

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**

Wednesday, September 19, 1973

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

**PETITIONS: FLINDERS PARK BRIDGE**

Mr. SIMMONS presented three petitions, one signed by 1 998 residents of Flinders Park, Lockleys and Underdale, another signed by 95 students and staff members of Flinders Park Primary School, and the other signed by 922 students and staff members of Underdale High School, stating that it was their desire to have a cycle and foot bridge constructed across the Torrens River in the vicinity of Kanbara Street, Flinders Park, so that students and staff would not have to travel to and from schools in the area through hazardous traffic conditions.

Petitions received and read.

**PETITION: CASINO**

The Hon. L. J. KING presented a petition signed by 61 citizens who expressed concern at the probable harmful impact of a casino on the community at large and prayed that the House of Assembly would not permit a casino to be established in South Australia.

Petition received.

**QUESTIONS****GAS SUPPLIES**

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Premier say what steps are being taken to ensure that adequate supplies of natural gas are available for South Australian users, particularly the Electricity Trust of South Australia, beyond the present 20-year contract currently existing between the producers and major consumers in this State? Further, can we be given an indication or an assurance that our own situation will not be jeopardized by a rapid depletion of South Australian gas reserves through sales to markets in other States? The annual report of the Electricity Trust of South Australia, tabled in this House yesterday, has expressed concern at the extent of natural gas supplies in this State. In part, the report states:

Electricity supply in South Australia has in recent years become increasingly dependent on the supply of indigenous fuel, Leigh Creek coal and natural gas, and the trust must plan to use fuel resources from within South Australia for well beyond the 20-year period of the present gas contract. Discussions were commenced last year with the producers with a view to negotiating the purchase of additional gas for future use. Although some further discussions have now taken place, there is at present a complete lack of progress due to the inability of the producers to guarantee appropriate quantities of gas. The trust is disturbed at this lack of progress which would appear to be due to a falling-off in the gas exploration programme. The welfare of the people of South Australia is intimately bound up with an adequate supply of electric power. The trust sincerely hopes that early action will be taken to ensure that adequate supplies of natural gas can be guaranteed for South Australian use.

Two aspects of this matter concern me. First, there is the suggestion that the lack of progress in obtaining assurances beyond the present 20-year contract period could be the result of a falling-off in the gas exploration programme. It appears that we have sufficient supplies to meet our own needs for 20 years, but no guarantee beyond that, and little effort to achieve this guarantee. If this is so, should we be concerned that in the meantime we are pulling off our reserves to New South Wales when it might be more prudent to retain them for our own future use? I appreciate that 20 years is a considerable period of time during which

many fuel or energy discoveries might be made, but I wonder whether the old dictum "better sure than sorry" might be well worth—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader is making comments not necessary for the explanation of the question.

Dr. EASTICK: I seek a reply to my question.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government naturally has been concerned about the provision of adequate assurance of supply to the Electricity Trust and negotiations have proceeded on the basis of our ensuring that supply. I went to Canberra with the Chairman and General Manager of the Electricity Trust to discuss future supplies to the trust and for other purposes in South Australia with the Commonwealth Minister for Minerals and Energy. We are satisfied that there will be proven in the field sufficient gas to cover our requirements in South Australia for a considerable period beyond the period of the present contract. In order to ensure that we have the dedication of the necessary supplies, special riders were attached to the contracts for the sale of gas to the Australian Gas Light Company, and the sale of gas to A.G.L. was subject to those special riders. We are concerned that there has been a falling-off in exploration at the field. During the last three years, when exploration there has been at a fairly considerable rate, we have been proving gas at a rate even greater than had been forecast by the producers or the Mines Department. More recently the producers are not spending money to prove the field until they are certain that markets are available for the gas they are proving. This is an essential provision to ensure that there will be adequate exploration. The Mines Department reports show that adequate gas will be proved on the field when the expenditure for exploration takes place because all the indicators are there and have been proved over a period.

Dr. Eastick: Then this report is not mindful of the facts.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Naturally, the Electricity Trust has looked at its position with regard to immediate guarantees on on-going gas supplies proven so that it can make its decision about expending money to put in plant that will involve the burning of natural gas; that is perfectly proper and understandable. An offer has been made to the producers from the trust that prepayments could be made on its contract to assist the producers to have an adequate cash flow to proceed with exploration now. This matter is currently under discussion with the producers.

The other thing that has to happen in relation to the producers is that finality is achieved with regard to their other sales because they have proved up a considerable excess of gas at the moment. The current contract for New South Wales and the prospective contract for Redcliffs will take up their natural gas supply and require a further proving of the field, provided that those things eventually come to pass. Until we have the signatures on the dotted line, bankers are not keen to advance money to the producers to go on proving gas—until they have a proved contract for sale. At the moment, the situation is a little bit like the chicken and the egg. I assure the Leader that the Government is equally involved in the necessary negotiations and is involved in working with the trust to put to the producers the proposition that prepayment could be made to give them the necessary cash flow to prove the extra gas reserves on the field which, from all reports, we are certain are there and which previous exploration, as a result of work undertaken by the Government in finding markets for the field, has proved are there.

Mr. COUMBE: In view of the Premier's statement to the Leader regarding the slowing down of exploration and the proving of gas reserves at the Moomba field, can he tell me whether this has any connection at all with the decision made by the Commonwealth Minister for Minerals and Energy (Mr. Connor) for the removal of the subsidy to mineral and oil exploration? Can he say also whether any consideration has been given, as indicated some time ago, to the possibility of a wet-line being constructed to Adelaide?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Undoubtedly, there has been some influence on the rate of exploration by the decision to withdraw the special incentive. On many scores, representations have been made to the Commonwealth Government in relation to minerals exploration in South Australia and, in putting our position to the Commonwealth Government, while it is true that at times this incentive was used improperly to gain a special tax advantage, we said that there were other cases where expenditure on proper exploration programmes was to the advantage of this country. However, we have not been able to get any flexibility in that programme through our representations to the Commonwealth Government. As far as the wet-line is concerned, the answer is "No". Currently, negotiations are proceeding on the basis of the proven supplies in the area. We have sufficient proven supplies, given the contract to New South Wales, to make a liquid pipeline viable: that has already been shown. So, there is no question that the wet-line is viable, provided that present exploration, proof of existing reserves on the field and the de-ethanizing of gas deposits make it possible for a pipeline to proceed. That, of course, does not affect the position of the Electricity Trust of South Australia or the South Australian Gas Company.

#### TAXI-CABS

Mr. GROTH: Will the Minister of Transport obtain for me a report from the Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Board on the number of cab licences issued, together with the number of cabs that actually work full time in the Salisbury-Elizabeth taxi board zoned area? As a result of an article in yesterday's *News* stating that the Salisbury council would ask the board to consider a 50 per cent increase in the number of licences in the Salisbury area, I have received protests from the four owner-drivers referred to in the article. The position is that the company that holds about 29 of the licences uses full time only about 16 cars. For several weeks some cabs have not been on the road at all, other than to replace cabs that have broken down, and it is therefore necessary to have these repaired.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall be pleased to have the matter investigated and bring down a report.

#### JAPANESE LANGUAGE

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Before asking my question I congratulate the member for Mawson, because I understand that he has been elected by his Caucus to be the new Minister. I hope he has a pleasant time in office, though I do not say a long time, and on behalf of myself and the Liberal Movement I promise to make it as uncomfortable as I can for him. I hope you will pardon my transgression in this respect, Mr. Speaker. Has the Minister of Education taken any action regarding the teaching of Japanese at a tertiary level and, if so, with what result? I asked the Minister a question on August 21 about this, when I suggested that an approach should be made to the Japanese Government for financial help with this scheme, as financial help is at present forthcoming

at a secondary level. The Minister concluded his short reply to me as follows:

Certainly, I shall be pleased to take up the matter in the way the honourable member suggests. Before doing that, however, I think I should consult the universities and the Chairman of the Australian Universities Commission (Professor Karmel) to see precisely how such assistance would fit in with present plans that might be broader.

I noticed a report in today's *Advertiser* of the decision of the University of Adelaide to introduce Chinese as its first Asian language. Although this matter has been under debate for some time, a decision has now been taken, so obviously the university will teach Chinese. However, it is unlikely that the university will also embark on teaching Japanese. The press report states that Indonesian is offered by Adelaide and Salisbury Colleges of Advanced Education, and is being planned by Flinders University. All this makes it seem as though Japanese is being excluded. It is because of the Minister's earlier reply and of the University of Adelaide's decision that I ask the Minister whether he has been able to do anything yet as a result of my earlier question.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am unable to give any further information now regarding any approaches to Flinders University or to the Australian Universities Commission. I have referred the general question of the study of Asian languages at the tertiary level to the newly-established South Australian Council of Educational Planning and Research, because it is clear that we need to get some overall rationalization in the development of any courses and general studies in this area. My view is that it is necessary to provide in this State opportunities at the tertiary level to study Japanese, Chinese and Malay-Indonesian as the minimum Asian language requirements. It is also my view that, once these are established at the tertiary level, we will be able to sustain the teaching of these languages at the secondary level within a short time, because university and college graduates trained in these languages would be available to teach them in the schools. It is no accident that at present, apart from French and German, we have a greater capacity to teach Spanish in our secondary schools than any other language because Flinders University established a school of Spanish virtually within about a year of its initial establishment. The honourable member may rest assured that I am concerned to see the establishment of Japanese at the tertiary level and that the steps necessary for this to take place are either being taken or about to be taken. However, I am unable to give a guarantee that it will take place soon (say, in 1974), but I will do everything in my power to see that it does.

#### PAY-ROLL TAX

Mr. PAYNE: Has the Treasurer a reply to my question of September 12 about pay-roll tax?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Pay-roll Tax Act provides a general exemption in cases where the annual amount of salaries and wages paid does not exceed \$20,800. It does not, however, provide a specific exemption regarding cemeteries. Therefore, if the amount of salaries and wages paid by the Centennial Park Cemetery Trust in a year exceeds \$20,800, the trust would be liable to pay the tax. West Terrace Cemetery is serviced by personnel of the Public Buildings Department, which, being a Government department, is presently exempted from paying pay-roll tax. No tax is paid by the Payneham and Dudley Park Cemetery Trust, as its salaries and wages bill falls within the general exemption limits. Enfield General Cemetery Trust is not exempted from paying the

tax. Cemeteries did not have exemption under the Commonwealth Pay-roll Tax Act unless they fell within the general exemption. There is no special exemption given in any of the State Acts and, unless there are some special reasons for so doing, I could not hold out any promise that a special exemption for cemeteries would be given.

#### FOOD PRICES

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Premier say what explanation he has for the continuing sharp increases in food prices in Adelaide, especially in view of the fact that at least some of the lines are at present subject to price control in this State? The Premier will be aware, I am sure, that the Commonwealth Statistician has released figures showing that regrettably Adelaide's food prices have increased by about 19.8 per cent during the past 12 months, compared to a national average for capital cities of 17.7 per cent. He must also know that the August Adelaide price increase of 2.9 per cent is the steepest for six months and, again, is above the national level. It seems that, with price control only, the effect is not sufficient to control food prices.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member should be aware, if he has analysed the figures, that the major increases in the past 12 months have been in meat, potatoes and onions, none of which is subject to price control or susceptible to price control. The big increase has been in meat prices and, in this matter, we face the difficulty that at present farmers are restocking and, in addition, we have the pressure on Australia of a general world inflation in meat prices. There is economic demand for meat internationally and, if we imposed price control on meat in South Australia, stock would not get to our abattoirs. The only way in which meat prices could be controlled within Australia would be by the exercise of Commonwealth power. In relation to potatoes and onions, the honourable member must know that the prices of these have fluctuated seasonally over the years. We have an increased price at present, but that is likely to fall with seasonal changes in conditions. As far as other prices are concerned, apart from the price of milk (which is under price control), we have not had a marked increase compared to the other States. I appreciate that the figures that have been mentioned cover a period of 12 months, but I am pointing to where the major areas of increase have been. In certain areas, our price increases have been about the national average, given an increase in costs as a result of Commonwealth awards. In these circumstances, to maintain the viability of the firms concerned, there was no alternative but to grant some increase in price. However, if we consider our overall position and the fact that before the increase in meat prices in the past 12 months we had low meat prices compared to prices in the remainder of Australia, we see that we are still doing all right. If we look at the overall cost of living in South Australia as compared to that in Sydney or Melbourne, we see that we are still markedly better off as a result of the price restraints exercised in this State.

#### WHYALLA WELFARE CENTRE

Mr. MAX BROWN: Has the Premier a reply to my question about the time for which the plan for the Whyalla welfare centre will remain open for public comment?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Whyalla Cultural/Community Complex Committee agrees that the plan should not remain open for comment longer than is necessary but, since a questionnaire is being used, it must be

available for comment at least until this questionnaire is completed, which could be the end of October. Meanwhile, a planning brief with estimates of costs for the cultural centre itself is being prepared. Also, other negotiations are being conducted (for example, with the Young Men's Christian Association) for community physical recreation buildings which can, it is hoped, be fitted into the plan when agreed. By continuing these negotiations while the plan is open for discussion, time can be saved.

#### MINLATON PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. HALL: Will the Minister of Education say when his department will build a new primary school at Minlaton? I have received from the Honorary Secretary of the Minlaton Primary School Council Incorporated a letter in support of a verbal approach that was made to me recently, and the subject of a proposed new school building at Minlaton is widely canvassed in this letter. I will not in this brief explanation burden the Minister by reading the whole letter. However, in part it states:

The present school complex is a conglomeration of buildings ranging from old stone rooms, up to 90 years old, partly comprising a converted dwelling, through to a collection of wooden temporary classrooms. Even though a further playing area, about 220ft. by 100ft., has recently become available, the school area is overcrowded. The matter of a new school has been the subject of considerable correspondence and approaches to the department dating back to 1960. A suitable site for a new school was secured in 1963.

The letter also states that in 1970 members of the deputation reported that they had been sympathetically received by the Minister of Education and that, provided that the Commonwealth Government made available the expected funds for education, the earliest they could expect work in connection with a new school, in the most favourable circumstances, would be for tenders to be called in December, 1971, and for the school to be ready for occupation early in 1973. They were also told that the new school was then on the design list. Another point arising from the deputation was that no new toilet block would be built at the school. The latest communication from the Minister of Education regarding the school was contained in a letter to the District Clerk of the District Council of Minlaton, dated February 2, 1972, the last paragraph of which is as follows:

The present position is that a new school at Minlaton is on the schools referred list and as soon as circumstances permit it will be placed on the design list. Every effort will be made to include a school at Minlaton on the design list as soon as possible, but I cannot say when this will be and therefore when it is likely to be built.

As it is now September, 1973, and the Government has been the recipient of the greatly enlarged sums of money from the Commonwealth Government in the meantime, I submit my question to the Minister in the hope that he will say that the school will be built.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I should like to make two comments before I reply in detail to the honourable member. The first is that I am pleased that he is still taking an interest in his district, and the second is that, although the Government has been the recipient of additional funds, it has also been the recipient of years of neglect of Liberal Governments in this respect. The amount of work that has to be done to upgrade and replace unsatisfactory school accommodation covers a huge expenditure. The department and I agree on the necessity to replace this school. I met a deputation from the school a couple of years ago, when I made clear that the Government accepted the need to replace the school on a new site.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: They need to replace the member, too.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I hope that the member for Goyder is successful in replacing one of the two Liberal members who would otherwise be elected to the Senate, and I believe that his departure from this Chamber will lower the standard of the Opposition not only in this House but also in the Senate. The number of schools scheduled for replacement throughout the State is large, and the amount of work involved will take us some four, five or six years to complete, and those are just the urgent cases. Inevitably the department has to determine priorities in this area, and priorities have to be determined in considering the needs of an area where there is an expanding number of students. Not only do we have a situation where the school accommodation is unsatisfactory but we have to provide for an increased number of students and consider the relative priorities of areas of schools for replacement because of the conditions in which they are currently operating. I can assure the honourable member that Minlaton, like Mannum and other places on the referred list, is considered whenever we are able to put new schools on to the design list. So far there have been schools which have had a higher priority and which have had to take precedence of the replacement of Minlaton Primary School.

#### **SURREY DOWNS SCHOOL**

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Education ascertain when the new four-room open-space unit which is currently being built at Surrey Downs and which is nearly completed will be ready for occupation?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I shall be pleased to do that.

#### **KANGAROO ISLAND LAND**

Mr. CHAPMAN: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say whether his department intends to acquire section 37, hundred of Ritchie, Kangaroo Island, this land presently being held by Maxwell George and Dorothy Ismay Flavel? I refer to an article that appeared in the *Sunday Mail* of May 27, 1972, referring to lands on Kangaroo Island that were to be purchased by the Government. The report referred especially to Grassdale Station and contained a map depicting the western end of Kangaroo Island and outlining clearly the station to which I have just referred. Also outlined in this map is an area described as "lightly shaded area for future acquisition". It is this area to which I refer. In view of this report and the accompanying map, can the Minister say whether the Government intends to acquire these lands?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I will certainly obtain the information. I understand that the map to which the honourable member has referred was inaccurate. This matter was raised by the former member for Alexandra, and information was provided to him. I will check on the matter and let the honourable member know.

#### **ONKAPARINGA ESTUARY**

Mr. HOPGOOD: Has the Minister of Works a reply to a question I asked recently about the Onkaparinga estuary?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: When Mount Bold reservoir is full or nearly full, it is the practice of the Engineering and Water Supply Department to inform council officers by telephone of the possibility of large overflows. During the weekend of September 1 and September 2, this practice was carried out, the first contact being made at about 2 p.m. on Saturday. At that time, there was only a small discharge over Mount Bold reservoir, but heavy rains in the catchment areas indicated that large overflows could be expected. Frequent contact was maintained with council officers throughout Saturday and Sunday,

as the flood passed through the reservoir. However, arrangements are being made for a consultation between departmental officers, police and council officers to ascertain whether there are areas in which co-operation can be improved or extended.

#### **BRANDERS**

Mr. VENNING: Will the Minister of Works ascertain whether the Minister of Agriculture is aware that the promise to supply sufficient branders at the abattoirs cattle market has not been honoured, and will he request the South Australian Meat Corporation Board to provide the necessary branders so that the present method of selling and branding can be maintained? I have a letter from those concerned at the abattoirs, which states:

At a meeting of all sections of the meat trade with the Chairman of the South Australian Meat Corporation early in the year the following statement and question was directed to the Chairman: "There is a shortage of branders. Will the board supply sufficient branders to handle sales in the two sets of yards?" The answer was: "If there are not sufficient branders the matter will be rectified."

As the promise has not been honoured, will the Minister take the necessary action?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will take up the matter with my colleague.

#### **LEES REPORT**

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister of Transport say when the Government will act on the recommendation in the Lees committee report that the Government should define the role of the railways and set financial and other limits within which the railways must operate? In view of the need to provide \$30,000,000 from Revenue Account this financial year for the Railways Department as a transfer towards deficit and of a statement contained in the Lees report, which is, "Unfortunately, there seems to be no stated objective for the railways", a statement from the Minister on the recommendation I quoted from the report is now overdue.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not accept the view that the honourable member has just put forward that a statement from me is overdue. The position is plain: the Lees committee was asked to undertake a task, which it did, and did with distinction, and I am grateful for the work it did. The report it brought down is one of the most, if not the most, comprehensive we have ever had. It is certainly the first time there has been a thorough examination of the whole situation of the South Australian Railways. If the honourable member had cared to check his facts before he asked this question, he would have known that I have said on several occasions, including statements in this House, that the Lees report is currently subject to consideration and subsequent discussion with me and the Railways Commissioner in certain areas, and with me and the South Australian Railways Advisory Board in other areas. That is the present situation. The \$30,000,000 deficit to which the honourable member has referred, is subject to a Bill now before the House, and I understand that some aspects of this matter were discussed last evening. Instead of hiding behind innuendoes, the honourable member should come straight out and say whether he agrees or disagrees to providing finance for the Railways Department. If he believes that money should not be made available, let him say so and stand up and be counted, because, as does the member for Rocky River, he advocates the closing of railways. That is not the policy of this Government.

Mr. Venning: Some railways.

The SPEAKER: Order!

**CASINO**

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I move:

That in the opinion of this House a casino should not be built in South Australia.

