will have much to worry about, although it was a cause of considerable concern to people in my district.

The other union matter which has reared its ugly head recently is one that was fought out on earlier occasions in this State. A hotel proprietor in my district was visited recently by union officials. He employs a couple of young girls to prepare food for counter lunches, and so on, and he was told by union officials that, if he did not compel these girls to join the appropriate union, he would be black-banned and the union would see that he got no supplies of liquor. Being an Australian who subscribes to the view that this is basically a free country where there should be freedom of choice, he was disturbed by this procedure.

He rang me. It appeared that the union would be able to cut off his beer supplies, although he had sufficient to hold out for a few weeks. I told him he should see how the situation developed and referred him to the Seven Stars case, where the proprietor, who had a certain amount of spirit, took the union to court and won the case; the union now leaves him alone. In due course, union officials presented themselves at the hotel of my constituent. The proprietor said that he understood that what they were doing was not legal, but they were not concerned and said he must do what they asked or he would get no beer. He replied, "So you are trying to blackmail me", and they said he could call it that, but they were interested only in forcing these two youngsters into the union.

The proprietor told the officials he had no objection to their talking to the employees and that, if they could be convinced of the merits of the case and wished to join the union, that was their own affair and they could do so, but that in no way would he tell them that they must join the union if they did not wish to do so. The argument became somewhat heated and in the end the union officials and the hotel proprietor parted company. The situation now is one of stalemate. I do not doubt that the proprietor could take these officials to court and win his case, but the humbug and the expense involved are completely unjustified. Any reasonable Government, in my view, would see that certain basic freedoms were preserved and that the law was upheld.

Those two matters have come close to home, and I have seen at first hand what I consider an ugly face of unionism in this country. In the time available, I will not be able to do justice to the other matter I wish to mention, but it is of great significance to South Australians. It was introduced by the member for Mallee a short while ago. I refer, of course, to the matter of the accountability of Government departments in South Australia. The Auditor-General's Report contains numerous

disturbing references to the lack of accountability and the lack of proper accounting procedures in almost all major Government departments. The Public Accounts Committee has concerned itself with investigating (certainly in my time and, from what I can gather, it has continued to investigate) some of the departments, trying to draw their attention to their shortcomings, and reinforcing the comments of the Auditor-General, apparently without a great deal of success, and certainly without any co-operation from the Government. One Minister has been especially unhelpful to the Public Accounts Committee, but I shall not go into that at the moment.

Mr. Gunn: Was it the Deputy Premier?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: In fact, it was. On page 1 of his report, the Auditor-General states:

As shown above total payments from Consolidated Revenue and the Loan Account for the year were $1 306 000 000. When one considers that the whole of that amount has been or will be provided by the public through taxes and charges, whether levied by the State or the Commonwealth, it is clear that a serious responsibility must rest on those who have the authority at various levels to expend public moneys. It is essential that the nature and extent of this responsibility be properly defined so that accountability can be determined . . .

Later, the report states:

If in some cases additional staff may be required, the savings that would result should far outweigh any additional cost involved.

We find that almost every department is the subject of an adverse comment. At page 52, an adverse comment appears on the Agriculture and Fisheries Department in relation to Budget procedures; at page 77 the report contains a reference to a deterioration of accounting standards in the Education Department, and, reading between the lines, one would gather that the situation was chaotic; an adverse comment regarding the Engineering and Water Supply Department appears at page 96, and this is one of the major departments at which the Public Accounts Committee is looking, with lack of co-operation and success thus far, I gather. An adverse comment on the Environment Department appears to page 109, on the Highways Department at page 132, and in relation to the operation of the Woods and Forests Department at page 248. This is an alarming situation, destroying the confidence of the public in the way in which public money is being spent. I would hope that any responsible administration would bend over backwards to see that this situation was improved. I intend to take up the matter again in this place at the next opportunity.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): Of the three matters I wish to bring to the notice of the House, the first two are minor, but not trivial; they are important. Yesterday, in the mall, someone was handing out, free of charge, the Premier's record. Perhaps I should wish him many happy returns on his birthday yesterday, and wish him all the best for his second half century of life. I raise this issue because the most recent politician I can recall who had to hand out his own documents very cheaply was Andrew Jones. On that occasion, Andrew Jones's book was being sold at two copies for 1c. On this occasion, I understand that the Premier was offering six records for nothing whatsoever, which is an even cheaper rate than that of Andrew Jones. If I may continue this analogy, Andrew Jones did that during his last term in Parliament. I think that was very much in the stage of the decline of Andrew Jones. However, I understand that his book was a better document to possess than is the record of the Premier now being handed out.

One aspect that concerns me is that the records apparently were being handed out face down, so that people receiving them did not know what they were being given. I suspect that this is a matter that should be referred to the Public and Consumer Affairs Department, because I consider it to be misrepresentation when someone hands out something and people receiving it are under the impression that it is worth while, but when they turn it over they realise it is valueless.

