HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, August 3, 1977

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

PETITION: SUCCESSION DUTIES

Mr. LANGLEY presented a petition signed by 24 residents of South Australia, praying that the House would urge the Government to amend the Succession Duties Act so that the present discriminatory position of blood relations was removed and that blood relationships sharing a family property enjoyed at least the same benefits as those available to *de facto* relationships.

Petition received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: JUVENILE COURTS ACT

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Minister of Community Welfare): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I consider this statement necessary in view of a report on page 9 of the *Advertiser* this morning. It contained a criticism of the appointment of Mr. Gordon Bruff, the Acting Director-General of Community Welfare, to the working party established to advise on the implementation of the recommendations of the Royal Commission into the administration of the Adelaide Juvenile Courts Act and other associated matters. In the report, Mr. L. Bryan, Secretary of the Aboriginal Education Foundation, said that, having heard Mr. Bruff give evidence before the Royal Commission, "one's faith can only be shaken". Presumably Mr. Bryan is implying that, as a result of what he heard at the Commission, he judges Mr. Bruff to be an unfit person to be a member of the working party. I would suggest that, on the basis of the statements made by Mr. Bryan, Mr. Bryan is an unfit person to make such a judgment on Mr. Bruff on the grounds that he is unable to get his facts straight despite his presence personally at the Commission. I shall return to the question of facts shortly, but first let me say that Mr. Bruff has my complete and unqualified support, both in his capacity as the Acting Director-General of the Community Welfare Department and as a member of the working party to which he has been appointed. Let me add that Cabinet backed that complete and unqualified support by appointing Mr. Bruff as a member of the working party, and neither my faith nor Cabinet's in Mr. Bruff has been shaken by Mr. Bryan's totally unjustified remarks.

In the report, Mr. Bryan claimed that, during the Commission, Mr. Bruff had several times admitted being unaware of incidents referred to by other witnesses. I point out that Mr. Bruff was the first witness before the Commission; he could not claim he was unaware of incidents referred to by other witnesses, because there had been none. Mr. Bruff was questioned on entries in logbooks from the McNally Training Centre which had been obtained at the request of the Royal Commissioner. He said he had not read the logbooks, and I support that it was perfectly reasonable that he should not have done so.

Mr. Bryan claimed Mr. Bruff had also said he had not known of some decisions by the McNally centre administration. However, a reading of evidence given by Mr. Bruff shows that he clearly stated that he could not be expected to know every detail of every incident, large or small, which occurred within his department. The Commissioner himself agreed with that statement. It is obvious that a departmental Director must delegate responsibilities to his officers. Mr. Bruff made quite clear that on matters of policy and administration he would know the facts and, on matters involving major incidents at training centres, he would know the broad details from reports made to the central office.

Mr. Bryan said that the "Aboriginal Education Foundation was indignant at the way the oral rape of a boy, nine, on remand at McNally had been treated". It takes a little interpretation to work out what Mr. Bryan is talking about here. First, boys aged nine years are never held at McNally. Where secure care was required for a boy of that age, it would be provided at Brookway Park Training Centre, which accommodates boys up to the age of 14 years. One must assume that Mr. Bryan is referring to an incident raised in the Commission concerning a possible sexual assault on a boy aged 16, who was on remand at McNally. The question of oral rape having occurred was certainly raised, but no such offence was ever proved, nor was such an offence witnessed by staff at McNally. Mr. Bruff clearly stated that he believed the police should have been called in to investigate this incident and that an error of judgment may have been made when this was not done. However, he supported the actions of staff at McNally for doing the best possible in the circumstances, both from the point of view of no clear evidence being available on whether an offence had occurred and because the boy concerned did not wish to proceed with charges.

Mr. Bryan also said the foundation was particularly concerned at the indifferent way in which the staff had treated the incident. I believe this is an unwarranted slur on McNally staff, who have proved to my personal satisfaction many times that they are people dedicated to promoting a better future for the boys in their charge. I believe that McNally staff made their judgment on the best information they were able to gather at the time, and that this judgment was made in good faith.

Mr. Bryan states that "in theory, the hard-core older youths are kept from the young and new offenders during the day, but at night they are all in the same dormitory and the young and weak are subject to bullying by older hard-core louts". Mr. Bryan is obviously not aware how training centres operate. At both Brookway Park and McNally, youths there for the first time are kept in a separate unit. There are separate dormitories for each unit, and no mixing occurs at night. Plans to convert dormitory accommodation to individual accommodation have been under way for a considerable time and already, as a result of the Royal Commission, work at the centres has been deferred pending a review of the most appropriate accommodation which should be provided.

Mr. Bryan also claims it is openly admitted by Community Welfare Department officers that rape and assault frequently occur in prisons and institutions. I doubt that any officer of my department, experienced in these matters, would deny that such incidents can happen and do happen in institutions. However, I do not believe they would say such incidents were frequent. At McNally, there is a night officer for each unit. This does not make it impossible for incidents of this kind to occur, but it certainly removes the possibility of its being frequent. Finally, Mr. Bryan implies that only threats of substantial compensation to rape victims would induce McNally staff to make a meaningful attempt to stamp out this practice. This is another completely unwarranted slur on McNally

staff, who are as opposed as is any other decent member of the community to the occurrence of rape or any other sexual offence.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following written answer to a question be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

COMMUNITY WELFARE CENTRES

In reply to Mrs. BYRNE (July 28):

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: A preliminary design brief was prepared by the Community Council for Social Development and is being studied in the department prior to proposals being forwarded to the Public Buildings Department. That department will then need to prepare designs, specifications and a cost estimate, and it is expected that the project will need to be submitted to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works for its approval. Even if all those matters could be completed satisfactorily, in view of the reduced amount of Loan moneys allocated to South Australia this year, it would not be possible to commence building operations before 1978-79 at the earliest.

JUVENILE INSTITUTIONS

Mr. TONKIN: Can the Minister of Community Welfare say why he was not aware of the disturbing practices and happenings at McNally Training Centre and other institutions before evidence was given to the recent Royal Commission, and will he consider appointing a member of the field staff of the department to the working party that has been set up? The evidence presented to the Royal Commission (and I am not referring to the press reports this morning) was widely reported and gravely disturbing in many respects. It disclosed the fact that senior officers of the department, and presumably the Minister, were totally unaware of many of the details given in evidence at that time, including incidents involving juveniles convicted of serious offences and sexual offences mixing with boys in the remand section, boys thus presumed to be innocent. The Commissioner pointed out to the Deputy Director of the department that he realised things were happening in the system that the Deputy Director had never heard of. The Minister announced a Government inquiry into security at youth assessment and training centres on June 28, 1976, following repeated calls by the Opposition. I remind the honourable member who snorted that we did in fact advocate the Royal Commission, too. The Minister stated in a letter to the *Advertiser* on March 8, 1977, that he hoped that the committee appointed to investigate the training programmes, facilities, and security at all youth assessment and training centres would produce a range of recommendations to help further the Government's aim of providing the best treatment for young offenders, and yet he and his senior officers were obviously unaware of the true state of affairs at these centres. Why, as the responsible Minister, was he not in possession of these facts; who was to blame for this deplorable state of affairs; and what action has he now taken to ensure that he can properly discharge his responsibilities in the future?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I would have thought that, the Leader's having appeared before the Commissioner and given evidence that he had personally been one of the architects of the original plan for the treatment of juvenile offenders in South Australia, he would have the decency to accept the fact that he has not always been right. I am perfectly willing to say that I am not always right. If I remember correctly, the Leader also agreed with the Royal Commissioner that, in the time that had passed since he and others had, in good faith, put forward ideas for the treatment of juveniles, there had been changes, and evaluations of the behaviour of juveniles had brought forth new ideas that should be considered. The Leader does not seem to be as forthright recently as he used to be. I suggest that he would also, if pressed, agree before this House that he does not know everything that goes on, even in his own household, any more than I do or anybody else does. As I have already pointed out today, those of us in positions of authority or power have to delegate. Inability to delegate is one sure sign of a person in charge being the wrong person for the job.

Secondly, the Leader tried to imply that it was as a result of actions by the Opposition that caused the Government to set up an inquiry headed by Dr. Richard Nies. He said the inquiry was announced on June 28, but, from memory, I think it was in July. I hate to disillusion the Leader, but the idea germinated in my head, without any assistance from him, whilst I was flying from Perth to Adelaide, discussing the Community Welfare Department with the Director-General of that department, Mr. Ian Cox. Whilst I can understand the Leader wanting to get on the bandwaggon, I assure him that that was not the case: it was not the Opposition's raising this matter. A period had elapsed in which certain methods were being used, some evaluation had been undertaken, and that, in those circumstances, we ought to have independent, skilled, professional advice on the future course to be taken in these matters.

I know that this State will be grateful to the Government and that every juvenile in this State who subsequently receives treatment will be grateful to the Nies committee. They will also be grateful to the Royal Commission, which has recently been held. I was a little surprised to hear the Leader try to claim credit for that also. I suppose if one is running second all the time, one must try to get on to something for which one can gain some credibility, but I suggest that recent polls of the man in the street, to quote the member for Fisher, have shown that the credibility of the Leader is at an all time low. Earlier I referred to the change in the Leader's forthrightness. I suggest that if there is an area in which he ought not to dabble on a political basis it is on the question of our young people.

I believe that, when he was a member of the social welfare advisory committee some years ago, he was genuine, he gave of his best, and came up with ideas for the treatment of juveniles. Now he is trying to come up with some sort of political issue at the expense of the young people of this State. It does him little credit. I suggest that this indicates the position his Party is in: it is not coming up with any policies. All that it is trying to do is generate some kind of smear or fear in this area. It is interesting to note that, of the members in this House, the only member who was chided by the Royal Commissioner (or rebuked, which I suppose is the correct term) was the Leader. That is a rather unique distinction. All of us who did not gain that distinction are

rather pleased that we did not, because to be chided publicly in that way emphasises what I have been referring to, that is, the present political nature of the Leader. I repeat that I have no quarrel with the work he did some years ago, and no quarrel with his *bona fides* at that time. They can only be suspect now because of the way in which he approaches this matter. Amongst the plethora of questions the Leader asked me I think he asked whether I would consider appointing a member of the field staff to that committee. The answer is "Yes", and, as proof of my *bona fides* in the matter, I point out that the Nies committee, which was originated by me and which was supported and accepted by the Cabinet of the Labor Government (and had nothing to do with the Opposition rabble), had on it a member of the field staff. I think the Leader would know that, but he chooses conveniently to ignore it. I assure the Leader that I will certainly examine this area, but I do not intend at this stage to usurp the role of the working committee, which was set up to examine both the results of the Royal Commission and the report from the Nies committee, and to make some recommendations to the Government for implementation.

When those recommendations are put forward, the Government will take the necessary action, as indicated in the statement I made earlier. At present a holding operation is being conducted. The Leader would be the first to chide me and the Government for spending money unnecessarily on something that may have to be changed in a few weeks or few months time. I am sure all members know that this is what he attempts to do, on false premises most of the time. I am not going to accept from him that sort of charge. Having regard to the fairly flimsy nature of what has been suggested, the Leader has received more than the reply that he expected.

LEGAL AID

Mr. SLATER: Can the Attorney-General say whether the allocation of funds by the Federal Government to the Australian Legal Aid Office has been reduced and what effect this action will have on persons seeking aid in South Australia?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I know that funds to the Australian Legal Aid Office have been cut by the present Government. The cuts have been going on almost from the day the Federal Government took office, as it has shown its contempt for the Australian Legal Aid Office during the time it has been in office by the way it has carefully sought not only to reduce funds for the office but also to reduce the effectiveness and efficiency of that office. From the time this Government took office the Attorney-General made it patently clear that his prime desire was to ensure that the Australia Legal Aid Office was completely abolished and destroyed. The Federal Government has gone about that process efficiently.

It has tried to cover up the fact that it was totally opposed to providing legal aid in this way by seeking to have the States take over the responsibility for funding legal aid. We as a State, and the other Labor States especially, have stood out strongly against any moves to force the States to take over financial responsibility for the Australian Legal Aid Office and, as a result of that action, the Federal Government has now conceded that Federal finance will be needed to provide legal aid in Australia. Its officers are negotiating to provide funds for the State Legal Services Commission in South Australia, and I understand that those negotiations are well advanced.

Notwithstanding the fact that those negotiations have not been finally concluded, there has been a cut-back in the funds available to the A.L.A.O., and, accordingly, there has been a cut-back in the services it has been able to provide. It has been manifested in the way that the Federal Government has directed the Australian Legal Aid Office to change the means tests, and in the way the Federal Liberal Government has tampered with the means test to ensure that fewer people in Australia are able to claim legal aid through the Australian Legal Aid Office. From my own experience with the Australian Legal Aid Office branch at Elizabeth I know that it is not now able to deal with all matters brought to it by people. The office cannot provide legal aid to all the people who seek legal aid from it. This has been a pattern that has been developing more and more. It has certainly been a pattern that has been encouraged by the Federal Government, because that Government well knows that, by reducing the availability of legal aid and by lowering the efficiency of the Australian Legal Aid Office, most members of the community will reach the stage at which they will begin to criticise the Australian Legal Aid Office, and the Federal Government will then be able to push all the myths that the Liberal Party so loves to push about the inefficiency of Government services and that sort of thing.

No doubt, that is the basis of the Federal Government's attitude on this matter, and it is managing to some extent to do that effectively, because people in the community are reaching the stage in which they find that, when they go to an Australian Legal Aid Office, they are forced to wait for a long time and that the lawyer they do see is overworked and cannot pay the sort of personal attention to their matter that they have the right to expect a Government service of that sort should provide. Accordingly, morale is low in the office, and the staff generally believe that they are not getting the sort of support that they should expect from a Government. The effect is that Federal Liberal members can tell people, "Well, you don't expect to get good services out of this type of Government-run agency." Inevitably, they say that Government agencies run second-rate services. That is a myth and a lie: it is not true. Properly funded, efficient Government offices can be equally as good as any private service in providing legal aid to poor, necessitous people. I should think that this is an area out of which the Federal Government could have left politics, and could have simply proceeded to provide legal aid in the way in which the office had been established. Unfortunately, that was not to be, and the Federal Government should be roundly condemned for its attitude towards the Australian Legal Aid Office.

JUVENILE INSTITUTIONS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Minister of Community Welfare outline what action has been taken by him to ensure that hard-core offenders are isolated from young and new offenders in institutions for which he is responsible? On November 24, 1976, the member for Glenelg asked the Minister a question about hard-core offenders being allowed to mix with first offenders at McNally Training Centre. In his reply, the Minister, after roundly abusing the member for Glenelg in a somewhat similar fashion, I might say, to the abuse he levelled today—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Come on! Get on with it.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I would suggest—

The SPEAKER: Order! I must ask the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to only ask his question. The honourable member must not debate the issue nor concern himself with interjections that make him stray from the question.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I realise that more latitude is given to replies to questions than is given to the asking of questions, so I shall try to confine myself—

Mr. Whitten: Now you're reflecting on the Chair.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I heard the statement made from the Chair.

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the honourable member that the statement made from the Chair was that the replies to questions are beyond the control of the Speaker. However, I also point out (and this practice is increasing) that members who are asking questions are not asking one question but are asking several. I am sure that if the honourable member would review the question asked a few moments ago by his Leader, he would realise that more than one question was asked in that so-called question. The honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I shall continue with my question, and quote from the question asked by the member for Glenelg of the Minister. In his reply, the Minister said, among other things:

Secondly, what he has put forward would be about the greatest mish-mash and hotch-potch of the facts that it has been my misfortune to have to listen to for some time. What is going on at McNally is what should be going on.

We have heard the Minister refer in rather unflattering terms to the remarks of Mr. Bryan, in his earlier statement today. The Royal Commissioner in his report also refers to the matter in my question, because his report states, at page 62:

At present such children are prosecuted and can as a result find themselves in either Brookway Park or Vaughan House. This result is undesirable for two main reasons. First, these children have committed no criminal offence in the true sense. Secondly, in such institutions they will associate with children who have in some instances committed serious crimes on more than one occasion.

Then again, referring more especially to McNally, at page 75 of his report the Commissioner states:

One disturbing feature arose from the evidence about remand facilities at McNally Training Centre. This centre holds some young offenders who are not susceptible to treatment: for example, murderers and at least one rapist. They are held in the remand section (in fact, the old maximum security section) and although efforts are made to keep them apart from children on remand, in the very nature of things this is not entirely possible. It is highly undesirable that children who may not be guilty and who are in fact by law deemed to be innocent at that stage (that is, pre-court appearance for trial) should be associating with convicted children. As a matter of some urgency some provision should be made for these long-term detainees to be held apart from children on remand.

That is the end of the quotation from the report. Evidence presented to the Royal Commissioner indicates quite clearly that the Minister did not know what was going on when he replied to the member for Glenelg. Because of these facts, I ask what is being done at present to separate these hard-core offenders from the other less serious offenders or those who, in fact, are on remand.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I think the question was what action is being taken to segregate the hard-core offenders. If I remember rightly, the question asked by the member for Glenelg in November last used a somewhat harsher term than that, and I am sure the honourable member would be honest enough to remind me. The reference was not to "old lags", but it was something along those lines.

Mr. Mathwin: All I can remember is the way you dealt with me.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I dealt with the honourable member according to his deserts. The honourable member at the time clearly indicated that what he was putting up, when it was examined, was the mish-mash and hotch-potch to which I referred. On reflection, I can only say that I would not add a word to that explanation if I were asked to give it again to the member for Glenelg. I think it probably still applies. However, in fairness to the member for Glenelg—

Mr. Chapman: Oh come on, the question came from the front bench.

The SPEAKER: Order! If there were fewer interjections, replies would be more readily forthcoming. As I have pointed out previously, interjections invite rebuttal. The honourable Minister of Community Welfare.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The member for Glenelg did one thing for which he should be given credit. Subsequent to that period he indicated to me that he would like to visit McNally and, subsequently, with due credit to him, he visited the place and inspected it. Since that time, as I have not received one communication from him on that matter, I was perhaps credible enough to assume that what he had seen there had satisfied any query or curiosity he had about the place. I think he was accompanied by the member for Alexandra, and their visit occurred some time in March, at about 3 p.m. or 4 p.m. I understand from my officers that the honourable members were shown everything they wished to see and, to the best of my knowledge, they did not express anything other than satisfaction. I stand to be corrected on that if the honourable member has some comment. The question being asked is unfortunate, because it assumes that everybody wears a guise: a rapist has a special label and other young persons, who have committed any of these crimes enumerated by the Deputy Leader, are in a different shape, or label, or box; I am not sure what he is driving at.

Mr. Goldsworthy: I was quoting from the Royal Commissioner's report, you dope.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: That remark was unparliamentary.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Anything from the Deputy Leader does not have the validity it would have if it came from somebody else, so I do not intend to give that remark due weight. The Royal Commissioner's report can be quoted from other pages also: for example, despite what the Commissioner said, he also called on Community Welfare Department officers for assistance in those same areas, and this is referred to in the report, as the Deputy Leader knows. He asked for the services of Mr. Althuizen, and his services were readily made available to the Commissioner in order to assist him in arriving at the conclusions he has arrived at. I am not quarrelling with those conclusions. I have already pointed out to the Commissioner that the Government acted immediately to set up a working party to remain in consultation with Judge Mohr on this topic to ascertain what needs to be done in that area. Some of the staff have appeared before the Commissioner. There have been group discussions under the guidance of Mr. Meldrum, officer in charge in that area, as to the treatment of juveniles contained therein, whether they be on remand, on assessment or actually under treatment.

The whole question about the security at McNally and of the class of accommodation is in a state of fluidity, as I have told the House several times especially when the honourable member for Light, I think, asked me a

question in relation to security. It is not a static position. Officers at McNally are fully aware of the differences in characteristics displayed by juveniles, depending on the crime that they are there for, and I have confidence in their ability to provide the best accommodation that can be provided in the circumstances. I do not know what else the Deputy Leader wants from me. Is he suggesting that I should go out there and do it myself? That would be ludicrous. I am not qualified in that area. It is the task of any Minister in this House, or in any Government, to accept the advice of the people who are professionally competent to give it. I have cited to him the fact that the Royal Commissioner was perfectly happy to accept professional advice from Mr. Althuizen, one of the officers of that department, so I do not know what else he is trying to get from me. I assure him that I am conscious of the needs of the public in this area, and also of the needs of those juveniles. I intend to continue to discharge this office in the way that I have, to the best of my responsibility. I cannot offer him any more than that. I would have thought that that would be satisfactory.

STUART HIGHWAY

Mr. KENEALLY: Can the Minister of Transport say whether his attention has been drawn to a statement that was made on the 5CK news this morning and, I understand, on the regional ABC television news last evening in the north of the State, to the effect that a Liberal Senator has claimed that the State Government, and especially the Minister, is not concerned about upgrading the Stuart Highway: he, in fact, said that the Minister was completely apathetic about it. This Senator is well known in Port Augusta for his interest in the area being confined to making political points. I am afraid that there may be some people in South Australia who take him seriously: for that reason, I ask the Minister whether he can tell the House what the correct situation is.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am aware that the Senator was reported by the national radio station this morning as having made some remarks, which at the very least one would call a great pity. At worst, however, I think it is just malicious politicking. Some Opposition members would be well versed in this area, as is Senator Jessop. The facts ought to be laid down once and for all so that there is no more cheap snide politicking on this question. The facts are these: in the latter part of last year, the highways construction gang, which was at that time working on the Willunga Hill deviation road, was informed that it was being transferred to the North to start the building of the Stuart Highway. In support of that decision, the Premier wrote to the Prime Minister seeking his approval for the Highways Department staff to be domiciled at Woomera. Our intention was quite plain. That decision was made in the belief that the worst the State would get in funds for national roads would be the same amount as was received in 1976-77, namely, $17 300 000. However, we hoped that the Federal Government would provide the sum that had been recommended by the Bureau of Roads, namely, $21 600 000, but instead the Federal Government cut the funds to South Australia to $15 000 000. If one adds the escalation factor to that, South Australia suffered a reduction of about 25 per cent in funds for national highways. To say, as Senator Jessop has done, that South Australia is apathetic to the question is wrong. It is his Government—the Government he put in office when he supported the action of holding up Supply in 1975—that has created this starving of funds to South Australia. The Senator would be better served and would serve South Australia much better if he contacted the Federal Minister and asked for additional funds. I want to make it quite plain that, although South Australia is receiving only $15 000 000 for national highways, the works programme that has been provided to members of the Opposition shows that we propose spending $20 800 000; in other words, $5 800 000 of State funds is also going into national roads. If any members of the Opposition or Senator Jessop are prepared to tell me what job they would cut out so that the money could be spent to seal this 50-kilometre section, I would be very pleased to hear what they have to offer. Until the Federal Government provides the funds necessary, the Stuart Highway cannot proceed.