I believe that casinos and gambling generally thrive on the weakness of human beings. One can argue that there are many forms of gambling (some people may call it entertainment) in which the individual expects to become rich very quickly. I can see no overall benefit in establishing a casino in South Australia, and comparisons can be drawn later. I realize that gambling is very difficult to deal with by legislation because of the moral aspect, and one cannot necessarily legislate in relation to morals. However, there are other points that can be considered, one of which is to convince people that they have responsibilities as well as rights. I believe that an important aspect that has to be emphasized to the average man in the street is that he has the responsibility of looking after his home and his future and that he should not be led astray by a gambling house such as a casino.

As with other forms of social conduct, I admit that gambling is not a social problem, but it becomes one when its extent and its repercussions require it to be subject to legislation. Enough proof is available from experience in other countries to show that it has been necessary to introduce legislation against casinos because of the problems created by them. We cannot prevent completely individuals from gambling; consequently, gambling should not be a social problem unless it is practised by a substantial number of persons or social groups in the community. I accept this as being factual: if people realize that they can spend \$10 gambling or on any other entertainment (if they wish to call it that) there are no problems, because society does not have to worry about the adverse effect of a casino on such people. However, in many instances in our society a weakness of human nature is present in the type of person with a penchant for gambling. This weakness has been inherent in the human race for many centuries; it was not created yesterday.

For this and other reasons I cannot consider the proposed legislation on moral grounds, nor will I consider it on those grounds, but I refer to points made by persons who have petitioned members. I am sure that all Parliamentarians would have received a certain document. I know that it has not been produced in a form suitable for presentation to Parliament, but many submissions have been directed to the Premier's Department, showing that a considerable number of people are willing to say that they do not want a casino in South Australia. The first reason why a casino is not wanted relates to crime. The pamphlet states that a casino will create crime—

through a significant upsurge in criminal activity. Supt. Shepherd, head of the Tasmanian C.I.B., blames Wrest Point casino for suicides, misappropriation of company funds, thefts and assaults.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Boloney!

Mr. EVANS: The Premier can say that if he likes, but many petitioners in all districts have subscribed to these views. The facts prove that there is an increase in crime—

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: They do not.

Mr. EVANS: A Superintendent of Police in Tasmania believes that they do, and his occupation brings him into contact with all facets of crime. The pamphlet's second point, relating to poverty, is as follows:

By encouraging people to spend more on gambling, money is diverted from essentials, resulting in increased poverty. Casinos thrive on the little man's hope to get rich quickly but offer no real hope of winning.

Under the heading "A drain on community resources", the pamphlet states that casinos create—

an increase in the incidence of bankruptcy, forgery, embezzlement, confidence tricksters, robbery and divorce. All cause a heavy drain on the community's resources.

Under the heading "Higher costs", the pamphlet states:

The taxpayer will have to meet higher costs for new gaming inspectors, increased social welfare assistance. Local residents and visitors can expect to pay more for basic commodities.

Under the heading "Tourism", the pamphlet states that casinos destroy—

legitimate tourist activities which rely on the natural attractions of the area; motels and other businesses are subjected to fierce competition through price cutting by casino operators. Culture suffers by the diversion of money away from cultural development to gambling.

The pamphlet then turns to the quality of life, a term used by many Parliamentarians and others nowadays. The pamphlet states:

South Australia is attractive to many because of its distinctive quality to life. A casino will do nothing to enhance it.

Under the heading "People", the pamphlet states:

Casinos are not just for the rich, they also affect the poor. (Wrest Point has reduced its stakes so that even the poorest in society can participate.)

The Premier believes that there would be no real increase in misappropriation of funds, embezzlement, theft, bashings, and suicides, but some members of the Police Force in Tasmania already admit that there is an increase. Many people in society have double standards. They say that it is wrong to have a casino, but they still buy lottery tickets. Some churches say that it is wrong to have a casino, but they still conduct small lotteries themselves. To a degree double standards are involved, but there is a greater opportunity for crime to increase near a casino. So, the people who have double standards draw a line at this point and say, "No; we do not need a casino in South Australia." The law should protect society, but the law was never intended to regulate the private morals or habits of an individual.

In other words, if an individual can participate in something without interfering with others, financially or otherwise, the law does not have to intervene. But when others are interfered with it is up to the State as a whole to intervene in order to protect its own rights and to make people accept their responsibilities. I do not believe that gambling creates anything of value: indeed, it has a corrosive effect on both the individual and cultural values. The introduction of a casino will increase gambling, as the history of gambling in both the United States and the United Kingdom proves. Legislation was introduced in England to control its 1 200 gambling houses operating in 1968, and the committee in question now intends to reduce the number to about 200.

The authorities know that a problem exists, and Harold Wilson has said that gambling has become a "squalid raffle". Here is a man with the same line of thinking as that of members of this Government, who believed that gambling was a problem in England and who set about curbing the operations of gambling houses in that country. Unfortunately, gambling increases the number of problems that exist in society, and I should like to explain how I believe society must take an interest in this matter. Some people who gamble do not know where to stop. If a person who gambles decides to embezzle from his employer in order to try to win back what he has lost (we know that this happens even in relation to gambling on horse-racing), this may eventually cause friction in the home and sometimes the dissolution of the family unit.

If the husband walks out on his family, as often happens, society must carry the burden, and those in the community who are prepared to be thrifty and who put away some money for a rainy day are taxed more heavily and have to carry this responsibility. I accept that it is society's responsibility to pick up the threads and to help those people who have lost contact with our normal way of life. In other words, if people end up in the gutter, broke and with no home or anywhere to go, it is society's responsibility to try to re-establish these people in the community. Although we all agree that that is the case, do we not also agree that, as society has this interest in the individual, it should legislate to ensure that he accepts his responsibilities?

A casino is a glorified gambling house. It is furnished pleasantly and offers an incentive for people to take part in what might be called a social activity, spending large sums of money if they do not have much willpower. Indeed, gambling is a form of addiction with many people, especially in relation to gambling machines. At this stage, the Hobart casino is the only gambling house in Australia that is legal. Various operations are taking place in other States, especially New South Wales, as well as in this State in a small way. Some may argue that, as gambling is being done illegally, it should be legalized, but I believe that, when the authorities know that illegal gambling is taking place, they should close down the establishment in question, although that has not occurred.

The Premier talks about establishing a casino 50 miles (80.47 km) from Adelaide—"get it out of the road, so the average man won't drive there"; it is a lot of tripe to say that the average man will not drive, say, to Wallaroo or any other place if he wishes to gamble. I point out that 50 miles in these days of modern transport can be traversed in only one hour. Those members who come from country areas know that many country football teams travel far greater distances than that just to play football. Newspaper articles have made the point that, if people drive 50 miles or 100 miles (160.9 km) to participate in a gambling operation where liquor is permitted to be consumed, inevitably some of them will be affected by alcohol, either to a large or to a small degree, and this will increase the risk of road accidents, involving injury and death.

Every paraplegic in our society represents another responsibility that we must carry. No individual in society is completely divorced from his responsibilities, nor can society divorce itself from its responsibility to look after the individual. As I have said, it is ridiculous to say that the average man will not travel 50 miles or 100 miles from Adelaide to a casino. If people wish to gamble in a casino, I can see nothing wrong with their travelling to Melbourne, where there is an international airport, and thence to Hobart. Indeed, they would derive the benefit of a trip out of this, whereas if they visited a casino in their own State it would be just a short trip. I am not envious of Tasmania for having the Hobart casino: good luck to that State! If people wish to go there, let them do so.

Victoria is considering the establishment of a restricted casino, whereas the Hobart casino is unrestricted, but people wishing to enter the Victorian casino would first have to establish their financial credit, or show their oversea visa. As I have said, Victoria has an international airport and would bleed some of the trade away from Tasmania if it established a casino as a tourist attraction. Does anyone here really believe that little old South Australia, more than 400 miles (643.7 km) away from Melbourne, will attract tourists here to gamble, when there

are casinos in Melbourne and Hobart? It is admitted already that 80 per cent of the Hobart casino's patronage derives from local people, 20 per cent deriving from tourists. The Victorian casino might take 10 per cent of that tourist patronage and the balance of clientele would have to be made up from local people if sufficient patronage were to be maintained. A report in the *Australian* of Saturday, June 9, states:

The local debt collector—a surprisingly friendly, surprisingly talkative man named Creeson—agrees—that there are likely to be some problems in the future. The report continues:

Mr. Creeson and his representatives of the Tasmanian Collection Service are keeping a watch on the casino. Looking for people who make regular visits, gauging whether they win or lose. An uncomfortable thought. Mr. Creeson is passing on the information to the people who buy his services—he calls it intelligence—and some Hobart people are going to discover when next they need it that credit is more difficult to obtain.

In other words, this man is looking to see who spends money. He has some knowledge of their business activities and the amount of money they have or receive, and if he thinks they are overspending or getting into debt he then warns people outside the operation and interested in lending money on motor cars, houses, or other assets, by saying, "Look out, Jones is spending pretty heavily in the casino." So the warning is going out that creditability might be lost. Mr. Creeson went on to say:

There could be some reputations crash in Hobart. I have seen some important people regularly attending the casino. We are watching them with concern because they look like they might be getting into trouble. They are mainly in the upper and middle classes, people with second cars and nice homes. They might find they will lose them. They are obviously fascinated by the casino and from what we can gather they are not really coming out on top.

He believes that many people who normally lead sensible and thrifty lives, balancing the budget, could be overspending in the casino. There is no doubt that if casinos are brought here it is simply commercializing the gambling operation. People refer to it as an industry, as they do now regarding the horse-racing sport, but really it is commercializing gambling.

It is simply saying, "We, as a Government, believe we can collect some tax if we have a casino here and it does not carry the stigma normally associated with collecting tax. It is a voluntary tax, because people go there expecting to become rich." People know before they walk through the doors that 30 per cent of the money they invest is lost immediately. No-one makes anything overall. There are losses all along the line, going back to the business enterprise, and some small percentage to the Government. If we go back through the past and follow the process of gambling over the centuries, it is usually the shady customers who are tied up in the operation. Their business dealings (if they are business men) have not always been 100 per cent above board, and if they are not in a business operation they have been active in crime and other areas of doubtful operation within our society.

The "jet set" in our society no doubt will travel and has travelled already to Tasmania to play the tables there, but I want members to think of South Australia as a State that is not a bad place in which to live. I do not say that having a casino here would make it all bad, but I think it would have an adverse effect on the way of life of the people in the community where it is established. The Premier has changed his approach and said he will put the matter to the people by referendum; he

has approached the situation correctly. If the people of South Australia want a casino and vote for it, then persons like myself (who have an opposite view) must admit that we are wrong in trying to interpret the attitude of society.

On May 29 last our Leader advocated a referendum on the casino and it was said then that the Government was not interested in a referendum and thought it was unnecessary, and legislation could be passed without having a referendum, as of course it could.

Mr. Coumbe: At that time.

Mr. EVANS: That was the Premier's attitude at that time, but now the Government has changed its mind. I asked a question of the Premier yesterday, and I accept the reply as being factual. I asked whether any firm that had an interest in establishing a casino in South Australia had made an offer to the Government to pay for the cost of a referendum. The Premier replied, "No". I wonder whether there is a large sum of money to be invested and much money to be made by companies. I wonder whether any guarantee has been given or any suggestion made along the lines that, "We are prepared to spend a large sum of money to promote the idea if it is put to a referendum." I wonder whether some business enterprise has said, "We see you are in a bit of a dicey situation, and if you put this to the people by way of referendum we will guarantee there is enough publicity to go out and win it on the day."

I wonder whether that is why the Premier and the Government have changed their minds about the referendum. Is it part of Australian Labor Party policy that there should be a casino and does the Government realize, from the numbers of signatures coming in on petitions, that it would lose the battle and that the only way (not the surest way) in which it could come out of the difficulty and retain some credibility is to have a referendum, knowing that someone is willing to contribute a large sum of money to promote the idea? Time will tell whether my assumption is right or wrong. It will be evident from the type of advertisement appearing in the newspapers, from what we hear on the wireless, and what is shown on television screens. If I am wrong, and if there is a debate later regarding some other measure, I will apologize if the opportunity arises, but I believe I am right.

If some big business enterprise from another State or one with money coming in from other places, such as Japan, puts up the money for the "pro" side of the referendum, what hope has the negative side of fighting the cause? Where are the principles of A.L.P. members when they say that big business is a horrible thing and that monopolies should not be allowed to exist? Will they have the same approach to the building of a casino? I wonder whether it will be only one firm setting out to push the cause or whether a collective call will go out from several firms or companies making available the money, the time, and the expertise. I shall be disappointed if that proves to be the case. The *News* said on one occasion that I had asked the question: do we need a casino? On Monday, October 9, 1967, under the heading "The seven steps to inferno", the *Australian* posed the following 20 questions:

According to Gamblers Anonymous, most compulsive gamblers will answer yes to at least seven of these questions. A Yes to 10 or more means you are in real trouble.

1. Do you lose time from work due to gambling?
2. Is gambling making your home life unhappy?
3. Is gambling affecting your reputation?
4. Have you ever felt remorse after gambling?
5. Do you ever gamble to get money with which to pay debts or to otherwise solve financial difficulties?

6. Does gambling cause a decrease in your ambition or efficiency?

7. After losing, do you feel you must return as soon as possible and win back your losses?

8. After a win do you have a strong urge to return and win more?

9. Do you often gamble until your last dollar is gone?

10. Do you ever borrow to finance your gambling?

11. Have you ever sold any real or personal property to finance gambling?

12. Are you reluctant to use "gambling money" for normal expenditures?

13. Does gambling make you careless of the welfare of your family?

14. Do you ever gamble longer than you had planned?

15. Do you ever gamble to escape worry or trouble?

16. Have you ever committed, or considered committing, an illegal act to finance gambling?

17. Does gambling cause you to have difficulty in sleeping?

18. Do arguments, disappointments or frustrations create within you an urge to gamble?

19. Do you have an urge to celebrate any good fortune by a few hours of gambling?

20. Have you ever considered self-destruction as a result of your gambling?

In many cases, I believe that they are the problems associated with gambling. I have said that there are many forms of gambling. People gamble on the Totalizator Agency Board and with bookmakers, and there is betting on dog-racing. Undoubtedly card gambling goes on in the city every day of the week amongst small groups; it is very hard to detect. Probably other games, such as crown and anchor, unders and overs, and so on, are played amongst small groups but not on a large scale (at least not to my knowledge). Now we are talking about a straight-out gambling house as a means of raising finance for the State and encouraging tourists to come here. I think it would be reasonable for this Parliament to wait and see what happens at Wrest Point, at Melbourne, and at Launceston. Will casinos be built at places such as Melbourne and Launceston? Until we have greater knowledge, we cannot afford to take the gamble of having a casino—and it would be a gamble. In the *Sunday Mail* of September 2, when speaking about various forms of gambling and generally attacking the principle of a casino, Max Harris said (and this is worth recording):

Meantime, since we aren't going to have a referendum—

and that was the position at that time—

it's up to the working man, the trade unionist and the educated politician to make a clear decision. Do we need to have an Adelaide Club for the big-spenders in South Australia? Plus a lot more drunken driving fatalities caused by young silvertails and expense account boys with more money than sense. Because sure as God made little apples, that's what you're going to get.

I do not think there is any doubt about that. Most road deaths now occur on open roads where people travel great distances (sometimes intoxicated, sometimes not) after attending functions. Some people say that if we have a casino it should be in the city, but I do not want to see it established anywhere. I do not think South Australia needs a casino.

The Premier said that there would be no poker machines in South Australia. However, if there is a casino in South Australia, regardless of whether the present Premier is still Premier in six to seven years, within that period people will demand that they be allowed to have poker machines. The chances of winning are just as great with poker machines as with any of the other games played: the machine is balanced so that the house wins and the gambler cannot win. He is guaranteed to lose and there is no way to win. Although individuals may come out on top sometimes, generally there is no chance of winning.

Now that the Government has made this announcement about the referendum, there is every chance that this motion will not be voted on until the end of the session, some time in November or December. Therefore, members will not have to show their colours, unless they are willing to state publicly (as some have stated already) that they do not support the concept of a casino. I would have preferred (and I hope members agree) to take a vote on this motion in a couple of weeks. Before we ask the people their opinion about a casino, let us, as legislators, form our opinion whether or not we support a casino. Then we will know how members of this Parliament react to the situation. The Labor Party has made the vote on this matter a conscience vote, with individual members being able to please themselves how they vote, and I think that is a great approach. On this subject, we should have a free rein to speak and vote as individuals.

Let us hope we can get through the debate on this motion and have a vote before the matter is put to the people, so that we can see whether the attitude of Parliamentarians corresponds to the attitude of the community at large. I hope that the people of South Australia will never support the concept of a casino here. I would prefer to support a concept suggested in a letter that we should have here a Disneyland (something that the family can look at) as a tourist attraction. The Premier knows that in considering a casino the Government is looking for a bit of taxation. It would be a worthwhile exercise for someone at one of our universities to carry out research to see how much it costs society to maintain many of the people who have fallen by the wayside as a result of gambling and other social problems. As I do not believe we should encourage gambling, I oppose the establishment of a casino and I ask members to support my motion.

Mr. RUSSACK (Gouger): I second the motion and oppose the establishment of a casino in South Australia. I accept my responsibility as a representative of a district; I believe that adequate evidence exists that most electors in the Gouger District oppose the establishment of a casino. I hasten to add that I know that a section of the district favours the establishment of a casino.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I have 600 of their signatures here.

Mr. RUSSACK: I have presented a petition from more than 800 people, and I will give those figures shortly, if the Premier will be patient. I wish to outline the procedure to be followed, as indicated by the Premier in reply to questions on August 16. First, the Leader of the Opposition asked the Premier about establishing a casino in South Australia. When asked a further question about inquiries made by certain firms, the Premier said:

The inquiries have been myriad. The people concerned have been told that before applications could be considered, legislation would have to be considered in this House; but, at any rate, one would have to look at certain basic matters before any consideration could be given by the Legislature. As to those basic considerations, which were the considerations set forth in my statement this morning, there have been two applications: one by a syndicate in respect of a site near Victor Harbor; and one by A. V. Jennings Industries Limited and Federal Hotels, which are the operators of the Wrest Point casino, in respect of a site at Wallaroo. Inquiries have been made concerning the completion of similar studies and submissions by a group at Mount Gambier and by a group in respect of a site at Andamooka.

Apart from those inquiries, there have been general inquiries from people, all of whom have had the same

conditions made clear to them as were made clear to the Jennings group and to the group in respect of Victor Harbor. Whether or not those concerned are proceeding with studies, I do not know. Inquiries were made in respect of the metropolitan area, and I made clear that I would certainly not recommend the establishment of such a facility in an area of large population, because the Government does not believe that such an establishment should be a means of drawing taxation money or profits from the poorer people in the community. In overseas areas many casinos have been established where the local citizenry is not allowed to enter; foreign visitors only may enter. There are considerable difficulties in Australia in making a similar arrangement; distance from large areas of population was thought to achieve a similar result.

Therefore, I am confused by the Premier's statement relating to the establishment of a casino in South Australia. According to the procedure laid down by the Premier, a decision was apparently to be made first whether a casino should be established in this State. Yesterday's *Advertiser* contains the following report:

A State-wide referendum will be held on a proposal for a gambling casino in South Australia. The Premier (Mr. Dunstan) said yesterday legislation to provide for a casino would be introduced to Parliament within "a couple of weeks". If the Bill passes, all submissions to build the casino will be referred to the Industries Development Committee for appraisal. The committee's final selection for the granting of a licence will then be put to a referendum. "The referendum will relate to a specific proposal for a licence for a casino in a specific place", Mr. Dunstan said. "People will know quite clearly what they are voting for or against."

Again, according to *Hansard* of August 16 the member for Bragg asked the following question:

Can the Premier say whether the Government intends to hold a referendum to allow the people of South Australia to say whether or not they approve of the establishment of a casino? If it does, will the Government take notice of the opinion expressed at that referendum?

In reply, the Premier said:

We would not hold a referendum without intending to take notice of its result. However, we do not see the necessity to hold a referendum on this matter. The Bill will be brought to the House, referred to the committee, and a report made.

Evidently, the situation has now changed and the Premier considers that a referendum is necessary, whereas on August 16 he believed that a referendum was not necessary. If the Bill to establish a casino in South Australia is passed by this House (and I hope it is not), a site will then be recommended by the Industries Development Committee and the final decision, as I understand it, must be ratified by a referendum of the taxpayers of South Australia. One reason the Premier gave (and this was referred to in press reports) was that the establishment of a casino would be a revenue-raising project; his second reason was that it would encourage tourism. I agree with the Premier that the State needs revenue and that it needs to foster tourism, but I believe that his two reasons are grossly inadequate to support the establishment of a gambling casino in South Australia.

