

motion was the Medibank strike, but I wonder what part doctors played in that. There have been many allegations of defrauding of Medibank funds by doctors. What part will the A.M.A. and its rules play in that matter? When a doctor or group of doctors deprive Commonwealth funds of money by defrauding, that is more serious than a situation in which a poor worker strikes to obtain justice because he has been deprived of about \$8 a week from his pay packet. I am convinced of the member for Davenport's role as a union basher, and I strongly oppose the motion.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I support the motion so ably moved by the member for Davenport, who has made out a strong case, and I am surprised that Government members have not supported him. Workers of this State should have the support of all members and not only of Opposition members, because we know of the strong-arm tactics used by some sections of the trade union movement. Much has been said about rules. I understand that the member for Semaphore said that a shop steward always had a copy of the rules, so that it does not matter if members do not have a copy.

Mr. Olson: That's better than not having a copy available, which you are saying is the position.

Mr. MATHWIN: Recently, after I had raised a question about trade union rule books, the Parliamentary Librarian tried to obtain copies but we have only one set of rules, and that is from the Australian Building Construction Employees and Builders Labourers Federation. Rule (c) of the objects of that organisation provides:

To assist in the movement for the socialisation of the means of production, distribution, and exchange.

Rule (e) states:

To assist by federation or otherwise in upholding the rights and privileges of workers.

However, it is well known that this trade union is imposing a fine on its members who did not comply with its instruction about the political strike on Medibank. The member for Whyalla agrees that it was a political strike. Unions have stated that their members must toe the line or they will be punished. The member for Whyalla referred to money being taken from the pay packets of members of unions to pay the Medibank levy, but he did not say that money is taken from the pay packet in order to pay a Labor Party levy. Workers have not given permission for that money to be taken from their pay and be given to the Labor Party for a political fight. The poor worker, if he does not want to pay, must see the Secretary and tell him: obviously, the Labor Party is interfering with the pay packet of its members without their permission.

Mr. Whitten: The members agree to the rules of the organisation.

Mr. MATHWIN: How can they agree, when they do not have the chance to see a rule book? I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

BRANDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

This short Bill makes several machinery amendments to the Brands Act, 1933-1969, the principal Act. Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends section 4 of the principal Act by inserting a definition of "the department", and making certain other consequential amendments. Clause 4 repeals sections 17 and 18 of the principal Act and inserts in their place a new section 17, the effect of which is to allow free use of brands consisting of a numeral or any brand on the near or off ribs of cattle.

Clause 5 amends section 53 of the principal Act, and recognises the fact that *The Stock and Station Journal* is no longer published. Clause 6 amends section 54 of the principal Act by removing a reference to a register that is no longer required to be kept. Clause 7 re-enacts section 62 of the principal Act in much the same form as it previously existed, with the exception that special provision is now made for branding cattle vaccinated against brucellosis. Clause 8 is formal and self-explanatory. Clause 9 is consequential on the amendments made by clause 4, as are the amendments made by clauses 10 and 11.

Mr. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

CATTLE COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

This Bill amends the principal Act, the Cattle Compensation Act, 1939-1974, and is to some extent consequential on the amendments effected to the Stock Diseases Act. Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends section 4 of the principal Act by changing the definition of "disease" to accord with that inserted in the Stock Diseases Act. Clause 4 is consequential on the amendments made by clause 3. Clause 5 enacts a new section 4b in the principal Act which will recognise a practice that has existed for some time in the computation of stamp duty, that is, the practice of "averaging".

Clause 6 amends section 5 of the principal Act so as to ensure that, in appropriate cases, cattle destroyed under the new powers conferred on inspectors under the Stock Diseases Act will attract compensation under this Act. Clause 7 is consequential on this. Clause 8 amends section 11 of the principal Act by recognising that the fund established under the principal Act may receive subventions from the Commonwealth.

Mr. NANKIVELL secured the adjournment of the debate.

STOCK DISEASES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.