Mr. Slater: Two Italians got them, and thought they were licorice pieces.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Licorice would be more valuable than the record. I am gravely concerned to see in the latest edition of the *Herald*, produced by the Australian Labor Party, an advertisement by a Government statutory authority. To put the matter in its correct perspective, I realise that this is a small advertisement from an authority which is a trading organisation and which also advertises elsewhere, but a fundamental principle is involved. It is dangerous for a Government department or a statutory authority to advertise in political journals, especially when it is the political journal of the Government of the day. It is a situation that leaves the authority wide open to severe questioning by the public, because it cuts across the absolute independence of any Government department or statutory authority.

I am sure the Government would argue, on behalf of the authority (which is the State Government Insurance Commission), that the advertisement has been inserted for business or commercial reasons, and it is hoped to receive a commercial return. The Government in allowing such an advertisement in its A.L.P. journal is cutting across the independence of the Public Service and creating a doubt whether public funds are being improperly used. I suspect that they are on this occasion, although I realise that it is a small advertisement and that the amount of money would not be large. However, a fundamental principle is being breached.

Mr. Whitten: Do you know how these advertisements are placed?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I wonder whether that statutory authority would advertise in other political journals if it were asked to do so, and I would like to know how much it advertises in the *Herald*. The honourable member knows that a fundamental principle is involved, and is obviously embarrassed by the fact that I have referred to this matter.

Mr. Whitten: You shouldn't talk about principles.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I assure the honourable member that if I were in Government and had any say in the matter, I would not allow a statutory authority to publish an advertisement in a Liberal Party journal, and I challenge anyone to throw that statement back at me when we become the Government after the next election.

My third important issue relates to the Education Department. Recently, I was distressed to find, after receiving a reply to a question I had asked, that in the Education Department there were 371 positions, and in the Further Education Department there were 77 positions, carrying an annual salary of $18 000 or more, a total of 448 people in the two departments. My fear is that both departments, especially the Education Department, are becoming too heavy with administrators by building up a large hierarchy that is not essential for sound education in this State.

I believe that education resources are being used for administration instead of teaching. More teachers should be provided for remedial teaching of handicapped or retarded persons. The number of these teachers in the

Eastern suburbs is gravely deficient. After receiving many requests, I have written to the Minister asking for a remedial teacher at the Burnside school at which many pupils need such assistance. Recently, a friend of mine told me that his son had developed a bad speech defect. In seeking assistance from the department, he found, to his amazement, that only one speech therapist operated in all the eastern suburbs and had to cover 9 000 primary schoolchildren.

This seems to be a grave deficiency, as members would realise that speech (among other things) is important in this world, and every attention should be given to it. I believe that there is a misdirection of resources for education, and more should be applied to remedial teaching and less to administration. I am also distressed to find that seven positions are still vacant in the Education Department with an annual salary of $25 198 a year. I thank Mr. Max Bone (the present Director-General of Futher Education) for what he has contributed to education in this State. Recently, it was announced that he will resign as Director-General. Mr. Bone has given a lifetime to education, and this Parliament and the State should compliment him and sincerely thank him for what he has done.

Mr. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): I draw the attention of the House to the many inquiries being conducted in Mount Gambier, for which there seems to be no apparent funding in the present Budget. The list of inquiries being conducted is substantial and impressive. The inquiry into the need for a civic centre at Mount Gambier has been continuing for about two years, including a 1974 report and an early 1975 report, neither of which were made public but which were conducted by Hassell and Partners at a cost of $1 500, which, I believe, was paid by the State Government. Now, we are in stage 3 of this inquiry, with a report costing $15 000. Several sites in the town have been considered, the two main ones being Watson Terrace and Jubilee Highway, with both sites having many things to commend them.

The second inquiry is into Government offices in Mount Gambier. A strange thing happened in 1975, one of several things that happened. Before I left for overseas on an educational visit to inspect aspects of libraries, resource centres and student problems in the United Kingdom, a joint project was announced, supported by the Treasurer, the then member for Mount Gambier (Mr. Allan Burdon), the Mayor of Mount Gambier, and others. This joint project was the Fricker Carrington project to develop a large area in the centre of Mount Gambier, the Percy Street area, by erecting Government and other offices. One must assume that it had Government backing, even though it was denied more recently when I visited the Treasurer personally, because the then member for Mount Gambier was so enthusiastic about it that he made the front page of the *Border Watch* with the Mayor of Mount Gambier. Subsequent to my election to the seat of Mount Gambier in July, that was scotched; it was allowed to lapse through lack of Government support, and it was alarming, because the project would have meant considerable labour being used in Mount Gambier.