Two other aspects have been overlooked: namely, the moral and sociological consequences. Concerning these two aspects I am certain, because of letters that have appeared in the daily press, because of petitions that have been presented in the House, and because of personal letters that have been written, that most South Australians oppose the establishment of a casino here. I, personally, can speak only of the detail contained in letters written to me, although I have presented to the House a petition containing the names of 839 people who oppose the establishment of a casino, and I have a small yellow form containing the names of another 199 people who oppose a casino. The



form was sent out by the South Australian No Casino Committee, but it is unacceptable to the House.

I have received 29 personal letters from people who oppose a casino, whereas I have received only two from people in favour. One of those came from the proprietors of a business in Wallaroo and the other from the Northern Yorke Peninsula Chamber of Commerce. The motion agreed to at a meeting of the chamber has been recorded in the *Yorke Peninsula Country Times* and I will refer to that matter after I have finished giving the detail of people's opposition to the casino. The letters of protest have come from 47 centres, 27 of which are within the Gouger District. Although a member of the Northern Yorke Peninsula Chamber of Commerce, I did not receive a notice of any meeting. However, I have been told by an authoritative source that the meeting was a meeting of the chamber's council, attended by only 10 members, and that it was necessary for the motion to be carried on the President's casting vote. I mention that to illustrate the true situation surrounding the chamber's letter.

I stated publicly that I would oppose this motion and that I would not support the establishment of a casino in South Australia. My statement was reported in the *Sunday Mail* several weeks ago. Believing, however, that it is wrong for a person to come to a decision without first investigating the true situation, I have visited Hobart recently to investigate the casino and to obtain the views of a cross-section of the community, and I will give an unbiased report of what I found there. I express appreciation to the Tasmanian Premier, who permitted the Under Treasurer to give me certain information. I assured the gentlemen with whom I was able to speak that I would not disclose any detail they gave me in confidence, and I do not intend to do that. As I was able to discuss the position with these gentlemen, I possess certain facts that will enable me to make an intelligent decision on this matter. I spoke with the Under Treasurer and with Government and Opposition members of the Tasmanian Parliament, and I also had the privilege of speaking for an hour with Superintendent Shepherd, of the Criminal Investigation Branch, whose comments were quoted by the member for Fisher earlier this afternoon. In Hobart I also spoke with the personnel superintendent of one of the city's biggest retail stores and with the credit manager of a retail establishment. I also spoke with shop assistants, store departmental managers, taxi drivers and people in the street.

Although the casino has been accepted by many people in Hobart, there are still those who do not think it is a desirable amenity, even though it means revenue for the Tasmanian Government. The casino also attracts tourists, especially those who fly in from other States and from overseas. I confirm what appears in yesterday's *Advertiser* under the heading, "No chance for country casino", as follows:

An S.A. casino 40, 50 or even 60 miles from Adelaide would have no chance of success, Mr. G. J. Hulton said yesterday. Mr. Hulton, the Tasmanian Director of Tourism and Immigration, said in Adelaide that the Wrest Point Hotel-Casino had an 80 per cent local patronage, which undoubtedly was because of its location. The remaining 20 per cent was made up of visitors. We have proved in Hobart that the majority of patronage comes from local people and we hope this is maintained, Mr. Hulton said. The project had been accepted by the people of Hobart and was being supported by them, he said. Mr. Hulton described the Wrest Point venture as a "suck it and see" project which had exceeded all expectations.

He said he regarded the complex as a facility of international standard accommodation with the casino as a catalyst. The casino had proved a very major part of the concept in terms of patronage, although it was only

a minor part of the concept. After a visit to Wrest Point last month, *The Advertiser* Man on the Spot, Bernard Boucher, wrote: I am convinced of one thing—for our casino to succeed there is only one place for it, and that is right here in Adelaide.

Although these comments confirm opinions held on the revenue and tourist aspects to a large degree, they totally ignore the moral and sociological consequences of the casino. First, experience proves that 80 per cent of the casino's patrons are local people, apart from what Mr. Hulton says. Secondly, as I understand that bookmakers have been the first to feel the effects of the casino, it seems that money is being diverted from one source of gambling to another. I attended the casino with a local identity and, in the course of the evening, he spoke to many people whom he recognized as members of the general public. Thirdly, casino patronage declined in July and there was an upsurge in August, which could be attributed to two factors, the first being the receipt of income tax cheques and the second the reduction of the age of majority to 18 years becoming effective about that time. The control is commendable at the casino and I found nothing to be faulted about its conduct.

Mr. Payne: Did you have a flutter yourself?

Mr. RUSSACK: No, I did not. However, the control required to be exercised shows (in fact, proves) that there is a potential for malpractice. I notice that the Premier is smiling.

Mr. Slater: I like the croupiers. I think they look good!

Mr. RUSSACK: Yes, they are very attractive. The fact that there is closed circuit television being used constantly and a need for specialized policing of the law shows that there is a potential for malpractice. No poker machines are installed at Wrest Point, but the game of two-up will be introduced soon. On August 16, the member for Torrens asked the Premier the following question:

Can the Premier assure the House that the project will not lead to the introduction of poker machines in South Australia in either the short term or the long term?

The Premier curtly replied, "Yes". I say that there is a definite possibility that the installation of poker machines could follow the establishment of a casino. In fact, I do not see any difference in the forms of gambling, and I should think that a roulette table would have the same qualities or principles as a poker machine. I should like to say many more things about this matter and to develop several important points. Indeed, I should like to speak about Wallaroo, because I am concerned about the people of Wallaroo and am sympathetic to them. However, I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

#### CRIMINAL LAW (SEXUAL OFFENCES) AMENDMENT BILL

Mr. DUNCAN (Elizabeth) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, 1935-1972, and the Police Offences Act, 1953-1972. Read a first time.

Mr. DUNCAN: I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

It provides for various amendments to the criminal law to remove specific reference to homosexual acts and to provide for a code of sexual behaviour in society regardless of the sex or sexual orientation of the person committing the prescribed behaviour. The introduction of the Bill is a further step towards legal reform in an area where, in the past, there has been much emotion and much questioning in the community.

I have introduced the measure because I consider that the law in this area is entirely inconsistent and not based

on sound legal principles. The effect of the present position is that a minority of otherwise law-abiding citizens are declared criminals and are unable to make to society the useful contribution that they would otherwise be able to make. The state of the law at present is iniquitous and entirely unsatisfactory, in my view. Although this is so, I suppose it is inevitable that, when this Bill is considered both in this House and in another place, those provisions referring to the abolition of legal prescriptions against homosexual acts in private between consenting adults will be highlighted and given great prominence, at the expense of other provisions in the Bill.

As I have said, the measure provides a code of sexual behaviour that rationalizes the law in this area as between males and females and removes several anomalies that exist at present. If members consider in detail the proposed changes, they will see that in total the changes represent a much needed consolidation of the laws regulating sexual behaviour and will make for a much smoother application of the criminal code in this area.

As members will be aware, the present law controlling homosexual behaviour results from an amendment to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act passed last year which resulted from a Bill introduced in another place by the Hon. Murray Hill. Following that legislation, the legal position in respect of homosexual acts has been left little different from what obtained before the amendment was made. The law still clings to the concept of illegality of homosexual behaviour and merely provides a defence for an accused if he can prove that the conduct occurred in private between consenting adults.

This is a far cry from the objective, spirit and intent of the Hon. Mr. Hill's original Bill, which clearly sought to remove the criminal sanctions against such conduct. It is now nearly 18 months since the murder of Dr. George Duncan and the inquest which established that his death resulted from victimization because of his homosexuality. I suppose it is fair to say that this incident, more than any other, has brought the subject of homosexual law reform to the fore in South Australia.

Since that time, this Parliament has seen the introduction and passing, in amended form, of the Hon. Mr. Hill's Bill, and both the Parliament and the people of South Australia generally have become well aware of the issues involved. There has been much publicity in the media and, as members are aware, when the matter was last before the Parliament both daily newspapers in South Australia indicated support for the measure. Although the general awareness has grown and the public awareness on this issue is high, in introducing a Bill of this kind it is important, in my view, that I should canvass the issues involved.

As I have said, I consider that the results of the 1972 amendment are entirely unsatisfactory because it has failed to deal with the matter in any acceptable way. As it finally reached the Statute Book, the amendment really only gave vent to the views of those who still believed that homosexual behaviour should continue to be a crime. I completely reject such an approach and consider that such a view is completely untenable on the evidence available.

The effect and scope of this Bill is wider than in the case of that of the Hon. Mr. Hill, which sought to make legal homosexual acts between consenting males over 21 years of age. This Bill, although having a similar objective to that of the Hon. Mr. Hill's original Bill, also extends sections of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act and the Police Offences Act to provide for a code of sexual behaviour regardless of sexual orientation and applicable to all persons.

My Bill provides for a penalty of life imprisonment for sexual offences against children under 12 years of age, regardless of the sex of the child or of the offender. It also provides for the imprisonment of sexual offenders who are schoolteachers, guardians, or other persons of special responsibility who commit sexual offences against their wards. An offence of homosexual rape is created, and the Bill ensures that other offences such as indecent interference, abduction, defilement and so on apply regardless of sex or sexual orientation. Further, the Bill provides that any premises found to be used for homosexual practices where males prostitute themselves would constitute a brothel, attracting the same penalties as would premises now used for heterosexual practices.

This Bill in no way seeks to assist or approve of homosexual practices or to condone any acts of indecency against young persons or any public display of homosexual conduct. No-one suggests that this Parliament approves of fornication, adultery or Lesbianism because we do not catalogue them in a list of crimes, nor would any such approval be given by the Bill to homosexual activities, particularly as certain types of homosexual conduct would remain a crime attracting the most severe penalties. The Bill will mean that the burden of criminality will no longer be attached to acts committed in private between consenting adults.

The present law is unjust and unenforceable and, aside from the main question whether homosexual acts between consenting adult males in private should be crimes (and I will deal with the argument on that proposition shortly), the present law has introduced concepts that are foreign to the British tradition in criminal law. By introducing the concept of a defence for an accused charged with a criminal act, the law has effectively transferred the burden of proof from the prosecution to the defence. Any unfortunate person charged with an offence under section 69 (a) of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act is now put in the position of being deemed guilty and then having to prove his innocence, and this is a most unsatisfactory situation. The law has also given an entirely new and strict legal meaning to the word "private". Places that in normal circumstances would not be regarded as being public, such as rooms in private houses, are now regarded as public for the purposes of section 68 of the Act. Again, the element of deliberate discrimination between homosexuals and the rest of the community is, regrettably, much in evidence.

Summarizing, the Hon. Mr. Hill's liberalizing Bill has been converted into an Act that improves the lot of homosexuals so little as to be completely worthless. It is in the context of this background that I now turn to the central question raised by this Bill which, put simply, is as follows: whether a person, by virtue of his committing homosexual acts, must be prosecuted by society or, where no positive harm is caused to third parties or society, whether such a person should simply be ignored by society's laws.

The Bill is a statement of support for the second proposition. It is a recognition of the view that the law should not enter into matters of private moral conduct except in so far as they directly and positively affect the public good. In saying this, I recognize that it is part of the function of the criminal law to safeguard those who need protection by reason of youth, age, or inability to withstand the force of others. I certainly strongly support such protection. Indeed, the Bill seeks to strengthen such safeguards by expanding certain offences involving persons of special responsibility in society to apply regardless of the sex of the offenders or victims. This is a

reflection of the policy of not differentiating, so far as behaviour is concerned, between homosexual and heterosexual activities.

In the course of raising this matter, I have taken the opportunity to acquaint myself with a small amount of the vast quantity of literature on the nature and origins of homosexuality. As members may know, the matter is a subject of long and laborious argument between and among theologians, psychiatrists and psychologists, as well as Parliamentarians. Although I do not wish to canvass the arguments today, I want to emphasize certain parts that I believe are crucial to the philosophy of this Bill. It is important to make a clear distinction between homosexual offences and homosexuality. The former are at present prescribed by the criminal law, whereas the latter is a state or condition and cannot come within the purview of the criminal law.

I make this distinction to emphasize the point that homosexuality exists in the community and, although attempts have been made to treat homosexuality in the nature of a disease and attempts have been made to cure it, these actions are, in my view, open to grave moral questioning. In any case, none of the approaches made on this basis of which I have heard has been entirely successful. In other words, homosexuality is here to stay, and no amount of legislating will change that fact. A further important point is that homosexuality is not an "all or none" situation. All gradations can exist from apparently exclusive homosexuality to apparent heterosexuality with minor, transient or latent homosexuality. A further matter flowing from this is that, as homosexuality is not an "all or nothing" situation, the propensity to commit homosexual acts varies according to the degree of homosexuality or heterosexuality in a person.

The importance of these points is that homosexual persons cannot reasonably be regarded as separate from the rest of mankind, and this is indeed relevant in considering the changes contained in this Bill. We are faced with a situation in which the law provides an absolute prescription and punishment for a situation that stems very much from a flexible basis. One of the great difficulties in dealing with this matter is determining the extent of homosexuality in the community. My investigations have failed to reveal any completely reliable estimates of the heterosexual and homosexual ratio in Australia. Of course, criminal statistics of the number of detected homosexual acts are available, but it is fair to say that this would merely be the tip of an iceberg and is not particularly of value. Statistics from other countries are available which indicate that up to 4 per cent of the population of countries comparable to Australia are practising homosexuals. Certainly, since there can be little doubt that the sexual drive of those fortunate enough to be heterosexual can be attributed to homosexuals, but of course directed elsewhere, it must be, as the present law stands, that hundreds of thousands of homosexual criminal acts (speaking legalistically) are committed in South Australia each year.

It is absurd that, as a result of the law as it stands, homosexuals apart from motorists, comprise the largest class of so-called criminals in the land, yet as we know few convictions are recorded each year for homosexual offences. Clearly, the detection rate is therefore minimal. The law is as random in its application as it is demonstrably unenforceable. This situation is unfair to homosexuals and needs to be changed urgently. Those who wish to retain the law as it stands must face up to the fact that, if the law could ever be enforced at all, that could be done only with a massive recruitment of police and an invasion of

privacy in a way that I believe the people of this State would not tolerate. Nor can it be pleaded that the law can bring reformation to homosexuals, as has been suggested previously. To send homosexuals to an all-male prison is as therapeutically useless as incarcerating a heterosexual maniac in a harem.

There is now strong evidence that the psychological nature of the condition of homosexuality is such that the threat of criminal sanctions is not an appropriate means of approaching this matter and this fact, together with the evidence that homosexuality is not an "all or nothing" condition (as I have mentioned earlier), has led me to the view that the time is long overdue for reform in this area and that the appropriate form of reform is for society to require a standard of sexual conduct from all of its adult members, whether they be homosexual or heterosexual, male or female. Many heterosexual acts are not criminal if committed in private but are punishable if committed in circumstances which outrage public decency, and I should expect the same criteria to be applied to homosexual acts.

It is my intention that the law should continue to regard as criminal any act which is committed in a place where members of the public may be likely to see and be offended by it but, where there is no possibility of public offence of this nature, it should become a matter of private responsibility of the persons concerned. In my opinion such an act is then outside the purview of the criminal law. Of course, it will be for the courts to decide whether or not public decency has been outraged, and there should not be any greater difficulty about establishing this in the case of homosexual acts than there is in the case of heterosexual acts.

I now wish to deal with certain specific arguments which have been advanced in favour of retaining the present laws. Some people have seriously put forward the suggestion that the present law acts as a deterrent and, therefore, should be retained. I ask how would we married men respond to a law enforcing celibacy upon us. Would we be deterred? I doubt it. Since homosexuals have similar compulsions which are directed to men and not to women, how is it credible that the law acts as a deterrent? Others have suggested that to change the present law will in effect be "to open the flood-gates". This argument was put strongly in another place last year by various members opposing the Hon. Mr. Hill's Bill.

I believe that this argument is one completely lacking in merit. If one considers my comments of a few moments ago, concerning deterrents, and applies those comments to the situation of a person whose propensity is to homosexuality, it is clear that by merely changing the law the incidence of homosexuality and hence the propensity to homosexual acts in the community will not be altered. It is my firm belief that the problem of the incidence of homosexuality in the community cannot be solved merely by legal prescription against homosexual acts.

I know that all members of this House and of this Parliament would like to see a lessening of the incidence of homosexuality, and I believe that education and the use of our society's resources to research this matter more fully to provide more male child care officers and more male teachers are far more likely to succeed in this aim than seeking recourse to the penal system. In drawing this Bill I have sought to abolish the specific prescriptions against homosexual behaviour and to apply the sections relating to heterosexual behaviour and offences against women to homosexuals and males.

I have not attempted to deal with the broad questions of the adequacy or otherwise of penalties or of the ages of victims of offences in general, as I believe that, as these matters are applicable to the broad spectrum of the whole of the criminal law, they are best left to a general review. I have had the opportunity of reading the speeches from *Hansard* which were made at the time when the 1972 amendments were being considered, and it is fair to say that all members who contributed to that debate did so in a most dedicated manner, regardless of their view of the subject. It is clear that the debate took place in a rather emotional atmosphere, owing to the then recent death of Dr. Duncan, and it is my view that that may have coloured the debate and the attitudes of members at that time.

I hope this Bill will be treated in the same dedicated manner and that, in the less emotive atmosphere now prevailing, it may complete the task of providing a just and enlightened criminal law in this area. When the Bill goes to another place I hope it will receive favourable consideration so that these unfortunate people in the community will not be treated in such a shameful manner as they are now.

In considering the sections of the Bill in detail, clauses 1, 2 and 3 are formal. Clause 4 of the Bill amends section 5 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act by adding definitions of "common prostitute" and "rape", thus ensuring that the policy of the Bill, that the criminal sanctions for sexual behaviour shall apply to both males and females to offences involving prostitution and rape is applied. Clauses 5 and 6 are formal, merely correcting a drafting problem.

Clauses 7 and 8 expand sections 50 and 51 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act to provide offences of carnally knowing and attempting to carnally know a person under 12 years of age, regardless of sex. These sections at present only apply to female children, and the Bill introduces new offences where male children are involved. Clause 9 has the same effect on section 52, widening its ambit to include male as well as female children of 12 years of age, and providing for a new offence where the victim is a male. Clause 10 broadens the ambit of section 53 of the Act to make it an offence for any person, regardless of sex, being a guardian, teacher, schoolmaster or mistress of any child under 18 years of age, regardless of sex, to carnally know any such child. This introduces new offences where school-mistresses are involved and where male persons are involved as victims. Clause 11 is consequential on the amendments to sections 51, 52 and 53 of the Act.

Clause 12 seeks to amend section 55 to apply the provisions of that section to male victims of 13 years to 17 years and of unsound mind and clause 13 seeks to amend section 56 to provide an offence of indecent assault regardless of the sex of the perpetrator or the victim. Clause 14 amends section 57 to provide that, within the ambit of the section, male victims of under 18 years of age will be unable to consent to indecent assaults upon them in certain cases. Clause 15 seeks a consequential amendment to section 57 (a) to apply its provisions regardless of sex.

Clause 16 provides for the amendment of section 57 (b) to introduce two new offences concerning indecent interference with males under the age of 17 years and of males over that age without their consent. Clause 17 seeks to expand section 58 of the Act to provide for an offence of committing acts of gross indecency with, or in the presence of, any male person under the age of 16 years and to provide that it is an offence for females to commit such

offences. Clause 18 broadens the ambit of section 59 to include male victims of abductions.

Clause 19 broadens the ambit of section 60 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act to include male victims of forceable abductions and clause 20 broadens section 61 to include unmarried males under the age of 16 years within the ambit of that section. Clause 21 extends the ambit of the offence created in section 62 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act to include male victims under the age of 18 years, while clause 22 seeks to amend section 63 to provide for the procuring of males to become common prostitutes to be included in the section.

Clause 23 extends the ambit of section 64 to create an offence of procuring the defilement of males by threats or fraud and clause 24 amends section 65 to include males under 17 years as subjects of the offence created by that section. Clause 25 amends section 66 to apply the provisions of that section to all persons being unmarried and under the age of 18 years.

Clause 26 provides for the amendment of section 67 consequential on the amendments to section 65 and section 66 of the Act. Clause 27 seeks to apply the offence of permitting youths to resort to brothels contained in section 68 to all persons under the age of 17 years. Clause 28 provides for the repeal of section 68A and for the enactment of a new section 68A providing for the consolidation of unnatural offences, and clause 29 repeals section 69 and enacts a new section proscribing behaviour between humans and animals.