JUVENILE INSTITUTIONS

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Community Welfare appoint an Aboriginal to the working party to advise on implementing recommendations of the Royal Commission into the Juvenile Courts? The Minister is aware, I am sure, that a higher than average number of Aborigines are inmates at McNally Home. The Minister would also know that there is a need for their specific problems to be fully understood. I am concerned that there is no representative of the Aborigines on the working party.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: It is not an unreasonable question for the honourable member and I welcome it. It is much better than many he tries to deal up. It shows some thought, and I am pleased to receive it. Perhaps the honourable member is not aware that the members of the party that functions as the Dr. Nies committee had a representative who was an Aboriginal. There has been a continuous Aboriginal input into the Nies committee, which sat from June last year to about July this year. It was in July that I announced we had the report. Therefore, at almost every session or meeting of the committee an Aboriginal viewpoint has been put forward. The honourable member may not have realised that Judge Newman, of the Juvenile Court, who was a member of the Nies committee, is also a member of the working party. The Government has tried to cut down the size of the working party to keep it to a handy size so that it can get on with the task which we all agree needs to be carried out. We have had two committees of inquiry, costing the State money, that have produced worthwhile ideas. I think we ought to try to put them into practice. The idea of the Government was to get the matter under way as soon as possible. The question has some merit, and I will look at it in more detail.

GRAND JUNCTION ROAD

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Transport obtain a report on the current planning of the Highways Department regarding the reconstruction and widening of Grand Junction Road between North-East Road at Holden Hill and Anstey Hill? The Minister will be aware that I have raised this matter previously by correspondence and by questions and speeches in this House. I referred to the matter also in the adjournment debate last evening, when I elaborated on the reasons why this work needed a high priority.

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

LIBYA

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Premier say whether the Government is satisfied about this State's trading relations with Libya? I have personally felt some unease about the encouragement of our trade with Libya over recent months, and I am prompted to ask a question by a comment by Max Harris in the *Sunday Mail* last Sunday. I saw in another part of the *Mail* that the Premier spends the first part of each Sunday snorting about what is said in that column about him. Now that the matter has been raised publicly in that way, I think it only proper that it should be raised in this House, because, as I understand it, there is broad agreement that there should not be trading relations with countries like Rhodesia or South Africa, and that was mentioned in the article.

Mr. Becker: Can we afford to lose the business?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Maybe the member for Hanson does not give a damn about moral questions: I do not know. There seems to be little doubt that the regime in Libya is repressive and totalitarian and, in our eyes, totally undesirable, yet we are doing everything we can to encourage our trading links with that country. It seems to me that the principle is the same as the principle we have applied in relation to other countries such as South Africa and Rhodesia. I put the question to the Premier because it is his Government that has taken the lead in fostering those trade relations.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: On the question of trade relations with countries with whose domestic policies we disagree, the Government of South Australia has of course taken note of United Nations decisions and declarations in this area. In consequence, since there are specific resolutions in relation to Rhodesia, the Government is not involved in assistance in a development fashion in that country. We do believe, however, that it should be the general policy of developed countries to assist in the economic development of under-developed countries and that it is an obligation on our part to provide expertise and technology where we are able to assist development. That does not imply involvement in or endorsement of the domestic policies of the Government concerned. I point out to the honourable member that close relations exist between the South Australian Government and the development policies of the Malaysian Government, but that does not mean that the South Australian Government endorses or supports many aspects of the domestic policy of Malaysia. This Government does not. However, in involvement in the anti-poverty and development programme, in accordance with the decisions of the Lima conference, we believe that the South Australian Government is acting completely correctly. Regarding what is happening in Libya, the trade relations are that we have an agreement with the Libyan Government to provide dry-land farming at an experimental and demonstration area at El Marj. In addition, expertise has been provided to Libya for the development of dry-land farming techniques, and equipment has been provided to improve the food supply in the poor areas of that country. The provision of dry-land farming techniques to Libya has been, of course, to the advantage of our manufacturers and our seed growers' co-operative.

Mr. Millhouse: That is one of the ingredients in the decision: it is profitable to South Australia to foster these trade links.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is profitable to South Australia but, at the same time, the basis of the relationship is such that there is clearly no exploitation by South Australia: it is entirely in accordance with the Lima conference decisions. Indeed, a reason why Mr. Bakewell, the Director-General of Trade and Development for South Australia, is now the Deputy Chairman of the Commonwealth Secretariat on developing countries (the special committee of that secretariat) is his expertise in this area.

Mr. Tonkin: It does him great credit.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It does. Plainly, if the South Australian Government was to confine its relations with other countries to those countries with which we agreed entirely in the international and domestic policies, we would have relations with few countries and States in the world. In fact, it would be extremely difficult to have much to do with Queensland.

JUVENILE INSTITUTIONS

Mr. RODDA: Can the Minister of Community Welfare inform the House whether his department is continuing the practice of deliberately holding in custody juvenile offenders remanded for a three-week assessment at the McNally Training Centre for much longer periods? I refer to the Royal Commission into the Juvenile Courts Act, during which Judge Mohr spoke of a deliberate practice to delay the release of juveniles at the McNally Training Centre. Judge Mohr, the Royal Commissioner, said that some juveniles remanded for a three-week assessment at the training centre were deliberately being held in custody for longer periods. Judge Mohr said it had apparently been decided by the people at McNally that another couple of weeks in custody would do certain offenders a world of good. Apparently, the way this system worked was that, at the end of the assessment period, someone would stand up in court and apologise that the assessment had not been completed, and would ask for a further remand in custody. At the time, Mr. Bruff, the then Acting Director-General of the Community Welfare Department, said he was very much opposed to the practice which was contrary to departmental policy.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: It was not my understanding that it was thought to be a deliberate practice. "Apparently deliberate" was the inference I drew originally. To my knowledge it certainly was not common practice, as has been suggested. The department is aware of what is contained in the Royal Commissioner's report, because Mr. Althuizen from the department was involved directly with assisting the Commission, as is shown at the end of the report. The honourable member probably has not yet read the report but is operating from the prepared sheet which he is using for the question. For that reason it may not have been apparent to him. I would not agree with that practice either, if it were so: I am not saying that I agree that it was so. The Commissioner may have believed it, and I have no control over what the Commissioner genuinely believed. I did not think it was a deliberate practice when I read of it, but what is in the report is very clearly known throughout the department and, in discussions with the Acting Director-General, this is one of the things that I have mentioned.

Mr. RUSSACK: What action has the Minister of Community Welfare taken to stop the use of the treatment known as guided group interaction, which has been used widely in juvenile institutions in South Australia and which,

in evidence before the Royal Commission, was said to have bad psychological effects on certain people? At page 103 of his report, the Commissioner states:

Guided group interaction is a recognised method of treatment and is and has been widely used both with children and adults. It is the subject of much debate in the literature and is seen by some as being the panacea for all problems and at the other end of the spectrum as being virtually useless and potentially (at least) positively dangerous . . . It has been described as "highly abrasive", and a child with a personality disorder which makes him unsuitable for such a programme can, in some witnesses' opinion, be subjected to psychiatric damage.

The Commissioner goes on to say:

I have come to the conclusion that to insist on guided group interaction being the sole treatment model is to take too narrow a view of the matter.

Then, I believe, a request was made of the Minister by the Commissioner to appoint Mr. Althuizen to be in charge of an inquiry. The report continues:

The project I wished Mr. Althuizen to undertake was a survey of institutions interstate which were comparable in function with those in this State and to eventually report to me on his findings with recommendations for improvements in South Australia.

Towards the end of his report, Mr. Althuizen states:

These guided group interaction programmes have largely been discontinued, with a number of reasons being cited: the technique was felt to have led to increased conflict and hostility amongst residents; it was said to have had a negative effect on staff (who were reportedly taking the problem orientation and conflict home with them); the problem assignation was seen to provide residents with justification for their behaviour; it often aroused excessive guilt and anxiety in residents; the need for an extensive investment of continuing training to reinforce competence and measure effective; the pressure resulted in high turnover of staff.

I therefore ask the Minister what action, if any, he has taken to stop the use of the treatment known as guided group interaction.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The question is an interesting one. Probably the only area of agreement in the handling of juvenile offenders throughout the world (and I am sure the Leader would agree) is that total detention with no treatment does not seem to do much good for the juvenile. Once we get away from that standpoint, there are different schools of thought. There is a method of treatment known as transactional analysis. The very title suggests intriguing possibilities, and I do not propose to go into this for two reasons: first, I am not qualified in that area; secondly, that is not before us.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: And third, there is a good book on it in the library which honourable members can read if they want to.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: There are other methods of treatment advocated by various disciplines in the corrective sphere throughout the world. Interestingly, when Professor Sarri arrives here shortly for a sabbatical at Flinders University, we will endeavour to get very high level advice on treatment methods generally. The question actually asked is what has been done to stop G.G.I. at McNally. What I did, on the advice of my professional officers (and I made an announcement about this, which has apparently escaped the attention of the person who helped the honourable member to prepare the question: I do not remember on what date I made it, but it was subsequent to the period of the document, or prior to it; we changed from two units to one) was make an announcement so there could be no doubt in anyone's mind that the kind of information that was coming from the Royal Commission was freely available and readily known at McNally among the staff generally.

There has been a reduction. I am not in any way attempting to question anything in the Royal Commissioner's report. We have the working party to analyse it and give advice to the Government, but it does seem to me that the statement that G.G.I. is totally discredited, if that is so what is implied, is a little hard. I do not think that is so.

Mr. Mathwin: It's caused havoc at McNally though, hasn't it?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I would not agree with that. The honourable member ought to be fair. I gave him credit for a step he took which many members of the Opposition and most of the Judiciary never took (as the Royal Commissioner pointed out): they had ready access to these places but few availed themselves of it. The member for Glenelg did, so I hope he will not spoil it now by getting in where he is not required. I am giving a fair answer to the question. It seems to me, on the reading I have been able to do (and I can speak only for Ron Payne here; I cannot absorb everyone's opinion or do everything wanted), that it is not totally discredited. It needs judicious application, and it is very heavily dependent on the use of very competent and highly trained staff. I think that the honourable member knows that. One of the problem areas with the G.G.I. is that one cannot always get the staff that one wants. There are vacancies, and despite unemployment in the country we are still unable to get all the staff we want. I think that what I have done in this area is reasonable at this time, bearing in mind that it is really not a good idea to pre-empt the report of the working party any more than we possibly have to do at this stage.

Mr. WARDLE: Can the Minister of Community Welfare say whether the Government in future will accept responsibility and pay compensation for damage that is done by juveniles who abscond from institutions? Most members who have been in this Parliament for any great length of time have found it necessary to write to one or two or three Ministers about absconders and the destruction that they have created to property in members' electorates. I recall an occasion when a young professional man had a valuable vehicle stolen. That vehicle contained more than $1 000 worth of equipment. This young man had a family of three children. Theft of the vehicle forced him into bankruptcy, through no fault of his own, because his vehicle was driven into the Murray River about 100 miles from where he lived and where the vehicle was stolen. This is a serious matter. It has been the reason for a number of motions in this House in the past. It has become the accepted policy of the Liberal Party, and I suggest that, if the Government is to accept the responsibility for rehabilitating young offenders who abscond from its institutions, it ought to accept responsibilty for compensating members of the public whose property has been damaged or stolen because of an absconder's action.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I notice, Sir, that the honourable member has asked me whether the Government will in future do what he requires. I cannot speak for the Government; I can speak only for myself. I say, as a Minister, that I would certainly consider this kind of action in the future. The Government, of course, in this State is collective by way of Cabinet, and no doubt the other Ministers who are here, and the Premier, will also

have heard the honourable member's question and will give it the consideration it requires.

Mr. VANDEPEER: Can the Minister of Community Welfare say how many offenders have absconded from the McNally Training Centre, Brookway Park, and Vaughan House Training Centre since January 1 this year, and of these how many have absconded previously?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: That question has some merit. For a start, it's brief.

Mr. Millhouse: You're getting good at allotting marks.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: It is interesting to hear the honourable member taking umbrage at my allotting marks when he gives us free legal advice all the time without being asked.

Mr. Becker: It's never any good.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: No. I am surprised at his taking umbrage. What has been asked for is factual details. I do not have them on hand, and I suggest that when the honourable member gets the answer he will probably wish he had not asked the question, because I can assure him that there has been a considerable reduction.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Can the Minister of Community Welfare say what is the current cost to the Government to keep each juvenile offender in an Adelaide institution?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think there is a Question on Notice about that.

Mr. CHAPMAN: There is, but it is not the question that I raise. I have read that carefully, and I ask the Minister to listen to my question.

The SPEAKER: Will the honourable member repeat the question?

Mr. CHAPMAN: What is the current cost to the Government of keeping each juvenile offender in an Adelaide training institution? That is not consistent with the Question on Notice.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: How do you know?

Mr. CHAPMAN: Because I have read it.

Mr. BECKER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. That is covered by a Question on Notice.

Mr. CHAPMAN: May I proceed with the explanation, Mr. Speaker? With respect, the term I used was "current", meaning "at present", and so it is not consistent with the Question on Notice. On August 5, 1976—

The SPEAKER: Order! One moment while I check this. It is not exactly the same, but it is similar to the Question on Notice. I will allow the question, but it is very much on the borderline. The honourable member may proceed with his explanation.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Because it is a borderline question it is of particular interest to me, especially when one refers to the article that appeared in the *News* of August 5, 1976, where in some detail are reported the actual costs the Government was incurring at that time in relation to offenders in respective training institutions. For example, whilst the heading indicates that it cost at that time about $80 a day an offender, it went on to cite several institutions, including Lochiel Park, McNally, and Vaughan House: incidentally, the latter two were considerably less than the $80 a day claimed in the heading. I should like details of present costs to the Government, if the Minister is able to provide those.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, you have ruled that the question is borderline. So I am happy to reply to it. The member asked for the figures for the present year: that will be for the 1977-78 financial year. When I have those figures, I will let him have them.

BUS QUEUES

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister of Transport say whether employees of the State Transport Authority have control over queues at city bus stops when ticket sellers are operating? In March this year a pensioner constituent of mine was standing in a queue. When the queue moved forward, she fell over an unattended school case that was on the ground. My constituent was knocked unconscious by the fall, and suffered a fractured nose, a pierced eardrum, and internal bleeding. She is still attending the out-patients section of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. Because she did not get the name and address of the student who owned the case, she wrote to the State Transport Authority, and was visited on a Saturday afternoon by an officer of that authority, who told her that the authority was not liable. The Adelaide City Council also informed her that it was not liable. My constituent has suffered much inconvenience and pain since the fall. Could some control be instituted, or could some request be made to students especially, not to leave their cases or bags unattended in a queue at a bus stop when they are window shopping or talking to some other person?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: A report on this matter has crossed my desk, but as I am now quoting from memory, if details are not correct, I will have them checked and let the honourable member know. At this queue, as far as I am aware, there was no queue ticket seller: therefore, obviously there was no-one in charge. However, I understand that, even if such a person is present, he is simply a ticket seller and his responsibility starts and finishes there. He has no power of a special constable, or anything of that sort, to require people to remain in a queue, to move up, or do anything of that nature. I think all he would have is the power of persuasion to prevail upon people to act properly. It is to the credit of Adelaide people that in general they respect queues; rarely will a queue jumper be found in Adelaide. The problem, as I recall it, was caused by someone unknown leaving a case on the footpath, and this lady unfortunately tripped over it in attempting to board the bus. I do not think it is reasonable to expect the State Transport Authority to assume responsibility for improper actions of people unknown in leaving cases or anything else. I do not know how such a problem could be resolved. I fear that the cost of meeting all kinds of claims could be quite prohibitive: if we start with one, we would have to meet them all. I will examine the docket again to ascertain whether anything further can be done. However, to the best of my knowledge, the lady tripped over a case left on the footpath, and that had no connection with the State Transport Authority. If there were any recourse to legal proceedings, I presume it would be against the Adelaide City Council, because the case was left on the footpath.

At 3.15 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

MOTOR FUEL RATIONING (TEMPORARY PROVISIONS) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 2. Page .)

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I support this Bill with some reluctance, at least its second reading. My reluctance is obviously associated with the deep significance attached to a Bill of this nature, introduced in any Parliament and in any system of Parliamentary democracy. The Government of any State or any nation is responsible to the people through Parliament. Nothing should take away from the democratic rights of members of Parliament their ability to represent the people of this State. I regret that we have to consider such legislation; I regret that there is some risk that motor fuel supplies will be cut off, and that we must be prepared to meet the circumstances that arise if that happens. Retrospectivity is a form of legislation to which we, as a Party, are totally opposed, and to which the Government is basically opposed, although it has slipped a few times.

Emergency legislation comes into a similar category, because it deals with the future and with a hypothetical situation, and sets out reserve powers that can be initiated without the specific approval of Parliament. In other words, Parliament is today being asked to accept legislation for a hypothetical situation that may arise in the future. As such, it is totally impossible for us to consider every possibility that may arise in the future. Therefore, I believe that any emergency legislation setting out these reserve powers can only be treated with great caution and great care. It is necessary that we be prepared for an emergency at any time. The fact that we are prepared to deal with an emergency should never be used as an excuse to keep the subject or the cause of the emergency, the direct set of circumstances, out of Parliament and away from Parliamentary debate and examination. Emergency legislation is no substitute for specific consideration of a specific matter, or a specific set of circumstances. Emergency legislation is no substitute for specific legislation designed to deal with a set of specific circumstances.

For that reason, emergency legislation, when it is passed, must be of a transient nature only. The Opposition strongly believes that each emergency, if it is serious enough to warrant the introducing of emergency legislation, is serious enough to warrant the calling together of Parliament if it is not sitting, or the immediate consideration of the problem by Parliament if it is sitting. This is the crux of the matter which we are debating. Emergency legislation of this kind, which will allow for motor fuel rationing, inevitably will impinge on the freedoms and rights of individuals. It may be that it is necessary that a Government infringe on those rights to meet a particular set of circumstances, but no Government must believe that it has that power in its own right and that it should hold that power from one election to another. That right is a right which members of the elected Parliament hold on behalf of the people who elected them, and they safeguard, and it is their duty to safeguard, the rights of every individual.

Obviously, any emergency must be brought into the people's place, the Parliament of this State, for debate as soon as it is possible to do so. For that reason, I find the date set down for the completion of this piece of legislation, October 31, nearly three months from this date, to be totally inappropriate and totally contradictory to the whole spirit of emergency legislation. We are being asked by this Government to give away for one-quarter of a year our fundamental rights to speak on behalf of the people on what could be a most important matter affecting every aspect of their lives. I am not prepared as an individual member to give away that right, and I do not believe any member of Parliament should be prepared to give away that right and responsibility. When the Minister introduced this Bill, he gave as the reason that Parliament would be up next week and that to avoid calling Parliament back we would have to get the Bill through this week. I will accept that no-one particularly wants to interrupt a busy schedule. If Parliament will be up next week (and we all have appointments because of that), I still do not believe that is sufficient reason for not bringing the matter into the House. I for one, and I speak I am sure for all members of the Opposition, if duty calls and these matters must be discussed, will be only too happy to come back to Parliament and discuss them and give them our full attention.

The matter could be reviewed periodically. I am prepared to accept that emergency legislation may be necessary to deal with the short term. Obviously, the Minister has some inside information which members on this side do not have. Obviously, he is expecting some sort of major fuel crisis. I suspect that he knows what contingency plans are in effect for the situation following the outcome of the Zaphir case in Toowoomba. Mr. Zaphir, who is the organiser of the Storemen and Packers Union—

The SPEAKER: Order! There is nothing in the Bill about the Zaphir case. This is merely a Bill to control the distribution of fuel.

Mr. TONKIN: There is reference in the second reading speech of the Minister to a dispute, but nevertheless I will accept your ruling, Sir. There is nevertheless evidence that there has been a case recently of a union official threatening an agent with a ban on supplies of motor fuel. That occurred in Toowoomba, and for the first time an old Queensland law is being used to lay charges against that trade union official. I do not know to what extent that impinges upon this legislation, but I do know that it could have the most disastrous effects on South Australia and it could be the direct reason for this legislation's being brought into effect. The Government states that fuel rationing will not be brought in unless there is a "real need", and that only fuels in short supply will be affected. We have been through all this twice before. We know exactly what it is like to have a fuel shortage. We have had fuel rationing only once, but I think more than twice we have been through an acute shortage. Because the Minister knows that there is likely to be an industrial dispute that is going to tie up our fuel supplies, he wants us to get this through so that we will not have to bring Parliament back next week.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Isn't that sensible?