I suspect it was a political decision, although that is difficult, if not impossible, to prove. But this remarkable enthusiasm dwindled to rejection over a period of three or four months, plus a general election. The obvious situation is that Government offices are still needed in Mount Gambier. Currently, they are very fragmented and, when I visited the Treasurer, he made it apparent that he favoured one project which I assume to be the Watson Terrace project. However, in the *Border Watch* the Deputy Premier openly said that he favoured the Helen Street project, where the Engineering and Water Supply Department used to be. I know of another allotment in Elizabeth Street, Mount Gambier, which the Minister for the Environment has earmarked for his department.

I believe that fragmentation is not the best thing for Government and local government offices, and there are many reasons I presented to the Treasurer for not fragmenting but consolidating at one favourable site, particularly the Watson Terrace site. Probably a joint effort whereby the State Government and local government could combine, with financing on a long-term loan or probably more favourable circumstances than that, the property ultimately reverting to the city council after some years, would be a generous offer that one would hope for for one's district. I know that the Mount Gambier Town Clerk has recently been lobbying the Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department about a sporting complex for Mount Gambier, and this, one assumes, would include a heated swimming pool, which has been a strong recommendation for several years by the parks and gardens committee.

Another inquiry under way is the Radford inquiry, by Professor Radford of Flinders University, into accommodation and other needs for the aged in Mount Gambier. That report has not been made public, and my city council was asking for it recently; so I bring that to the Government's notice. Another inquiry was into a driver-training centre, costing $8 000 on the basis of each organisation responsible contributing one-third. There is a relatively cheap solution to that, as the Mount Gambier Light Car Club has offered its area with ready-made roads, about 10 or 11 miles from Mount Gambier, for the complete centre. Another inquiry is into the need for a community arts centre, incorporating working crafts, museum and an art gallery. The existing building was recently visited by Mr. Amadeo from the Premier's Department.

The Victorian Government has taken an interest in its Western Wonderland project in the area south-east of our own South-East area, following the Seranta report, some two years ago. There is another inquiry by the Education Department and the Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department into the condition of the Young Men's Christian Association pool in Mount Gambier, which is desperately in need of repair and maintenance. Other projects which the city council has in hand are the Blue Lake Sports Park (a large sports complex), the Crouch Street Youth Hostels Association project, to be located on a small parkland area, and the lakes beautification in Mount Gambier.

About 18 months ago the Treasurer, with the Minister of Community Welfare, inspected Mount Gambier, along with members of the city council. We drove around the entire city, pointing out the hopes and needs of the district, and one of the comments made, I believe by the Minister of Community Welfare, was that Mount Gambier was not being realistic, that it was very optimistic and ambitious in wanting to provide all these amenities, in the apparent haste in which it was wanting to provide them. We have waited a considerable time for many of these things. The inquiry into a civic centre was initiated in 1948, and that is a considerable time ago, one must admit. The question is: if we are being optimistic or unrealistic (the Treasurer and his Ministers have inspected Mount Gambier on many occasions and I think we are up to about 40 Ministerial and Premier's visits during the last 52 weeks, a considerable number) and asking for too much, the people and the city council of Mount Gambier would like to know how

much the Government is prepared to put into these schemes. If we establish our priorities, to what extent will the Government come to the party to help us?

We must be realistic and get down to brass tacks and establish our own priorities. Many promises have been made and so many inquiries are currently under way, and, if it is the Caucus opinion that Mount Gambier is too ambitious, the Government, in aiding and abetting in providing these inquiries, is raising hopes and, therefore, it is up to the Government to let the people of Mount Gambier know to what extent it is prepared to help. We should not have to wait for pre-election promises to be made that may not be realised subsequently: the Government must start off here and now by letting the people know to what extent it is prepared to be committed. Loans have to be negotiated, and the public must be told of the effect the decisions will have upon rates and taxes and all of these important things. The people of Mount Gambier are waiting for some viewpoint from the Government before they themselves are asked to make some commitment to the various projects.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): Recently in a grievance debate, I made some remarks about problems of discrimination by the Government and Government departments against private schools, especially Catholic primary schools. Because of the attitude of the Public Schools Sports Association of South Australia, private school athletes are made ineligible for selection for State football, netball and athletic teams. They are unable to compete in interstate carnivals, and this discrimination against these young people handicaps them, because they are not allowed to compete with the State schools or in other States. They miss, of course, the obvious things that young children or any athletes get, namely, the fellowship through meeting athletes from other States and from other areas of this State. When public school teams go to other States, they are usually billeted privately. They form friendships that in many cases are lasting friendships throughout their lives. Private school children miss that fellowship and co-operation with others. They cannot go to the host State as a team and, likewise, they are ineligible to participate in the reciprocal movement of interstate teams coming to South Australia, because they are not part of the whole programme. Independent schools are not allowed to enter any of these areas.