Clause 30 makes amendments to section 74 to provide consequential amendments to court procedures regarding the exclusion of the public, while clause 31 seeks a consequential amendment to section 75. Clause 32 amends section 76 to correct an error in drafting resulting from earlier amendments.

Clauses 33 and 34 amend sections 77 and 77 (a) of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act respectively to correct errors in drafting resulting from earlier amendments of the Act. Clause 35 has a formal amendment to the Police Offences Act. Clause 36 amends section 25 of the Police Offences Act to include soliciting of male persons for prostitution. Clause 37 amends section 26 of the Police Offences Act to repeal the offence of soliciting in the section, as it is now covered in section 25 of the Police Offences Act.

Dr. TONKIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### PETRO-CHEMICAL PLANT

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Hall:

That in view of the confusion surrounding the proposal to build a petro-chemical plant at Redcliffs on Spencer Gulf and the possible conflict that may arise with the Commonwealth Government concerning the export of petroleum liquids, the Government should inform the House:

- (a) whether it has a legally binding letter of intent from every company required to participate in the construction;
- (b) whether it has the unqualified approval of the Commonwealth Government for the export of liquid petroleum from South Australia; and
- (c) whether it will give an absolute assurance that the environment and ecology of Spencer Gulf and its surroundings will be fully protected before any constructions commence.

(Continued from September 12. Page 715.)

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): The Premier is the master of the half-truth. It is because of some of the remarks he made in this debate last week that I have been moved to support this motion. I do not want to go over all the points made by the member for Goyder last week; I want to concentrate on just a few of what

I consider to be the essential matters which he canvasses in this motion, and particularly the legal position concerning what the Premier is pleased to call "letters of intent". Heaven alone knows what is the precise meaning of that term! It has no precise legal meaning—it is a term that the Premier is fond of using and that the uncritical accept with no analysis at all. I defy any member opposite or the Premier himself to define what he means by a letter of intent. Certainly, it is not a legally binding document in any sense whatsoever and, although the Premier has denied this and said last week that a contract could be entered into tomorrow if we wished, I do not believe for one moment that that is the position and I am not prepared to let him get away with any such assertions in this House without replying to him.

May I point out why what is called a letter of intent is not a legally binding contract or why it has no legally binding effect? First of all, in this particular case, which letter is to be legally binding? Is the Government to be bound by either one or the other of the two letters of intent? The answer is that it is bound by neither and, therefore, neither of those parties can be bound to the Government. It is absurd to suggest that either of the letters of intent is valid.

Secondly, because the letter which he tabled in this House and which I will quote in full in a moment is so vague, it cannot even be regarded as an offer to enter into a contract. Finally, in any case, under the law of contract, an offer even if it is a legally binding offer can be withdrawn at any time up to the time of acceptance; and there has been no acceptance by the Government of South Australia of any offer whatsoever. So, whatever we may say about this, we certainly cannot say, as the Premier tried to say last week and as he would like to have the people of South Australia believe, that there is any legal obligation upon any concern to construct a petro-chemical works at Redcliffs or anywhere else in this State.

Let us look in more detail at this because, having said that the Premier is a master of the half-truth, I am under an obligation to support that. At page 714 of *Hansard* the Premier said:

There were two major consortia negotiating with the producers and the Government for the development of Redcliffs.

I have already said that we cannot have both, that the Government cannot play off one against the other and expect to hold either of them as a matter of law. The Premier went on to say:

Both of these consortia have delivered to the Government letters of intent to proceed to put a petro-chemical works of world dimensions and world scale, one of the biggest in the world, at Redcliffs.

He has talked about other people using hyperbole, but he is very fond of using it himself. We often hear of people who come to South Australia being described as "a world authority" or the statement that something will be "the biggest in the world", but that is quite meaningless. The Premier went on to say:

Each is competing for the development . . . We could, if the honourable member wished and if that was the only criterion involved, sign a contract tomorrow for the petro-chemical works; the legally binding offers are in my office. Neither has so far been accepted.

I have already dealt with that as a matter of law. I challenged the Premier to bring those offers down to this place and see whether they were legally binding, but he has resiled and refuses to show them or make public what they were. I said:

Are these the offers in the documents you tabled?

The Premier replied:

No; they are subsequent documents.

Then I said:

Will you table them?

The Premier replied:

In due season.

I then asked:

When will that be?

The Premier replied:

When we have come to an agreement with one or the other, the indenture that is signed as a result will be a matter of inquiry by a Select Committee of this House, and all the documents relating to the negotiations will be tabled.

I then asked:

But you will not table them now?

The Premier replied:

No, I will not, because the companies concerned do not want me to.

In other words, whatever the companies may say, he does not want us to see these documents. The only document which has been tabled is a letter, certainly not a legally binding document, from Dow Chemical (Australia) Limited, which is dated February 2. As the Premier is apparently relying on this letter I propose to read it. I will pause at the appropriate paragraphs to see how misleading were the Premier's remarks last week. The letter begins:

Dear Mr. Premier, We greatly enjoyed our discussions with you last Tuesday, January 30, and appreciated very much your kind hospitality afforded us at dinner that evening.

There is nothing legally binding about that! The letter continues:

We believe the exchange of views—

that is a good vague term—

regarding the development of a petro-chemical industry at Redcliffs in South Australia enabled all the interested parties to have a better appreciation of each other's views. It is our belief that an excellent opportunity exists to develop a world-scale petro-chemical complex at Redcliffs that is capable of competing with other world-scale manufacturing centres, not only at time of start-up but as a continuing expanding operation.

That is all pretty grand stuff, too. There is nothing there that one could say by any stretch of the imagination (and I am sure the member for Playford will support me in this) could be construed as legally binding. The letter continues:

Based on the past conversations we have had with members of your Government, we understand that the South Australian Government is prepared to supply electricity and steam to the plants at world competitive prices.

What on earth they are, we do not know; they are certainly not defined. The letter continues:

It is also prepared to supply and install both port, infrastructure facilities and fresh water.

That is a little more definite but certainly not enough to spell out any sort of an offer. The letter continues:

The Delhi-Santos group have given us verbal assurances of their expectation of supplying sufficient quantities of gas, ethane and salt from Lake Torrens, although some additional proving work is necessary before maximum quantities can be committed. It is anticipated that satisfactory contractual arrangements will be completed for these raw materials.

In as many terms, they admit there that those arrangements have not yet been made. The letter continues:

We envisage that a project of this type with all of the ramifications involved will lead to a total capital investment by all parties concerned of in excess of \$30,000,000 and as such considerable negotiation, planning and discussion is required.

In other words, the thing is not sewn up yet. The letter continues :

We can now assure you of our intention—  
and this is the closest that anyone comes (although it is still a long way from it) to anything that is legally binding—

to proceed to plan and construct facilities at Redcliffs that will consume at least 130 000 to 170 000 metric tonnes of ethane annually, with the expectation that this consumption will be 420 000 metric tonnes.

Even that is not an offer that is legally binding: it is too vague to be so construed. The letter continues:

Because of the complexity of negotiations, particularly with oversea customers, we request that this matter be kept confidential until a mutually agreed announcement can be made.

In fact, it was not kept confidential, because it was let out. The letter continues:

We would appreciate confirmation from you that our project meets with the approval and has the support of you and your Government.

We do not know whether they have that confirmation. We know that they are being played off against another crowd who also want to build the Redcliffs petro-chemical works. We have absolutely nothing: there is nothing whatever but publicity. No-one is bound to anything by that letter nor, I believe, by anything else, and certainly the Premier was not willing to table the document that he said would prove it. I am not willing to take his word for these things, because I know him too well and have known him for too long. What I have said refers to the first point of the motion, and I hope it is sufficient to knock out the Premier's defence to that point. We come to the second point of the motion, but the Premier did not touch on it at all. I shall read it so that whoever follows me in this debate will be able to deal with it.

Mr. Keneally: Obviously, you haven't read his speech.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, I have.

Mr. Keneally: He covered the second point.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: What is it?

Mr. Keneally: The one you are going to make now about the export of petroleum.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: All right. At least the member for Stuart can read. I quote:

(b) whether it has the unqualified approval of the Commonwealth Government for the export of liquid petroleum from South Australia;

I can find nothing—

Mr. Keneally: Which indicates that you can't read!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —in the Premier's speech that gives any clue to such approval by the Commonwealth Government. If the member for Stuart can point to it, I shall be pleased to read it now.

Mr. Keneally: Then you should be here next Wednesday.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The honourable member cannot point to it. Nothing in the Premier's speech meets that point at all. One of the strange things about this is that while we have the Premier saying that he has two fish biting on the hook, and what wonderful people they are and what wonderful things they are going to do, we have his Commonwealth colleagues who are intimately concerned with this matter spewing hate about multi-national companies. If these are not multi-national companies involved in this exercise, I do not know what are. The Labor Party has to speak with two voices: at the Commonwealth level it is complaining about multi-national companies, but at the State level we want them because we want the development we believe they can bring us. This is the split personality problem that the Labor Party has, and eventually it will destroy that Party. Certainly, it will

destroy the Commonwealth and State Governments now in office.

Mr. Wright: What are you talking about?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Is that the best retort that the member for Adelaide can make to the argument I have been developing? The honourable member must have been sorely affected by his experience this morning if he cannot do any better than that in reply to me. No answer is given by the Premier to the second point of the motion, and Government members know it. I shall listen to the member for Whyalla to ascertain whether he can fill that gap. I turn now to the third point in the motion. I need not ask the member for Stuart to come to my rescue on this.

Mr. Keneally: No, you can read!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The motion states:

(c) will give an absolute assurance that the environment and ecology of Spencer Gulf and its surroundings will be fully protected before any constructions commence.

The Premier had the gall to say, "As to an absolute assurance that the environment and ecology of Spencer Gulf and the surrounding district will be fully protected, I have given that undertaking on many occasions". He might have, but certainly the minute from Mr. Bakewell, dated June 4, 1973, and tabled in this House (and which I have obtained from the Clerk as a result of my exchange with the Premier last week) does not give that undertaking. As members may recall, it was about something that had been lost. The minute states:

I can vaguely remember a minute—

one can scarcely believe that one could have a vague recollection of a minute that gave a clear undertaking that the Premier had given—

some time during 1972, on the proposed petro-chemical industry and possible effects on the marine life in the gulf. I think it would have been between April and September, but cannot be sure. I cannot clearly remember whether the communication referred to was a loose minute, notes of a conversation, or part of a docket. My recollection is that the "piece of paper" contained a discussion on a petro-chemical complex, whether at Adelaide or Redcliffs, and indicated that such could have an effect on the marine life if pollutants or heated water were allowed to enter the gulf. The premise of the paper appeared to indicate that were the industry to take water from the gulf (or the Murray), it would be necessary for the industry to cool it (I think by cooling tanks) before returning it or putting it into the gulf. In other words, the paper said that with commonsense in using cooling tanks etc. and proper controls during construction, there should be no problem.

It does not say "there will be no problem" but "there should be no problem". I hope that the member for Whyalla will deal with this part, because it concerns many of his constituents. The minute continues:

I have, on several occasions, (and so too has Mr. Scriven) told industry that in any construction they would need to consult at each stage with the Environment and Conservation Department.

Perhaps the Minister responsible for that department will come into the debate and give an assurance or perhaps some elucidation about the present situation. The minute continues:

They have further been told this liaison would be necessary on their projected plans and proposals. In this respect where industry have said that large quantities of water would be used, it has been made clear that before water is returned or placed in the gulf, it would have to be cooled to the temperature existing in the gulf. Dow, Mitsubishi, Alcoa, Goodrich, etc. all understand their responsibilities, and quite frankly I consider any suggestion that the petro-chemical industry is indiscriminately going to pollute this area as ridiculous so long as industry follows the guidelines laid down for them.

We have no idea what the guidelines are, and we do not know whether they are willing to follow them. The minute continues:

Unfortunately, the minute, docket, or note referred to in my first paragraph cannot be located, nor are we certain from whom it came. However, I am quite certain in my own mind that I have seen such a piece of paper.

I sympathize with Mr. Bakewell: having had some experience in office, I know that dockets can go astray. One tears around and has people scurrying in all directions looking for them: sometimes they are found but, apparently, this one has not been found. The recollections of Mr. Bakewell about this matter do not give one any confidence as to the contents of the undertakings, if any, that have been given on this matter. If everyone is so sure that all is well, why are Scoresby Shepherd and others making an investigation in the gulf now on this matter?

What if their investigations prove that it cannot be done? Are we to tell the two consortia that they cannot have the Redcliffs project? Have they been told that what they are planning to do, according to these letters of intent that the Premier will not show us, may come to nothing if there is going to be pollution in the gulf? What is the position with regard to this matter, which is vital (to use an overworked word) to the life of the gulf? These things should be answered, but the Premier did not answer them. He spent most of his time abusing the member for Goyder. Last week the Premier seemed to be obsessed with the announcement by the honourable member that he would seek selection to the Senate. Every speech the Premier made last week came back to that theme and avoided the issues that he was supposed to be debating.

There are three issues in this motion, and I ask the member for Whyalla to deal with them: first, whether there is any legally binding obligation on anyone to go ahead (and I do not believe for a moment that there is or could be in the present situation); secondly, the attitude of the Commonwealth Government; and, thirdly, the question of the ecology of the gulf. Those three points should be made clear to the House and the public now, and I challenge the member for Whyalla and his colleagues, including the Minister of Environment and Conservation, to make them clear.

Mr. MAX BROWN (Whyalla): I am going to disappoint the honourable member. I intend to deal only with two important aspects of the motion. The member for Goyder, in explaining this motion, said that he regarded as a political gimmick the statement made by the Premier during the last State election campaign that a petro-chemical works would be established at Redcliffs. I wonder whether the statement of the member for Goyder was made on the basis that the member for Pirie, the member for Stuart and I were returned to this House at the last election; I can assure the members for Mitcham and Goyder that we would have been returned to this House whether or not there was to be a petro-chemical works.

The member for Mitcham says that he does not know what the term "letter of intent" means. I believe that the honourable member is a lawyer (although this point has been debated) and I am only a working-class fellow, but my understanding is that a letter of intent is issued on the ground that someone intends to do something. I believe that the two companies involved in this question obviously intend to do something; they are very vocal on that matter. I am gravely concerned about this motion, first, because the member for Mitcham has again poked his nose into an area that does not concern him and, secondly, because he does not know what he is talking about. If anyone has ever played politics (and we all play politics—let us not

kid ourselves about that) the honourable member for Goyder is certainly playing politics in connection with this motion.

Turning to the overall picture of the industrial development of South Australia, I am sure all members would agree that diversification of industry is very necessary in this State. Our two main industries are the motor vehicle industry and the electrical appliance industry. In times of economic trouble, South Australia suffers because it depends far too much on those two industries. So, members should welcome any possibility of getting another major industry in this State. It is not simply a question of the industry being established at Redcliffs or of the industry being near the Stuart District; the essential point is that the new industry will be away from the metropolitan area. Consequently, we will see a diversification and decentralization of industry; this is very important. In reply to the point made by the member for Mitcham about a letter of intent, I point out that the proposed expenditure is \$300,000,000.

Mr. Harrison: That is not chickenfeed.

Mr. MAX BROWN: I agree. Surely, if any company is to spend that sum, the expenditure must be planned in great detail, and I believe that such planning has been done. We are examining every possible avenue to ensure that the project goes forward, that it is planned correctly, and that it will be "a goer". The member for Goyder, in fooling around with a major project, is trying to make political capital, but he has no foundation for doing so. If we are going to criticize what any Government does, surely that criticism should be constructive, not destructive. When the member for Goyder was Premier he did not plan any venture as well as the Redcliffs project has been planned. I would go as far as to say that while he was Premier he paid very little attention to planning; in fact, he encouraged very few industries to come to South Australia.

In paragraph (c) of the motion the honourable member attacks the Government on the question of protection of the environment. In all honesty, I believe that the present Labor Government has paid more attention to the environment than has any other State Government, including Labor Governments in any State. Australia is in a fortunate position concerning the environment, because it can (and should) learn from the experiences of countries such as the United Kingdom, America and Japan. I humbly suggest to the member for Goyder and the member for Mitcham, who say that before establishing this industry we should have an absolute 100 per cent guarantee that the environment is protected in every way, that that is an improbability.

Mr. Millhouse: You are prepared to take less than 100 per cent?

Mr. MAX BROWN: It is impossible to give a 100 per cent assurance that an industry will be established somewhere without polluting to some degree the air, land or sea surrounding the area.

Mr. Millhouse: You are prepared to accept less than a 100 per cent assurance on that?

Mr. MAX BROWN: I think I have to.

Mr. Millhouse: That's all we want to know.

Mr. MAX BROWN: I have to accept it.

Mr. Millhouse: How much less?

Mr. MAX BROWN: It is a question not of how much less but of what has to be done to safeguard the environment in the area to the maximum extent.

Mr. Millhouse: What does that mean?

Mr. MAX BROWN: We could go on with this dialogue for another hour and a half.

Mr. Millhouse: I don't think I'd ever get an answer.

The SPEAKER: Would the honourable member care to include the Speaker in the discussion?

Mr. MAX BROWN: Certainly, Sir. I believe that the present Government has done as much as it can in the matter of the environment. We do not need to be reminded that a Ministry of Environment and Conservation was established as a precedent, and the Minister has done a good job since assuming this portfolio. In addition, during the last session of Parliament the Minister of Marine introduced an amending Bill to provide much needed higher penalties for offences involving oil pollution emanating from ships in the gulfs. The need for this provision concerned many people, and it was an important measure. Further, this Government has had conducted a survey of both Spencer Gulf and St. Vincent Gulf waters, and this survey was undertaken not as a political gimmick but through concern that evidence existed of pollution in both gulfs.

Mr. Keneally: It comes from Kangaroo Island, actually!

Mr. MAX BROWN: It had nothing to do with Kangaroo Island. I was interested in that survey, and I was surprised to learn that it showed that the waters of Spencer Gulf were fairly free of pollution. I was also surprised to learn that what pollution existed seemed to be more pronounced in the waters near Port Lincoln. However, the survey showed that the waters of Spencer Gulf compared more than favourably with waters surrounding industrial areas in other countries, and this was an important result of the survey. I had the pleasure and privilege, on behalf of the industrial movement of Whyalla, of making certain submissions to the Committee on Environment in South Australia and, in addition to making several submissions that I will not go into now, I had the honour of representing the professional fishermen in the area. Although I am not a fisherman (I do not fish at all), I gave evidence to the committee on a matter raised by these fishermen, and the Director of Environment and Conservation (Dr. Inglis), a member of that committee and now Chairman of the committee investigating the Spencer Gulf area, showed much interest.

The matter concerned the fact that these professional fishermen maintained that the weed was disappearing in what is called the False Bay area. Whether or not it was disappearing, I do not know: I could only accept the statements of these people whose livelihood is involved in that part of the gulf. These fishermen say that the pollution emanates from the blast furnace wharf of the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited works: the iron ore dust from this wharf settles on the weed, and when the tide comes in (there is considerable tidal movement in the area) the dust that has settled on the weed does not dissolve. Indeed, I cannot see how any iron ore dust would dissolve if, for example, it were put in a small container of water. The fishermen concerned claim that this is the real reason for the disappearance of the weed in the area.

How does one get rid of that sort of pollution? I do not have the answer, nor does Dr. Inglis, although the member for Mitcham, being a lawyer, may have it; I do not know. However, so far we have not been able to prevent this situation, and I do not know how it may be prevented unless perhaps we get rid of this industry altogether.

Finally, I believe that the Labor Government, in establishing the petro-chemical works, has done everything possible and investigated all the necessary avenues to prevent pollution as a result of the establishment of this important

\$300,000,000 complex. I am sure (and I assure the member for Mitcham) that we will continue to investigate every possible source of pollution from this industry. For those reasons, I have no hesitation in opposing the motion.

Mr. KENEALLY secured the adjournment of the debate.

### SEX DISCRIMINATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 29. Page 577.)

The Hon. D. H. McKEE (Minister of Labour and Industry): Recently, I gave notice that I would move for this Bill to be referred to a Select Committee for further examination, and I should like to give a few brief reasons in support of that motion.