Mr. TONKIN: Yes, it is very sensible, and I am prepared to accept that, but I am not prepared to let it go on any longer, because if there is an industrial dispute which ties up our fuel supplies in South Australia and which will necessitate motor fuel rationing, a significant step indeed, this House must be given the opportunity to debate that matter at the first opportunity. Having the time limit of October 31 simply means that if Parliament for any reason is up for longer than a week or two or is prorogued, we will not have an opportunity to come back to this House to debate the basic cause of an emergency that will affect everyone in South Australia. I believe it is a simple enough proposition, as we do every year to the Prices Act, to come to the House at the end of two or three weeks and bring in an amending Bill to put the date forward another two or three weeks. That gives an

opportunity to this House to debate the issue again and to reconsider the issues in the light of developments in the industrial scene. I for one cannot stomach the thought of having this legislation held over us for three months at a time when Parliament is virtually signing away to the Government its responsibility for three months. I am strongly opposed to that length of time in that clause. Clause 13 relates to the old question about the powers of the police in relation to stopping and questioning. It provides:

(2) A person shall forthwith
(*b*) truly answer all questions put to him under subsection (1) of this section.
Penalty: Two hundred dollars.

I have some reservations about that. It is a contradiction of the generally accepted principle that no-one should be required to answer questions which might incriminate him. I take some reassurance in the fact that the specific questions that may be asked are specifically set out. In other words, there is a clear limitation on the questions which may be asked, but I feel bound to mention that it is in principle unfortunate. I am more concerned about clause 15 (2), which provides:

The Minister may, by notice in writing, prohibit or restrict the movement of any particular consignment of bulk fuel, of any class of consignments of bulk fuel, or of consignments of bulk fuel generally.

Other clauses provide for offences. I am puzzled by this clause, because it seems to me that, when motor fuel is so much in short supply that it is necessary to ration it, it would be far more sensible to have powers in the legislation to move bulk fuel to cope with the emergency so that fuel rationing would not disadvantage needy members of the community: I refer here to hospitals or essential services, even to transport. I cannot for the life of me see why in clause 15 we are specifically prohibiting that. I believe there should be a two-way thing here. I think the Minister should have the power, again by order in writing, to direct a person to take a specific action as well as to prohibit him from taking a specific action in relation to bulk fuel. In other words, he could if he wishes direct that bulk fuel may not be moved, as clause 15 states now.

However, to even that up he should also have the power, in my view and, I think, in the view of members of my Party, to direct that bulk fuel shall be moved to cope with a specific emergency. I hope that that situation will not arise; in fact, I suppose we are dealing with a hypothetical subject that we all hope will not arise. I would hope that, if an acute emergency arose during the general emergency, the Minister would not have to issue an order and that fuel would be moved in the appropriate way to be made available for hospitals or the essential services that need it.

I believe that the Minister should have that power just as he has the power to prohibit the movement of fuel. For that reason, I intend to take action at the appropriate time to widen that clause and equip the Minister to take action on the broadest possible spectrum so that he can do everything that is necessary to preserve the well being and safety of the public. After all, that is his responsibility.

I approach this legislation with some reluctance, because I hope that it will not be necessary to use it. If it is necessary, however, and if we must prepare for an emergency about which the Minister seems to know, we must have it, but it is our responsibility as members to bring this matter into the House for specific debate as soon as possible. For that reason I support the Bill to the second reading stage, but give clear notice that, unless something is done about cancelling the larger part of the open cheque that we are being asked to endorse today, I will not support the third reading.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): This Bill imposes severe restrictions on the supply of petrol to people in South Australia. It is only right that this Parliament should consider carefully this measure. I should like to comment on three aspects raised by the Minister in his second reading explanation. The first aspect relates to the likely dispute that is going to arise in Queensland out of an issue involving the Storemen and Packers Union, and it is known as the Zaphir case.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must point out to the honourable member that that matter is before the court and is therefore *sub judice*.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I appreciate that it is *sub judice*, but the Minister has referred briefly to it. I realise only too well that I cannot touch on any matter that is *sub judice* as such and therefore that I cannot touch on the industrial aspect of the dispute. However, I can touch on other aspects, without breaching the *sub judice* rule, under Standing Orders.

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the honourable member that I shall judge that.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: All I wish to say in relation to the principles now applying in Queensland (and I am not referring especially to the dispute) is that the practice there is for some union organisers to collect or receive 10 per cent of the subscriptions paid by members. Frankly, I believe that is a practice that has initiated many disputes in Queensland, and I suspect that it is the basis of this dispute. It has been advertised that the dispute concerns union non-membership; in fact, it relates to dual membership, because the people concerned are already members of certain unions. I simply wished to outline that aspect because much misunderstanding has occurred in the community about it. The impression has been given that the dispute relates to whether or not a member is a member of one or another union.

The SPEAKER: Order! Nothing whatever in this Bill relates to an industrial dispute in Queensland.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: No, but the whole purpose of the Bill is to overcome the possible shortage of petrol arising out of a dispute in Queensland.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member should read the second reading explanation, because Queensland is not mentioned. The explanation states that, because of a possible dispute, there could be a shortage in South Australia. That does not give any member the right to talk on any subject that he may wish to link to the Bill. The honourable member's comments must relate to the Bill.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: You have asked me to read the second reading explanation, Sir. I have it before me, and I have already marked the relevant portion of it. I will read it to you, Sir, because I have already read it several times myself. In introducing the Bill the Minister said:

All members will be aware that there is at least a possibility that supplies of motor fuel may be restricted in this State pending the outcome of industrial disputation quite remote from South Australia. Accordingly, the Government considers it prudent to place on the Statute Book a measure having limited life but capable of dealing with any emergency that may occur within the next three months.

The SPEAKER: That is the very point that I was making. All that the Minister said was that a situation could arise in this State; he did not say anything about Queensland or

anyone that the honourable member would wish to introduce to the debate. I point out to the honourable member that he must speak to the Bill and not about an industrial case that is pending in another State.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was also referring to a possible dispute. We do not know which dispute, if we wish to keep our heads in the sand, but it, too, could be in a remote place. I will not use any other words to describe it, except the words used by the Minister, but it could be anywhere and could involve any union. It could even involve the Storemen and Packers Union and could even be about the union subscription rates. Anyway, that is enough about that subject. If it is a touchy subject to Government members, I appreciate—

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the honourable member that it is not a matter of to whom it is touchy or to whom it is not: it is a matter of my upholding the Standing Orders of this House, and I will not allow the honourable member or any other honourable member to use this debate as an avenue to exploit some political gain.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: You—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister of Labour and Industry is out of order.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The second of the three aspects I wish to raise relates to the basic fundamentals of any democracy. It concerns us all and concerns a Parliament that purports to be a democratically elected Parliament. That basic right is the freedom of movement of individuals within our State. This Bill imposes a possible restriction on that movement, and that is the key of the entire Bill. Certainly, any responsible member would give the Government powers to control an actual dispute in a potential crisis in our community, but a dispute has not yet arisen, and petrol is still flowing through our service stations and from the Port Stanvac oil refinery.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Thousands of litres of it.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Yes. Why is the Minister willing to impose such possibly severe restrictions on this State—

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Have you read the Bill?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Yes, and the Minister has tremendous powers, with which I shall deal soon. Frankly, as a member of Parliament, I am willing to give that sort of unlimited power to the Minister or any Government for three months. I refer now to the basic freedom of movement of any community in a democracy. That community should not be subject to the sorts of potential restriction imposed, especially by clause 13 (1) (*a*), which gives the police power to stop any person, to ask that person where he is going, his name and address, where he has come from and where he got his petrol. That is a gross infringement on our society and should be imposed only as a last resort when the emergency arises or the essential services of this State are threatened severely.

The third point on which I shall touch is that the Minister has said that this Bill is being introduced because this House may be up for a week. It is my recollection that with all the previous petrol strikes we have had in this State (and there have been two where we have actually introduced emergency legislation), the legislation was not introduced until at least a week after the strike had started. Therefore, I question why on this occasion it would be necessary to impose restrictions as at day one of the strike, unless, of course, the Minister suspects that the strike might be particularly long and drawn out. If he has more knowledge about potential industrial disputes, which we are not allowed to talk about in this place, in other remote areas of Australia, perhaps he should inform the House why he believes the supply should be immediately frozen from the first day of the strike.

Mr. Nankivell: It might even interfere with an election.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: It might, and I suspect that that might be one reason why the Government would like the powers for three months. If, as the Government tells us, the House will not be up for more than one week at a time, I do not see any real necessity for such legislation until we have a strike on our hands, when we could assess the severity of the strike and assess what action was necessary to ensure the continued supply of essential services to the State. I shall support the legislation only if severe amendments are made in Committee. I cannot discuss those amendments in the second reading debate, but I make that condition, and I will not support the Bill in its present form.

Mr. VANDEPEER (Millicent): I should like to ask a question and to investigate the reason why this legislation is necessary. I feel that that is a reasonable question, and one that should be asked in relation to all legislation coming before this House. We could say that the legislation has been brought down to ensure essential services in our State. However, I believe that we must go further back to find the real reason. To say that we are maintaining essential services is only a rearguard action. It is attempting to shut the gate after the horses are half-way out. The question is this: why are our essential services in danger? They are in danger because there is a threat of strike action by a small section of our community.

Mr. Dean Brown: In a remote part of Australia.

Mr. VANDEPEER: Yes, in a remote part of Australia. It is a section involved in a very vital part of industry, and all industry eventually will stop if the supply of energy is curtailed. The group of workers involved is a relatively small part of the whole work force, and an even smaller part of the total population.

Mr. Dean Brown: How do you think the primary producer will get on?

Mr. VANDEPEER: He will fare badly, as he always does when we come to strikes in Australia. The members of the group I have mentioned wield tremendous power in that, without their will to work, the economy would come to a halt. Those who work in fuel distribution and energy production wield tremendous power in our community. If they fail to work or go on strike, the whole economy comes to a halt. They have organised themselves in their industry so that no-one else, apart from the Government, can take any action to remedy the situation if they should go on strike.

Mr. Venning: Would that help?

Mr. VANDEPEER: Only temporarily, and it only provides essential services. It does not remedy the whole situation. The honourable member is quite right. Our whole economy can stop or go on the will to work of a few people. Is that a truly democratic situation? Is it right that a few people, merely by putting their heads together, should be able to bring a nation to a standstill?

The SPEAKER: Order! I should like to point out to the honourable member that he is deviating from the clauses of the Bill. I do not think there is reference in the Bill to the subject matter he is discussing.

Mr. VANDEPEER: Perhaps we are straying a little from the Bill but, as I said, I am here to examine why this legislation is necessary. It is necessary because of the

actions of a small group of people. The situation in which a small group can wield such power brings me to a comparison with other areas of our democratic society. This is extremely important. If we look at the administrative side of our society to see what happens, a similar situation arises. We can see what trouble we get into if we allow that situation to arise.

Let us take our Parliament. Many years ago we had all Independent members, if we go back far enough. Then some smart gentleman saw that, if he and one or two others put their heads together, their block vote would hold great power, because at whatever point they placed their vote or whatever area they supported, and if they continued to vote in a block, their point of view would always come out on top. This situation has developed over the years to reduce the whole of Parliament, which may have consisted of all Independents, to a Parliament of minor groups or Parties or, as it is today, of two Parties. It is divided two ways, or almost two ways, with due respect to my colleagues on my left.

The remaining Independents were forced to rally and combine in one group so that they would have power to oppose those who had formed the first powerful group. Today, in this House we are divided two ways. Can we relate that to the situation in Australia today, where minor groups are putting their heads together and wielding tremendous power in the area in which they work? In this case, we have those working in the fuel and energy industry putting their heads together for various reasons and trying to better their position. Small power groups like this, working in an essential service or perhaps in the factories, organise themselves into groups and wield great power, as they have control of the maintenance people, knowing full well that if the maintenance crew is not on deck the factory eventually will stop. I condemn this situation, which is completely undemocratic. Democracy in the first place was developed to hold the freedom of the individual as the main criterion of good government and, if we relate the situation I have described to the situation in Parliament, I feel we may divide our whole community in two ways.

Mr. Millhouse: More than two ways.

Mr. VANDEPEER: I mentioned that previously.

Mr. Millhouse: I think you had better go on with it, because I think you have forgotten—

Mr. VANDEPEER: You can see the principle involved.

Mr. Millhouse: I think I see what you are trying to say.

The SPEAKER: Order! I feel I am being most tolerant. I am still at a loss to understand how the honourable member hopes to tie the statements he has made to a Bill for an Act to provide for the distribution of motor fuel.

Mr. VANDEPEER: This Bill for the control of the distribution of motor fuel has been introduced for certain reasons, which go further than those on the surface, and which go much deeper and far beyond the borders of this State. I think the causes for that should be examined by this Parliament.

The SPEAKER: They may, but I point out to the honourable member that there are other avenues open to him whereby he can discuss those issues, but not when speaking on the terms of this Bill.

Mr. VANDEPEER: Well, Sir, it is with your direction that I will continue, but I believe at this time it is appropriate that we examine the situation caused by the power wielded by these smaller groups. We are being forced to pass legislation to supply essential services to this State because of that power being wielded. In deference to your ruling, Sir, I will not continue along those lines. I support my Leader in saying that this Parliament should be called together at any time in order to discuss this problem, and to allow it to be aired properly before such powers are introduced. I realise that the House is not sitting next week, but it is possible to recall Parliament during that week. Perhaps it would be inconvenient, but we must not take away the opportunity for elected members of our State to openly discuss this problem before the power is given to the Government. I believe that that is an essential procedure in a democratic society. I support the Bill, although I have great reservations about the reasons for the Bill being introduced and about many of its clauses.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I do not quite see the sinister implications in the Bill that members of the Liberal Party say they see.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: I would agree with that. You've got more sense.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know that the Minister will agree with everything I say, but I appreciate him saying that. I understand there could be a national petrol strike because of trouble in Queensland, and the Government wants to make sure, ahead of any panic, that it has power to control the sale of motor fuel, should that become necessary. I understand that is the reason for introducing the Bill now, and also as a matter of convenience, because Parliament is to have a holiday next week, so the Minister wants the Bill through this week. I am sympathetic to the honourable member for Millicent, whose political career is being brought to such an untimely end by the member for Mallee.

Mr. Vandepeer: That's got nothing to do with it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It has not?

Mr. VANDEPEER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I think that remark is far beyond the range of the Bill we are discussing.

The SPEAKER: Yes, I must uphold the point of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I apologise to the member for Millicent. I thought I was being kind and charitable to him and to the member for Mallee, who has done him in.

Mr. Nankivell: That is the last thing I'd want to do.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is the last thing he wants to do, he says, having won the preselection. It was the first thing he wanted.

Mr. VANDEPEER: I make a similar point of order, Mr. Speaker, that this discussion about the Mallee preselection has nothing to do with this Bill.

The SPEAKER: I must uphold the point of order. The honourable member for Mitcham must discuss the clauses of the Bill.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I was using those remarks as a foundation to say that, because the honourable member was so upset about that happening, his speech was so hard to follow. It was only a little point that has been rather blown up. I believe that a period of three months for this Bill is rather a long time, because its provisions are quite severe, and there is no doubt about that. The provisions give the Minister enormous power, and a power that is quite undesirable to be exercised in our community, except in a real emergency. I accept that this Minister does not intend to use that power in any way unless we have this national petrol strike, but of course it is there. It is a temptation to him, or to anybody who may come

after him, even in the next three months. The wood could be put on him by Cabinet, or any of these things could happen.

These things may be theoretical, but they are extraordinarily important in our community. What we should avoid doing is giving sweeping powers, that are really openended, on an important matter to the Government. That is what we are doing. I accept that it is necessary during the next few weeks, and I will not fight too hard against the three-month period, but we must bear in mind the powers that the Minister has (and they are life and death, of course) over the sale of fuel. I refer especially to clause 5 (1), which provides:

The Minister may, in his absolute discretion issue a permit . . .

We have to peruse clause 8 to ascertain what the permit does, but it is only if a person has a permit that he can get petrol. That is the scheme of the Act: if you are not a permit-holder, you cannot buy petrol, and it is in the absolute discretion of the Minister whether he issues a permit. There are quite severe penalties imposed for offences. Clause 9 (2) seems to be a strange clause to me. I cannot quite see why anybody, even in the draftsman's worst nightmare, should draft a clause to read:

A person shall not use, or cause, suffer or permit another person to use, motor fuel that has been sold pursuant . . . for a purpose other than a purpose, if any, for which that fuel was sold . . .

I cannot see why fuel would be sold for no purpose at all. This is one of those extraordinary things. Why the draftsman included the words "if any" I do not know, because the number of purposes for the sale of petrol would be small, if any. Several matters are not worth arguing about, although I have argued about them before. I accept that we need to have some powers in the short term, but the real reason for my speaking is that the Minister, in his widely reported speech yesterday (and this was the most widely reported part, except for the introduction of the Bill) said:

In the course of this session this House will be asked to consider, more leisurely, a measure that will remain on the Statute Book and be capable of being brought to life to deal with relatively short-term emergencies, thus obviating the need for this House being asked to consider, at short notice, measures of this kind.

I strongly oppose that action, and I do not think we ought to do it. One of the few remaining holds Parliament has over the Government is that it has to be consulted when an emergency arises. If that is to be avoided, by the Government bringing in some legislation that can be invoked at any time of emergency, that is a bad thing, and even if it is only in theory, theory and practice merge fairly quickly. The powers of Parliament will be greatly reduced, so I will certainly oppose any such Bill, and I hope that second thoughts will prevail and we will not see a Bill of that nature. One wonders what sort of powers it will have if this is the best that can be done (on the third attempt) to give the Government powers in an emergency. What reduction in powers would there be in a Bill that is, as it were, a standing Bill for the purposes of giving the Government emergency powers? The Bill would probably be similar to this one. I would not buy this Bill if it were to be permanent or if it could be invoked by Executive decision at any time that the Government wanted: that would be quite wrong. I make that point strongly. I hope that the Government will not go on with the intention that the Minister expressed yesterday to introduce some emergency powers Act, which in its discretion it could invoke at any time. That would be bad.

Although I do not like the terms of this Bill and I think the three-month period is longer than we need, I am willing to accept, because I do not know any better on the facts, the assertion of the Minister yesterday that we may need to use a measure like this soon. I do not agree with the member for Davenport that we should wait until we are into the crisis before we do anything about it. That was a childish point. I do not like this sort of legislation: I do not think any of us do, and the less we see of it, the better. The shorter the time that it is in force, the better.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): The Minister would have us believe when he introduced the Bill that this was a matter of expediency (there is no argument about that) but he did not come clean and say that it was a matter of political expediency. Several comments have been made about why I challenge him as having introduced a measure for political purposes. The remoteness of another place is foremost in our minds: there can be no argument about that without any further discussion. In his second reading explanation the Minister said:

More importantly, the Government believes that it is better to have such a measure available before a crisis occurs, rather than act hastily at the height of an emergency when panic buying and general confusion could result.

The Minister has demonstrated that the Government is not acting hastily in having had a Bill drawn up. If the Bill is discussed in the form that we have been asked to consider, it could stay on the file and be considered responsibly and effectively if such an emergency arose, when we could all be summoned back to this place. We have been elected to represent people in just such a circumstance. If the Minister wants to proceed beyond this point on a hypothetical question, or on a possibility, weight is given to my claim that it is purely for political expediency that he has been forced into the position of introducing the Bill now.

In 1972, a Bill was passed in almost identical terms although with a different heading. The Liquid Fuel Rationing Act, assented to on July 31, 1972, was restricted in its length of operation. An amendment was passed subsequently to allow it to function for a greater period of time, and then the measure was taken out. The member for Mitcham alluded to the fact that there was another Bill which we considered but which has gone into the too-hard basket. I do not find the emergency legislation to which he referred quite as repulsive as he does. I wholeheartedly agree with him that we do not want any measure on the Statute Book that will permit Executive Government to dictate the well-being of people in this State. I believe that the 1975 Bill, which was debated extensively in its early stages in July of that year, would be on the Statute Book now had it not been for the refusal of the Government to consider amendments put forward by the Legislative Council.

It would not consider them because it was under direction from South Terrace, and there is no argument about that. There is sufficient documentary evidence in the debate of 1975 to indicate that it was the fault of the Government that that measure is not now on the Statute Book for any actual emergency that might occur. However, that measure was designed to create two classes of citizen in South Australia. The official Opposition refused to bow to the dictates of Trades Hall, even though the Government was prepared to do so, the measure was set aside in the Legislative Council. The Government is shedding crocodile tears now, and

suggesting that we are in urgent need of action to safeguard our future. We have needed urgently legislation for a long time that would provide satisfactory provisions for any emergency situation that affects the people of this State. It could have been there and could have encompassed this measure but for the dictatorial attitude of the Premier and those who support him.

One provision I find difficult to understand concerning the original 1972 Bill and this Bill is that the earlier Bill included a schedule, which indicated the nature of the permit which would be provided. It may not be a major point but this House had the opportunity to look critically at the means that were to be used in the measure. This Bill denies Parliament the opportunity to examine this (some may say mundane) aspect of the provisions of this Bill. These are aspects that will affect people in the community, and are details that should be before Parliament for perusal, in order that members can decide on the ultimate passage of the Bill. There would have to be a tangible explanation before I would be willing to accept the removal of these simple procedures from the scrutiny of Parliament.

Comment has been made on the length of time for which this measure will operate. It is quite abhorrent to me seeing that, in the not too distant future, another Bill is to be introduced. If it is not going to come before Parliament in the near future, then the statement in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech to this Parliament at its opening and the Minister's second reading explanation of this Bill must come under question and, therefore, the Government must come under question. A period of no greater than one month is adequate; I support a lesser period than that. A period of three months to October 31 is against the best interests of the people in the community, and I would vote against the third reading of the Bill whilst that provision remains in it.