The system is that, first, the teams in the State compete among themselves and, at the end of the competitions, they nominate their best players. District sides are chosen from the various schools and, from the young athletes in these squads, a State side is selected. The ludicrous part of the whole situation is that independent and State schools are now working much closer together than ever before and, by continuing this practice, it means that we are turning the clock back about 20 years. The heads of the various primary and senior schools are getting together, and they have an amicable arrangement among themselves, yet the young athletes in question are not given the opportunity of representing the State.

In the eastern suburbs, such as in the Newton area, there have been cases of a State school and a private school combining to form a football team, because the schools, consisting of so many migrants, have been unable to form a team each. When it came to State selection, only half the team was eligible for selection, because the remainder was from a private school. Two years ago, a team was allowed to compete, after pressure from St. Joseph's Primary School, at Hectorville, which is the State's biggest private school, in the competition. However, after it competed, its members were told that they were ineligible for awards or for State selection. The school has a small oval and has problems connected with swimming. The school needs the use of transport, and asked to be allowed to use a school bus. I understand that the school was given approval to do this but, when it tried to organise it, the Education Department placed so many obstacles in its way, such as the school having to provide its own insurance, that the cost was astronomical, and the school was unable to take the opportunity of using a school bus.

The sports associations of these schools pay the same fee as any other school pays, yet they were told by the Primary School Sports Association that, when the season finished, the top netball team would be recognised not as the top team but only as the second team. That is discriminating against these schools, and I am sure that every member would agree with me that it is wrong. On athletics day, in October, 1975, any winner of a race could not represent the State if he came from an independent school. That is most unfair. I understand that this year, for the first time in netball, Catholic children and children in other independent schools have been allowed to compete in the country sides. However, when it comes to State selection, these children are not eligible for selection. That is an absolute disgrace, and something should be done about it soon.

The other matter I raise deals with what the Attorney-General intends to do about the massive number of maintenance cases piling up in our courts creating great hardship to some of my constituents. The Adelaide Magistrates Court deals with between 12 and 15 maintenance cases a week, and there is a backlog of many hundreds of cases. The court is months behind. The Family Court of Australia (established under the Commonwealth Family Law Act) is empowered to hear maintenance cases, but it does not have the facilities. The Adelaide Magistrates Court claims that family matters should be heard by the appropriate court, and it also has the power to hear these cases.

A deadlock exists here between the Federal court and the State court, and I believe that it is about time that the Attorney-General did something about this colossal backlog of cases which is causing hardship to so many families in this State. It is high time that the Attorney acted to relieve the problem existing in this State, particularly as it concerns young people who are left with families, who cannot receive maintenance because the payments have been stopped, and who have to wait months to have their cases heard in either court.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I am pleased to have the opportunity to refer to some matters about which I have been concerned for some time. The first matter deals with the State Planning Authority's plans as set out in the Eyre Development Plan. This plan designated 54 areas that ought to be set aside for recreational purposes. Many of these areas comprise valuable agricultural country, which, in my opinion, would be far better left in the hands of those who have been working it for many years. I wrote to the Minister and asked whether he could tell me when his department intended to take over these areas so that the landholders would know what their future would be. I received a second reply, dated September 6, which states:

No. 3—Gawler Ranges: Because of the natural features of this area it is still thought desirable that all or part of the Gawler Ranges should eventually be park. The precise area to be acquired is yet to be defined, but would depend on if, and when, any of the pastoral holdings in the region come on to the market.

That is a fine statement! How would it leave those pastoralists who have properties in the Gawler Range? They will not know whether they will be on their properties for one, two, five or 10 years. It will deny them the opportunity to make any future plans. They will have no tenure or security, whatever, because they will be aware, as all honourable members are aware, that in the future the department might decide to acquire those pastoral leases compulsorily. This land is some of the best pastoral land in South Australia, and it would be irresponsible for the State Planning Authority even to consider acquiring all the Gawler Range for use as a park or a large recreation area.

If small areas were acquired, I do not think anyone would complain as long as proper discussions were held with the lessees and care was taken that the areas selected would not make it difficult for the lessees to carry on their operations, and that areas such as water catchment areas and the like are not affected. I cannot understand why the authority would seek to acquire such valuable pastoral areas. Such acquisition would be irresponsible, and the Minister would do better by giving a definite answer.

The next area of concern is in relation to County Dufferin, sections 2 and 86. I know that area well, and it comprises about 390 square kilometres of pastoral country. Why would the authority seek to acquire that area when there are thousands of square kilometres of country that could be just as easily acquired? Why acquire sections being used for grazing purposes? Why does not the authority acquire land a little farther away that is not being used? That is a ridiculous situation.