The SPEAKER: I point out to the honourable Minister that at this stage he cannot debate the motion for referral to a Select Committee, because that motion can be moved only at the conclusion of the second reading stage.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The reasons I shall give relate to matters that conflict with agreements reached between the State Governments and the Commonwealth Government. Although I support the Bill in principle, and while it relates to areas worthy of consideration and perhaps reform, in its present form it could cause several problems. One of the main difficulties would be the appointment of a sex discrimination board, which would cut across the operations of the South Australian Committee of Discrimination in Employment and Occupation, appointed by agreement of all the States and the Commonwealth Government to ratify International Labour Organization Convention No. 111. Any duplication of the work being done by that committee in relation to discrimination would be entirely unwarranted. Much more research is required if the Government intends to legislate in this area of social reform. For those and other reasons, I think the Bill should be referred to a Select Committee, a course of action that I am sure will have the full support of all members.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I am grateful to the Minister for his comments, and I consider that the referral of this Bill to a Select Committee is something we should all support. However, I hope most sincerely that this will not be a way of burying this Bill or of avoiding the issues involved in it. The women of the community in South Australia have, by their communications with me, strongly supported the items contained in the Bill. A similar measure has been introduced in Westminster, into the House of Commons and into the House of Lords, on various occasions as a private member's Bill, and it has been the subject of a Select Committee in both the Lords and the Commons. As recently as Monday last it was reported that the Government now in Westminster had introduced a Government Bill along much the same lines as the one I have introduced into this House. Since it is being introduced there by the Government we can presume there is every chance that it will be passed. It has had the benefit of a Select Committee, and the findings of that committee have been used in framing the Bill. I sincerely trust that this move suggested by the Minister is not a way of dodging the issue.

I am grateful indeed for all the letters and suggestions I have received from women in the community since the Bill was brought into this House, pointing out ways in which they have been discriminated against. One that I received only this morning speaks of a woman's duties that are the same as those of a third division male clerk in the State Public Service, yet she receives a much lower salary. In the days before decimal currency, her salary



was £850 a year whereas her contemporary and colleague, a male doing the same duties, at that time received £1,340. This situation is being perpetuated, and she is now receiving \$2,300 a year while the male rate for the same position is \$3,370. She says that, when equal pay was first introduced, her application was rejected, as was her appeal against the board's decision. I shall not go into further detail, but this is typical of what is going on at present and it must be changed. We must have a situation in which we have equal pay for equal work and in which women are not discriminated against.

I am grateful for the way in which my second reading speech was received in this House. It was made in rather trying circumstances, but it was made specifically because my mother, who had died on the previous evening, was particularly interested in the Bill. She was widowed when I, as an only child, was five years of age, and we had quite a battle to make good. In the climate of that time, in the mid-1930's, her education and training for employment were quite unsuitable; further, even had she thought of obtaining employment (which she did on occasions) eyebrows would have been raised and it would have been considered not the done thing. I suspect she would have had considerable difficulty in getting any suitable employment, anyway. I am grateful to my mother for all she did and for the interest she showed in this Bill, and I am most grateful to members for the help and assistance given me. I also thank the Minister for his consideration.

Bill read a second time and referred to a Select Committee consisting of Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Duncan, McKee, Mathwin, and Tonkin; the committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to adjourn from place to place; the committee to report on November 21.

#### **PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 12. Page 716.)

Mrs. BYRNE (Tea Tree Gully): I thank the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Ross Smith, and the member for Fisher for their support of the Bill. In addition, I wish to thank members of the public who have expressed to me their opinions and support of the Bill. Regarding the amendment of the member for Fisher relating to the prohibition on the chaining of birds, I have caused inquiries to be made of veterinary surgeons—

The SPEAKER: Order! I must inform the honourable member that during the second reading debate on a Bill an honourable member may not discuss amendments, as such amendments are not before the House. Amendments cannot be discussed until the Committee stage.

Mrs. BYRNE: The member for Fisher gave notice that he would move two amendments. As I cannot canvass those amendments at this stage, I will leave my comments on them until the Committee stage.

Bill read a second time.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher) moved:

That it be an instruction to the Committee of the whole House on the Bill that it have power to consider amendments relating to chaining of birds and exhibiting of regulations.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 5 passed.

Clause 6—"Abandonment of animals."

Mr. EVANS: I move:

To strike out "section is" and insert "sections are"; and to insert the following new section:

5e. Any owner or person in charge of a bird who suffers or permits the movement of that bird to be restricted by means of any chain, rope or tie attached to any part of the body of that bird shall be guilty of an offence against this Act and liable to a penalty not exceeding two hundred dollars or to imprisonment for any term not exceeding six months.

I do not believe that it is desirable to chain or tether birds by the leg, as is the normal practice. I know it has been said that inspectors are available to note any cruelty that occurs. However, inspectors catch only a small percentage of the offenders. At present, not many people tether birds, but, with the regulations coming in to oblige an owner of birds to have large cages so that birds have freedom of movement, the attitude may be that cages will be big and expensive, and that a chain or cord can be used to tie a bird to its perch. We all know that a cord or chain can be ensnared in any protruding object and that the bird's leg can thus be hurt. Moreover, if a bird is frightened by something and moves quickly, suddenly reaching the end of its tether, an injury can be done to its leg. In our present society, I do not think there is any need to chain or tether birds, and I think it should be spelt out that this practice is an offence.

If people know that it is an offence to tether birds, when they see this happening they will inform an inspector immediately, and there will not be the need for inspections in relation to cruelty to birds. It is difficult for a person to know whether, for instance, his neighbour's chained bird is receiving a leg injury or is suffering, as to find this out requires close inspection. To overcome these difficulties, I ask members to support my amendments. I do not think this would be interfering with people's rights, and it would offer greater protection to birds kept in captivity, providing them with greater freedom.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I support the amendments, as they will lead to the protection of birds that have previously been chained. Persons who are more involved with this matter than I am have pointed out to me that birds that are chained, particularly with chains of heavy and uncomfortable metal link, can come to considerable harm. With the new legislation to provide for larger cages for the bigger birds, there will be no need really to chain cockatoos, crows, galahs, and so on. The bird protection group, which waited on the member for Fisher and other members on this side, put forward considerable evidence of the injury done to birds by these chains in the way of arthritis to limbs, and so on.

Mrs. BYRNE: Although I oppose the amendments, I appreciate the sentiments expressed by the mover and the seconder. I caused inquiries to be made, because it is important that a correct decision be made now. If cruelty exists, something must be done to prevent it. My inquiries revealed that the incidence of injury reported to have been caused by the chaining of birds was minimal and that the allegations of suffering caused by this method of restraint, reported to the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, had been few. Of nine veterinary surgeons who were questioned, five had not treated an injury from this cause during the past three years, whereas the other four had each treated one or two cases. The R.S.P.C.A. has told me that it has received five allegations during the last three years of suffering caused by birds being chained; only two of the five allegations could be substantiated.

It seems to me that the consensus of opinion of those who have had experience in the field of animal management and who have been canvassed is that chaining cannot be considered to be cruel, and that is also my

considered opinion as a result of the inquiries. Action can be taken under the provisions of section 5 (1) (a) and (b) against any person who causes suffering to a bird as a result of chaining it.

Mr. MATHWIN: I support the amendments. Inspectors would find it difficult to decide whether cruelty had been caused as a result of the chaining of a bird. Many chains used to tether birds are probably heavier than they need be, because many people give little thought to the type of chain the bird requires. I have been told of many instances of this by authorities on this matter, who have explained to me that problems exist and that cruelty and injury can be inflicted on certain birds. I am disappointed that the member for Tea Tree Gully opposes the amendments. I find it difficult to understand why.

Mr. Wells: She told you why.

Mr. MATHWIN: I am pleased that the member for Florey is prompting me. I compliment the member for Tea Tree Gully on introducing the Bill, but I find it difficult to understand why she opposes the amendments, which deal with cruelty to animals and birds. If there is no law relating to such cruelty, it would be difficult for an inspector to witness cruelty from outside the premises. It could mean that only tradesmen who visited the premises and friends of the bird's owner would be able to report the matter to the society. If the amendments are passed, people could see from afar whether the bird was improperly chained, and the inspector could ensure that the law was being observed.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister of Environment and Conservation): I oppose the amendments, mainly for the reasons given by the member for Tea Tree Gully. Although I appreciate that, on the surface, it seems that the chaining of birds should be banned, the member for Fisher did not mention the situation regarding birds already chained if the amendments were carried. I have observed that many people have placed a chain on a cockatoo to give it freedom of movement, by the use of a circular hook on the end of the chain placed on a T-bar. This enables the bird to climb up and down the T-bar and walk around the base of the perch.

Mr. Chapman: The bird could get tangled up and hang by the legs.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: That could happen. If the amendments are carried, people who have previously had a bird on a chain will have to buy a cage or take some other action. However, many people who may have had a bird for years may not be willing to make the change, so they will have to decide whether to release or destroy the bird or buy a cage for it. We should not create a situation whereby a bird may be released but it could not survive for long after release. The problem is not severe enough for us to create a situation that could lead to difficulties, in view of the few complaints that have been made.

Mr. CHAPMAN: The Minister has reinforced a point I wish to make when he said that the owners of birds would, in some cases, be required to build a new pen or cage or dispose of the bird. The amendments are designed to reinforce the Act for the protection of birds, not the owners of birds. I am amazed that the Minister has switched his argument to the individual owners.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: I merely said the bird would probably die if it was released. If it was destroyed, that would hardly be helping it.

Mr. CHAPMAN: The member for Tea Tree Gully quoted the statement in the report that the injury done to birds as a result of chaining had been found to be only

minimal. Therefore, the possibility of injury exists, and we should be trying to prevent cruelty to animals and birds.

Dr. TONKIN: The Minister's over-practical argument surprises me. The first consideration is the well-being of birds kept in captivity. Perhaps the Minister or the member for Tea Tree Gully can tell me whether a minimum length is prescribed for the chain that holds the bird. The member for Tea Tree Gully has said that, if the birds were not chained, the cats would get them. However, the cats would be more likely to get them if they were chained. If we must provide that birds be put in cages, we should do that, but I do not believe that birds should be chained.

Mr. PAYNE: I oppose the amendments. One would have been able to give more credibility to the remarks made by the member for Alexandra in his concern for the welfare of birds in captivity if one had not heard his remarks on another occasion about the welfare, as he saw it, of human beings. I have not heard any member who supports the amendments referring to the possibility of harm being done to caged birds. This is possible, particularly in the cockatoo family. Birds are put on chains by people who have an affection for the birds and wish to keep them as pets. The sulphur-crested white Australian cockatoo often attains a wing span of 2ft. (.6 m), and who is to say what is a proper confine for such a bird? What kind of cage would anyone suggest was more suitable than chaining?

The member for Bragg has said that the length of chain is not specified. He probably has similar problems on other occasions when he is talking about matters that he does not know about. It is common to see birds chained to a slipping fitted to a wire, when they can fly and get more exercise than when they are caged. In my experience of sulphur-crested cockatoos and galahs, I know of birds being chained for 10 to 12 years, and I have never known of a correctly chained bird being injured.

The bird that is normally chained will be better off by being chained than by being caged. Most birds that are chained become tamer, and it is common to let them off the chain for exercise. This can be done when the patent chain that is available is used. I agree with the Minister that a change of location is available on a property when the stand and chain are used. One must favour chaining under proper and adequate conditions. Adequate supervision is provided for in the Act.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I oppose the amendments and accept the position put by the member for Tea Tree Gully and other members. We must consider the matter in a practical way. I accept the suggestion that problems can occur when birds are chained. However, when practising my profession I have had to attend to more birds with leg and wing damage, particularly the former, that had been caught in the walls of cages than I did to birds that had been on chains. Also, many people who keep birds in cages afford them more opportunity to spread their wings by putting them on chains at certain times. The Committee would be giving the member for Tea Tree Gully the support she deserves by rejecting the amendments. I acknowledge the point made by the society concerned with the protection of birds. However, I believe that aspect is already covered in the Act. Birdlife will be more advantaged if the amendment is rejected.

Mr. EVANS: I was well aware of the Leader's attitude before I moved the amendments. What he has said merely proves that birds are kept in unsuitable cages. As the regulations will stipulate the type of cage in which they can be kept, the risk of injury will be eliminated as much as possible. I do not believe there is any justification for chaining birds.

Mrs. BYRNE: I agree with the member for Bragg that we must consider whether cruelty exists. Having caused extensive inquiries to be made in this respect, I learnt that in over three years the R.S.P.C.A. had received only five complaints, only two of which were substantiated, regarding suffering caused to birds being chained. In the same period 3 100 complaints regarding cruelty were made to the society. Power already exists under the Act to enable action to be taken against the owners of birds that are suffering. As this aspect is already covered, I oppose the amendments.

Mr. Millhouse: Can you say whether these amendments will do any harm?

Mrs. BYRNE: They will, although I do not know how many people in this State have birds on chains. However, I imagine that there would be many, and either all these birds would have to be released into the wilds (where they would probably perish, having been cared for as they had over the years) or they would have to be caged. Most birds on chains receive more affection and attention than do birds in cages, probably because their owners are closer to them and handle them more. As action can already be taken under the Act, the inclusion of this provision is unnecessary, and I therefore oppose the amendments.

Dr. EASTICK: It should be clarified that my previous comments did not apply solely to small cages. Indeed, birds in large aviaries receive more injuries than do those in smaller cages. Once there are protrusions, injuries are likely to occur.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Tea Tree Gully lost my support on this important matter as a result of her speech. She does not know (and I take it from his nods of approbation that the Minister on the front bench does not know either) how many birds are chained in South Australia.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You weren't here earlier.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I was, and by interjection I learnt that the member for Tea Tree Gully did not know how many birds were chained in South Australia. As a result, I am impelled to support the amendments. There must be many thousands of birds in captivity in South Australia, and I believe there are alternative, and indeed far more humane, ways of keeping them than by chaining them.

The Committee divided on the amendments:

Ayes (11)—Messrs. Arnold, Becker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Evans (teller), Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse, Russack, Tonkin, and Venning.

Noes (26)—Messrs. Allen, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne (teller), Messrs. Corcoran, Coumbe, Crimes, Dunstan, Eastick, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, McKee, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.

Majority of 15 for the Noes.

Amendments thus negatived; clause passed.

Clauses 7 to 13 passed.

Clause 14—"Regulations."

Mr. EVANS: I move:

After "amended" to insert:

(a) by inserting immediately after subsection (1) the following subsection:

(1a) Without limiting the generality of subsection (1) of this section, the Governor may make regulations providing for the display of copies of regulations made under this Act in any premises or any premises of a class or kind in which animals or cages or receptacles for the confinement of animals are offered for sale;

and

(b)

This amendment gives the Government power to make regulations to ensure that shop proprietors and persons who sell cages will display the regulations in a position where they can be read by potential customers, who may be prevented from committing an unwitting offence.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

### INFLAMMABLE CLOTHING (LABELLING) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 22. Page 471.)

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): When speaking on this Bill some weeks ago, I pointed out that the Minister of Labour and Industry had intimated that certain action was proposed on behalf of the Government, and I suggested to the member for Glenelg, who introduced this Bill, that suitable amendments be introduced. I must commend the member for Glenelg, first, for his enthusiasm in bringing this matter before the House and, secondly, for the way he presented his case, because this is a most important subject. However, at this stage we have no knowledge of the Government's intention, although I understand legislation on a uniform basis at a national level is to follow recommendations made by the National Standards Association.

As we can do nothing further in this matter until those recommendations are put before us, I point out that the objective of the member for Glenelg is to get something done *pro tem*, and I am sure all members will agree with the sentiments expressed by him. Indeed, since this Bill was introduced much publicity has been given in the local press to displays of children's clothes depicting those clothes which should not be worn by children. Such action is to be commended, because it is an attempt to bring this important subject to the attention of the public, stressing the dangers involved. Further, displays of certain women's night attire involving the same inherent dangers have also been publicized, and I am pleased that this Bill introduced by the member for Glenelg has created such interest in the community. Pamphlets have been published by the National Safety Council, and I know that the Minister, too, has been responsible for some work in this regard.

In recalling my own involvement in this matter, it is important to remember that the public itself must be educated and told of the great dangers inherent in the indiscriminate use of unsuitable night attire. Also, in any consideration of the use of these types of garment, it is proper to consider those groups in our society who need protection and who in many cases cannot help themselves: I refer to the elderly and the sick who in many cases live alone. Be it from a gas fire, an electric fire or, even worse, a kerosene heater, we have seen the results of the many accidents that have occurred.

In commending the member for Glenelg for introducing this Bill, I suggest that this matter be further considered with a view to moving certain amendments. Statistics published by the Adelaide Children's Hospital support this suggestion. A question has been asked recently in this House about whether the burns unit at the Royal Adelaide Hospital is yet in operation and providing the same service as that provided for children at the Adelaide Children's Hospital. As a reply to this question has not yet been received, I point out that, if this burns unit is not yet in operation, I regard it as a most serious matter and I should like to

receive a reply to this question, because I am sure the Minister would support the installation of such a unit and would co-operate with his colleague to ensure its speedy installation. As neither the Minister nor the member who introduced the Bill is here, I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

#### **APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)**

(Continued from September 18. Page 814.)

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General) moved:

That further consideration of the Bill in Committee be now resumed.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I bring to the attention of the House and of the Minister of Transport—

The SPEAKER: Before calling on the member for Glenelg, I seek information as to whether the member for Glenelg is the chief speaker with the authority of the Leader of the Opposition.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): The honourable member has that permission, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MATHWIN: I bring to the attention of the House and of the Minister of Transport a matter which disturbs me, as member for Glenelg, and many of my constituents. I refer to the condition of Morphett Road, especially the stretch from the Oaklands railway crossing northwards to the Warradale army camp. The centre strip is a tarmac area and the right and left shoulders of the road are in an unmade condition and have been so for many years. No kerbing or water tabling is provided, resulting in problems of flooding on adjoining properties during the winter. The residents, most of whom have lived there for many years, have had to put up with this problem of Hooding in the winter, dusty and troublesome conditions in the summer, and then the quagmire when winter comes around again.

Recently I had a telephone call from a worried constituent who told me that he had sent his young daughter to Warradale Primary School, a little farther up the road, dressed in new clothes, and that, within four minutes of leaving home, she had returned covered from head to foot in mud. Morphett Road carries a vast amount of traffic, including heavy traffic. It is pointless to say the traffic volume will decrease: obviously it will increase.

Another problem concerns the Oaklands railway crossing. In reply to a recent question from me, the Minister said that work on the Marion Road railway crossing might be completed first and that the construction of the Oaklands crossing would follow. The Marion Road crossing is a rail crossing and it is expected that the railway will go over the road and that construction will commence in 1973. When that is completed, work can be commenced on the Oaklands crossing. This project will be a fly-over, meaning that the road will go over the railway. The Minister said this work would take up to seven years. I do not imagine it took longer than that to build the Empire State building, yet I was given the reply that it would probably be 1980 before my constituents in Morphett Road could expect relief.

I have asked the Highways Commissioner whether it is possible for relief to be given by temporarily repairing the road shoulders. I do not ask for the whole of Morphett Road to be repaired from the crossing to Anzac Highway, because I know that this would be difficult. However, a report I read recently indicated that the stretch of Morphett Road to be completed this year or next would be that from Anzac Highway to the Sturt Creek, even though that stretch

contains only about four houses, the Morphettville Racecourse, and an area owned by the Engineering and Water Supply Department which is on the western side of the racecourse and used for car parking. Very few people would be inconvenienced if that stretch of road were left.

Surely it would be better to provide some relief for people on Morphett Road between the army camp and the Oaklands crossing rather than improve an area which concerns nobody except racegoers and commuters.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: And they are nobody?

Mr. MATHWIN: I did not say that. However, I am concerned for the people within my area; this matter involves not only the residents on Morphett Road but others living close to the road. Apart from people living there, the local traders (the area has two sets of shops) have approached me many times and have also approached the council concerning the problems of people shopping in the area. People will not go to these shops in bad weather. At times they cannot even get to the shops without getting their feet wet, and women with children have special difficulties in getting the children to and from the shops. In all seriousness, I ask the Minister to consider this matter carefully. I agree that in some circumstances it would be difficult to do what I have asked because of the problem of providing a temporary crossing over the railway while the fly-over was being completed. However, if the Minister and the Commissioner decide it would be impossible to do the job at firsthand, I ask that they seriously consider providing relief for my constituents and for the local traders.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

(Continued from September 18. Page 814.)

Schedule.

Minister of Transport and Minister of Local Government, \$899,310.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: So far, from my observations this debate has been a tame affair.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You weren't here at all last night.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I looked in vain in this morning's newspaper to see whether anyone had made the slightest impression on anyone else, and there was not a thing. Obviously, except for wasting time, the Liberal and Country League has made little impression at all.