Considering the matter fairly and squarely, the fact that we do not have such a measure already on the Statute Book is the fault of the Government, not the fault of the Opposition, which has always acted responsibly on this subject. So responsible in fact that we once sought suspension of Standing Orders so that a matter that was being publicly acclaimed as an emergency could be considered on a Thursday. However, it was not considered until the following week, because we spiked the Premier's guns.

Mr. Tonkin: If I remember, it was reported that the Government was stunned.

Dr. EASTICK: Yes, the Government was so in need of this emergency legislation that it walked away from it on the floor of this House and left it on the Notice Paper for a further five days before Parliament was called to consider the so-called and publicly acclaimed emergency. We are not in such a vital situation now as we were then.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: That is why the Bill is going through today.

Dr. EASTICK: If the Minister wishes to believe that he and his Government is off the hook regarding any hasty action in the event of the hypothetical situation materialising, he has already dispelled that claim against him by placing it on file. I believe it should not go any further. Every member, and certainly every member on this side, has said publicly that he will come next week at the drop of a hat to take this matter another step forward should the need arise. The situation that the Minister has suggested is real has not yet arisen, and I throw it back to him on that basis.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour and Industry): I thank members for being relatively short in their speeches and making the points they thought were valid. I will be reasonably short in my reply. The Leader said that he regretted that such legislation had to be introduced, but went on to say that South Australia was at some risk. The Government and I believe that South Australia is always at risk, because it has only one storage for motor fuel and, as a consequence, the most minor industrial disturbance can cause problems for South Australia. If we have a major dispute, we are at grave risk. I do not know how many times I have had to telephone all round Australia to talk to stevedoring people and waterside workers to ensure that the fuel supply for South Australia has continued. That is the South Australian position but members opposite might not be aware of it.

I want to make my points on this serious legislation so that members opposite can understand what it is all about. There is always a grave risk of any industrial dispute causing South Australia to be short of petrol. In my second reading explanation I said that situations occurring in remote areas could cause fuel shortages in South Australia again. I am conscious of the situation in Queensland, as everyone should be. It has been suggested that we ought not pass legislation, but it should be left on the Notice Paper. Members have said they would be willing to come back to the House to debate emergency legislation. The Government thought the best situation would be not to ask members to keep coming back. How can I confidently forecast to the House how many times that would occur? How do I know what will be happening on the industrial scene in future? This is a national dispute, not a State dispute that could be solved over a cup of tea.

It is all right for the member for Davenport to smile: he is not in Government and probably does not care whether there is a fuel shortage or not. I cannot turn off or on a dispute of this significance if it develops, and I do not know how it will develop. South Australia could or could not be affected in many ways by this dispute. It could take a long time for it to be resolved. If there were a threat of a stoppage next week, almost immediately the Premier would have to call the House together. The member for Davenport said that we ought to leave it until the crisis occurs, and that is absurd. We have been in that situation before. I do not think any self-respecting responsible Government should be caught in that way.

If a national stoppage occurred, if a State stoppage occurred, or if a ship did not arrive on time, a crisis could occur in South Australia. I think we ought to have on the Statute Book legislation that would allow us to take charge of fuel in store, so that it could be rationed to those who were entitled to it, including emergency services. I would be lacking in my duty if I did not report to the Government the situation as I see it on the industrial scene in Australia at the present time. I would be the first to be criticised by members opposite for not having taken the proper precautions to ensure that there was no petrol crisis in South Australia.

It was with some temerity that members opposite made their points regarding their opposition to clause 15. The member for Davenport said that he totally opposed the great powers given to the Minister. However, his Leader wants to increase those powers. That is totally inconsistent, and it would be good if we could hear the voices speaking with one accord from the other side. I am not sure of whom I should take notice.

Mr. Dean Brown: What are you referring to?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I am referring to what the honourable member said about clause 15. The other matter that intrigues me is that, whilst the member for Davenport may not have been in this place in 1973, although the Leader and other Opposition members were present, when legislation was enacted in 1973 to control an emergency situation that already existed, clause 15 was carried without dissent. Clause 15 in this Bill is exactly the same as clause 15 in the 1973 legislation, and the Leader of the Opposition would be on record as having voted for it.

Mr. Dean Brown: Was there such a situation then?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Yes, there was, and this legislation has been put on the Statute Book to cover such a situation.

Mr. Dean Brown: It hasn't arisen yet: let's judge it when it comes up.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Of course it has not arisen yet. The member for Davenport would be the first member to go to television and radio and criticise the Government for being irresponsible in not having suitable legislation on the Statute Book. Do not let us kid ourselves; let us be honest some times. Let us consider South Australia and what effect this national dispute, if it should occur, could have on South Australia. The Government is trying to place preventive legislation on the Statute Book that will not be enacted.

Mr. Dean Brown: But you are—

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I paid the member for Davenport the courtesy of listening to his poor speech, and I should like the opportunity to make my last couple of points.

Mr. Venning: The member for Davenport made a very good speech.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The Speaker following him (the member for Mitcham) did not think it was a good speech, because he pointed out the inconsistencies in the speech. It has been said to me, and has again been raised by interjection "Why not wait until the crisis occurs?" It has been suggested by the Leader and also by the member for Alexandra that I have prior knowledge of when a dispute will occur. No such situation has arisen. The Storemen and Packers Union, or any other organisation, has not consulted with me nor me with them about their policies or those of this Government. That is a slanderous accusation.

Mr. Chapman: But their intentions—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Alexandra has twice interjected whilst out of his place.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I am not in a position to judge in any way what will occur in this dispute, and I am not able to forecast what is going to happen.

Mr. Chapman: You've been told what's going to happen. Come clean!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: If that was the case, I would not have to introduce this legislation on the basis of a three-monthly interval; instead, I could introduce it at two-weekly or three-weekly intervals. Surely that gives the lie to what is being said by members opposite. It bursts what they are saying into oblivion. If I knew what was going to happen, I could post-date the legislation to coincide with the dispute. I object strongly to the accusations made about me and my Government by the Opposition. We are able to discuss this matter, but are taking this action merely to protect South Australians from what may or may not occur on a national basis.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Division of Act."

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I seek your ruling, Mr. Chairman, on the matter of leaving out "BULK FUEL" in clause 3 and inserting "EMERGENCY ORDERS". It relates to the entire matter that will be covered in clause 15, because that clause is affected totally by this point. Can we therefore discuss the total issue in relation to clause 15 under clause 3?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. TONKIN: I move:

Page 1, line 11—Leave out "BULK FUEL, ETC." and insert "EMERGENCY ORDERS, ETC.".

Page 4, line 23—Leave out "BULK FUEL, ETC." and insert "EMERGENCY ORDERS, ETC.".

I listened with some interest to the Minister during his summing up in the second reading stage, when he referred to some inconsistency complained about by the Opposition in relation to the wide and sweeping powers that we are seeking by way of this amendment. The Minister believes that we are seeking even more power for this legislation, even though we complained that it is already too strong. Having listened when the Minister put forward the case, I again considered the legislation as drafted and then again considered my amendment to clause 15 and can now see exactly what is the real situation and why it causes the Minister so much concern.

The legislation as drafted originally in clause 15 prohibits the movement of any bulk fuel. Suddenly, I realised that the Minister does not want people to be able to move bulk fuel: he does not want an even-handed policy whereby people can be directed to move fuel to where it is needed. The Minister wants to protect a situation that may arise in this State in which people will refuse to move fuel. That seems obvious to me. The Minister is concerned only with reinforcing what could be industrial action in this State. If this is not so, I would be pleased to hear the Minister say so. However, it is perfectly apparent to me now that the legislation as drafted and which I wish to amend is designed to reinforce possible industrial action in this State.

Mr. Chapman: Or to avoid having to make a decision against the union.

Mr. TONKIN: That is the second point. Obviously, the Minister does not want the power to be able to direct that fuel be moved or changed from one location to another to meet an emergency within the general emergency. He does not want that power, because he can see that it might involve having to direct trade union officials who are engaged in an industrial dispute. This practice is reminiscent of a situation that pertained before when we considered legislation of this sort. The Minister can show his honesty, his sincerity in his approach to this entire matter. Later, I will have something to say about his other comments, because it is not appropriate to do so now. He can take on the responsibilities of a Minister of the Crown where his total responsibility is to the people of this State, their safety and well being. If he is not willing to take that responsibility, he is not fit to be a Minister.

Mr. VENNING: I am concerned about clause 16, which relates to fuel storages. What is the position regarding a primary producer who has storages of diesel fuel and petrol and relies on those storages for getting his stock to market? What is the position under this legislation regarding the fellow who has safeguarded his needs—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! It appears that the honourable member is speaking to clause 16, not to clause 15.

Mr. VENNING: I am speaking to clause 15, which relates to the definition of bulk fuel. This is an important situation for primary producers. Will the Minister give a ruling?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour and Industry): Am I to understand that the Leader has moved to amend clause 15?

The CHAIRMAN: No. The Leader has moved an amendment to clause 3 but, as clause 15 is tied to clause 3, clause 3 is the test clause.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I am lost. I want to know where we are. As I understand the situation, the amendments moved are to clauses 15 and 26.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Leader asked the Chair whether he could move an amendment to clause 3 and discuss clause 15, because they were test clauses. The Minister could speak on clause 3 and discuss clause 15. The Leader's first amendment is the test.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The Government is opposed to the amendment. I think it loses the whole purpose of the Bill. The reason for clause 15, in my view, is to take charge of the situation if a petrol shortage may exist. This legislation is totally consistent with that passed in 1973. There is no difference. The verbiage and the wording are identical. I have already foreshadowed that the Government intends at a later stage (and this was foreshadowed also in the Opening Speech) to bring in a more permanent type of legislation. If there is any real reason for debating clause 15, or if the Opposition has any real reason for debate, surely that would be the time to settle down and to argue the whole thing out. Here we are trying to implement a situation to give us control of available petrol supplies. If the Leader and his Party think for one moment that we will accept any type of amendment that will create a confrontation rather than a consultation issue with the trade union movement in this State, they are in for a big shock, because that is not going to occur. If that is what the amendment is about, as it appears to me, with broken picket lines, and going in—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! If the Minister or any other member continues in that vein, we will merely widen the debate in Committee. I hope that the Minister and Opposition members will stick rigidly to the clause before the Chair.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I accept your ruling, Mr. Chairman, but that appears to me to be the content of the amendment. The Government opposes it.

Mr. TONKIN: The Minister does not make sense. He says quite categorically that clause 15 has been written in so that we can take control of the situation and control the available fuel supplies. I looked through clause 15, and I shall go through it again. The cardinal words in the clause are these:

The Minister may, by notice in writing, prohibit or restrict the movement of any particular consignment of bulk fuel.

That says nothing about taking control. The Minister says he wants to take charge of the situation so that he can do everything necessary to uphold the wellbeing and safety of the South Australian public—at least, I presume that is what he has said.

Here is an amendment designed to enable him to do that. It will enable him not only to prohibit the movement of fuel but also to direct the movement of fuel, to bring about a transfer of fuel supplies so that, if an emergency arises within the general emergency, he can take the responsible attitude that one would expect of a Minister of the Crown in such a trying situation. Quite the reverse of seeking to bring about a confrontation issue, we are trying to vest the Minister with the necessary authority to do what is right and necessary for the wellbeing of South Australians and yet, for some reason, he does not want this power. I do not like this legislation and I do not think it should stay in operation for any length of time, but, if we are to have it, let us do it properly and put the Minister in a position where he can do everything that is needful.

Mr. Venning: He can see the joke of the legislation now: he's laughing.

Mr. TONKIN: I think it is a joke. There is no other explanation for the fact that he is not prepared to seek any powers other than those which will reinforce industrial action. He wants to opt out from his proper role as a Minister of the Crown making decisions for the welfare of the people.

Mr. Mathwin: He wants to wash his hands, like Pontius Pilate.

Mr. TONKIN: Yes, he is doing a Pontius Pilate. The legislation is not satisfactory as it stands. Every member must realise the score. If the Minister is honest he will accept that responsibility.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I support the amendment. It is important to change the clause in the way contemplated by the amendment. In these circumstances, I see the whole of the legislation before us as being quite fruitless unless the Minister or an authority nominated (in this case it is and should be the Minister) has that emergency power. Whether it be a requirement to shift fuel from a ship ashore to the point of further refining, or from depots in the State to other distribution points, or from one distribution point to another, while I have never supported handing out ever-growing authority to the Government, in my view if the Bill is going to stand up at all it is necessary that the Minister not only understands the importance of the situation but also has the initiative and the strength to accept the challenge element in it. There is, I agree without any hesitation, a challenge element. The Minister made this clear in his remarks before we went into Committee when he said that there was a risk in the situation, that we were subject to impending trouble because of the situation in Queensland, and that it was quite likely in this State, with its current and immediate past industrial trouble, that we would run into trouble. Therefore, I ask the Minister to reconsider his attitude to the Leader's amendment.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

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

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

Pair—Aye—Mr. Coumbe. No—Mr. Jennings.

Majority of 2 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Clauses 4 to 14 passed.

Clause 15—"Definition of bulk fuel."

Mr. TONKIN: As clause 15 has been discussed in some detail, although unsatisfactorily from the Minister's point of view, I do not intend to proceed with the amendment to this clause. However, I seek some information from the Minister about subclause (2). If an emergency arises

involving the transfer of fuel to a power station at Peterborough, for instance, and it is necessary to preserve essential services to the hospitals, the meat works cold-rooms, and a whole range of essential services, what action will the Minister take to preserve power and essential services to Peterborough if in fact he does not have the power to order that bulk quantities of fuel be shipped there to keep the community safe and healthy?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I would take every action necessary within the confines of this Bill to ensure in such circumstances that fuel was available. I am sure that my arguments would be accepted by those people who had control of such a situation. The real purpose of this clause is to prevent people peddling petrol throughout South Australia in huge quantities, such as 44-gallon drums, and in particular taking it to other States.

Dr. Eastick: They could move 16 gallons or 35 gallons.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: It is a 44-gallon drum. My advice is that the fuel could be in 44-gallon drums. The real answer to the question is that the reason it is there is to prevent the situation being capitalised upon by people moving fuel around the State and profiteering. This reason was readily accepted by the Party opposite when similar legislation was before the House previously.

Mr. TONKIN: The Minister has not answered the question in any way at all. He has said that he will take every action possible within the confines of this Bill. Looking at the rest of the Bill, it is obvious that the Minister is confined to prohibiting the transfer or removal of bulk fuel, and nothing more. The Minister will be bound by clause 15, and he will be prohibited by the Bill. He will be able to fall back on the provisions of this clause and say that, although he would like to help the people of Peterborough, he cannot do so because it would be against the provisions of the Bill. It has become apparent that the Minister will use this clause to avoid discharging his duty to the people of South Australia.

The Minister talked about this legislation preventing trafficking or peddling of bulk supplies of fuel. I accept that that is a necessary part of this whole business. If we are going to ration motor fuel we do not want people breaking the law, but is it more important to catch a few people who are cheating the system than it is to look after the welfare of large groups of people in the community? It depends on one's attitude. The Minister has made clear his attitude. He is not prepared to include in the legislation a clause that will enable him to discharge fully his duties. The people of South Australia can judge for themselves.

Dr. EASTICK: By referring to 180 litres we are referring to a drum or container with a capacity of less than 40 gallons. A 40-gallon container or drum was referred to in section 18 of the Liquid Fuel (Rationing) Act, 1972, as follows:

"Bulk fuel" means the liquid fuel in a container having a capacity of not less than 40 gallons.

In this Bill we are offered less than that, because the conversion makes it 181·6 litres.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: But isn't 180 litres what the manufacturers recognise as the old 44-gallon drum?

Dr. EASTICK: I am not talking about what the manufacturers recognise: I am talking about the fact that any person with a drum or container with a capacity of more than 180 litres will be in some difficulty, but it goes further than that. It does not even say that the drum has to be full. Clause 15 provides:

In this section—

"bulk fuel" means the motor fuel in a container having a capacity of not less than 180 litres.

Mr. Dean Brown: What about all the interstate trucks?

Dr. EASTICK: Exactly. What about the petrol tankers and what about the auxiliary tanks they have? What about aircraft? As the Bill is drafted (and this is almost a copy of the previous legislation), a person may not convey fuel in a container which has a capacity in excess of 180 litres. The container does not even have to be full. A person could be in difficulty if the container held only a few litres. We are getting many funny faces from members opposite that suggest that we cannot read but other people can. I repeat, however, that the Bill does not talk about the actual physical content, and that is what I find to be completely against the best interests of people who would be undertaking normal activities with motor vehicles and with aircraft. I believe the Minister should have the clause withdrawn.

Mr. Nankivell: The conversion is 39·6 gallons.

Dr. EASTICK: Certainly it is not the 44-gallon drum the Minister thinks he is dealing with in this Bill. As the Minister has obviously been ill advised, I move:

That progress be reported and the Committee have leave to sit again.

The Committee divided on the motion:

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

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

Pair—Aye—Mr. Coumbe. No—Mr. Jennings.

Majority of 2 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

Dr. EASTICK: We have had no information from the Minister—

The Hon. J. D. Wright: If you'd sit down I'd explain it.

Dr. EASTICK: It is all very well for the Minister to say that if I sit down he will give me an explanation. However, the Minister was not seeking to stand up when the Chairman was putting the motion.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Do you move progress?

Dr. EASTICK: No. If the Minister had been awake he would know that the Chairman had already put the motion.

The CHAIRMAN: I hope that the member for Light will come back to the clause before the Chair.

Dr. EASTICK: Most certainly. You had, Sir, called for the "Ayes" with the Minister still seated. I ask the Minister to explain why, in the conversion from imperial to metric units, a variation has occurred. Can he also say in what circumstances be believes it reasonable to expect a person, who has affixed to his motor vehicle a fuel tank with a capacity of more than 180 litres with a volume less than that in the tank, subject to the provisions of this measure to be? Under this provision such fuel would be recognised as bulk fuel. If the clause was to provide for a container of not less than 180 litres and full, it would be an entirely different situation, but a container could have in it only 1, 2, 3 or up to 177·9 litres and still be caught within the provision.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: If we wish to be technical about the situation, that could be applied to the conversion. However, clause 15 (2) provides:

The Minister may, by notice in writing prohibit or restrict the movement of any particular consignment of bulk fuel, of any class of consignments of bulk fuel, or of consignments of bulk fuel generally.

Under that provision I am required to give notice in the first instance. Therefore, if notice had not been given, it would not apply.

Dr. EASTICK: I am still not satisfied that, in a challenge before a court, the court would be as tolerant or as *laissez faire* as the Minister is being.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: I am not.

Dr. EASTICK: The word "generally" indicates that the matter has a far greater connotation than the Minister is admitting. Unless he will say that a vehicle with a normal off-the-delivery-line tank will not be caught by this provision, there must be difficulties. A position could arise where a person has a truck that has a tank with a fuel capacity in excess of 180 litres and must go through all the rigmarole of applying to the Minister or the appropriate officer for an exemption. That is ridiculous.

Clause passed.

Clause 16—"Fuel storages."

Mr. VENNING: During the horse and buggy days primary producers kept stacks of hay containing 200 or 300 tons, but now they store bulk fuel. A primary producer can store 1 800 litres of fuel, which is less than 400 gallons of fuel. Will the Minister therefore clarify the situation under this legislation regarding primary producers?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The situation for anyone, whether he be a primary producer or a person with a private fuel base on his own property, is that if he is within the limit of 1 800 litres he is catered for under the measure.

Mr. VENNING: A primary producer may be putting in a crop and may rely on his stock of fuel to do so. Are these stocks to be frozen?

The Hon. J. D. Wright: I never made any point about that. He would come within the category—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Private conversations are out of order.

Clause passed.

Clauses 17 and 18 passed.

Clause 19—"Allegations in complaint."

The CHAIRMAN: I draw honourable members' attention to an error in this clause. I intend to treat it as a clerical adjustment and leave out the words "or deliver" in line 34.

Clause as amended passed.

Clauses 20 to 25 passed.

Clause 26—"Expiry of Act."

Mr. TONKIN: I move:

Page 7, line 7—To leave out "thirty-first day of October" and insert "twenty-first day of August".

This is a crucial part of the Bill, and I would not be bothering to talk about it unless it had an expiry date. The date provided allows about three months for this legislation to operate. I did the Minister the honour earlier of assuming that his motives were lilywhite, but it became quite apparent that they were biased. I am forced to look beneath the surface to see why the date of October 31, 1977, should be chosen. The answer is clear: the Government, in its run-up for a possible election, does not want any electoral back-lash from this sort of discussion.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There is nothing in the clause regarding electoral matters, but simply a date of expiry of the legislation.

Mr. TONKIN: Why was October 31 chosen? I am not asking you, Sir, but I am simply asking a rhetorical question. Perhaps the Minister will say why that date was chosen.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Why do you think it was chosen?

Mr. TONKIN: I have just canvassed that proposition. It would probably suit the Government well: if there were to be petrol rationing, it could move in without having to call Parliament together if Parliament had adjourned or had been prorogued. It would suit it very well not to call Parliament back and not have to discuss the circumstances surrounding any industrial dispute or other cause of an emergency that would cause these provisions to operate.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Are you serious about this?

Mr. TONKIN: Indeed, I am. It seems to me that the three-month period is a deliberate attempt to subvert the due democratic processes of Parliament. When the Minister looks as he is looking now, I know that I am close to the truth. I believe that legislation with such sweeping powers must not remain on the Statute Book for three months. The Minister has contradicted himself many times this afternoon. He said at first that he did not know what was going on, and therefore the time limit must be three months because he had no inside information. He did not know of anything that would give rise to a situation to bring this legislation into effect by proclamation.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: That is true.

Mr. TONKIN: He agrees, and yet in his second reading explanation he said that the Bill must be through this week, because it would be inconvenient to call Parliament back next week in case of emergency. Which way does he want it? Either the reason he gave for bringing in the legislation urgently was a misrepresentation, or what he is saying now is a direct misrepresentation. He cannot have it both ways.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: I thought I answered that very well.