I refer now to the Darke Peak Range, which the Government intends to acquire. From discussions with people in the area I understand that on one occasion an officer from a Government department inspected the area, held discussions with the landowner and, when it was pointed out to the officer that it would be desirable in the interests of protecting his stock (the farmer normally had his sheep shorn in July) that a fence be erected about 150 metres up the hill he was told that, if he argued, the officer would have the fence located 200 metres down the middle of the paddock. That is the type of arrogance that people must endure from the State Planning Authority. I have criticised the authority on several occasions, and I am still not satisfied about the situation. These are three cases about which the Minister should clearly state what his department has in mind. I will be waiting to see what the Minister has to say in future.

So far as I am concerned, the authority should be restructured and several of its powers should be handed over to local government. If local people cannot make decisions, who can? Local people know best what an area needs. Certainly, they know the position far better than someone sitting in a large air-conditioned Adelaide office. I refer to another case involving a constituent at Ceduna. He wished to subdivide land into three blocks. His application to the district council was satisfactory, as was his application to the Engineering and Water Supply Department. However, when he approached the State Planning Authority he was refused permission to subdivide, and given no reason whatever. This constituent wanted to make one block available to a member of his family, and he was actually going to give another block to a friend, but the authority said, "No". Surely, the Murat Bay District Council knows what is best. The Adelaide officer who made that decision has probably never seen the blocks, and he is never likely to see them. This is a clear case of bureaucracy at its worst, and people should not have to tolerate that sort of nonsense any longer.

Mr. Keneally: We have had a completely different experience with the State Planning Authority at Port Augusta.

Mr. GUNN: The honourable member can talk about his district, but I know what has happened in my district, and I am raising the matter in this House because it is the proper place to raise it. We have heard a series of statements by the Minister of Agriculture in recent weeks about drought relief. Why has not the Minister of Lands been making these statements? Is he on the way out? Is he not regarded as competent? Drought relief is normally handled by the Minister of Lands. Today, in this House, the Deputy Premier made a statement, and I was interested to see that it was printed on a Lands Department letterhead, but all other statements—

Mr. Keneally: Have you checked whether a statement was made on that matter in another place today?

Mr. GUNN: I am referring to the document in front of me. Most people get their knowledge from statements made over the radio, and they have been issued by the Minister of Agriculture; why, I do not know. Unfortunately, the Minister of Agriculture has been engaged in a smear campaign against the Commonwealth Government without any jurisdiction and justification whatever. Yesterday, I rang the office of the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry to try to clarify the situation. I was told that on Thursday last the Hon. Mr. Chatterton had a meeting with Mr. Sinclair. I was informed that the Commonwealth had broadened the criteria previously existing concerning drought relief. The Prime Minister had also offered the States, if they were not happy with the proposal of spending $1 500 000 to qualify for the $10 000 000, a Commonwealth $1 for every $1 spent by the State. The States could make a choice. Obviously, from the comments made by our Minister, he was not interested: he wanted only a platform from which to attack the Commonwealth Government, because the State Government has been tardy and has not taken action when it should have taken it in this matter.

The State Government should have joined the Victorian Government months ago when it started to pay farmers $10 a head to destroy stock. About six weeks ago the Victorian Minister told me that Victoria had already destroyed 30 000 head of cattle. Farmers had to destroy their cattle weeks ago in my district, and they will not qualify for any assistance now. That is why the South Australian Government has been unable to spend the $1 500 000: it has not been available to spend (and the Government knows that). The Government has been simply creating a situation in which it can attack the Commonwealth Government.

It is time the Minister of Lands looked at the situation. He should not allow the Minister of Agriculture to go around the country making irresponsible statements. Some of the money the State Government claims to be spending on drought relief is not allocated as grants but is allocated as loans. This is Commonwealth money that is being lent by the State to drought-affected farmers and interest will be charged on it. I hope that in future the State Government will face up to the situation and be a little more realistic.

Mr. BECKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. WELLS (Florey): I want to draw to the attention of the House the disgusting behaviour and intimidatory methods used by a pastoralist in this State, namely, Mr. R. H. Angas, of Angas Pastoral Company, against his employee, Mr. Bailey. Mr. Bailey was employed by Angas for a period of six years. After eight months employment he was elevated (that was the term used), to the position of overseer, although Mr. Bailey was the only employee on the property. Of course, Angas had used this ploy to avoid responsibility under the Pastoral Award. He was a wellknown hater of trade unions and trade unionists. He had threatened to ruin Bailey if he had anything at all to do with a union, or if Angas even heard that Bailey had any connection with unions at all. This matter is fully documented in the papers before me, and I speak from these documents. Bailey was required to work by Angas for 16 hours a day, seven days a week. He received no annual leave, no public holidays and no sick leave whatever. However—

Members interjecting:

Mr. WELLS: Members opposite think it is a joke because it relates to intimidatory methods against a worker. At times Bailey had to wait weeks for his pay. Once he waited three months before being paid. He and his wife and family lived in a house owned by Angas.