Mr. Becker: When will you grow up?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The honourable member has only one interjection. Normally he has a crick in his neck that prevents his looking at me at all, but whenever he does he only says, "When will you grow up?" There is nothing more he can say.

The CHAIRMAN: I suggest that the honourable member get to the line under discussion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I now have the opportunity to debate the Government's metropolitan transportation policy. I warn my friends in the L.C.L. that at the end of my remarks I intend to move a motion that is tantamount to a motion of no confidence. I give that warning now so that they can decide what to do, and I also give the warning to the Minister, if he desires to take it.

Mr. McRae: Will you have a seconder?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Apparently the honourable member is not familiar with Standing Orders, which show that, in Committee, I do not need a seconder.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the honourable member to resume his seat. If he intends to depart from the line under discussion and move a motion, I request him to move that motion now.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Very well. I move:

That the vote of \$899,310 for the Minister of Transport and Minister of Local Government be reduced by \$100.

I will use this opportunity to debate the Government's metropolitan transportation policy, which is the responsibility of the Minister. I believe that, except for carrying on the plans of the former Government (whilst denying that it was doing so), the present Government has no transportation policy. Since the present Government came to office, we have had the Breuning report, which I always thought was a poor affair and superficial. One of the things contained in it was a suggestion that we should indulge in what was known as dial-a-bus. The Breuning report, referring to this as "Action Recommendation A-8: Dial-a-Bus Demonstration Project", states:

Dial-a-bus is a special bus service in which a traveller calls up a central switchboard whereupon a bus is directed to pick up the traveller at a given time near his origin. Thus the walk to a stop and the wait there are eliminated. The purpose of a demonstration project is to learn how travellers respond to this service and where particularly it might operate best.

Because this was something a bit new in the report, the Minister latched on to it and, between then and July this year, dial-a-bus was held out to the people of the metropolitan area of Adelaide as something new that would solve our transportation problems. It was literally the only proposal that the Government put before the people of the State to improve transportation within the metropolitan area. The Government pinned its hopes on dial-a-bus. As I have said, we have had absolutely nothing else new from the Government. Everything else that has been done by the Government in the field of metropolitan transportation, despite the bluster and words of the Minister, has been simply a continuation of what was going on before and what would have continued, irrespective of the Government.

The reason for my motion is that I believe the Minister has acted scandalously over the subject of dial-a-bus, quite apart from having no real transportation policy at all and no plans to solve our transportation problems. On August 7, I put a series of Questions on Notice to the Minister on this topic. Some members were rather disparaging about the number of Questions on Notice I had that day, but I assure them that all these questions were for a purpose (I do not work these things out just for nothing). My questions and the Minister's answers appear on page 193 of *Hansard*. I well knew that the Government had some time before established a committee to inquire into dial-a-bus. My first question to the Minister was as follows: "Did the Government establish or cause to be established a committee to evaluate proposals for a dial-a-bus system for Adelaide?" The Minister replied, "Yes."

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Which you knew you would get.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: So it was a waste of time asking it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Attorney-General will tell his colleague that, if one is interrogating (and Questions on Notice are a form of interrogation), one must lay the foundation in early questions for later questions. Then I asked the Minister, "Was the name of the committee the Dial-a-bus Steering Committee? If not, what was its name?" The Minister replied, "Yes." My third question was as follows: "When was the committee established?" The Minister replied, "August, 1971." I then asked, "Who were its members?" The Minister then set out the names of members of the committee. My fifth question was as follows: "Did it make a report?" The Minister's reply to that straight-out question was that it had commissioned a

firm of consulting engineers to carry out specific research and forwarded the consultant's report in two stages to the Minister of Transport, with a covering letter.

I then asked, "To whom did it report and when?" The Minister replied, "To the Minister of Transport in December, 1971, and in August, 1972." My seventh question to the Minister was as follows: "Has that report been made public and, if not, why not?" The Minister replied, "No. The report was commissioned by the Government to obtain information for the use of the Government." Then I asked, "If not, will the report now be made public?" The Minister replied that it would not be. My ninth question to the Minister was as follows: "Did the committee request that its report be made public?" The Minister replied, "No." I then asked the Minister, "Was the report of the committee to the effect that a dial-a-bus system would be successful in Adelaide?" Members will notice that the Minister side-stepped the question. That is significant, because the Minister said, "The consultants suggested, among other things, in the conclusion of their report that the introduction of dial-a-bus in the eastern suburbs would represent a major experiment and would test dial-a-bus in its most complex mode of operation."

That was no reply to a simple question. There was no reply to the question because a truthful, straight-out honest answer would have been embarrassing to the Government. I believe that the committee was set up and that it was a good committee. The committee met and deliberated, and it commissioned from Pak-Poy and Associates a study on this matter. The study, which I believe recommended against dial-a-bus, was forwarded with a covering report to the Minister, and the request was made that it should be made public. However, it was not made public. Its contents and conclusions were never made public, but they were contrary to dial-a-bus: they were that dial-a-bus would not work and should not be proceeded with.

The second set of questions I asked was about the Pak-Poy report. My first question in the second set was as follows: "Did Pak-Poy and Associates make a survey into a dial-a-bus system for Adelaide?" The Minister replied, "Yes." As I have said, this was done at the committee's request. I then asked, "If so, when was the survey made?" The Minister replied, "From October, 1971, until August, 1972." My third question was as follows: "If a survey was made, what was the cost?" In reply, the Minister said that the cost was \$27,000: that is, \$27,000 for the survey into dial-a-bus. I then asked, "Who paid for it?" The Minister replied, "The Planning and Development Branch of the Minister of Transport Department."

It was because this department had paid the price that I have moved the motion on this item. Continuing, I asked, "Did such survey show that a dial-a-bus system was likely to be successful?" Again, it was a straight-out question, but the Minister replied, "See answer to the previous question." He side-stepped the question previously, and he side-stepped it again. My sixth question was as follows: "If not, what did it show?" The Minister replied, "See No. 5 above."

In other words, he was not game to say what the report disclosed. That was the situation as disclosed by the Minister. I do not believe that that report did other than recommend against dial-a-bus, and there is some confirmation of that belief in an article in the *Advertiser* of July 26 (after the experiment had failed), as follows:

Dial-a-bus proved a dud 12 months ago. A committee of transport specialists advised the South Australian

Government 12 months ago that any dial-a-bus system in Adelaide would be unsuccessful.

The Minister has repeatedly refused to disclose the contents of either the Pak-Poy report or the committee's report. The only reason he has refused to do so is that he knew that it would be embarrassing to him and to the Government to disclose the contents of either report. I challenge the Minister when he replies (and I hope he will reply) to deny that that is why he will not disclose the report, and to give any other reason why the contents of these two reports should not be made public. The only way I shall be convinced that I am wrong in this matter is by being shown these reports. However, I believe that I will not see them, because I am sure that I am right, and I believe that members know that I am right.

The Minister had these reports. What happened next? He was, according to himself (and I accept this), approached by a Mr. Wood to go into a dial-a-bus experiment. Knowing that the report and the survey had shown that dial-a-bus would not work (and, in any case, would not be an answer to our transportation problems even if it did work), he allowed Mr. Wood to go ahead with the experiment. He not only gave Mr. Wood permission to go ahead with it: he also spent money on the experiment. I know that, compared to total Government expenditure, the sum spent on dial-a-bus was not great. The sum given to Mr. Wood and his company was only a few thousand dollars. At least, we are not dealing with vast sums of money, but that does not alter the fact or the principle that Government money was wasted on something which the Government knew, before it began, would not succeed.

The Government had spent many thousands of dollars more in being given that answer by a firm of consultants who are experts in this matter than it spent in encouraging a man in an experiment that was doomed to failure from the beginning—indeed, before the beginning. That is the situation concerning Mr. Wood. Members can make up their own minds as to the morality of what the Minister did and, indeed, what the Government standing behind him did collectively. I believe that it was a poor show indeed. The experiment inevitably failed, and we had in the House early in the session a statement from the Minister reporting to the House and explaining the reasons for the failure. That appears on page 29 of *Hansard*, if the Minister wishes to refresh his memory. He had the gall to say in the early part of that statement:

To enable members fully to appreciate Mr. Wood's reason for ending the experimental period, I believe that it is appropriate for me, as Minister of Transport, to provide information . . .

He gave the most piffling and trifling reasons for the failure of the experiment that one could imagine. At no time in the statement did he get to the root of the problem, which is that, in a city with the distribution of population and as extensive as Adelaide, dial-a-bus would not work. He gave all kinds of reason, which simply add up to poor management: the break-down of the radio transmitter; people complaining; workmen putting their forks through cables, etc. All this added up to no more than bad management; yet that was the information the Minister put before us so that we might fully appreciate Mr. Wood's reasons for abandoning the experiment. I also asked the Minister, after this, what would replace dial-a-bus now that it had gone and what, if any, were the suggested solutions to the need for cross-suburban transport in Adelaide, alternative to dial-a-bus? If what I have said is wrong and the Minister was not pinning all his hopes on dial-a-bus, why did he not give a better reply than this to the question when I asked it? The reply that I received states:

The staff of the Director-General of Transport's branch of the department is investigating the possible improvement of facilities for cross-town travel by conventional transport means.

Bless my soul, what has everyone been doing for, I was going to say, a decade? Is that not the most obvious and trite reply that one can imagine? Is that all the Government can show that it has in setting out its policy on metropolitan transportation? Heavens above, the Minister should not be in office if he cannot do better than that! That is the situation that we have reached. Dial-a-bus was a dead duck from the beginning. I consider that the Minister acted badly in encouraging a man to go into it when he knew full well that it could not work.

I consider that he has acted scandalously in suppressing those reports merely to save himself embarrassment, because they showed, as we all knew, that it would not work. Now the Minister has no policy whatever. He had a trip abroad and came back about a week ago. When he came back, he said that we should upgrade public transport. That is another truism, something that we all know: there is nothing new in that. He did not have to go abroad to be able to say that.

The Government has no policy on metropolitan transportation, and it is about time it developed one or admitted that it has not the answers to these things. What have we heard from the Minister in the last few days in this place when Liberal and Country League members have asked him about this? All he has been able to say is that the Commonwealth Government (the wonderful Labor Government that is in such good standing in the community!) is pouring money into metropolitan transportation. He did not say how he would spend the money or what good it would be. The only reply that he could give to the question about what this Government would do was that the Commonwealth Government would give us some money.

This is not good enough, and for those reasons I have moved the motion, which is, of course, a motion of no confidence in the Minister. I have given notice to the Committee, particularly to my friends on this side, so that members can make up their minds about whether to support me. I hope that they do support me, because certainly, if any Minister deserves to get the stick for what he has done or, rather, has not done, it is the Minister of Transport, particularly because of the disgraceful episode of dial-a-bus.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport): Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Crimes: Just wait for it.

Mr. Millhouse: I am.

Mr. Crimes: You'll get it.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: What a wicked waste of 30 minutes of Parliament's time this has been, with the member for Mitcham raving and ranting to try to get into the press, when there is not one press reporter in the gallery!

Mr. Millhouse: There's one.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am sorry; there is one press reporter in the gallery. If he can make anything intelligent out of the honourable member's ranting, he must be an ace reporter. The member for Mitcham has been at about his worst, talking on one topic only and, as usual, using half-truths and omissions so as to create a completely false impression. He talked first about the Breuning report, and one could be pardoned for believing, in listening to him, that there was only one recommendation in that report, namely, one on dial-a-bus.

The honourable member did not refer to another thing, yet the Breuning report contains five policy recommendations. The honourable member did not talk about them,

probably because the Government has acted on them. Then there are three organizational recommendations, and the honourable member also did not talk about them. In fact, the longer I listened to the honourable member, the more I believed what a friend of mine had said to me a long time ago, namely, that if a person was caught riding a bike without a bell on it, that person should make sure that the member for Mitcham did not represent him in court, because he would get the death penalty.

The Breuning report also contains 12 action recommendations, amongst them being one regarding dial-a-bus. After listening to the honourable member, I am sure that there was probably no-one in Australia more pleased than he was when he read the announcement that the trial study, the pilot study, had shown that the system would not work. Indeed, he was the most pleased man in the world at that.

Mr. Millhouse: Don't be silly.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I think he has made quite clear this evening that he would be pleased.

Mr. McAnaney: He has never been pleased.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am sure he was pleased then. He did not tell the Committee this evening exactly what Dr. Breuning had said, and perhaps the Committee ought to know that. The report states:

Dial-a-bus is a special bus service in which a traveller calls a central switchboard whereupon a bus is directed to pick up the traveller at a given time near his origin. Thus the walk to a stop and the wait there are eliminated. The purpose of a demonstration project—

Mr. Millhouse: I read this out.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the honourable member did, he did not take much notice of it. The report also states:

The purpose of a demonstration project is to learn how travellers respond to this service and where particularly it might operate best.

How in the world the member for Mitcham could say, if he did read that out and understood it, that that purported to be something that would solve all the transport problems of Adelaide is beyond my imagination, and one would have to have a mind such as the member for Mitcham has to believe it. He is probably the only person in Australia who would believe it. Although he claims that I have said that dial-a-bus would solve all the transport problems of Adelaide, I have never said that, as the member for Mitcham knows.

He has made some further rather wild but serious allegations that do not become a person in the legal profession. He stated categorically that I had encouraged Mr. Wood to engage in the dial-a-bus business. That is a complete untruth, and the member for Mitcham would know that if he had listened to what was said here and if he had read *Hansard*. What he has said is completely untrue and is typical of the way he performs.

Mr. Millhouse: Why did you pay him money, then?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: That interjection is typical of the further lies of the member for Mitcham. No money has been paid to Mr. Wood. We financed, as a project, the first few days of his operation, as part of our research project.

Mr. Millhouse: "Dial-a-bus cost us \$3,000, says Virgo."

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The member for Mitcham again is trying to twist words to make something and to make wild claims, hoping that what he says will stick, but it just will not stick, and he knows that. The trouble that he is concerned about is that at long last there is in South Australia a Government that is upgrading public transport rather than destroying the metropolitan area, as the honourable member used to talk about when he was

standing here as Attorney-General, representing the then Minister of Roads and Transport, who was going to destroy so much of the metropolitan area of Adelaide. He was delighted with his Government's plans until one Saturday morning, when he was confronted with some of his own constituents from Mitcham on a Mitcham council inspection, when he went completely to water because they pulled up the bus and said to him, "Will you look to the left and to the right and realize that you are destroying this part of Kingswood." The Hon. Murray Hill and the Hon. Jessie Cooper, who were on that bus with the member for Mitcham, also went to water, and the next moment the Hills Freeway proposal was withdrawn.

Mr. Millhouse: Oh?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is no good the member for Mitcham saying, "Oh", because he knows that what I am saying is true. Indeed, he cannot deny it, as every member of the council, including the Town Clerk, was there, and you went to water when you were put under pressure. However, the Government of which you were a member was willing to cut a great swathe through the southern half of Adelaide.

Mr. Millhouse: Go on.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: However, this Government is now concentrating on the provision of adequate public transport.

The CHAIRMAN: Will the Minister please address the Chair and refer to the member as the member for Mitcham.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The point has been made clearly. The member for Mitcham is smarting under the accusations, which he knows are completely accurate, and he cannot use all his cunning to get out of it this time.

Mr. Millhouse: Get back to the point!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The point is that the member for Mitcham has moved a vote of no confidence in me as Minister, and I am trying to show him (and I think I can show all other members) that this motion is completely unjustified. Having wasted enough time on the frivolous matters raised by the member for Mitcham, I want to conclude on the point he raised about this Government's policy. He said that I have just had another overseas trip and that this Government had no policy regarding public transport. I agree with him at least on one point: that I have had the privilege of again visiting some overseas countries and seeing what they are doing. Indeed, I saw two dial-a-bus operations, one in a town the name of which I cannot remember in southern California and another at Haddonfield in West Virginia. The former is being subsidized by the United States Government through the Department of Transportation to the extent of about \$35,000 a month.

I was shown figures (and was given literature on my return journey which substantiated this) which showed that the service at Haddonfield is experiencing a deficit of about \$80,000 a month. However, that is an inflated figure because much research is involved in it. It was clear (and it was readily agreed by those who knew what was happening in the area) that it was extremely unlikely that in the circumstances dial-a-bus could continue to operate, because of its economic results. However, these experiments are being continued. Unfortunately, such funding as that in America is not available here. It soon became crystal clear that the financial commitment would far exceed what we considered we could reasonably carry. The other matter which deserves comment and which ties up the two points regarding my overseas trip and this

Government's policy on transportation is that it became clear while I was overseas that the policy this Government adopted in February, 1971, is now the policy of every city that I visited.

Mr. Millhouse: And what is it?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I did not think I would ever hear such an ignorant remark being made by the member for Mitcham. He has been sitting in this Chamber for a long time but he obviously never listens, because within only the last few days the member for Eyre asked me what the Government's policy was and I spelt it out in single-syllable words so that he would understand. Apparently I will have to put it in braille so that the member for Mitcham can understand it.

Mr. Millhouse: Just tell us now.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: For the benefit of the member for Mitcham I will labour on for just a little longer. In February, 1971, the Government said that it would not proceed for at least 10 years, if then, with the construction of freeways contained in the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan, which was approved by the Government of which the member for Mitcham was a Minister.

Mr. McAnaney: When will you get us out of the terrible mess that we will then be in?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the member for Heysen will keep quiet, I will conclude what I was saying. The Government said then that it would, on an owner-approach basis, help anyone by buying the house he could not sell on the market because of the cloud of suspicion that the former Liberal Government had created—

Mr. Venning: Rubbish!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: —and, furthermore, that it would concentrate on upgrading and expanding our public transport system.

Mr. McAnaney: When?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am pleased the member for Heysen asked that because, if he was awake, he would realize that for the first time in South Australia more than \$6,000,000 will be spent on public transport this year, and that is as a result of the action taken by the Commonwealth Labor Government. We could not get it out of the former Commonwealth Liberal Government: we had to wait for a Labor Government before we could get it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am disappointed that some of my former colleagues in the Liberal and Country League are not willing to speak in support of this motion. I suppose it caught them unaware, and it takes them a long time to react.

Mr. Arnold: That's why they are former colleagues.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is a good reason why they should be. I was encouraged by some of the interjections made by the member for Rocky River. However, let me get on to the Minister of Transport who is, after all, the target.

Mr. Chapman: That's a change. The L.C.L. has been the target in the past.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Alexandra is thinskinny tonight. I do not know what is the matter with him. I have for many years watched the Minister, since he has been a Minister and before that when he was in Opposition, and I am able to tell when he thinks he is on firm ground and when he thinks he is not on such firm ground. I have no doubt, from his bellicose reaction this evening, that he is feeling very uncomfortable because he knows that he is in a very weak position indeed, and that his ground is not only weak but also almost non-existent. The only reply he was able to give to any of my points on policy, on dial-a-bus, on encouraging Mr. Wood to

continue, and on releasing the reports and their contents, was to abuse me, with a little abuse of others thrown in for good measure. That confirms my belief that he has no answer to the questions I put to him.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You reckon you have the right to abuse me but that I can't come back: that is typical of your one-sided attitude.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister is still persisting. Whilst I have his attention I draw it to these points. I made much of his replies to my Questions on Notice: they were his words and his replies; I did not make them up or get them from the newspaper. I asked those questions deliberately in that way in order to get the information from him so that I could use it, and that was the information I received. In all fairness to the Minister, I must say that I interjected about the cost of dial-a-bus, and that is something I omitted to refer to before. He is reported to have said in the *News* of July 26 that the dial-a-bus project had cost the Government about \$3,000 or \$4,000.

I believe that was a deliberate inaccuracy, because when he replied to my question about the cost of dial-a-bus and when I put to him that we believed that the cost was not \$3,000 or \$4,000 (as he had been willing to tell the people of this State in a newspaper announcement) it was found that the total cost was \$31,473.24, which is 10 times as much as he had admitted publicly at the time the experiment fizzled. What he has done this evening confirms my belief that he has no reply to my points, and I come back to the fact, for the Minister's edification, that not one word did he say in his abusive reply to me about the reports. He did not refer to them or give any reason why they were not made public; he did not try to deny what I had said about the Pak-Poy survey; or about the report of the dial-a-bus committee.