Mr. TONKIN: The Minister may have thought so, but it does not satisfy anyone on this side and, I suspect, no-one except the most charitable on the other side. Does he want it because, as he outlined in the second reading explanation, something is to happen urgently so we need the legislation urgently? A little while ago, he said he had no prior knowledge of anything that was going on but that we wanted it for three months so that the Government could bring in permanent legislation. The reason is obvious. The Government is anxious to avoid a debate in this Chamber, if necessary, for any period up to October 31. This is part of the way in which that can be done. I cannot support that. It is a pretty lousy reason for electoral advantage but, more especially, I do not believe that this sort of legislation should stay on the Statute Book any longer than is necessary. I am not sure that two weeks is necessary.

The effect of my amendment is to allow for the week when Parliament will recess, the critical time we heard about from the Minister. It will give us another sitting week to consider the legislation and any necessary amendment to keep it going. If we want to keep this legislation alive, the Minister has only to bring into this Chamber a Bill of one line to amend clause 26. Why is he not willing to do it? If it comes into the House at this stage, we will debate it and he will have to justify his application of emergency provisions or his desire to bring them into operation.

I do not mind if we have to do this every two or three weeks. The Opposition is willing to consider that. We will come back to Parliament at short notice at any time to discuss an emergency. After what we have seen of the Minister's attitude to a previous clause, there is every reason to come back and debate any emergency that may arise.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The Government opposes the amendment. I repeat that the Government foreshadowed permanent legislation in this regard. Although that was criticised by the member for Mitcham, that is the Government's intention. That legislation will not be ready for two or three months and, in any case, we have the Budget session to get through. That is a very heavy session. I do not think it is fair to ask the Government continually to interrupt the time of Parliament to bring this legislation back. If we were bringing in legislation for immediate enactment, perhaps Opposition members could have some argument in this respect. The legislation will be there only if it is needed. Surely that is a fair proposition. It will be enacted only if something happens over which we in this State have no control. If we were to do what the Leader wants, it would mean that every two or three weeks it would be necessary to go through this whole debate and waste the time of Parliament. It would prolong the Budget session. The Government does not accept the amendment.

Mr. TONKIN: Let me give an assurance on behalf of the Opposition. If the Minister introduces legislation to amend clause 26 and extend the period of the legislation, provided nothing has changed, provided an emergency is not imminent, provided there is no sign of an emergency on the horizon, we would not in any way delay the passage of such a Bill to extend the validity of this legislation for another two or three weeks. Let us get that quite clear. I also make clear that this Chamber has the right to debate any changed circumstances, and the Minister hit the nail on the head when he said it would be too much trouble to debate the whole matter again. I am sure that it is going to be far too much trouble for the Government to debate the whole matter again if circumstances have changed. That is what the Minister is talking about—he is trying to pull the three-card trick. This is treating Parliament with contempt, and the Government thinks that the Opposition is going to fall for that. I am not going to have a bar of that. I repeat, the Opposition gives the Government the assurance that, if it is necessary and the circumstances are the same at the end of the period, and if it is needed during the next sitting to revitalise this particular measure, the Opposition will go along with it and not delay the business of the House but, if there has been a change, or these powers have been invoked (or it looks as though they are going to be invoked) the Opposition will have its say. That is what the Government is trying to deny the Opposition by placing a three-month limit on this legislation now.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

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

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

Pair—Aye—Mr. Coumbe. No—Mr. Jennings.

Majority of 2 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

Dr. EASTICK: I move:

Page 27, line 7—Leave out "thirty-first day of October" and insert "second day of September".

The purpose of this amendment is to take the measure to the day after Parliament is next due to recess. The Minister has said that he does not want to be doing this on a week-by-week basis. This amendment makes the period almost four weeks. Any development during that four-week period, if it is serious, should be considered by members. That is not being unreasonable. It will not interfere drastically with the working of Parliament or the time of the Government, because, as has been stated here, members on this side would accept without question a simple extension of time if evidence was given that the alteration was necessary. I believe that this measure giving the Minister a blanket cover until October 31, is, as has been stated previously, completely intolerable to members on this side. I believe that the compromise now offered is reasonable and should be supported. If not supported, it will mean that all members of the Opposition will refuse to pass the third reading, as they find it a quite intolerable piece of legislation because of the open-ended manner in which the Minister has presented it. That, without going any further than a brief reference to clause 15, was clearly indicated by his acceptance of a *laissez faire* situation. I believe that what we are asking is in the best interests of the people of this State: it can be seen to be so by the public, and it certainly can be seen to be so by members. I hope that it will be seen to be so by Government members.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The amendment is not acceptable. I have already outlined the reasons the Government needs the legislation until that date. I see no point in going over the grounds again.

Mr. MATHWIN: I support the amendment. The reasons behind this legislation are obvious. If the Government refuses this amendment, which gives it the extended time outlined by the member for Light, it is obvious what moves are afoot and what they are all about. It is dangerously devious, and it is obvious how the Minister is playing his hand. No doubt he is doing it with the advice of Caucus and the Minister of Mines and Energy. I am most disappointed in the Minister of Labour and Industry because, at one stage, I firmly believed his intentions, but he has now completely washed out that belief. His and the Government's intentions are now obvious.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

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

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

Pair—Aye—Mr. Coumbe. No—Mr. Jennings.

Majority of 2 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Title passed.

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

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): This Bill, as it comes out of Committee, is exactly the same as it went into Committee. It is subject to the same disadvantages that were ventilated thoroughly in this House.

Members interjecting:

Mr. TONKIN: I point out, for the Minister's benefit, that in Governments with a less totalitarian approach,

Bills are occasionally amended and amendments are accepted by government, but I realise that such an event is not in the Minister's experience. Basically, this Bill is a travesty of what we know as Parliamentary democracy and it holds the whole basis of freedom of speech and debate and the rights of the people's representatives in contempt. Not much more than that can be said about it, as the reasons for its introduction are obvious. Government members have been quiet; they have been treading on eggshells throughout the passage of the Bill. Interjections have been fairly well controlled. Obviously, members opposite badly want this legislation passed. Why do they want it passed so quickly when we have had real petrol crises many times in the past, as the Minister himself said, that have been far more acute than now? The only thing I can say is that it is to take the sting out of an election backfire. That is the long and short of it. That the Minister is unwilling to accept his responsibilities as a Minister and direct and consider the welfare of the people of South Australia, does him and the Government no credit. This is a black day for South Australian Parliamentary democracy.

The House divided on the third reading:

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

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

Pair—Aye—Mr. Jennings. No—Mr. Coumbe.

Majority of 2 for the Ayes.

Third reading thus carried.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (NARCOTIC AND PSYCHOTROPIC DRUGS AND JUSTICES) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with an amendment.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from August 2. Page 332.)

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): I thank His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor for his thoughtful and energetic contribution to South Australia. I join with him in expressing my sincere sympathy to the families of the late Sir Glen Pearson and Messrs. Stott, Clarke and Shannon. All have served South Australia well. This speech is about the trade union movement. Although my political opponents will brand this speech as "union bashing", my object is to analyse constructively the effects unions have upon the community, to outline their responsibilities and to encourage them to pursue useful goals in place of the existing power struggle.

For some time there has been a growing antagonism between trade unions and the community. Although most of the blame for this can be fairly laid at the feet of a minority of unions with militant and politically motivated leaders, the stigma has stuck to the entire union movement. The community sees unions as overriding the decisions of democratically elected Governments, of contributing to inflation, of encouraging industrial violence, and of attempting to destroy our industrial and social system. A recent Morgan Gallup Poll found that 43 per cent of people interviewed believed that unions' wage demands were the main cause of inflation, and 63 per cent of people held the unions as principally responsible for strikes and industrial trouble, "We don't believe in the social system, so why should our fellows try to make the system work?", to use the words of the General Secretary of a large and powerful union in the oil industry.

As a result of this antagonism, the community is increasingly rejecting unions or, at best, putting up with them as an unfortunate evil. Although union activities are constantly before us on television and radio and have a large slice of press columns, there seems to be a lack of constructive comment from the community as to what should be the purpose of unions and how effectively to control their power. The rejectionist attitude has failed to solve the problems caused by them, and this failure is reflected in the growing industrial power of the union movement, even under some strongly anti-union Governments. Antagonism to trade unions arises from much more than the use of blackmail, threats and indiscriminate power by the militant unionists. It also arises because trade unions are pursuing the objectives of uniformity and equality in an age and society when individuality and personal choice are the prime demands of the community. These emerging community attitudes mean that the trade union movement and large, bureaucratic organisations, including business corporations, need to discard their existing methods and objectives and adopt instead ones which allow employees flexibility, self-esteem and motivation.

The higher general level of education of employees and the high material wealth of the general work force now mean the individual wishes to make a choice on hours of work, level of pay, and other benefits. The recent choice of employees in several companies to accept a four-day working week with a reduction in pay in lieu of some retrenchments, and in some cases in defiance of the union's stand, reflects this change in attitude. Some people, including the Premier, Mr. Dunstan, see industrial democracy with worker representatives or trade union officials making the decisions through a complex committee structure as the answer to this individualism of the worker. Of course, nothing could be farther from the truth as any committee structure becomes bureaucratic and highly inefficient, which is reflected by many large business enterprises and the public sector. I spent six frustrating years working in such a bureaucracy. More time and effort was spent in trying to overcome and beat the system than turning out productive work. The most productive people were those who learned how to use the system to their own advantage.

This individuality and reaction to the uniformity of both trade unions and the large corporations have encouraged workers to subcontract their labour and possibly their tools and entrepreneurial ability. Self-employed subcontractors, and even employees of small subcontractors, are able to make their own decision on matters relating to work. Subcontracting has already occurred in the house building and construction industries. The trade union reaction, as witnessed at the Smithfield site of the South Australian Housing Trust, was to force subcontractors to join the union and to break down the subcontracting system. The move towards subcontracting in these particular industries arose from the rigidity, conformity, and inefficiencies imposed by the building unions, particularly the militant builders labourers' federation.

Three recent examples illustrate this rigidity. A cleaning contractor who had a contract to clean a newly completed multi-storey building was forced to have his cleaners (already union members) join the builders labourers' federation. For a three-week job this meant additional union fees of $1 500 being paid to the union and an additional wage of $50 a week being paid to each employee. The alternative was the threat of a complete strike by builders labourers on all other construction sites of the principal contractor.

The second example was the demand that tools and pipes for plumbers must be carried only by a builder's labourer. Then there was the strike on the Gateway Inn, when a foreman dared to move a wheelbarrow blocking his path.

Trade unions were originally formed to ensure a fair wage and satisfactory conditions for all workers. Those long-term objectives have now been achieved. According to the journal *The Economist*, Australia has an extremely high level of wage equality. Before taxation only one country, Hungary, has greater wage equality than Australia. We have greater equality than countries such as Sweden, Yugoslavia and Japan. After allowing for taxation, Australia is still expected to be at, or near, the top of the list.

Australian employees enjoy a very high standard of living. Despite contrary claims, over the past 20 years labour's share of the gross domestic product has increased. Using gross domestic product as the base, labour's share increased from 57 per cent in 1956-57 to 61·4 per cent in 1970-71 and, since then, wage increases have outstripped G.D.P. increases even further.

It is significant that most of the major benefits for the work force, such as long service leave and workmen's compensation, have been achieved through legislation of Parliament rather than the industrial system.

Having achieved their original objectives some trade union leaders seem hell-bent on indiscriminately and arrogantly wielding the power that their positions bestow upon them, and more often than not to the detriment of the very people whom they serve. British socialist Paul Johnson had the following to say about British trade unions:

> Huge unions, each pursuing wage claims at any cost, have successfully smashed other elements in the State—governments, political Parties, private industry, nationalised boards—and now find themselves amid the wreckage of a deserted battlefield, the undoubted victors. They did not plan the victory. They do not know what to do with it now they have got it. Dazed and bewildered, they are like medieval peasants who have burnt down the world's manor.

Johnson goes on to describe union leadership, as follows:

> Men ought to be judged by their record, and their record is contemptible. Smug and self-assured, oblivious of any criticism. They have encouraged British industrial workers in habits and attitudes, in rules and procedures, in illusions and fantasies, which have turned the British working class into the coolies of the Western world, and Britain into a sinking, bankrupt industrial slum.

Australia must not follow the British example. One could be forgiven for thinking that we are heading in that direction, especially as our trade union structure is based upon the British system.

Few Australians realise the inefficiencies built into industries through unreasonable union demands and poor industrial agreements between management and unions. Examples of these inefficiencies have been pointed out to me during visits to specific industries. For example, a gang of men had been allocated 13 minutes to complete a certain repetitive task and, once their eight-hour quota had been completed, they were permitted to finish work for the day. However, in reality the task could be completed in about four minutes. Therefore, provided no major problems occurred, these Government workers did about three hours work each day.

In yet another example, duplicate crews of crane operators were supplied by unions with overlapping duties so that demarcation disputes could be resolved. Then there was the rigidity of lunch breaks. New work was often not started within 30 minutes of a lunch break for fear that the time necessary to complete the operation might carry over five minutes into the lunch break. On other occasions, 15 minutes of work past knock-off time meant at least one hour of overtime on penalty rates. No economy can prosper under such constrictions.

A comparison of rates of loading cargo on to ships clearly reflects the inefficiencies in Australia. Loading speeds on the Australia/U.S.A. West Coast service show that in the U.S.A. West Coast ports 200 to 300 tonnes an hour are loaded, whereas in the Australian east coast ports only 100 tonnes an hour are loaded. Equally revealing is the following comparison of container loading speeds:

	An hour
Continental European ports	25 to 30
United Kingdom	12 to 20
Italy	12 to 15
Australia	8 to 12

These inefficiencies are invariably found in service industries and the construction industry, where the costs are passed on to the consumer and where there is no direct threat from imported goods. Unfortunately, the employers readily accept the inefficiencies as a necessary cost of industrial peace. Such employees must be held at least partially responsible for these inefficiencies. Industrial conciliation and arbitration commissioners also seem dedicated to achieving industrial peace, irrespective of the cost to the community. Who will call halt to such practices? Who will guard the community interest?

A responsible but frustrated union official has complained to me that many employers indirectly encourage militancy from the union movement by ignoring reasonable claims but acting quickly when a direct threat is made to their financially secure position. Obviously, our conciliation and arbitration system is grossly inadequate. These are isolated examples, but similar cases are widespread. Unless something is done, Australians will face higher levels of long-term unemployment and a lower standard of living.

I issue a challenge to the trade unions: help solve the structural problems in our industry and economy rather than remain bogged down in the conventional union role of the past 100 years. Trade unions should be co-operating with Governments and employers to improve productivity, to assist technological advancements, to prevent wage inflation, to correct the anomalies of wage relativity, and to reduce the long-term unemployment of youth.

A simple political or paternalistic stand on these issues will be useless. What is needed is a dramatic change in the demands, claims and expectations of unions. They need to adopt a whole new attitude to encourage industry rather than try to strangle it. Equally, management will need to change its management techniques to ensure that employees are treated with the respect and dignity that all humans deserve and that consultation and involvement with the work force is greatly improved.

One cause of the high unemployment of youth has been the drive by unions for wage uniformity, irrespective of experience. As an example, sections of the furniture

industry have a paid rates award which forces the employer to pay the same salary to a lad who has just completed an apprenticeship as that being paid to a skilled craftsman with 20 years of experience. It is a breach of the award to pay any over-award payments or bonuses to the more skilled and experienced person. As a result, inexperienced youths cannot find jobs.

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

Mr. DEAN BROWN: It is a farce to have Industrial Commissions accepting such award conditions while Governments mouth platitudes about youth unemployment.

The manufacturing sector has declined in Australia in recent years. There have been retrenchments in many factories and, because of the union principle of "last on first off", the young with fewer years of service are usually among the first to be retrenched. They are in a "Catch 22" position. This principle serves the interests of the older workers, but it is time for the unions to review it and give consideration to the young within their ranks.

Relativity between wages for skill has been largely lost. An unskilled builders labourer receives $174·50 a week, while a fitter with a four-year apprenticeship receives an award wage of $137·60 a week and an average over-award payment in South Australia of $19, making a total of $156·60 a week. Wage relativity in Australia more often seems to be determined by the union's industrial muscle and the level of competition from imported goods, rather than the skill and the length of training. Therefore, the incentive for learning skills and gaining experience has been lost.

Australian industry has been slow to introduce new technologies. One of the reasons has been the trade union movement's resistance to the introduction of new technology, for fear of redundancy or the necessity of retraining the employee. Employers also fear industrial action as a consequence. The rigidity of the traditional trade training and the maximum age of 23 for apprentices have been two more barriers. The present dispute with cooks at the new Government frozen foods factory is a classic example. The factory has been built to reduce overtime and weekend work, but the cooks are demanding their previous wage at hospitals that included heavy penalty rates and overtime. If cooks do not know that they cannot have their cake and eat it, who does?

Trade unions should be encouraging the introduction of new technologies by employers so that Australian industry is capable of competing on international markets, thus not only protecting job opportunities but creating new ones.

The challenge is there for unions to accept a new role. If accepted, these new objectives need to be carried out in co-operation with the community rather than in conflict with it.

I turn now to the protection of individuals and the community. Many trade unions have used indiscriminately their power against individuals and the community, and, as a result, there is a growing public outcry for Governments to introduce legislation to protect the community. But legislation by itself is quite inadequate. Also needed are people who are prepared to work to maintain our liberties.

Churchill once said, "Liberty is not a right, it is a duty." If liberty is to be preserved, then the community must be prepared to defend and work for it.

Heath, as Prime Minister of Britain, found that a firm stand by a Government against a union was inadequate. Heath lost Government, and the coal miners won their claims and a sympathetic Government to the detriment of a once great nation.

If the freedoms and rights of our democracy are to be protected, the following requirements must be met: (1) A Government prepared to ensure an adequate legislative and administrative framework to protect individuals and the community. (2) A majority of union members prepared to participate actively in union elections and meetings to ensure that union actions and decisions reflect the views of the majority rather than the views of the militant few. (3) A group of employees prepared to act in concert when union demands ultimately affect the whole industry: individual employers, especially smaller ones, are at a grave disadvantage with respect to the unified power applied through the trade union movement. (4) An aware community ready to defend and work for their freedoms and individual rights.

Any one factor by itself will be inadequate. Another problem is that employers and Governments have short-term objectives when settling industrial confrontation, while unions have long-term objectives. Unions therefore apply economic and industrial pressure whenever it suits them: time is not critical. Employers on the other hand have to meet short-term economic goals or face bankruptcy. Builders labourers have employers over a barrel by placing unreasonable demands upon them in the middle of large concrete pours or during the final stages of a construction project, knowing that in the short term it will be financially beneficial to the employer to meet the demands rather than face costly industrial disputation.

The recently announced Liberal Party policy for trade unions and employer associations stressed the need for employees to participate actively and responsibly in their respective unions. The main body of the work force should participate at union meetings and in ballots. Meetings of workers should be conducted in such a manner that facts can be properly and calmly explained, away from the menacing atmosphere of many of the present style of meetings where confrontation prevails.

The present lack of participation is all too apparent. One rather "unpopular" militant union secretary in this state was re-elected recently for another five years with only 4·5 per cent of the members voting.

One basic freedom that has been seriously eroded is the democratic right of a person to join or not join a trade union or any other association. This principle is a fundamental part of the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights, of which Australia is a signatory.

Although under State legislation it is illegal to dismiss any person for not being a member of a union, employers who are faced with the threat of financial collapse through the imposition of picket lines or black bans will knuckle under to union pressure and place demands upon employees to join the union. Therefore, the establishment of a principle in legislation is insufficient when economic and industrial muscle is applied.

I realise the plight of union officials when attempting to encourage an apathetic work force to join and participate in the costs of union representation. Most of us are only too willing to accept benefits without contributing financially. However, such frustrations for unions should not be allowed to override the democratic rights of an individual or a community.

A Liberal Government in South Australia will protect this freedom of choice by allowing a person to register through the Industrial Commission as an objector to union membership without having to state the grounds of objection.

This move will ensure a realistic choice for everyone, including persons who work in closed shops. The objector would pay an amount to the commission equivalent to the union membership fee. In this way the objector is not able simply to dodge the payment of money. The commission will pass the money on to approved charities, especially industrial charities such as Bedford Industries Vocational Rehabilitation Association Incorporated and the Phoenix Society Incorporated Sheltered Workshop.

The protection from compulsory unionism which already exists under State legislation will also be further strengthened.

In addition, a Liberal Government will withdraw all industrial instructions of the present Labor Government demanding union membership within the Public Service, companies tendering for Government contracts, and for persons employed under the State Unemployment Relief Scheme.

If unions are concerned about their membership, they should more closely reflect the attitudes of a majority of their members. The contempt held by union members for their leaders was very evident during the Medibank strike. These members were too frightened to vent their feelings publicly, but they were certainly willing to express their disgust privately.

Unions cannot genuinely expect compulsory unionism while they continue to play Party politics and contribute so heavily to the Australian Labor Party. The growing opinion amongst union members is that there should be no levy paid to the A.L.P. or any other political Party.

As mentioned earlier, the community has developed a strong antagonism to trade unions and their officials. Recent opinion polls generally show that 70 to 75 per cent of Australians believe that unions have too much power. A similar proportion believe that unions should not call strikes for political reasons. This raises the whole question of what is the responsibility of a trade union to the community. No attempt seems to have been made to establish a widely accepted code of ethics or conduct.

Restrictions on undesirable practices have already been established for business enterprises, through legislation such as the Trade Practices Act, the Companies Act, and consumer legislation. It is obvious that the time has come when similar guidelines of conduct should be laid down for trade unions.