Mr. Coumbe: Where?

Mr. WELLS: At Angaston. Mr. Bailey was paid no overtime, and was ordered to work when he was suffering from a virus. Eventually he contracted pneumonia and suffered a physical breakdown. Angas visited the house as many as four times a day and told Mrs. Bailey that he intended to dismiss her husband and that he would require them to vacate the premises that they were occupying. This practice continued until Bailey was well enough to continue work. When he was ill Bailey was forced to take his first lot of annual leave. That was made available so that Angas could avoid paying Bailey sick leave. From 1970 to 1974 Bailey had used no sick leave. He was forced to work during his lunch breaks, tea breaks—

Members interjecting:

Mr. WELLS: It is no laughing matter: it is a documented case about which members opposite will certainly hear much more.

Dr. Tonkin: I would advise you to do a bit of checking.

Mr. WELLS: The Leader should be doing the checking. Bailey was required to spray poisons without wearing protective clothing, as a result of which he became ill. In December, 1975, he objected to the treatment being meted out to him and immediately demanded the holidays due to him. Angas immediately became vicious. The member for Eyre can laugh, but I do not believe that this is a laughing matter, certainly not when a man and his family are intimidated and subjected to this sort of treatment. It is a disgusting situation. Eventually, Angas threatened to ruin Bailey; he threatened that he would see that Bailey never got a job on the land in South Australia, because of his association with a trade union.

Eventually, Bailey was given a letter tantamount to dismissal in which his immediate resignation was demanded. Angas gave him seven days to leave the house, and he was offered two months' salary and leave entitlements in lieu of notice. If Bailey had had union protection he would have been advised to take action against Angas for wrongful dismissal. The family was so distraught and in such an untenable position that they accepted the meagre sum offered by Angas and eventually left the property.

It did not end at that, because Angas was so vicious that he complained to the police that Bailey had opened his gates and let stock out, which was denied emphatically by Bailey and his wife. The letter stating that Bailey was to leave the property also stated that he should take with him all the family animals, including two dogs, a cat and four horses. The horses had had to be hand fed because Angas said that they ate too much of his fodder. It went beyond that, too, because agents from certain stock firms, apparently acting on Angas's instructions, went to the property to inspect the dwelling that the Baileys were occupying. They forced their way into the house, brushing Mr. and Mrs. Bailey aside. They photographed Bailey's possessions, including the kitchen table, the refrigerator, and so forth.

The most horrifying fact (and I wish I had more than four minutes left, because I could take at least an hour) is that almost daily we hear the member for Davenport castigate the trade union movement and condemn trade union leaders for intimidatory action aginst rank and file members and employees, yet I say that the member for Davenport had that correspondence in his possession two months ago, but did nothing about it. If it was a case in which a worker was at fault, the honourable member would be jumping up and down in his seat like a petulant boy complaining of the actions of a trade unionist. But here, he had the opportunity to reverse the situation and condemn a wealthy pastoralist for his unforgiveable actions against a worker of this State. However, he did not have the moral courage or guts to stand up and defend that worker, although he told the man that he was interested in the case. Despite this, he did nothing at all about it.

What would have been the position if it had been the workman's fault? The honourable member would have been on his feet in a flash to condemn the worker and the union leader, if a union leader was concerned. To their shame, he would have received support from practically everyone on the Opposition benches because it was an attack on a trade unionist. However, here we have a wealthy pastoralist, according to this correspondence, who treated a worker in a shameful manner. Yet the honourable member, who was in full possession of the facts, as I am now (and this correspondence has been referred to me by a colleague), did not act in any circumstances. At least, if he had instituted an inquiry, as the Leader has suggested I should do, I would have been satisfied. But he would not do so, because a worker was involved and because it might have embarrassed a wealthy pastoralist. A wealthy pastoralist does not worry me one iota, because as far as I am concerned it is the worker who needs and will get protection by members on the Government benches.

This is a disgusting case of victimisation and intimidation of a worker, which should never have eventuated. Mr. Angas is the person who should be investigated. He is the person who made the threats. He is the person who threatened to ruin the worker if he joined a union or had anything at all to do with unions or unionism. That is the disgrace of the whole matter, and that is what has brought about this position, which I have been able to air this evening. However, it will not rest at this stage, as 10 minutes is not enough time for me to explain the situation fully. I hope this case is given full publicity

and that an inquiry will be held into Mr. Angas's actions. If there is a case against him, that man should be proceeded against in any court that has jurisdiction in the matter.

There is not sufficient time for me to say any more. However, I am disgusted to see the smiles on the faces of members opposite and to hear them giggle and laugh, when they hear of a man being victimised, deprived of his livelihood, and thrown out of his house with his wife and children because of a dirty money-hungry pastoralist. This is an absolute disgrace to every member opposite.