I hope the Minister will have another chance to speak when I have finished and give a reply on that matter. If he does not, it will confirm absolutely what I have said. He made a good, abusive, politician's speech in trying to cloud the issues, but he did not at any time come to grips with my main point, which was the question of the reports. I know that he knows that offence is the best means of defence when one is in a tricky corner: if one can abuse one's opponent and distract attention from his points one has done well, and that is precisely what the Minister has done this evening. He has not altered one jot my opinion of him, the way he has handled the dial-a-bus project, or of his absolute bankruptcy of ideas to solve metropolitan transportation problems.

The CHAIRMAN: Does any other honourable member wish to speak in the debate?

Mr. Millhouse: The Minister is not game to get up and say anything about the reports.

The CHAIRMAN: If there is no further debate on the question, I shall put the amendment. If I put the amendment moved by the honourable member for Mitcham, that will preclude any further debate on the line.

Mr. McANANEY: On the warning you gave members, Mr. Chairman, we would not be allowed to discuss the Railways Department.

The CHAIRMAN: No: this matter concerns the item of Minister of Transport and Minister of Local Government, and has nothing to do with the Railways Department.

Mr. McANANEY: You did not make yourself clear.

The CHAIRMAN: The question before the Chair is that the vote for the Minister of Transport and Minister of Local Government, \$889,310, be agreed to; to which the



member for Mitcham has moved that the vote be reduced by \$100. The question is that the amendment be agreed to: for the question say "Aye", against "No". The "Noes" have it.

Mr. Millhouse: Divide.

The CHAIRMAN: I declare the member for Mitcham teller for the "Ayes" and the Minister of Transport teller for the "Noes".

*While the division was being held:*

The CHAIRMAN: Order! As there is only one vote for the "Ayes", I declare the vote in favour of the "Noes".

Line passed.

Highways, \$8,290,000.

Mr. COUMBE: I now raise a similar matter to that raised a few moments ago, but in a way which I consider to be responsible, and I hope that the reply by the Minister will be equally serious. I have referred on several occasions to metropolitan road transport, a matter which has evinced considerable anxiety in the minds of many people living in the metropolitan area. I recall the situation in February, 1971, when the Minister said he was going to continue to purchase land and houses from people who wished to sell and that this plan would be put into effect over the next 10 years.

Much anxiety and uncertainty has been created in the community by the lack of information provided by the Minister and his department on what is intended, although I note that the Minister's "high speed corridors" is a term apparently considered by the Auditor-General as a euphemism to replace "freeways". The Auditor-General refers to land purchased for this purpose as "freeway acquisition". In the financial year ended June 30, 1973, \$4,210,000 was spent on the acquisition of land for freeway purposes, \$1,430,000 more than that spent in the previous financial year. The Auditor-General cited the land acquired for the Central North-South Freeway, Adelaide to Modbury Freeway, Gillman Highway, the South-Eastern Freeway, Islington Highway, Glenelg Expressway, and above all, the North Adelaide Connector, and we know what that means.

The sum of \$1,500,000 was included in the figure allocated to the Central North-South Freeway for the purchase of about 12 acres (4.86 ha) of land and buildings at Mile End. This is what the Minister and his department is responsible for. True, the Minister said he is buying land for something that might eventuate in 10 years time, but I know from the reaction of some of my constituents who could be involved in future development that much anxiety and concern has been created, and this situation is not satisfactory. The Minister is purchasing land, yet until last week no-one in South Australia knew where the Minister was going, other than that he had gone overseas and had come back.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: No-one knew?

Mr. COUMBE: My constituents knew the Minister had gone overseas, but they had not the slightest idea of what he intended to implement as a programme to improve metropolitan road transport until last week when, at last, we obtained a statement from him. There is undoubtedly a great need for upgrading the public transport system in the metropolitan area, about which we all agree. We know that in the major cities of the world (including Adelaide), the motor car is the greatest menace to our cities, yet there is no simple solution to the problem. From my observations, and I am sure the Minister will agree, the greatest menace in the United States is the number of large cars carrying only one person and cluttering up the highways and city access roads.

This provides a good case for the upgrading of public transport in the metropolitan area. However, the Minister should make some definitive statement of his intentions so that people in South Australia, and in the metropolitan area in particular, know what he is thinking and what his plans are.

Mr. Chapman: He might have a new upgraded dial-a-bus system in mind.

Mr. COUMBE: I think the Minister has learned his lesson. He has certainly made statements about upgrading the metropolitan railways, electrification, the Christie Downs extension and the future proposal to go beneath King William Street. However, it was not until last week that we heard what was to be done concerning road transport: not even a mention during the Loan Estimates about the bus system, and it is this that I criticized at that time. Significantly, it was not until about a month ago, soon after the conclusion of a recent debate, that an announcement was made concerning new buses to be provided for the Municipal Tramways Trust.

In an earlier debate this year I deplored the lack of information concerning the provision of buses for the M.T.T., and I criticized the fact that no apparent increase was provided for. However, I welcome the public announcement that there is to be an increase in the public bus fleet. I asked a question of the Minister on July 25. Admittedly, the Minister went overseas. I asked it of his colleague on August 23. Eventually, I got the reply on September 13. The Minister at last gave us a glimmer of hope. I shall quote from his reply. Among other things he said:

In accordance with the Government's stated policy, the Highways Department is undertaking a continual programme of urban arterial road-widening and improvement.

I suppose we are going back to the statement of February, 1971, when the Minister enumerated a list of roads he hoped one day would be suitable for public transport.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That statement indicates the Government's policy on upgrading the urban arterial road network, if I remember correctly. That was in February, 1971.

Mr. COUMBE: That is the one I have just mentioned. The Minister's reply continued:

In addition, I expect shortly to receive recommendations in relation to express bus services and the possible implementation of exclusive bus lanes.

That is the first we have heard of "exclusive bus lanes". The Minister is keen to shrug off this sort of thing, but I have gone through *Hansard* to try to find any statements made about exclusive bus lanes, and I have not been able to find them. I can appreciate (and I hope the Minister realizes) that this gives a glimmer of hope for the future, but it will cost a tremendous amount of money. I can see the enormous amount of land that would have to be acquired giving further anxiety, I am sure, to many people. The Minister then went on to say:

the Director-General of Transport's office has been working towards establishing an overall order of priorities and programme for urban public transport.

He also said that shortly he was going to put out a publication entitled "Public Transport in the Adelaide Metropolitan Region—A programme of Improvements of Urban Public Transport". This was the first we had heard of anything along these lines, yet the Minister has been in office for about 3½ years. All we have heard is the announcement made last week.

In 1971 we heard a reference to some road-widening programme which would take place in the future, in X years time. At last, however, we have some definitive statement after a great deal of probing and much by-passing by the

Minister. I want the Minister now, if he will (and I am sure he will jump at the opportunity; I think it would be quite impossible to stop him), to explain just what is meant by what I have read from page 758 of *Hansard*, and to amplify this if he can. I do this in all seriousness; many people in the metropolitan area are vitally concerned.

Dr. Eastick: Many people in this House, too.

Mr. CUMBE: Many in this House are vitally concerned. This matter will affect vitally the future of the city of Adelaide and its environs and all the growth of the next decade or so. In many ways Adelaide is fortunate in its road system. Whereas some Australian and overseas cities are built on a ribbon-type development with through transport, Adelaide has a radial system: the bus systems and the Glenelg tram radiate from the centre of the city. I hope Dr. Scrafton, the Director-General of Transport, will give consideration in the document that is coming out to what I consider a most important aspect of metropolitan road transport, a series of ring routes and a series of cross-district connectors.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Such as at North Adelaide?

Mr. CUMBE: It will need a good many buses to take the victorious North supporters home on Saturday week! The Adelaide system, whether it be rail, bus or Glenelg tram, lacks cross-city or cross-suburban connectors in the metropolitan area. The private buses do a fair job but this system must be expanded and it could be incorporated in a series of ring routes. Having waited years to get this statement from the Minister, I express pleasure, on behalf of my constituents, the people of the metropolitan area, members on this side of the House, and, I suppose, all South Australian taxpayers, that something will be done at last. The Minister would be the first to realize that sooner or later most people in the country districts, my farmer friends, visit Adelaide and travel along our roads. Most people from the northern areas come through my electorate and they are concerned to see that the roads are sufficiently wide and that public transport is available. I should like to see encouragement given to the greater use of commuters, the system applying at some railway stations of motorists driving to the station and then taking public rail transport, as is done in many overseas countries. I invite the Minister to explain in more detail than in the reply given to me on September 13 just what are his plans.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I thought others might have wanted to say something and I was waiting so that I could answer them all in one hit, thinking it might be more expeditious if it were done that way.

Mr. McAnaney: We have another couple of hours yet.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If honourable members want to waste time, that is their business, not mine. I was rather astounded to hear the member for Torrens say that last week was the first time he had heard me make the statement that I hoped we would have exclusive bus lanes and express buses introduced. I have been talking about this for at least 12 months, and working toward it. Whether it has been cited as a specific matter and as such would show up in the index of *Hansard*, I cannot say. I would be amazed if it were not in *Hansard* somewhere; however, that does not matter very much.

The report, which is soon to be presented to me and which I have not yet seen, will summarize the activities of the Director-General of Transport. Much of the information contained in it will not only indicate the activities in which the department has been engaged and outline what will happen in the future but will also illustrate the type of submission we have made to the Commonwealth

Government. Although honourable members may not always get information that is as comprehensive as they desire (it may not be as comprehensive as I would like to give), it is not always wise to shoot off one's mouth when going into another area. Accordingly, we have presented our case to the Commonwealth Government, and I think we have been fairly successful, for our allocation is markedly better than the normal financial allocation.

No-one will quarrel with the fact that for many years public transport in Adelaide has been a poor relation. I believe that those who have been responsible for operating it have done a good job, bearing in mind the problems associated with it. However, at some time someone had to provide the financial support necessary or we would have had to close up the shop. Fortunately we now have financial support, and we are able to plan far more realistically. Previously we had to plan on the basis of doing certain things if we received financial support. We are now able to be more positive. For example, we can say that the Christie Downs line will be duplicated, extended and electrified; that there will be new rolling stock; and that new buses have been ordered. The honourable member complained with some justification that he had not been informed about the order for new buses. The fact was that, until we knew that there would be Commonwealth financial support, I could not say much about it. That has now been approved. I believe that we are starting a rather exciting era in which public transport will play a new role, different from the role it has previously played.

Mr. CUMBE: Will the Minister elaborate on the subject of exclusive bus lanes?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: An exclusive bus lane can operate in a number of ways. Land can be purchased and a completely new bus right of way constructed. If two-way bus traffic is being provided for, about 30ft. (9.1 m) is needed, so that there can be two lanes of the normal width of 12ft. (3.6 m). However, there are much cheaper and simpler ways of providing these lanes, and the end result can be achieved much more quickly. We can use existing lanes on roads the width of which is sufficient for this purpose.

Mr. Coumbe: There will be no car parking?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Let us assume that the Main North Road has been widened to a four-lane width along its total length. It would be feasible in the afternoon at the peak travelling time to have the lane nearest the kerb reserved for buses, the two lanes next to that being reserved for ordinary traffic travelling north. During the morning peak period this process could be reversed. A clearway would operate on both sides of the road in the morning and afternoon peak periods, and at both times the remaining lane would be used for traffic travelling in the direction opposite to that in which the peak period traffic was travelling. On examination, I think we would all agree that 95 per cent of our major arterial roads are more than adequate to meet needs except for the two peak periods during the day, and those periods last for an hour or an hour and a half at most (probably the period is more like half an hour). Exclusive bus lanes can be provided simply in that way, at a tremendously reduced cost.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: We have before us massive expenditure proposed for more highways, especially in the Adelaide metropolitan area. While he was overseas, did the Minister hear of any proposal to develop in western society an alternative to the motor car as we currently know it? Could we have soon a much lighter vehicle

with a lower horsepower that would be more economical with regard to the limited energy resources in the world?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not think I am competent to answer those questions. Americans think they must have Cadillacs, whereas English people are happy with baby Austins. The Americans are certainly saying that there is an energy crisis. Advertisements appear on television suggesting that people turn off their lights at times to help to deal with the energy crisis. I do not know what the final solution will be. I am not trying to be unkind to the Americans, but I think that they regard the motor car as a clear indication of their status in life: the bigger the car the more it does for their ego.

Mr. EVANS: When the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan was first introduced the Minister led a strong campaign against the proposal to develop freeways in certain areas. The question that people were asked to ponder at that time was that their houses and their way of life would be adversely affected by the large increase in the volume of traffic directed through their areas and the massive concrete jungle that would be created. The Highways Department is investigating roads in Blackwood and Belair, which are residential areas. The residents there appreciate their way of life and respect their houses as much as do those people who live in the path of the proposed freeways and expressways.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! What line is the honourable member debating?

Mr. EVANS: The Highways Department, which is planning roads in this area.

The CHAIRMAN: What line is the honourable member discussing?

Mr. EVANS: The Engineering Section of the Highways Department.

The CHAIRMAN: But that deals only with salaries.

Mr. EVANS: I am discussing the planning group, which the Minister is employing to carry out design work in my area.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member cannot continue to discuss that matter, because we are dealing with the salaries of the Engineering Section.

Mr. VENNING: Will the Minister point out the line that relates to the cost of the Commercial Road Transport Committee that he has set up? Previously, all Government departments paid pay-roll tax to the Commonwealth Government but, now that the State Government has taken it over, the Highways Department is the only department that pays pay-roll tax. Will the Minister explain those two points for me?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The matter of pay-roll tax should have been raised when the pay-roll tax legislation was before the House.

Mr. McANANEY: The member for Torrens covered the whole ambit of the Highways Department, and I do not know what limitations will be placed on what I am about to say.

The CHAIRMAN: The member for Torrens linked his remarks with the overseas visit of the Minister and his officers. Although he was given considerable latitude in that connection, he spoke on the appropriate line. The member for Heysen must confine his remarks to a certain line.

Mr. McANANEY: When the Minister was overseas, I am sure that he examined roads in regard to town planning; otherwise, he would have neglected his duty and wasted the taxpayers' money. As I understand

it, the M.A.T.S. plan covered three aspects: the electric railway under King William Street, the widening of arterial roads—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I do not know what the M.A.T.S. plan and the underground railway have to do with the Minister's overseas visit. The member for Heysen must link his remarks to the line under discussion.

Mr. McANANEY: I will link up my remarks with the Minister's statement about the Christies Beach railway line, which statement he made in relation to his overseas trip. The Minister discussed railways, roads, dial-a-bus, and the whole ambit of the Highways Department. If he is a capable Minister, he should do something to demonstrate it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that the Minister was referring to matters that had been raised by the member for Torrens, in connection with the Minister's overseas visit. I ask the honourable member to confine his remarks to that line or to any other line he cares to select under the Highways Department.

Mr. McANANEY: I refer to the Engineering Section, which includes planning, design, materials, mechanical, construction and maintenance, and asphalt. If that line does not include arterial roads into Adelaide and any proposed freeways, what does it include?

The CHAIRMAN: What line is the honourable member discussing?

Mr. McANANEY: I seek information in regard to the department's activities in connection with roads, on which we are voting large sums for the department to spend. I am dealing with roads and railways, which the Minister discussed under the line with which we are now dealing.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member for Heysen.

Mr. McANANEY: The M.A.T.S. plan was divided into three aspects, one of which was the widening of arterial roads, with which the Government is going ahead. About an equal sum was to be spent on arterial roads as was to be spent on freeways. When arterial roads are widened there is little increase in throughput, but a freeway multiplies many times the traffic flow, and costs about the same. The Minister is widening arterial roads at great expense (almost the equivalent of what would have been spent on freeways) that will not allow a much greater volume of traffic flow through the city. I am not dedicated to freeways, but there must be a north-south way of getting goods and passengers through Adelaide. More and more passengers and goods will use the South-Eastern Freeway and some way must be provided to get through Adelaide and connect the South-Eastern Freeway to the north-south freeway. I ask the Minister what will be done to deal with that traffic and with traffic from the south, as Christies Beach is developed further, coming through Adelaide. I should also like to know what amount of money the Highways Department paid Horwood Bagshaw Limited for the land acquired from that company, the valuation placed on the property by the Valuation Department, and when the land was purchased.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! This is not Question Time, and I suggest to the honourable member that he will have an opportunity to ask a question such as that on the next day of sitting. I am puzzled about how the honourable member is connecting his remarks with the item that he is speaking on, which deals with overseas visits. All the expenses of the Highways Department are primarily connected with administration, salaries and wages and, if the honourable member intends to continue to speak on the line he has mentioned, I ask him to deal with the overseas visits, or I will rule him out of order.

Mr. McANANEY: I am speaking on salaries and wages, and related payments. Those who use the roads pay for the work through vehicle registration fees and road maintenance tax. The tax pays the wages of the inspectors who collect it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I rule that the honourable member is out of order. He has been given plenty of latitude to connect his remarks with a line.

Dr. EASTICK: I refer to the Engineering Section, particularly the planning and traffic section of that item. For a long time we have provided for a planning unit associated with the forward planning of the department, more particularly planning for new forms of transportation. The Minister has told the Committee that the Government intends to implement a specialist bus corridor system, but he has not said positively which method will be used. I ask the Minister what amount of the time spent by the personnel covered in this item is associated with long-term projects and how much is associated with virtual day-by-day projects. Under the same general heading, design is referred to, and I seek information about the stage of planning of the Swanport bridge over the Murray River and whether any initial studies have been undertaken regarding the next bridge to be constructed over the Murray River after the Swanport bridge is completed. At the opening of the Kingston bridge this year it was stated that the next bridge constructed after the Swanport bridge probably would be at Berri.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will try to get the information.

Mr. EVANS: I refer to the Engineering Section. Under the heading "Design" \$1,652,000 is provided for designing engineers and other officers. Provision is also made for construction and maintenance officers. Personnel are working on the design of roads through the Hills to get a most satisfactory route, and the local community fears that the area will be cut by a four-lane main arterial road and a connector road to Goolwa. I have told the Minister previously that, if another main arterial road is to be provided to serve the southern part of Adelaide and give a connecting link to the freeway, the ideal way to provide it would be to use the Goolwa road to Kangarilla and to Paris Creek, and from there to Strathalbyn, and from Kangarilla over the Onkaparinga River towards Hackham. This is the responsibility of the planning and design sections of the Highways Department, and it is the only logical path that a main arterial road could follow. When the Liberal Government was in office, the Minister expressed strong views on this matter, saying that the M.A.T.S. plan should not cut urban areas in pieces. I now make the same plea to the Minister on behalf of my constituents, and request that this main arterial road pass through areas in which no substantial suburban development has taken place.

Mr. McANANEY: I refer to the construction of an expressway around the south of Mount Barker, which will not be accessible to local traffic. It is the modern trend not to construct such freeways through townships, thereby avoiding the possibility of inconvenience to local residents and of increased traffic flows through those towns. However, the Highways Department has planned an expressway south of Mount Barker, which will mean that traffic will pass through that town, to its inconvenience. Does the department intend to survey a route by-passing Mount Barker, instead of proceeding with the present plan, the concept of which is indeed backwards?

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member for Heysen should seek information and not ask questions of the Minister.

Mr. McANANEY: I am trying to obtain information from him.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will obtain that information for the honourable member.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Western society is orientated towards using motor cars to travel into inner-city areas, which is causing problems regarding parking, pollution and congestion, and is making it necessary for authorities to widen highways leading into cities. When he was overseas, did the Minister see any systems under which the public was using regional transport terminals outside of city areas to which they could drive their vehicles and from which they could obtain transport into the city? If there is a trend in this direction overseas, will the Minister say what incentives are used to entice motorists to leave their cars at these terminals and use public transport?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: There is a definite trend in this direction. I visited about 20 to 25 major cities, none of which is building freeways within its built-up urban areas. Indeed, this idea has been abandoned as a complete loss because it has not solved transport problems. Cities have now switched their thinking in other directions. In at least one major city in America a concerted move is being made (and I believe it will be successful, although it will probably take a few years) to demolish freeways that have already been built and restore the areas to their original condition. I brought back with me two coloured slides, which I examined recently, showing a freeway in the course of construction in Seattle. Public opinion having demanded that no further work should be done on the freeway, its 20ft. (6.096 m) high ramps have just been left standing there.