In Government, the Liberal Party will establish an industrial code of conduct for the trade unions, after consulting with representatives of the community, including employees, trade unions, and employers. The responsibilities of a trade union must include the acceptance of constraints upon practices that unduly intimidate, oppress, or hold at ransom the community or an individual.

This code of conduct should be written into every award as an enforceable contract binding on all parties.

From the multitude of industrial complaints I receive, it is obvious that very few people understand the complex system of conciliation, arbitration, and industrial law that we have in Australia. To make matters worse, industrial matters are either Federal or State responsibilities. Employees and small employers are especially lost in our industrial complexities, but these people suffer an even greater disability. They are invariably in a position where they have neither the financial resources nor time legally to protect themselves against unreasonable industrial action by large corporations or trade unions. Industrial action is invariably designed to cause financial dislocation; in other words, there is justice only for the financially strong.

A State Liberal Government will appoint an industrial ombudsman who will be able to investigate immediately complaints of industrial actions lodged by employees or small employers. The industrial ombudsman may report to Parliament or publicly on any matter of importance, and initiate legal action before the courts on behalf of the oppressed or victimised person. The ombudsman will not replace either the existing functions of unions or the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Commission.

The industrial ombudsman will be directly responsible to Parliament, and independent of any Government. The closest analogy would be the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs, except that he is responsible to a Minister.

The independence of the ombudsman has another major advantage, as it relieves the person who complained from the fear of reprisal or recrimination.

The Liberal Party supports the provision of effective legal action against illegal restraints of trade.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: When are you going to stop reading the speech?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! These private conversations are out of order.

Mr. Gunn: The Minister started it.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I appreciate your calling the House to order, Mr. Speaker. The interjection from the Minister of Mines and Energy was a sad reflection, first, on his intelligence, but more importantly on the close relationship and the committal of his Party to the trade union movement.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the member for Davenport is and has been reading his speech.

The SPEAKER: I must uphold the point of order. According to Standing Orders, no member is permitted to read his speech. However, it is permitted for members to use notes.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I am simply using copious notes, and I point out to the Minister who is concerned about that—

Mr. MATHWIN: Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Industrial disruption, which unjustifiably deprives the community of its rights to goods and services and forces firms into breaches of contract or causes restraints of trade, is wholly unacceptable.

There are more than 300 registered trade unions in Australia. Large employers often have to negotiate with as many as 10 unions, each with their own outlook. As a consequence, negotiation and consultation are much more difficult. A Liberal Government will co-operate with the United Trades and Labor Council in the encouragement and formation of industry-based unions.

Finally, improved industrial relations can be achieved only through co-operation and mutual understanding between the persons involved. The facts show an urgent need for an improvement in Australia.

The conflict between the community, industry, and a few trade unions is now so great that disruption is almost inevitable. A change in attitude is required. The different parties can work together for each other's mutual advantage and for the benefit of the community. It is time we all started trying.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I must comment, first, on the new sound that we have, ready for the year 2001. It would probably be better, Sir, if instead of saying, "Ring the bells", you said "Pierce the ears." It is my personal regret that the Governor, Sir Douglas Nicholls, was forced to retire so early because of illness. I congratulate him and Lady Nicholls on the job they did whilst in office, and I wish them a long, happy and healthy retirement. I also pass on my condolences to the families of those past members of this House who have died.

Like other members, I am becoming sick and tired of having to listen to the garbage put out by the Premier's propaganda plant, which, after Question Time last week, we now know to be the political branch of his department, situated in Victoria Square. After the recent telex incident, brought before this House only last week, the Premier admitted that he had a political branch within his department. Government members frequently—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Who wrote the question you asked this afternoon?

Mr. MATHWIN: I did not have it written. I was quite familiar with the question I was asking and which the Minister of Community Welfare refused to answer so many times and so frequently in the previous session. At last the Minister of Community Welfare knows that what I said to him was a fact; he would be the first one to admit it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MATHWIN: When members on the other side of the House tell us how lucky we are to have this Government in office and how well this socialist Government is doing in South Australia, they fail to tell us that we are the most expensive State. We pay the highest taxes in the Commonwealth. In housing especially, we are the dearest State a square metre of housing in Australia.

Mr. Langley: Including land?

Mr. MATHWIN: If we examine the costs (and the member for Unley was in the building trade, as I was), we find that in Adelaide it costs $209 a square metre. In Melbourne it costs only $199 a square metre; in Sydney, $184 a square metre; in Brisbane, $184 a square metre; and in Perth, $189 a square metre. Members on the other side must admit that those figures do not lie. Again, for stamp duty we are the most expensive State in Australia. We have to pay stamp duty of $730, compared to Victoria, $645; Queensland, $600; Tasmania, $588; New South Wales, $502; Tasmania, $500; and Western Australia, $500. We pay far more stamp duty than does any other State.

The cost of water in this State is greater than it is in any other State. The price of water has risen astronomically since 1970, when we were in office: it has increased from 7·7c a kilolitre to 19c a kilolitre in seven years. That is a colossal rise. I understand that nowadays when a visitor from another State comes to South Australia and orders, say, a Scotch and water, instead of water they have Scotch and soda. I do not mind paying a little extra for water, so I have Scotch and water. Referring to housing, which is right up the street of the member for Unley, we recall that Mr. Hawke (who has tried for several years unsuccessfully to run a third-class haberdashery store in Melbourne) said that he was willing to come to South Australia, and would build houses on 121·4 hectares set aside at Noarlunga. He would provide low-cost housing at a better price than that provided by the Housing Trust in South Australia.

Mr. Dunstan said on May 9, 1977, that the Government would assist the proposed A.C.T.U. low-cost venture at Port Noarlunga by providing low-cost land through the Housing Trust. The land was made available but the A.C.T.U. did not go ahead with the scheme, so Mr. Hawke was also a failure in the housing industry in South Australia. I suggest that he sticks to the job he knows something about; that is, as the official President trying to run the Labor Party, much to the disgust of the Premier of this State, who thought he had it all sealed in a bag that he would take over next year.

Mr. Langley: He will, next year; we will be re-elected.

Mr. MATHWIN: Will he? He will have more time next year because he will not be the Premier, so he will have more time to be the Federal President of the Labor Party. I have been in this Chamber when the Premier has bragged about the advantages of this State for tourists, and about what a good job has been done. Yet, we have seen the international hotel, as described by the Premier, still not a fact after many years. I have asked questions about this since 1971. First, it was going to be a Japanese high-rise development; then it was going to be an international-type hotel; and in 1972, sketches had been drawn of an international-type hotel for Victoria Square near Moores, but we have not heard any more about that. The story has gone on and on. Pages and pages of promises have been made by this Government about this issue alone. I suppose one can understand that the Premier would be scared after the performance of the builders labourers on the Gateway Inn, when they went on strike, and bricklayers had to labour for themselves. Then, when the bricklayers had erected a wall, the builders labourers demanded that it be knocked down.

I can understand that the Premier does not want to take the chance of starting that type of building in Victoria Square. Why is the Premier not honest? Why does he not say that nothing is going to happen on the Victoria Square site? There is not going to be an international hotel built, and the Government is not willing to do anything with the land. The Government's many broken promises make up a very sorry story indeed.

I am glad that the Minister for Transport is present, because I wish to say a few words about his problems. I do not want to make him blush and become upset when I refer to the Morphettville bus depot fiasco and what happened to it.

It is surprising to see that at last the Government is threatening to introduce legislation (it did the same thing last year) concerning environmental impact statements. It was not surprising to see that the Government did not introduce it last year, because it would have had the problem of facing the Minister. We might have seen some trouble in Caucus between one Minister and the other on the Morphettville bus depot issue. No doubt the Minister of Transport will be horrified by my bringing up the dial-a-bus fiasco. In the *Advertiser* of May 17, 1971, it is reported that Mr. Virgo said:

> One of the first things he would like to do when he returned to Adelaide was to instigate a study area for the dial-a-bus.

On August 5, 1971 (three months later), the Minister said:

> I would like to think that well before Christmas we will see a dial-a-bus in operation in South Australia.

Four months later, in the *Advertiser* of December 31, 1971, Mr. Virgo is reported to have said that a confidential and expert report to the Government stated that dial-a-bus services were not the complete answer to metropolitan Adelaide's transport needs. It was not the complete answer, and the Minister was worried about it. For

about two years things were quiet but, suddenly there was a bustle in the Minister's office because, in March, 1973, the Minister said that the world's biggest dial-a-bus system would begin operating in Adelaide in the following June. He said the service would be called Dial-a-bus, that 14 buses would be operated, each with 12 seats, and that people living within the area of the service would be able to dial a central number and go to any destination within the serviced area. He said that a bus would be at their doorstep within half an hour. We all know how successful that system was. The Minister of Transport said that it would cost the Government about $3 000 or $4 000, yet in the *Advertiser* of August 15, 1973, the Hon. Mr. Broomhill (who had decided it was time to get into the news, perhaps because the Minister of Transport had a sore throat or was away) said:

The State Government has spent $31 473·24 on the dial-a-bus programme.

The Minister of Transport made a guesstimate that it would cost between $3 000 and $4 000 for the system, but the actual sum spent was nearly $31 500.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That's a condemnation of private enterprise. That's what you are doing.

Mr. MATHWIN: The Minister can talk about private enterprise, but we know his system in relation to it.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What is it?

Mr. MATHWIN: Beat it until it is absolutely on its knees and then take it over. That is what he did with private bus operators because, when they asked for a subsidy he said, "No show". The Minister waited like a lion waiting for its prey and pounced on the private bus operators, saying "We'll buy you out." That is a typical take-over—a nationalisation programme, which is the basis of the socialist Government the Minister represents. Let us now consider the Adelaide railway station, about which the Minister should know something. On May 15, 1974, a report in the *News* stated:

State Cabinet has given the go-ahead for architects to draw up plans for the complete redevelopment of the Adelaide railway station site. Mr. Virgo said preliminary plans for a 14½ acre site included an international hotel—

there it is again: I have already been through the Victoria Square episode, but then we were to have an international hotel near Parliament House—

an administration centre for the railways and the State Transport Authority, office accommodation, shops and restaurants—

We already have a restaurant in the basement of the railway station that can cater for weddings. If a bride wishes to dress up in her wedding gown, trip down the steps and past the trains, she can have her wedding reception there. The report continues:

and other commercial facilities, and an 8 000-seat stadium.

What an airy-fairy plan. That was announced some time ago, yet we have heard nothing more about it from this Government. It is just another promise held out to the public to blind them. The Government has no intention of fulfilling that promise.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Do you really believe that?

Mr. MATHWIN: Yes. In 1973 the Minister was dealing with the Federal Labor Government in relation to the electrification of the Christie Downs railway line, and the Minister and Mr. Jones were getting on like a house on fire. On July 27, 1973, Mr. Virgo said that double-decker trains could be operating on the Adelaide to Christie Downs railway line by July, 1975. He stated:

We will introduce $22 700 000 project to electrify the entire Adelaide to Christie Downs railway service.

Either the Minister or the officers could not decide whether to proceed with a third railway line or have an overhead rail system, and they changed their minds regularly. No-one could get organised. Because of the problems of safety relating to the third rail system and the pressures that were being brought to bear on the Minister about the aesthetic value of overhead wires, the Minister was really behind the eightball.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Tell the truth, for a change.

Mr. MATHWIN: The Minister would know that what I am saying is correct. They fluctuated from the overhead system to the third rail system so often that the Minister would have been dizzy.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That is not correct.

Mr. MATHWIN: The Minister had his problems with the third rail system and the overhead system.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Actually, the argument was not whether it would be the third rail system or the overhead system: the argument was whether it would be an A.C. system or a D.C. system.

Mr. MATHWIN: That was another aspect of the argument: whether the trains should produce their own electricity using separate motors under each carriage. The Minister could not get past the conservationists in connection with the idea for an overhead system. Further, there was considerable pressure from the Left wing in connection with this matter. We know where the Minister's thoughts lie. On July 28, 1973, an *Advertiser* article states:

High-speed, electric double-decker trains could be servicing the new Adelaide-Christie Downs railway line by mid-1975. They will be part of a $22 700 000 project to up-grade the service. The trains would be capable of 70 m.p.h. and might be air-conditioned. With their fast acceleration and braking, they would reduce the Christie Downs trip to Adelaide to 40 minutes—faster and safer than people could expect to travel by road.

Two months later, an article in the *Sunday Mail* of September 9, 1973, states:

"Almost certain" electrification of the Adelaide-Elizabeth rail line was announced yesterday by the Transport Minister, Mr. Virgo. Mr. Virgo said that this would follow electrification of the Adelaide-Christie Downs line.

So, we have promises all along the way regarding the Christie Downs railway line. Then, on March 11, 1974, an article in the *Advertiser* states:

Mr. Virgo said that electrification of Adelaide's metropolitan rail system at a cost of about $15 000 000 could be completed within seven years. Work on the three metropolitan lines—Port Adelaide, Gawler and the Adelaide Hills—would begin soon after the $15 000 000 electric railway between Adelaide and Christie Downs was completed.

I believe that the first guesstimate for electrifying the line from Adelaide to Christie Downs was $8 000 000, but who would imagine that that would cover the cost of such a project? Later, the estimated cost was altered from $22 000 000 to $15 000 000. Of course, the original figure of $8 000 000 was ridiculous.

Mr. Keneally: Not as ridiculous as the honourable member.

Mr. MATHWIN: The honourable member wakes up every now and then with a silly interjection. On July 2, 1975, an *Advertiser* article states:

Mr. Dunstan said that it was hoped to have the first diesel train on the Christie Downs line late this year and to have the first electric train running in 1977.

After all the palaver of the Minister of Transport, the Premier took a hand in it, as we can see in that article. The Minister said that this was the greatest breakthrough ever. With the Federal Labor Government, the authorities

would have the money, according to the Minister, and would get on with the job. What happened? Now, we have not even got a decent locomotive. The authorities are so short of funds, after all the money that was promised by the Federal Labor Government, that the South Australian Government hardly has a locomotive in operation. Further, very few locomotives are in first-class condition.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: We now have a rotten Federal Liberal Government that gives South Australia nothing. Why don't you stick up for South Australia?

Mr. MATHWIN: It is no use the Minister's trying to tell us about the so-called disadvantages of the Fraser Government, because it was the Whitlam Government that promised this, and it was the Whitlam Government that reneged on the promises. The Minister should recall the row he had with Mr. Jones, the then Commonwealth Minister for Transport, when they walked out of a meeting fiery red and very upset. An article in the *Advertiser* of May 27, 1971, states:

Moves to introduce a 300 m.p.h. hovertrain transport system to South Australia were initiated in London this week by the Minister of Roads and Transport (Mr. Virgo). He said, "I'm hoping we shall be able to find a way in which South Australia may share in the development of the hovertrain."

The Minister went on with some wild schemes. A few years later he spoke about cactus as a possible fuel source, and said:

One of the most exotic schemes that could be considered is "personalised rapid transit". This enables a traveller to dial a destination and be automatically transported at up to 48 km/h in miniature cars over an electric rail network. The really big question is: can people take it? We can produce the system, but when people are being whizzed over complicated, interconnected, intercrossing tracks at 48 km/h without personal control, will the human psyche take it?"

That was his problem: can the people take it? According to the Minister, it was not a problem of finance and not a problem of his rows with Mr. Jones. His biggest problem was: can the people take it? We have all received a beautiful brochure issued by the Minister which states:

The Government's first big step in upgrading urban public transport. Travel will be a pleasure on the new line. Travel will be quicker and far more comfortable than ever before. This is an impression of the new interiors.

Now, we know there is no rolling stock and that very few locomotives are in first-class condition.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Don't talk rubbish!

Mr. MATHWIN: You well know that you have big problems in your railway system, and your rolling stock is well below par. You have done nothing about it. You are saving now on a deficit, with all this money from the Commonwealth Government.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: And you—

The SPEAKER: I point out to the Minister of Transport and to the member for Glenelg that they are both using the unparliamentary expression "you", and have been doing so quite frequently.

Mr. MATHWIN: I apologise, Mr. Speaker. I would not like to upset the Minister. I have a brochure, which has been sent to me from the United Kingdom, on the new Pendair system of transport. Some schemes involving this system are just coming into operation. It is the latest air-cushion train system, now in the experimental stages. The brochure states:

Elevated rapid transport: The construction time and capital cost of an elevated transit system are of the order of one-third of those of a corresponding conventional underground system. Because the Pendair overhead track is much lighter and smaller than that required for an elevated conventional railway, its vibration is less, and its noise level some 15 dbA lower. Pendair can also be used in situations where an elevated railway would not be acceptable.

On routes with an average distance between stops of about 1 km a speed of 80 km/h is as high as can be effectively used. A coach angle of roll of about 5 degrees with up to a further 5 degrees of track banking enables a cornering performance of conventional standard to be achieved with a simplified Pendair suspension which does not require separate bogies as mentioned above. The minimum turning radius for a non-articulated coach 15 m long is about 70 m in this case. Pendair elevated rapid transit makes maximum use of any suitable existing transport corridor, such as the central reservation of a motorway, to ease the problems of access into a built-up area. However, it is possible that some underground construction may often be needed for entry to city centres, as the final section of a system which is mainly elevated above ground.

I am willing to let the Minister see these brochures, if he wishes. I have much information. The matter must be researched even further, and it might be interesting for some of the Minister's airy-fairy ideas.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Have you got a fair bit of information there?

Mr. MATHWIN: I will give you the information.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You've got a fair bit there?

Mr. MATHWIN: Yes.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Could I suggest that, perhaps if you read it, you wouldn't talk so much rubbish.

Mr. MATHWIN: I have read it. I have been talking rubbish, because I have been quoting the Minister's comments for the past five years. I would be the first to agree that most of his comments are rubbish, and it is one of the few times that the Minister and I would agree. This rapid transport system has its advantages: it has no level crossings. It was designed to take advantage of a situation that eliminates interference with road transport systems.

One of the problems in my area relates to clearways and the system set up by the Minister, especially on Brighton Road. It is all very well to set up clearways, but first it is necessary to cater for pedestrians, the old and the young. Although Brighton Road is to become a clearway, three points on the road still remain where no activated crossings are provided for pedestrians. At Hove we have a school and a senior citizens club with about 740 members who find it virtually impossible to cross Brighton Road. The Minister must provide adequate protection for pedestrians, old and young, to cross the road in safety.

My district attracts more tourists than does any other area in South Australia, and it has more tourist beds than has any other South Australian area. We have a privately-operated bus service so that tourists may view the countryside, and yet the Government will not license the operator to carry tourists to Barossa Valley. It will allow him to take people to Victor Harbor and to areas in the Hills, but not to carry passengers to Barossa Valley. People who visit South Australia like to visit the Barossa Valley, but they have to take a tram or a taxi or a bus to the city to get transport to the valley.

This private operator has approached the department many times seeking a licence. He has been told what he must do, and he is quite willing to meet all demands put on him by this selfish Government, which is looking after its own service to Barossa Valley. This is another scheme on the part of the Government to try to break this private operator. It is an inconvenience to him and to the people staying in Glenelg who wish to visit Barossa

Valley. It is obvious that this service should be provided, and it is obvious why the Minister will not license this operator.

We have heard discussions lately on public holidays to be observed in December. I am sure the member for Hanson will support me when I say that Proclamation Day is a day for Glenelg. It is an historic occasion. We should support that day, and we should not take any other day in lieu of it. The date has been set by history and tradition, which come only with age. We are a young country, and we should maintain the traditions we have. This is a tradition that we should maintain, and I would never support the changing of Proclamation Day from December 28 to any other day, just for the convenience of some people.

We should support Proclamation Day, because it is a tradition that we should guard jealously so that no-one ever takes it away from us. My colleague, the member for Hanson, and I will do all we can to retain it for all time. I was interested to read in the *News* the other day a report of the matter raised by the Premier. Headlined, "Dunstan challenges value of home," the report states:

The Premier, Mr. Dunstan, is challenging the official Government valuation of his Norwood home.

It is clear, after looking carefully at details of property sales in the district, that prices for both residential and commercial properties are high.

This is news to the Premier. We have been trying to tell him that for years. The member for Hanson and I had a public meeting some years ago and tried to tell the Government what the situation was, but it refused to listen and said that we were stirring and trying to cause trouble in the community. The Premier said that we were being highly political, yet when it comes to his turn in Norwood and when his people are going to be faced with this problem, he says in the great wise words of the Leader of the Labor Party:

It is clear, after looking carefully at details of property sales in the district, that prices for both residential and commercial properties are high.

What a great, earth-shattering statement from the Premier of the State, who has only just learned, because he has received his valuation, that properties are increasing in value. The report continued:

This has been reflected in the new valuation. While the system itself is reasonable it seems to have produced large increases in the Norwood district.

This has been happening in Glenelg and Brighton, is happening now in Marion and West Torrens, and the Premier has just woken up to the situation. Of course, he is able to organise himself and get, for the benefit of his constituents, officers from the Valuation Department to come to his district. That is more than was offered to the member for Hanson and I: we were trouble-makers. We were frowned upon by the Premier and Government members, because we dared to raise the matter in this place for our constituents. The people from my district had to come to the city to see the valuer.

Mr. McRae: Are we going to reach the Glenelg tram at last?

Mr. MATHWIN: There is supposed to be much spending on the Glenelg tram line, but what about some new vehicles? We have heard much talk about unionism, communism, socialism, and one vote one value. Members on the other side should try to think up a system to operate in unions to provide for one vote one value, but we know what the situation is there. We know that, when a man puts his hand up for a specific union, he represents 8 000 or 9 000 votes. If that is one vote one value, I will go he. The same system works with selection in the Labor Party.

Mr. Keneally: How does it work in Glenelg?