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

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): First, I think I should dissociate Opposition members from some of the statements just made by the member for Florey. It is my job this evening to bring to the Government's attention (if it needs to be brought to its attention), and to the attention of the people of South Australia, the insidious manner in which the Government is stealing the opportunities and time of the Opposition in this House.

More and more time is poached by Ministers, particularly during Question Time, during which the Opposition is given time to question Ministers and ascertain from them what is happening, as well as to try to ascertain the Government's policy on certain matters relevant to members' districts. The replies being given by Ministers, particularly by the Attorney-General, and the budding hatchet men, including one of the new Ministers, the Minister of Community Welfare, are, and more so recently, getting longer and longer. The Dorothy Dixer questions asked by his own members are bad enough, but he has prepared long speeches of 15 minutes and sometimes of 17 minutes duration in answering questions. He has the replies written out; he and his press officer have prepared them. He is the time waster of this House, and this is affecting members on this side by poaching on their time for asking questions.

Mr. Langley: You interject all the time.

Mr. MATHWIN: The Minister needs no interjections. No Ministerial statements were given when you called for them today, Sir, but, after the first question had been asked, the Deputy Premier, to take the pressure off the Premier, made a Ministerial statement. When you opened proceedings today, Sir, the Deputy Premier had an opportunity to make that statement if he had wished. You asked all Ministers along the front bench. He did not take that opportunity, because he knew the Premier would be under pressure and, after a late night, would be unfit to answer properly. He kept the Ministerial statement in his bag until the pressure was on the Premier. When that happened and when the Premier was fluttering for a reply, the Minister made a statement to take the pressure off him.

In the time allotted for private members' business, the Minister of Community Welfare, the Labor Party's official time waster in this House, takes every opportunity to waste our time. Today, he spluttered through a speech on hares, the same as the one he made last year. He read the same speech today. When he had finished, no-one knew what he had been talking about. He did not know either, and he will not know, until he reads *Hansard* tomorrow, what he said. He took 30 minutes to do it, but he could have condensed the whole of his speech to fill one side of a postage stamp. The real significance of what happened today is that private members' time has been available in the main previously to the Opposition of the day.

Mr. Keneally: No.

Mr. MATHWIN: Yes. Many of the Bills on file are put there by Opposition members, and it is only right. The Ministers had at least two hours today—

The Hon. R. G. Payne: But—

Mr. MATHWIN: The Minister should be quiet and listen, and perhaps he will learn something. When the Government is in charge of the business of the House, many times business is adjourned on motion. We go from the first item on the Notice Paper to No. 14, and then back to No. 5, for example. The Government organises the Notice Paper as it wishes, and that is quite correct. I do not argue with that. On private members' days, however, it is usual for business to be organised by the members who bring in the Bills. If a member brings in a private member's Bill, he must do his own whipping and organise who is going to speak and where it will be placed on the Notice Paper. If a member wishes to introduce a Bill, he should have every right (as should the Government) to do so and bring it forward for debate, provided the Government has been given sufficient time to study the Bill in order to reply to it. Today, we tried several times to adjust the Notice Paper, as it was our right to do, but we received no co-operation from the Government and the Deputy Premier would not agree. At 5.50 p.m. with 10 minutes left, we were allowed to adjust our programme, as we should have been allowed to do well before that.

That is a disgraceful situation, and it means that this Government, for reasons of self-preservation, is doing what it wants to do not only in its own time but in the time given to Opposition members to introduce Bills for discussion. Question Time has been cut by half by the action of this Government, but since that scheme has operated Ministers are giving long replies in order to use up the time allowed for questions, and an Opposition member is lucky if he can ask one question in a week. Today, it has been brought to the attention of the House by the Leader and the member for Fisher what happens when we put questions on the Notice Paper and what sort of replies we receive.

Ministers evade our questions and refuse to reply to them. This Government is unfair—it puts politics first. It is not content with having 13 press secretaries and masses of public servants doing research at the cost of millions of dollars to the State, so that the Opposition will be forced to its knees and, at the same time, the Premier will have as much publicity as he can get. Recently, we saw a great display of the Premier's record in a Government department office in New South Wales in order to promote the Premier in that State.

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

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): It is no mean feat to spend seven years in Parliament and know less about the operation of the House than one knows the day one arrives. Yet, the member for Glenelg has accomplished that remarkable feat, as indicated by his speech. He has no idea of the operations of this House, and does not understand what a private member is. His total ignorance was an embarrassment to every member. I guess it is the price that people have to pay for greatness to have lesser individuals trying to drag them down to their level. Today, the honourable member for Davenport and now the honourable member for Glenelg—and honourable is in inverted commas—

Mr. MATHWIN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member for Stuart should recognise that members are addressed as honourable members for whatever district they represent when referred to by another member. The honourable member for Stuart has referred to the member for Davenport and me as honourable in inverted commas. That is a bad procedure, and I ask him to withdraw that remark.