Mr. MATHWIN: We all know in Glenelg that the dress rehearsal was a bit rough, but when it came to the actual point things worked out pretty well. Government members were treading on thin ice when referring to pre-selection in the Liberal Party, because we all remember well the pre-selection for the Pirie seat before the previous election. We all know what happened there. We know how the official Labor candidate got done cold by a person who had a great personal following in the Port Pirie area. What was the price he paid? He was expelled from the Party—a nasty man, a nasty member of Parliament. He was expelled for daring to oppose the Labor endorsed candidate, because it is not fair and not allowed to be done.

When the figures were added up and it was found to be even with the same number of members on this side as on the other, there had to be some tricky shadow boxing done, and they called on the great performer himself, the Premier, who went to the convention at Trades Hall and said, "We are on a razor edge, we have to have some help. You must support me. We must take this naughty boy back into our Party to help me and support me." What happened? The flock all got round the Premier and said, "Yes Sir, you are so right. We will support you and bring the prodigal man back into the Party."

What happened not long after, when there was a redistribution? What happened to this saviour of the Government? He got a seat that is impossible to win: they played the dirty on him. The Premier, who is a mixture (and what better mixture can you get than politician, lawyer, and amateur actor, what a great situation you have), was able to put it over him and the Party and said, "Well, tough luck, you have done us well and we will give you Rocky River because you have no show of winning it at all." It is all right for Government members to talk about members on this side, but if they really want to get into it they should consider what happened to the member for Pirie.

What happened to the member for Stuart when he got up, spoke in this debate: he is the Government's spokesman for the extreme left? He told us a lot. He did not tell us what we wanted to know, but he talked about socialism and communism. He did not explain to us where the pink finishes and the red begins. He did not tell us the difference between compulsory unionism and absolute preference to unionists. He did not tell us the difference between nationalisation and the taking over of industry by gentle persuasion. He did not tell us any of those things because, of course, he cannot. We know the front bench member for the far left, the Attorney-General, from his writings in *On Dit*, but the member for Stuart is the back-bench representative of the extreme left.

As we pass along this journey, we know all about trade unions. We know that union leaders want either capitalism without profit or socialism without discipline. That it the ultimate. Members on this side and the public want to know what the Government is trying to get with compulsory unionism. It is after the power that it has over the public through trade unionism in placing industrial muscle, or is it for the financial benefit that could accrue to the Party? I think that financial benefit is what the Labor Party really wants through compulsory unionism. We know that Mr. Goldsworthy, Secretary of the shop assistant's union, has many members who are not affiliated

with the Australian Labor Party. We all know why the Premier woos him at every opportunity, because he can see funds for the Labor Party.

Trade unions have many powers: the power to strike (which is not always for higher pay), the power to conduct a go slow campaign, the power to conduct a work-to-rules campaign, and the power to impose an overtime ban. All those powers have drastic consequences for rank and file members of the union. The threat of unemployment has been referred to by several members opposite. So, too, has the cost of losing a person's job. According to members opposite, the Federal Government is fully to blame for unemployment. We all know about Australia's problems. We should all know that unemployment is caused by the high cost of wages. We know that employers ask for experienced juniors, because of the high cost involved in employing young people. To prove that statement I would remind the House of the log of claims filed recently by the Federated Furnishing Trades Society of Australia, to which I referred recently. Under that claim no employee under the age of 18 years shall receive less than $550 a week. What employer could employ young people at that rate of pay each week?

Mr. McRae: Fair go! You know its an ambit claim.

Mr. MATHWIN: Yes, but it is still a claim.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: What is an ambit claim?

Mr. MATHWIN: As the member for Henley Beach has asked that question, I will refer to this log of claims in more detail. According to the claim, absolute preference of employment shall be given to unionists. I have yet to hear a member opposite tell me the difference between absolute preference to unionists and compulsory unionism. What is the difference? Either one joins a union or does not get a job and the family starves. Government members all know that that is the difference, and know that the reason for compulsory unionism is to boost Labor Party finances. According to the A.C.T.U., 1 per cent of a worker's pay is to be a union fee. From the metal trades unions that would amount to about $9 000 000 a year being ploughed into Labor Party funds.

Mrs. Byrne: That's not true.

Mr. MATHWIN: It is a fact. It is about time that members of Caucus and senior members of the Labor Party enlightened the community and union members, who have to pay sustentation fees.

Mrs. Byrne: I know more about it than you do.

Mr. MATHWIN: It is all right for the honourable member to say that, but she would know that a member of a union must pay a sustentation fee to the Labor Party, otherwise he is out. That fee enables the Labor Party to fight for its political aims. The honourable member would know—

Mrs. Byrne: You're wrong. You should check your facts.

Mr. MATHWIN: I am right. The member for Tea Tree Gully would know that it is 70c a quarter.

Mrs. Byrne: It's not.

Mr. MATHWIN: That money is used to aid the finances of the Labor Party.

Mrs. Byrne: You are generalising, and you shouldn't.

Mr. MATHWIN: Sustentation fees are going to the Labor Party and, now and again on top of that, some unions impose a political levy for the Labor Party. What does the member for Tea Tree Gully have to say about that? That is a levy demanded for the Labor Party. Is the Labor Party dissatisfied with the thousands of dollars it gets from trade unionists? That is the history of the Labor Party and is one chapter of that history about which all members opposite should be ashamed. The Party is demanding money from rank and file workers whether they like it or not, and whether they are of the same political complexion or not. That is an absolute disgrace and members opposite know it.

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

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): Mr. Speaker, I think you should adjourn the House for 10 minutes—

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not believe there is any need for that.

Mr. VENNING: —to allow that speech to sink into members opposite. They would have been really educated by the speech of the member for Glenelg this evening. Their reactions indicated clearly that the member for Glenelg was touching each and every one of them on the raw. In supporting the motion, I applaud the gracious manner with which Mr. Walter Russell Crocker, C.B.E., opened Parliament. I have known members of the Crocker family for some time, and they are gracious people. I think of Enroy Crocker, a relative of the Lieutenant-Governor, from Broken Hill, who was well known to everyone in that town and who received recognition from the Queen. He died in the 1960's.

I also express my sympathy to the families of those former members of Parliament who died during the past 12 months and who were referred to in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech. I refer especially to the late Tom Stott, C.B.E., who was a member of this Parliament for 37 years and was twice Speaker of the House. I find myself almost saying Sir Tom Stott, because I believe he should have been knighted. I tried several times to get a knighthood for Tom Stott but, because of jealousies within the industry at that time, certain people used their influence to see that Tom Stott was not knighted.

Mr. Keneally: Was Steele Hall involved?

Mr. VENNING: Yes. No-one had done so much for the wheat industry as Tom Stott did, and he did much for the man on the land. Tom Stott gave us the story of his life, which started when he was reaping on the family farm. He worked out how much he would get for the grain—1s. 4d. a bushel. He said to himself, "We are reaping at a loss." He took the horses out of the harvester, went home, and said to his father, "I am going to see the banker. The more we work the greater our losses, and it will not pay us to take off the crop." The banker persuaded him to go home, put the horses back in the harvester, and he took off the crop.

Tom Stott, through his dual affiliations, did much to help farmers, and he also gave valuable service in this House for 37 years. He had a monopoly: he had the constitution of his organisation so fixed that no member of Parliament could hold office in it, but he, as an Independent, had a special dispensation so that he could hold office. I will not hold that against him. This may be something that our present organisation could consider: perhaps we should alter the constitution to allow a member of Parliament to hold office in the United Farmers and Graziers. I believe that a member of Parliament can hold office in the Stockowners Association. An elected member of a grower organisation should be judged on his ability, irrespective of whether he is a member of Parliament or not.

Tom Stott was responsible for forming the Australian Wheatgrowers Federation, an organisation made up of representatives from all States. We can give Tom Stott

the credit for forming the Australian Wheat Board and the wheat stabilisation scheme: they go hand in hand. Tom Stott told the story of going to Western Australia to debate the issue with Sir John Teasdale, who, being a Western Australian, had the advantage of being the first speaker, and Tom Stott followed him. Tom thought that he was defeated before he started. Tom said that he told the growers that, under wheat stabilisation, never again would the wheatgrowers in Australia have to produce wheat at a price below the cost of production.

That was the turning point in connection with wheat stabilisation and it has been a wonderful thing for the growers. Where does one see anywhere people working for a payment below the cost of their labours? Tom Stott was responsible for forming the South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited. I know what pressure was put on the Government by merchants in those days to keep bulk handling out of this State. It was through Tom Stott's efforts and those of my predecessor, Jim Heaslip, who crossed the floor, that bulk handling was established in this State. So, the silos throughout the State could be regarded as monuments to Tom Stott. Unfortunately, as time passes, memories become short, and only the older members of the community recall the work he did.

There have been recent reports of the success of the marketing efforts of the Australian Wheat Board, which has sold 3 000 000 tonnes of grain to China, and there has been another sale since then. The nations that purchase our wheat like to deal with an organisation such as the Australian Wheat Board, rather than with individual merchants. It has been shown time and time again that the board has been successful in its endeavours to market grain. There have been some press comments lately that there may be some changes in the Wheat Board. I add a word of warning: if any alteration is made, those concerned should proceed with caution. The only alteration perhaps to be made is this: I believe that the value of grain in connection with the home market is lower than perhaps it should be.

The primary producer of this State has been subsidising the home market to a large extent. Government members do not appreciate what the primary producer is doing to assist in controlling the cost of living. In the press only last week Mr. Shanahan referred to the cost of tariffs to primary producers. They are hoping that the Federal Government will make a payout of about $128 000 000 to the industry for what it has forgone for the benefit of the Australian community.

I now refer to the death of Oliver Badman of Yacka, who was the member for Grey at one time and later a Senator. He farmed at Yacka, and he died about five or six months ago at the age of 92 years, and Sir Lyell McEwin and I attended his funeral. Some of my colleagues here do not know about him, because of his great age. He had not been seen in this place for many years. He used to write letters to the press, and at one stage he opposed bulk handling. When I attended the annual conference of the United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia Incorporated a fortnight ago, I was pleased that one of Oliver's sons, Ron Badman, from Naracoorte, was awarded life membership of that organisation. He had played an active part in the organisation for many years. He was associated with small seed production and, on one occasion, went overseas to promote the small seeds industry. It was pleasing, too, on that occasion that Mr. Ed. Roocke received his life membership. He was Chairman of the Quota Committee when we had a surplus of wheat in this State, and has been a great community man in the Booleroo Centre area, where he is being followed by his family.

When His Excellency opened Parliament he talked of seasonal prospects. At that stage they were extremely dry. He mentioned that stock numbers were down by 12 per cent; if he had said by 20 per cent I should have thought it was nearer the mark. However, there is probably some foundation for the figure he gave. In a drought year such as this in many areas it is not possible to feed 100 sheep properly, let alone more. However, the season has improved. Some areas have had good falls of rain and only a few areas now need a good downpour. We need a good rain right throughout the Commonwealth as soon as possible.

In his Speech, His Excellency mentioned that the Government would be introducing legislation to allow the Barley Board to handle oats. This has been the subject of much argument for many years. Oats is the cinderella grain, but I believe that the legislation that will come forward on the recommendation of the grower organisations will be such that growers will be permitted to deal with oats themselves for their own requirements without having to go through the board. Until one sees the legislation, of course, it is not possible to know what is involved, but in principle I believe it is a good thing that the Barley Board should handle oats for export.

Mr. Keneally: This will really impress those workers at B.H.A.S.

Mr. VENNING: I shall come to them directly. Legislation is to be introduced covering the varieties of wheat that will be permitted in South Australia. Tonight, the Minister of Transport has had a fairly good going over by the member for Glenelg. I had intended to deal with him, too. I would not say that the Minister falls down in his duties any more than does any other Minister, but in relation to the vast areas where transport is so important it is necessary to mention him. One of the urgent needs in the northern part of the State is to keep open the railway lines. We have heard much comment to the effect that the Federal Minister may close the Peterborough to Quorn line and the Gladstone to Wilmington line. The Federal Minister 12 months ago sent an economist, Mr. Lynch, to take evidence on the economics of the two lines.

Mr. Keneally: That is not the Mr. Lynch?

Mr. VENNING: No, Mr. Lynch from Tasmania. This report indicated that these lines were not paying their way, but I think everyone knows that probably no line in the State pays its way. However, the lines are there and doing what is required to handle the grain produced in the area. Following Mr. Lynch's report, the Federal Minister decided to set up another committee to look into various aspects of what would happen if the lines were closed. Its job was to look at the impact on the environment and to investigate what road works would be required if the lines were closed. The committee's report was to take into account the social effects as well as the availability and suitability of alternative means of transport should the closure be effected, including costs involved, for example, in necessary road improvements.

If this Government could show its ability to upgrade our roads system, I may have gone along with Mr. Lynch. Our roads system is such that I will not support the closure of these lines. As the member for the area, I shall do everything possible to keep these lines open until the Government can show me that it has the ability and the management expertise to do something about roads.

We are talking decentralisation every day, and the railways would be the best decentralised industry in our State. If these lines were closed, about 30 families would be moving away from the area, away would go our small country towns, school numbers would be depleted, and children living on farms would have to travel long distances for their education. I support the retention of these lines. Meetings have been held at Orroroo and Booleroo Centre, attended by many members of the communities in these areas. The whole area, to a man, is behind the retention of the lines.

The State Minister has been very critical of the committee set up recently to report on the environmental aspect of the lines. Mr. Barclay is the Chairman of that committee, and Mr. Keal, the South Australian representative, is Project Officer for the Transport Department. Also on the committee is Mr. Myers, of the Bureau of Transport Economics, from Canberra. So, we have one South Australian and two Federal people. The State Minister was up tight because he considered we should have two South Australians to one Federal member. We could argue all day about that, but the South Australian Government was keen to sell the non-metropolitan railways to the Federal Government, and it is only right that the Federal people should have the balance of power on the committee. Before any line is closed, the Federal Minister must confer with the State Minister. I know that the relationship between them is not good, and I can understand why. So, one looks at the activities of the Minister of Transport in this State with great suspicion.

I was disgusted with the reply given to my colleague recently in this House regarding the Cavan over-pass. We know that the Federal Government has increased its payments to the States in many areas of road activity and that for rural arterial roads there is to be an increase of 87·7 per cent. I know that it is true to say that in other areas there has been a decrease in the percentage compared to last year's expenditure. We find that, although the Commonwealth Government has made this allocation, it will not be spent in this manner because of the present involvement of the State Minister in other areas of the State. I think of the situation of the freeways, brought about by what was supposed to be the development of Monarto. We find that the State Government has still to plough much money into completing the freeway in that area, so until it is completed there will be a downturn in finance for many of the roads that are in urgent need of upgrading. The member for Gouger asked the Minister about the situation at Cavan, and the Minister said:

. . . however, there is one important aspect and that is why this has not yet been announced. Before we are permitted to go ahead with the expenditure of this money we must first ask Mr. Nixon in Canberra for his approval.

The Minister, when answering that question, said much money had been spent on drawing the plans for that work. That was on about July 20. I was concerned about this matter because I traverse that road frequently and am often caught in traffic jams, so I went to my Federal colleague and told him about the situation the Minister had stated. He immediately conferred with Canberra and found that Mr. Virgo had written to Mr. Nixon on May 10, and that Mr. Nixon had replied to Mr. Virgo on July 14. The question was asked a week after Mr. Virgo received the letter from Mr. Nixon. Having received that information on about July 22, I went to the Minister and said, "Have you heard from Mr. Nixon?" He knew that I had been looking into the matter, and he had to admit that he had received a letter from Mr. Nixon and that the work would proceed. That is all very good, and one could expect some activity to take place. It has not started yet, however, and I do not know how long it will be before it starts. It had not commenced when I passed there on Monday, so I will see on my way home tomorrow night whether anything has been done. It concerns me greatly to think of a situation in this State where we have a Highways Department organisation at Walkerville with machinery that could handle anything, and equipment throughout the State that I believe also could handle anything, yet we find a deterioration in the roads in this State. I hope that, as time progresses and the involvement of the Government in other works decreases, we will see an upgrading of the roads in the State.

Mr. Russack: Do you think that some of the money that should be going to rural areas is going into other areas?

Mr. VENNING: I am sure that is the case, because of the Government's involvement in certain projects. Also, the Government is not getting as much money as previously, and we have to rely on the Commonwealth allocation of finance for transport and roads. I would like to pay a tribute to Mr. Kevin Rohrlach, of Angaston. He is the contractor who was successful in winning the contract for the new bridge over the Rocky River at Wirrabara. This bridge was washed away in October, 1975. He has not been working on the bridge for long. He has had three of his men and a couple of local men working there, and I believe the bridge will open to the public in two months, which is a good effort in the time since the contract was allocated. It has taken a much shorter time that it took the Highways Department to draw up the plans, get rid of the old structure and prepare for the new. I pay a tribute to private enterprise for the way it handled the construction of that bridge.

The bridge built over the creek at Crystal Brook was washed away at the same time as the Wirrabara road bridge, and the new structure is nearing completion. I was concerned when Mr. Johinke came into my area a few weeks ago at my invitation. He was supposed to be accompanied by the Minister, but the Minister was unwell and Mr. Johinke arrived on his own. We looked at certain roads, and then went to the Crystal Brook creek and inspected the railway bridge construction. We conferred with the railway engineer on site, and he expressed concern that he could not get a full complement of men to work on the bridge. He required 27 and had nine. Crystal Brook is only about 28 km from Port Pirie, where there is a record number of unemployed, yet he could not get sufficient men. I point this out as one of the shortcomings that exist today, particularly under this Government.

Mr. Keneally: What do you mean?

Mr. VENNING: The administration, generally speaking. This Government would not know the meaning of that. We are moving into the Budget time of the year. We have seen water charges increased, as we saw them increased last year and the year before prior to the Budget, so that when the Budget was brought down the Government said, "It is a very good Budget; there has been no increases." The Premier is up to his old pranks again, because water charges have been increased, and electricity charges have also been increased by 10 per cent since July 1. In 1971, the Premier introduced a Bill in this House to make the Electricity Trust pay the Treasury a percentage of its sales of electricity. It was not a net figure that the Government worked on but the gross sales. The amount was set in the legislation at 3 per cent of gross sales. That year the Electricity Trust paid into the Treasury $468 000.

In 1972, because of increased charges for and consumption of electricity, that 3 per cent raised $2 080 000. In 1973, the Premier brought down further legislation to increase the 3 per cent to 5 per cent, so in that year the figure was $2 241 000, and in 1974 it was $3 700 000. In 1975, the trust had to pay into Treasury $4 800 000, and in 1976 the sum was $5 800 000. The consumption of electricity in this State is increasing; the volume of water being pumped from the Murray River from time to time is pushing up that consumption. Only the other day the Premier announced that electricity charges would be increased by 10 per cent. Last September he increased charges by 12½ per cent. Less than 12 months later he is pushing them up by an additional 10 per cent.

Mr. Keneally: And there's been a 13·5 per cent inflation rate.

Mr. VENNING: No, the levy is based not on the trust's net financial position but on net sales. If it was not, I would go along with what the honourable member says. From July 1, this year electricity charges have increased by 10 per cent. Because of increased demand, this year the sum paid into Treasury will be about $7 500 000, and the trust must find that sum.

Mr. Keneally: To provide farmers with services.

Mr. VENNING: No, that has nothing to do with it.

Members interjecting:

Mr. VENNING: For goodness sake, just listen, you ignorant honourable so-and-so's.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. The honourable member knows as well as anyone in the House that occasionally the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker draw slight errors to the attention of members, but the term "you" is definitely out of order. The honourable member would know that well. The honourable member for Rocky River.

Mr. VENNING: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. What members opposite were saying has nothing to do with supplying electricity to the people of South Australia. When introducing the relevant Bill in 1971, the Premier stated in his second reading explanation that the Electricity Trust did not pay any income tax and that he therefore believed that it should pay some money into the Treasury. That is why the levy was introduced. It has nothing to do with supplying electricity throughout the State. Every member of Parliament should watch such a situation, because it is not where a thing starts but where it finishes that is of concern. This levy is the octopus of the legislation introduced in 1971.

This financial year the trust must find $7 500 000 to pay into the Treasury before it can pay its own way and pay to bring Leigh Creek coal down to Port Augusta. I take my hat off to the Electricity Trust for the service it has given to the State under adverse conditions. Only a few weeks ago I was at Port Augusta when the trust opened part of its new plant that cost $3 000 000. That equipment was to control smog and other material coming from the trust's chimney stacks. By installing this new equipment the trust has arrested about 99·9 per cent of the pollutants and is collecting about 20 tonnes an hour as a result of using the equipment, so about 500 tonnes is being arrested each day by precipitators in the new equipment. I congratulate the trust. Among members of the trust board are Sir Thomas Playford; Mr. Dryden, the Chairman (formerly Engineer-in-Chief); and Mr. Cyril Hutchens, a former colleague of members opposite. Those people are doing a wonderful job and it must concern them that, because of this levy, they must find that sum to run the trust and supply electricity to the State.

I now wish to make a few comments about North Malaysia Week. We did not mind having it in South Australia, but to have it here when Her Gracious Majesty the Queen was in South Australia was a shocking indictment to Her Majesty and to the people of this State. Our children should have been presented to the Queen on the lawns at Elder Park. Many of us were there and saw the reaction of people, and that reaction was a condemnation of this Government for conducting North Malaysia Week when Her Majesty was here. It has been said that it would have been better had our children performed before the Queen. The children of this State did not have an opportunity to see Her Majesty. I hope that such a situation never occurs again in this State. In a report headed "Malaysia Week costs criticised" it is stated:

North Malaysia week had been a highly expensive operation involving a disgraceful contribution by the South Australian Government, it was claimed yesterday. Mr. J. R. Bray, a spokesman for the group Malaysia Information, said "Much of the expenditure had been hidden in departmental budgets. This included the use of police cadets as chauffers, the use of Education Department buses, the granting of time off with pay to some teachers, and the financing of Malaysian kampong huts by the Public Buildings Department". Mr. Bray said North Malaysia Week was a propaganda exercise by a repressive foreign Government. The action of the South Australian Government in using State money to finance it could only be called disgraceful.

I support the idea that the North Malaysians could have come to South Australia at any time, not when the Queen was here. I now want to have a word to say about the Premier's coming into my district. He has never informed me of his intention of doing so. The Premier has marauded throughout the State. He has said that he has wanted to meet the people to ascertain the needs of country folk. He was in my district some months ago, but since then not once have the people in the area heard any further communication from him. He met many councils and groups, which are still waiting to hear something from him about their needs.

The Premier was politicking in the area with the Speaker. I have a copy of a letter that has been distributed in my district by the member for Pirie; thousands and thousands of these letters have gone out in the district. The envelope is a Parliamentary envelope with the insignia on the back. I am not sure who paid for the postage. The letter states:

As the endorsed A.L.P. candidate for the seat of Rocky River I wish to inform you that I will be visiting your area in the immediate future and trust that I shall have the opportunity to meet you and talk with you. If, however, I can assist you in any way, please contact me at the above address. In the meantime, I take this opportunity to inform you that on Friday, August 12, and Saturday, August 13, I shall be visiting Yacka, Gulnare, Georgetown, Redhill, Koolunga, and Port Broughton, accompanied by our Premier, Don Dunstan. If you or any organisation would like to meet our Premier personally or as a group I would be happy to make the necessary arrangements. Yours faithfully, Ted Connelly.

I would have thought that the Premier would indicate to the member for the district that he was going into his area on these occasions. I am condemning only the Premier, not the endorsed Labor Party candidate. I have door-knocked in Pirie, and I am not condemning the A.L.P. The North-West Agricultural Society, of which I am a life member and of which my grandfather was the first secretary, has invited the Premier to open the centenary show on Saturday week. What does the Premier plan to do? He plans to politick all the way up there. If he had any

decency, he would leave politics out of it. He will be politicking in the area on the morning of the show. It is clear how small-minded Government members are, because I was pleased to have the Premier, as the Premier, open the show.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: It shows how worried you are.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Rocky River has the floor.

Mr. VENNING: When you, Sir, were speaking in the debate, you condemned what had happened in my Party with regard to preselection. It has already been said what happened in Pirie, and I would have thought that you would tread more carefully in connection with this point. I think your memory must have been short, because what happened in Pirie is a joke. I have a heap of cuttings from the *Port Pirie Recorder*, but I will not use them now because there will be later times when they can be put to better use. When the Premier was in Port Pirie on June 30, 1975, he was confronted by a group of people.

Members interjecting:

Mr. VENNING: Order, please for goodness sake!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Rocky River is out of order. The honourable member for Rocky River has the floor, and the Chair will decide who is out of order.

Mr. VENNING: I believe that a member must be heard.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Chair will decide that matter. I hope the honourable member for Rocky River keeps to the motion.

Mr. VENNING: When the Premier was in Port Pirie, he was confronted by people there wanting industries for Port Pirie. A press report states:

Mr. Dunstan said, "Monarto has not taken a single resource from your city. We have not spent a cent in Monarto that could have been spent in Port Pirie."

That was rubbish. An article published on June 21, 1977, refers to an interest bill of $113 000 for Monarto that is going on month after month. No wonder the Port Pirie people are concerned with regard to wasteful expenditure by this Government, when Port Pirie's needs are so great.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What about that house—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Rocky River is making the speech, not the Minister.

Mr. VENNING: Mr. Acting Speaker—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I inform the honourable member that I am the Deputy Speaker.

Mr. VENNING: I thought that you, Sir, had been promoted. At any rate, we only have to wait until after the next election. I was door-knocking in Port Pirie—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You didn't even—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! If the Minister keeps on interjecting—

Mr. Mathwin: It's about—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Glenelg is out of order. I would like the honourable member for Rocky River to continue his speech. Interjections are out of order.

Mr. VENNING: Thank you, Mr. Acting Speaker. I heard much about what happened before the previous election and about what the member for Pirie could have done for his constituents, if he had remained an Independent. They are not happy with what happened in Port Pirie, and it is a shame for the sake of the people of Port Pirie.

Mr. Goldsworthy: They reckon the Government bought him.

Mr. VENNING: I do not know, but I believe that the then member, after the election, could have got anything for the people there. When the Premier was in Port Pirie, he told the people, when they complained about the water supply, that water in the North would be treated in 1977. We are in 1977 now, but the newspaper of July 27 reports that crystal clear water is on the way, but only for a lucky 250 000 people in the metropolitan area. It will be a long year, if the people in the North are to have filtered water in 1977. I could refer to other broken promises by the Premier as he leads this Government.

When the locust plague hit the Northern areas in the past 12 months, the Government made money available for spraying, but local people were disgusted with the way in which the whole matter was handled. Had the action of the Government been in keeping with its publicity, there would not have been a grasshopper left. The propaganda was the best part of the Government's effort. I could not understand why the Government did not send in the heavies early, the men who knew the problems and the habits of locusts. Junior personnel were there, but if Peter Birks, for example, had gone into the area and stayed there, his experience would have been invaluable. He has been associated with the Agriculture Department for many years, and I believe his services should have been used to greater effect when the situation was critical.

I was amazed about some comments in newspapers, in which some officers said that grasshoppers would not affect vines. The newspaper of February 16, 1977, reported losses in the Barossa Valley: $90 000 in vines, $100 000 in potatoes, $30 000 in carrots, $2 000 in cabbages and cauliflowers, $35 000 in celery, and $2 000 in lettuce, with a total loss of $2 000 000. Had the Government brought in planes earlier, we would not have had the difficulties later experienced, as grasshoppers would have been controlled at the outset.

The locusts even got over to Kangaroo Island, and the newspaper reported that farmers on Kangaroo Island were the latest victims of the locust plague, and that the Agriculture Department reported severe damage to stock-feed crops on the western end of the island. The department's information officer said that strong north-west winds had carried the locusts past Adelaide and on to Kangaroo Island. Most of the locusts on the island were in small groups over a fairly wide areas.

The devastation caused by hoppers covered a wide area. They moved into the Barossa Valley and into Clare, damaging lucerne, and polluting stock feed. The total damage was estimated to be about $2 000 000. I hope that we will learn from our mistakes, and act more quickly in future. Primary producers did a magnificent job, spraying with demisters, and so on, but at times it is necessary to call in the Army, with planes and helicopters, to spray otherwise inaccessible areas. I hope that action will be taken more quickly in future, at the right time.

The Aboriginal Lands Trust has purchased land east of Port Pirie for a drying-out area. I put a Question on Notice regarding the cost of the land. I believe that the trust paid more than $540 an acre for an area of about 75 acres. The Minister, in reply to my question, said that it was a Federal matter and that I should confer with my

Federal colleague to get the reply. The people in the area are up in arms about this high valuation and what it will do to their land valuations as a basis for water rating. I know this is a delicate matter, but I am concerned about the repercussions of this high price.

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

Mr. VANDEPEER secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy) moved:

That the House do now adjourn.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): I indicate my concern at the duck-shoving operation being undertaken by Ministers in this place in relation to Questions on Notice. The Minister who wanted to bypass his responsibility and find an excuse the question he was asked yesterday regarding hydrocarbons and mineral wealth in this State.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You read the question. Any reasonable man wouldn't give you an answer.

Dr. EASTICK: Especially a man, in this case a Minister who wanted to bypass his responsibility and find an excuse not to tell members of the Opposition what the situation is, even though he discussed the same matters on air, as he did last week. Yet they are not willing to give this House the replies to perfectly legitimate questions, not hypothetical questions. I make the same reference in regard to the Minister of Works, and if we examine yesterday's Question on Notice No. 3—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Who's duck-shoving now?

Dr. EASTICK: We will come back to Question on Notice No. 86 in a moment. Question on Notice No. 3 on yesterday's Notice Paper was directed to the Minister of Works, and states:

How many times has the Water Resources Council . . .

He gave replies to part 1, but parts 2 and 3 were bypassed, and an indication was given that members of the Water Resources Council were not there to make decisions but to offer advice to the Minister. Part 4 states:

What reaction has there been to the above report by the Commonwealth Government?

The reply received was that 3 and 4 were answered in the reply to Question on Notice No. 2. The reply to No. 2 states:

The Water Resources Council is not charged with decision making, but making recommendations directly to the Minister of Works on the State's water resources.

This was quite obviously an attempt by the Minister to bypass the responsibility, which is his, to reply to questions put, or at least to state that he does not want to reply to a question. He should not go through the back door using the method I have just related. The Minister for Mines and Energy referred me to Question on Notice No. 86, which states:

On known facts, is South Australia's most promising financial and industrial potential expected to be associated with hydrocarbon exploitation or with the development and mining of the State's mineral deposits, especially those in the Yunta, Orroroo, and Roxby Downs areas, and what factors support such view?

The Minister duck-shoved that one, which was politically uncomfortable for him, by suggesting it was a hypothetical question. It is not a hypothetical question; it is an important question for the future of the people of this State. Quite obviously, the Minister does not want to get into difficulty with his back-bench and some of his Ministerial colleagues who are breathing down his neck because of his known attitude to the uranium question. The question continues:

What is the earliest date that significant royalties, in excess of $500 000, can be expected from new developments in either project?

The silly reply that came back to that question was that we are already receiving much more than $500 000 from hydrocarbons. That was not the question, and the Minister knew full well that in giving that reply he was trying to pull the wool over the eyes of members of this House.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Anybody could work out that the next extra $500 000 of royalties is to come from the sale of hydrocarbons in the expansion of gas sales to Sydney.

The SPEAKER: Order! That is not a point of order.

Dr. EASTICK: That was not the reply given by the Minister, and anyone who wants to refer to the appropriate pages of *Hansard* will realise how puerile was the effort the Minister just made to get himself off the hook. I find it difficult, on behalf of many constituents I represent, to obtain for them a quick and reasoned answer from the Engineering & Water Supply Department, especially in relation to water rates and excess water rates. Arguing with a computer seems to be an impossible task. Are we arguing with a computer, or have officers been told not to follow through requests that are made seeking details about water, especially excess water, charges? As an example, I refer to the matter of a constituent from the Greenock area who telephoned me tonight quite distressed. He has had a final notice from the department, notwithstanding that he has been in touch with it, and notwithstanding that there has been not a telephone call but a letter of inquiry instituted by his member wanting to know why he should suddenly receive an account for excess water from 1975-76, when he had already received an account for his excess water for 1976-77.

The simple explanation given to him was that somehow the department had forgotten to forward his excess water charge for 1975-76 and, when it found out that he had excess water consumption for 1976-77, it checked its records and decided that he would have to pay an additional charge for 1975-76. What the department did not know was that the excess charge for 1976-77 had arisen because of the problem encountered by this person when the locust plague went through his vineyard, denuded it, and he was advised by the Agriculture Department to get water on to the vineyard as quickly as possible.

Such action was taken by several people in the area, and it was assisted by my representations to the Minister, who sent an officer to the area to make further water available to those people. My constituent used water for 25 acres of vineyard irrigation in 1976-77, and he had used water on one occasion for three acres of vineyard in 1975-76. Yet the Engineering and Water Supply Department has come back to him and said that, for 1975-76, because his excess water charge for 1976-77 was about $471, it was estimated that he should pay about $423 for 1975-76. That is the account this man has received. Currently, he has before him to be paid tomorrow an account for more than $900. He cannot meet this charge because, as I have already pointed out, for 1976-77 his vineyard was denuded by locusts.

Therefore, there was no crop and no return and he has been unable to obtain a sympathetic ear in the department. Also, his local member has been unable to obtain a reply on his behalf to a written request. That is just one of the many examples that members could relate in respect of the inhumanity of a system which puts a computer before the individual and which hides behind a computer when, in fact, it is a matter which an individual officer should immediately take up. There are too many examples of this nature being brought to the attention of members. There is an urgent need for a hurry-up—

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

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): Being appointed the spokesman for the extreme Left, comrade Chair, I should like to make some comments about matters hopefully, in which, the member for Glenelg will be interested. It is absolutely significant to me, at least, in listening to the contributions of Opposition members in the Address in Reply debate that they have no concern whatever about the economic mess that this country is in. This contrasts greatly to the assumed interests that we thought they had when the Whitlam Government was in office. We have heard nothing at all from the gentlemen opposite about inflation, unemployment, or cutbacks in Federal funding, yet certainly the first two issues took up at least 70 per cent of their contributions in this House two years ago. We wonder why, suddenly, they are no longer interested in those issues. It seems to me that they are playing pure Party politics. They are prepared to support the Fraser Government's attack on the living standards of Australians, especially South Australians. I would have hoped that members opposite would get behind the South Australian Government to defend the rights of South Australians. After all, we are elected by South Australians to this House to protect the welfare of South Australians. Members opposite, in their blind following of the policies of Fraserism, are doing this State an injustice. I would have thought that we would hear something about cutbacks in education funding.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: The Leader is the worst knocker in this State.

Mr. KENEALLY: Certainly. The Leader, so aptly described as "Ocker the knocker", is setting a low standard. I would have thought that some of his colleagues would be sensible enough to disavow the Leader's attitude and come out in support of South Australia. We have heard nothing from members opposite about cutbacks in education.

Mr. Vandepeer: We haven't finished yet.

Mr. KENEALLY: I would be delighted to think that those members opposite who are still to speak would at least be willing to defend South Australian interests. We have heard nothing about the attack on funding for hospitals, urban transport, roads and water filtration. Only a few moments ago the member for Rocky River thought that it was a matter of great hilarity that filtering the water for northern parts of this State could not proceed. He said that the Premier was in Port Pirie and promised people there that their water would be filtered in 1977. I cannot recall the date, so I cannot argue about what he said. It is indisputable that the programme for water filtration in South Australia has been stopped because the Fraser Government has not provided funds to filter that water.

Any promise that has been made by the Premier about water filtration in South Australia depended on Federal funding. That was made clear at Port Pirie, and it has been made quite clear to people in South Australia. It ill behoves the member for Rocky River to treat this matter as a joke. I am sure that when the constituents that he purports to represent at Solomontown and Port Pirie hear about this (and they surely will), they will not be too pleased with him, although they will never have to suffer his representation.

Other Federal cutbacks have been made in social welfare and local government, and these are having a dramatic effect on the services that can be provided by the State Government and local government in South Australia. Of course, the member for Alexandra and the member for Mount Gambier can shake their heads and query that statement, because I have already made the point that they are the apologists in South Australia for Fraserism. They are not concerned at all about the interests of the people of this State: they are concerned only with defending their colleague, Fraser and his bunch of gangsters, in Canberra. When one recalls the paranoid attacks on the Whitlam Government, when we had that sensible Government in Canberra, and contrasts that with the supine attitude of members opposite to their Federal colleagues, one realises that it is absolutely sickening. That attitude will continue, but it will not confuse the electors of this State.

I would have thought that, in the Liberal Party's run up to the election campaign (and, frankly, the State is running up to an election campaign, whether it be in 1977 or 1978), the Opposition would be trying to promote policies in the areas in which people are affected, that is, in areas where the Government provides services for education, health, social welfare, local government, roads, water, etc., however, we have not heard a whisper. Members opposite are over-concerned with trying to promote a fear in the community about union activities, law and order, the old issue of pornography, and rape.

This Government is prepared to accept that any offence in pornography or law and order is to be deplored; but that is not what the Opposition is saying. If it was saying that, we would agree with them, but the Opposition is saying that this increase in crime in South Australia (which is not increasing at a rate comparable to anywhere else in Australia, let alone the world) is the fault of this Government. That is what the Opposition members are saying and that is what they are trying to promote. It saddens me to see the press, and especially the Sunday press, full of attacks on unions and on matters relating to law and order.

I listened closely today to the member for Davenport and what I think he was putting forward as the Liberal Party's policy on unionism. Here again we have the same tack. The whole argument that the honourable member put forward was on a misconceived base that all industrial disputations and troubles were the fault of unions. It seems to be beyond the wit of members opposite to conceive that some, if not all, industrial disputation may well be the fault of management, but there is no suggestion of this in the honourable member's contribution. He said there must be a rational debate so that constructive attitudes towards unionism in Australia could be evolved. When the leader of the trade union movement in Australia wants to speak constructively to the Federal Government, and more particularly to the Government in Queensland, those Governments are reluctant to speak to him; and, when we have these attitudes by the member for Davenport, how can we have a rational and constructive debate about union affairs?

He talked about the community attitude to the unions. The whole story of unionism in Australia is one of battling

against the established order, and that more than any other unit in Australia has the power to influence community attitudes. It is against that background that the trade union has to battle all the time. The honourable member's speech catered for that sort of attitude that has been forced upon the community in Australia by the Establishment, and is not looking towards a constructive debate. He also, amongst a lot of things that he said, seems to suggest in one breath that the trade unions are dominated by a dictatorial group of radical trade union leaders, and then in another breath he mentions how the rank and file of the trade unions do not accept their leadership. When members opposite talk about radical trade union leaders, do they talk about the type of men we have representing the Government in this House or about somebody they can never put a name to? That is what worries me: it is always some radical Left wing socialist trade union leader who is trying to destroy industrial life in Australia, but they are never prepared to put names to them. They say, "That is Scott, that is Carmichael, that is Halfpenny", but—

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

Mr. WOTTON (Heysen): I was very tempted tonight to take advantage of this grievance debate to grieve about a matter that the member for Goyder, the member for Torrens and I have to put up with on the first floor, in contravention of the Noise Control Act, with the dulcet tones that come across the corridor from the Minister of Education's room when he practises his trumpet every evening while we are trying to concentrate on what we shall do for the remainder of the evening.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You have no appreciation of good music.

Mr. WOTTON: I thoroughly enjoy music, but I appreciate music of a different type from that which the Minister of Education is trying to play.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: The member for Torrens has not been here.

Mr. WOTTON: This has been going on for a long time, since the three members were either promoted or demoted to the Government floor.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: On each occasion the member for Torrens was somewhere else.

Mr. WOTTON: No. I think the member for Torrens has expressed his feelings by occasionally slamming the door. I am pleased that the Minister of Mines and Energy is in the Chamber, because I want to discuss the Monarto Development Commission's Adelaide Hills study which is now being undertaken. When will we see the study team's first report? I have the privilege of being Chairman of the Adelaide Hills Land Use Committee, comprising 12 members who have a broad understanding of the problems associated with future development in the Adelaide Hills.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: At least 11 members have, anyway.

Mr. WOTTON: The twelfth member also has a sound knowledge. This committee has been meeting for about 12 months, and at the meeting before last it was decided that we would augment the committee to include representatives from various councils in the Hills area. Those invited to participate from my district are the District Councils of Onkaparinga, East Torrens, Mount Barker, Meadows, Stirling, and Strathalbyn. I acknowledge the support that these councils are giving this committee. I bring before the House the submission that the committee has put before the Monarto Development Commission, and I hope the Minister will note the submission and treat its suggestions seriously in connection with future development in the Adelaide Hills, because this matter greatly concerns most South Australians.

The submission is a result of several meetings over the past 12 months and discussions with planning officers and the Monarto Development Commission's study team. The committee appreciates that there are no simple answers to the many complex problems and conflicting interests of the area. While the committee is strongly opposed to setting up a statutory authority to control the Adelaide Hills area, it is firmly convinced that there is a need to set up a consultative committee, which perhaps could be called the Adelaide Hills Management Advisory Committee. The Monarto Development Commission should advise the Government to this effect. The committee should be set up immediately and it could be operating in a short time. I hope the Minister will note these points.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Would the honourable member indicate whether he would favour a special authority which consisted purely of a regional grouping of the Adelaide Hills councils, where the councils had authority?

Mr. WOTTON: If the Minister will allow me to continue, I will tell him who we suggest should be on the advisory committee.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: The honourable member is mistaken. I do not mean an advisory committee. In order to get a consistent policy, what if each of the local councils came together—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. WOTTON: That will be answered if I am permitted to continue. We believe that there should be a committee of 13 members, comprising one representative from each of the eight councils in the study area, and one representative from each of the following Government departments: State Planning Authority, Environment, Engineering and Water Supply, Agriculture and Fisheries, and Lands.

The committee considers that this advisory committee should have a full-time secretary, at least until it is well established and the work load assessed. The possibility of other interested bodies being represented on the committee was discussed at length many times, and it is the committee's opinion that all interested bodies and factions would be adequately represented through the various Government departments and council representatives. The committee strongly believes that, for the committee to be democratic and to reflect its wishes, most of its members should come from councils, as those persons would be the elected representatives of people living in the area.

The committee considers that such a body, set up in this form, would smooth out many of the conflicts of ideas and misunderstandings that now exist between councils, the State Planning Authority, and other planning bodies. Also, it would achieve most of the goals suggested for the Hills area that would be accepted by the community generally, while still recognising the unique nature of the topography of the area in relation to urban Adelaide. I believe that this suggestion is a positive step towards polarising many of the ideas regarding a Hills planning advisory body, which, as I said previously, has been proposed by a widely diversified group.

My main point is that such a plan could be implemented almost immediately. We have sent this submission to the Adelaide Hills study team, and we hope that it will soon forward its comments to us, believing as we do that this is a positive alternative to the setting up of a statutory authority.

As I said in my Address in Reply speech, most legislation that is introduced these days has embodied in it the establishment of a statutory authority of some description. The suggestion that I put before the House this evening, in the form of the submission from the Adelaide Hills Land Use Committee, would solve many of the problems associated with the development of the Adelaide Hills, without its being placed under a statutory authority. I ask the Minister seriously to consider my submission.

Motion carried.

At 10.19 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, August 4, at 2 p.m.