The SPEAKER: I must ask the honourable member for Stuart to refer to the honourable member concerned as "the honourable member" and withdraw the remark "in inverted commas", whatever that may mean.

Mr. KENEALLY: Certainly, Sir. As the honourable member has pointed out, it is merely a title and has nothing to do with whether a gentleman is honourable or otherwise. I accept your decision, Sir. We have seen this vicious attack on the Premier by these two gentlemen trying to drag him down to their size, and there are very few people who are as entitled to the description "lesser individuals" as are those two honourable members today. First, I congratulate the member for Mitcham on his excellent contribution to the Budget debate tonight. His timely warning of the dangers of nuclear proliferation contrasts dramatically with the decision made today, as we heard in the news tonight, by the Returned Services League in Australia, which has moved that Australia should develop its own nuclear capacity. "Deterrent", I think, is the word we use. It amuses me that, when "our side" increases its defence capacity, it is always a deterrent but, when the enemy, whoever it may be (the L.C.L. is paranoiac about it: it could be China yesterday and Russia today), increases its nuclear or defence capacity, it is always for aggressive purposes. What has happened in Australia, with all this anachronistic rubbish that the R.S.L. has been going on with today and the same sort of rubbish we have heard from Lang Hancock in the past two or three days, motivated, I suspect, by our colleague, of ill repute almost, in Queensland, Bjelke-Petersen—

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Why "almost"?

Mr. KENEALLY: —is that we are developing in this country an atmosphere in which the Federal Government can come out and promote this so-called external threat as an answer to all our domestic problems. Everyone knows it has become almost traditional in countries where the Government cannot cope with domestic problems, as our current Federal Government obviously cannot, for that Government to invent this external threat. It is no good for members opposite continually to go on trying to defend Fraser and his ilk. For 10 months they have been in Government and they cannot blame the Whitlam Government any more for the present economic situation of this country. At a time when every comparable trading nation in the world is reducing its rate of inflation and of unemployment, in Australia inflation and unemployment are increasing; they are rampant. The inflation rate is 13·7 per cent and it will increase considerably in the next two or three months, as we all know. What are the prospects of unemployment? Possibly it will be 7 per cent by Christmas. So, of course, Malcolm Fraser, aided and abetted by the woman from England whom this country can well do without, has to invent an external threat, and at the moment that is Russia in the Indian Ocean. It seems to me that the future of the peaceful world depends on countries trusting each other and working together. It does not depend on the paranoia of a country like Australia, isolated and insular from the rest of the world, which believes that it, and it alone, suffers from some aggressive intent from foreign powers.

Mr. Venning: Wake up to yourself!

Mr. KENEALLY: I have been fortunate, and it would be interesting if the honourable member had had the recent experience that I have had. I have been fortunate, and I am thankful to the Parliament, because it obviously showed me more courtesy when it allowed me to go overseas than it intends to show me now. Australia is the only country that suffers from the paranoia about political systems different from ours. I wonder about that. It is all right for the member for Mallee to have a disgusted look on his face, but for too long the Australian conservatives have hidden under the umbrella of some aggressive intent by some foreign country. That, of course, is an encouragement for us to tighten our belts, to accept all kinds of restriction and regulation, together with inflation and unemployment, because it is said that all our effort must be made to defend Australia against a non-existent threat. The Opposition knows that, and has known it for as long as its colleagues in Canberra have known it. The Federal Government, which took over Australia by means of a coup in November last year, has not been able to justify that decision one iota. It is now becoming desperate, and everyone knows just how incompetent and incapable these people are.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It is becoming almost impossible to hear the honourable member.

Mr. KENEALLY: I may even have to raise my voice so that I can be heard above the din. The Opposition does not want to listen to what I am saying, because it is secure in its own little paranoia that has sustained it for the past 20 or 30 years. This so-called external threat has won several elections for the Opposition. It always seemed to me that the Opposition was on very friendly terms with Mao Tse Tung, because every time there was an election in Australia he and his "yellow hordes" were said to be dead set on invading Australia. They were not said to be interested in the country during the term of the Government of the conservatives except at election time. I felt strongly enough, because of the recent announcements and the publicity given to the Returned Services League, Lang Hancock, and Bjelke-Petersen by our media, which does not do Australia credit by publicising the anachronistic ravings of these people whom the country could best do without, to raise this matter. I felt compelled by this publicity to take the time of the House this evening to express these few views about these gentlemen and the attitude generally of the Opposition and its colleagues in Canberra.

Motion carried.

At 10.28 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, September 23, at 2 p.m.