As an alternative, enormous sums are now being ploughed into public transport systems to restore them where they have been completely scrapped and to modernize and upgrade them where they have been allowed to deteriorate. The major cities are concentrating on rapid transit systems. Indeed, San Francisco has the B.A.R.T. system, which would be one of the most sophisticated in the world. It is a pity that this system, which was introduced because of public pressure probably ahead of its time, is not working as well as it could. An enormous sum had been spent on it and the public were asking for results and to be able to use the system. It began operating before all the problems were solved, but I have no doubt that it will be a great system. Many people believe that rapid transit relates to rail services only, but it can also be operated by buses. I believe the mono-rail system has a limited application, although it performs well in Disneyland and on a short run in Seattle. Where rail services are being upgraded or established, much effort is being made to provide free car-parking facilities at which people leave their cars and use the commuter trains or buses to the city.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): The amount of \$150,000 has been allocated for the purchase of office machines and equipment, although only \$12,575 was spent last year. Has this increase been caused by a computer programme?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will hand to the Leader a statement showing these details.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Is any research being done into alternative sources of materials for highway construction, rather than the continued use of quarry stone?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: An active group is engaged in research and I am sure it will consider anything suitable.

Mr. McANANEY: Did the Minister visit cities of the same size as Adelaide and consider trends that would be

suitable for a city of this size, rather than consider problems of cities of a much greater size?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not think I saw a city the same size exactly as Adelaide. The problem is not one of population only but also the geographical position. Adelaide is peculiar in that its inhibiting features are east and west, thus causing an elongated configuration. We considered what was being done in other cities and tried to determine their application to South Australia.

Dr. EASTICK: I thank the Minister for the details he provided about office machines and equipment. Items recommended but not approved include \$60,000 for digital mapping equipment and one first order stereo plotter, and \$20,000 for a 1 x 3 dimensional digitizing console and table. In the past three years the Lands Department has been allocated funds to purchase mapping equipment to use at the new Netley Branch of the Government Printing Office for the mapping requirements of the State. Can we be certain that equipment already available through the Lands Department will not be duplicated? Concerning the Minister's overseas visit, I suspect that one of the issues with which he was concerned was a transport system that may be applied between Monarto and Adelaide. I understand it has been suggested that a tunnel be built in order to reduce grades and facilitate the transport of large numbers of people on this route. Did the Minister see any system overseas that could be applied to the development of Monarto?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Before any equipment is purchased it is subject to an investigation and recommendation by the Public Service Board, which is competent to decide what is required. The question of a transport system to Monarto is now being investigated by the Director-General and his staff.

Mr. McANANEY: Concerning the item "Road Charges", the Auditor-General has claimed that a large percentage of the money that should be collected under the provisions of the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act is not collected. Can the Minister say how efficient is the system of collecting these moneys, and how the money that has been lost should be collected?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not have that information.

Dr. EASTICK: Although the freeway system will be an important link between Monarto and Adelaide, this does not solve the problems in respect of the 2½-hour train trip between Monarto and Adelaide. As the Minister has stated that this matter is being investigated by the Director-General and his staff, will he say what systems examined overseas can be specifically applied to the Monarto-Adelaide situation?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Obviously, if we knew the type of transport that was best suited for use between Adelaide and Monarto, we would not be having it investigated.

Line passed.

Railways, \$53,352,000.

Mr. McANANEY: What action will the Minister take, following the recent submission of the comprehensive report on the Railways Department, to implement the recommendations of that report?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will get a reply for the honourable member.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: What action does the departmental administration take to ensure that the efficiency of the railways is maintained at the highest possible level? Although I do not accuse the department of inefficiency, we must bear in mind technological changes which must affect the running of the railways.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The department tries to keep itself abreast of changing conditions and to adapt to the fullest extent possible. For instance, senior officers are continually being sent to schools, particularly at the University of New South Wales, to take part in appropriate courses. I believe that our officers are keeping abreast of current trends.

Mr. COUMBE: Senior officers of the Railways Department are responsible for planning as well as administrative work. As it is intended that the Commonwealth Railways shall take over certain country lines, can the Minister say when this is likely to occur?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: This matter is still at an exploratory stage and, although I expect to have a preliminary report within a couple of months, I cannot say more at this time.

Dr. EASTICK: Concerning the Rolling Stock Branch, in 1972-73 the appropriation was greater than the allocation this year in respect of expenses incurred in normal operations and maintenance. The allocation in respect of fuel for motive power is slightly higher this year than the allocation last year. The minimal overall increase in the expenditure of this branch again highlights the recommendation of the Lees report that certain activities of this branch (I presume associated mainly with the Islington works) should be allowed to run down. Will the Minister comment?

Mr. CHAPMAN: The member for Davenport asked the Minister whether the department was keeping abreast of changes in technology. Can the Minister cite cases in which technological studies have resulted in changes in the system to keep abreast of current trends?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Where the staff is greater than is required, generally we are permitting redundancy to take care of the situation. That is reflected in the line to which the Leader referred. I cannot give the member for Alexandra information on matters associated with the day-to-day operation of the railways; that is a matter of management, certainly not of administration.

Dr. EASTICK: To what degree will the workshops be permitted to run down? Is any part of this effect associated with some arrangement with Clyde Industries for the manufacture of locomotive units in the Port Adelaide area?

Mr. McANANEY: What efforts will be made in negotiations with the Commonwealth Government to retain the existing railway lines in South Australia?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There is no line in relation to negotiations between the State Government and the Commonwealth Government. I rule the honourable member out of order.

Mr. McANANEY: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The Leader was permitted to ask questions regarding transfer to the Commonwealth Government, yet I am not permitted to speak on the same subject. This is a case of victimization.

The CHAIRMAN: What is the point of order?

Mr. McANANEY: We have been asked to allocate considerable sums to the Railways Department, and the Minister has stated publicly that he is negotiating to transfer some lines to the Commonwealth Government. I am seeking information about his intentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the honourable member to confine his remarks to items under the Railways Department and to a specific line.

Mr. McANANEY: The Minister has said that, before the end of the current financial year, some lines might be handed over to the control of the Commonwealth

Government. On what terms will the Minister negotiate the transfer? Will he protect the interests of the people of South Australia? We are being asked to vote money for railway lines that may be transferred elsewhere.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The matter is being discussed at officer level and until the officers can report to the Commonwealth Minister and to me I cannot give the honourable member the details he seeks.

Mr. McANANEY: What effort has the Minister made to implement the recommendation of the Auditor-General regarding the extension of credit to customers of the department?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Railways Board and the Commissioner are as capable as I am of reading the Auditor-General's Report.

Mr. McANANEY: Is the Minister saying that he has not spoken to the Commissioner about the deficiency in the service mentioned by the Auditor-General? We are entitled to a reply.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Does the Minister suggest there need be no writing-off of stock as a result of theft for the next 12 months, since there is no provision for this? Is there a system within the department by which he may expect no thefts in that period or no loss as a result of theft?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not prepare these reports. As it is a matter for the Treasurer and the Railways Commissioner, I shall ask for details.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: A considerable sum is to be allocated for the wages of guards, conductors, signalmen, and other employees. What proportion of this sum for wages is allocated for conductors, and is there any possible alternative to conductors, such as machines or some other system to issue people with tickets?

Mr. Chapman: They wouldn't do that.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: We certainly would not sack some of the staff, as the member for Alexandra would, and then try to talk to them through their empty stomachs, as he suggested in an earlier contribution to this debate.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I think that the member for Davenport is a little confused when he talks about conductors, as they are the people who operate on the Overland and who tuck people in at night and bring them a cup of tea in the morning. The porters are the fellows who nip the tickets and so on, so I think they are the people to whom the honourable member is referring. We are currently examining automatic fare collection. I looked at some successful schemes overseas. However, there are some good machines and some troublesome ones.

Line passed.

Motor Vehicles, \$1,808,850—passed.

Minister of Transport and Minister of Local Government, Miscellaneous, \$2,629,000.

Dr. EASTICK: Has consideration been given to providing transport concessions for pensioners from other States? Is there a reciprocal arrangement relating to pensioners of this State who go to other States? Some other States already provide concessions for pensioners.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: On interstate trains?

Dr. EASTICK: Yes.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I announced that two years ago. Where have you been?

Dr. EASTICK: It is interesting to have that information by way of an aside. The Minister will appreciate that representations have been made to me about reciprocal concessions for pensioners travelling interstate. Material made available to various people, particularly Mr. Spurr,

by some of the Minister's Commonwealth colleagues (the Attorney-General, the Minister for Transport, and the Minister for Social Security), indicates that there is a difference of opinion about how beneficial these concessional services should be within the various States. Is there a reciprocal arrangement between the States, and will part of the \$980,000 provided for transport concessions for pensioners be used to benefit pensioners under this arrangement?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I think that the Leader switched horses. By way of interjection, I deliberately asked whether he was referring to interstate travel, and he said he was. Then he talked about reciprocal rights for pensioners from other States. If he was talking about rights of a South Australian pensioner to receive concessions in Melbourne or Sydney, that is a different matter. I think that it is two years since we succeeded in getting the final link of the rail network from Brisbane around the coast to Perth. After about 12 months negotiation (and fairly heavy work it was) with my good friend the former Minister of Transport in Victoria (he is now the Attorney-General), I was finally successful, and I immediately provided concessions for pensioners from other States from Adelaide to Port Pirie so that the link was then completed.

Dr. Eastick: Does it go beyond trains?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: No, it is on the interstate service. Let us be clear. Once he crosses the border, the South Australian pensioner has no benefits for travel other than for interstate travel. I wish we could get that additional concession: I have tried to get it.

Dr. Eastick: You're still pursuing it.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Regrettably, the Leader's colleagues in Victoria and New South Wales are unwilling to grant reciprocity. However, I am still pursuing this matter, and I will wear them down if I live long enough.

Mr. McANANEY: Regarding the allocation for concessions to pensioners, how much of this sum will be paid to private bus operators and how much will be paid to the Railways Department? I commend the Minister for widening the scope of concessions for pensioners to travel on private buses.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Minister give me the details of the \$13,000 actual payment made to Lions International last year?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I was able to get approval of my Cabinet colleagues for the printing of an additional number of booklets on first-aid.

Mr. CHAPMAN: The sum of \$514,250 was provided last year for transport concessions for pensioners, of which \$360,000 was allocated to the Municipal Tramways Trust. However, I cannot locate any allocation to the Railways Department for transport concessions for pensioners. Can the Minister explain the reason for the difference between last year's total provision of \$514,250 and the M.T.T. allocation of \$360,000?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will get a report.

Dr. EASTICK: Regarding the \$1,300,000 allocation to local government authorities for the reimbursement of rates and taxes for pensioners, can the Minister say whether that sum was only a guess because it was difficult to calculate what sum would be reimbursed? That sum may well have been arrived at before many local councils had declared the rates, many of which, as I am sure the Minister is aware, have been increased astronomically. As the Minister no doubt knows, the Government has

announced that concessions will apply not only in respect of council rates but also in respect of water and sewerage rates. People connected to water reticulation systems and to sewerage systems receive from the Minister of Works a document that sets out the concessions available, and the document includes a form to be filled out. However, certain people do not receive a notification. Can the Minister say whether there is any arrangement with local government that a form shall be forwarded to all recipients of rate notices which indicates to them that they may apply for and receive a concession? Can he also say whether the Government intends, by means of advertisements in the press or on television, to notify people in this category that they may be eligible for a concession? Has the Minister considered providing such concessions for war pensioners, totally and permanently incapacitated pensioners, etc.?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not think that the Treasury officials would accept the Leader's assumption that the \$1,300,000 was a guess: I think it is the result of a reasonable calculation and, in a year's time, we will know how reasonable it was. I think it was only yesterday that I replied to a question regarding notification to pensioners of possible concessions. I noticed on my council rate notice last evening that, if I were a pensioner, I could receive a concession. Adequate steps are being taken, and I know that local government has co-operated well in this regard. At this stage the Government does not intend to extend the concession beyond the present limits, which have been fixed as the holders of medical pensioner cards.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Regarding pensioners, the Treasurer, in his policy speech, said:

The concession fares available in the metropolitan area will become available for travel on privately run country buses. We will subsidize these fares and the concession will be available from July 1. The Government will also provide one annual free rail voucher to qualified pensioners for travel anywhere in the State. It will be usable at any time other than during the Christmas, Easter or school vacation periods.

Can the Minister tell me whether pensioners can travel on the metropolitan public transport services in those periods?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Yes.

Mr. CHAPMAN: In 1972-73, \$200 was allocated for the Kangaroo Island Ferry Committee. It seems that \$77 has been spent, and \$200 is being allocated again this year. Can the Minister say to which of the Kangaroo Island ferry committees this refers and for what purpose the meagre amount of \$200 is expected to be used? There are several ferry committees, not specifically Kangaroo Island ferry committees but committees investigating the possibility of establishing a ferry to serve part or all of Kangaroo Island.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Are they Government committees?

Mr. CHAPMAN: I am asking the Minister which committee this provision refers to.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: There is only one Government committee, and the honourable member knows that.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I do not know which committee is expected to operate for a year on \$200. Surely the Minister does not expect the committee that is investigating the service between Cape Jervis and Penneshaw to carry out, for \$200, the investigations that the Kangaroo Island people understand are being carried out.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the honourable member had taken an active interest in this matter, he would know that for some time the committee had been getting data

from the ocean, and so on, and if he had taken an active interest in the Estimates he would have seen an allocation on another line of \$40,000 for the activities of this committee.

Line passed.

Community Welfare, \$12,511,464.

Dr. TONKIN: I refer to the provision of \$8,000 for the fees of members of community welfare advisory committees and ask the Minister what committees have been established, for what purpose they have been established, and whether their reports will be available to this Parliament.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Minister of Community Welfare): Several committees have been established to deal with various areas and, in general, I expect that their reports will be published. I will not commit myself in advance of knowing precisely what the reports say, but my general intention would be that this type of report ought to be made available.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Regarding the provision of \$35,000 for the production of films by the South Australian Film Corporation, how will this money be spent and what kind of films will be produced?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The provision has been made to enable a film or films to be produced regarding community welfare matters, but at this stage no firm decisions have been made as to what films will be produced.

Dr. TONKIN: Why is \$35,000 provided when, apparently, the Minister has no idea what films may be produced?

The Hon. L. J. KING: This Budget for the forthcoming year contains financial provisions that may be applied in certain areas. An amount of \$35,000 has been earmarked for the production of a film or films but a decision has not been made on what is the best type of film or films.

Mr. Chapman: There is a need?

The Hon. L. J. KING: There is a need to spend much more than \$35,000 to publicize, by films, community welfare matters. When one is budgeting, one must allocate available resources. We have been able to allocate \$35,000 for film production on community welfare, and the next thing is to work out how to get the best value for that money.

Dr. TONKIN: I refer to the provision for residential care centres and ask the Minister what is the future of the Glandore Boys Home.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Glandore Boys Home has been closed. We have established cottage-home establishments and we are establishing another one. The boys from Glandore Boys Home will be accommodated in small substitute family-type groupings.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: An amount of \$950 is provided for purchase of livestock, plant and equipment at the McNally Training Centre. I understand that, although there were pigs at the centre last year, because of the health risk to the underground water supply of Adelaide it was intended no longer to maintain livestock at the centre. However, it seems that the number of livestock at the centre is to be increased, and I ask the Minister what sort of stock will be purchased under this provision.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The livestock at the McNally Training Centre was disposed of, but not just for health reasons, although that aspect played a part in the decision that was taken. Other things were also involved: first, the pig farm area was a high absconding risk and, secondly, most of the boys who are now inmates of McNally Training Centre have urban backgrounds and not rural backgrounds and, generally speaking, have no intention of following rural pursuits. For this reason alone, rural activities formerly associated with juvenile institutions have tended to

become less and less relevant to the modern situation. Although the allocation of \$950 comes under the heading of purchase of livestock, plant and equipment, it involves the purchase not of livestock but of two lawnmowers, oxy-acetylene equipment, a television set and a radiogram.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: As agricultural activities will not be pursued at the centre, is it intended not to use the bore there this year? It is well known that last year large amounts of water were pumped for the agricultural pursuits that were being undertaken and that, for a part of the year, the water flow was so slow that little water could be obtained.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I expect that the bore will be used for watering the lawns and grounds, and so on. However, I will check that for the honourable member.

Mr. McANANEY: I refer to the line dealing with children placed out with foster parents, this year's allocation for which has not increased much on that of last year. It was stated in the Auditor-General's Report that the number of children in church homes and under supervision of foster parents increased by over 30 per cent. Considering the increased cost of living this seems to be an inadequate sum. Will the Minister therefore explain this allocation?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The allocation provides for an increase of \$1 a week for all scales of foster subsidy, to apply from October 1, 1973: this has already been announced. The subsidy figure is based upon the average national weekly earnings and on the basis of a family of two parents and two children. After allowing for fixed items of household expenditure, the figure is then divided amongst the parents and children. On that basis, an adjustment of \$1 is required to make the rate conform to the increase in average national weekly earnings.

Dr. TONKIN: I note that this year's allocation for provisions and expenses incurred in the normal operation and maintenance of cottage homes and family homes has increased significantly over last year's actual expenditure, which pleases me. I note also, however, that this year's allocation for the purchase of livestock, plant and equipment for cottage homes and family homes is being increased to \$450 from last year's actual expenditure of only \$1. Can the Minister tell the Committee for what purpose that \$1 was used last year?

The Hon. L. J. KING: No, I cannot.

Mr. VENNING: I refer to the line regarding monetary assistance, provisions, clothing, travelling expenses, and so on. Does this relate to women with families who are experiencing difficulties and who are therefore being assisted by the department in the provision of houses and payment of rent to the Housing Trust?

The Hon. L. J. KING: In ordinary circumstances the department does not pay rent to the trust. However, this is the line under which all financial assistance is given and, for the most part, that assistance is given to people who will ultimately receive Commonwealth social security payments but who are for the first six months the responsibility of the State Government. After six months the Commonwealth Government is responsible for payments to these people, and it reimburses the State for half the sum it has paid out in that first six months.

Dr. TONKIN: Is the Minister satisfied with the support given to foster parents, and is he satisfied that the staffing of the department is adequate so that such parents can be given help in times of crisis and the necessary support in learning to cope with their responsibilities? Can anything be done to improve the position of foster parents?

The Hon. L. J. KING: Obviously, there is virtually no limit to the demand and need for services of social workers in the community in the fostering situation. The more trained people available, the more help can be given. I agree with the assessment of the department that the present situation is reasonable, in that every foster parent has the support of a social worker who visits the foster home every two months or, in some cases, every month. Where the fostering situation is satisfactory the social worker reduces the number of visits, and this practice is welcomed by foster parents. If they need assistance, they can contact the department and obtain it. Some people have complained, but the complaints are not echoed by most foster parents who seem to be satisfied with the present arrangements.

No doubt the position can be improved. Probably, a more satisfactory approach would be to try to increase the degree of professional or semi-professional expertise of the foster parents, and I think the training of foster parents is the answer. The sort of assistance that can be provided to mature foster parents by a young social worker may involve difficulties, and perhaps foster parents should be trained to a greater extent in order to cope with their problems. The department is available to support them in difficult situations in which specialist knowledge and experience is required. To that end we have conducted a school for foster parents at Whyalla and, although the results of that school are still being evaluated, I believe it has been a success and, if it has been, the experiment will be repeated in other areas. We could then have regular training courses for foster parents that would increase their proficiency and reduce their dependence on social workers. Because of the economies that could be achieved for the State, there could be real financial recognition of the services provided by foster parents.

Dr. TONKIN: Because of the shortage of trained social workers, what action is the Government taking to attract them to the department? Does an incentive scheme operate to help trainees, and has further thought been given to the use of auxiliary social workers?

The Hon. L. J. KING: Considerable efforts have been and are being made to attract trained social workers to the department. It provides studentships for tertiary training at universities and at the Institute of Technology the department conducts inservice training; and makes every effort to recruit suitable people, and it has had much success. Advertising and recruiting campaigns have been conducted throughout Australia, and an officer has been sent to the United Kingdom to recruit social workers, with some success. I think about 20 people will be available from the United Kingdom. The whole concept of community welfare centres in the Government's programme involves the idea of a team consisting of a social worker and three or four auxiliaries and voluntary aides to assist in the work. We have had several schools for voluntary aides, with excellent responses. About 50 have been trained, and I have been heartened by the interest shown in every area where we have sought to recruit volunteers to undergo training and to prepare for work under the direction of a professional social worker. In future the resources available to meet the welfare needs of the community will be augmented greatly by the services of trained volunteers.

Mr. EVANS: No allocation has been made for the promotion of social welfare within the community and after-school and youth activities. No doubt this responsibility has been transferred to another line. This year



\$81,400 has been allotted for the purchase of motor vehicles, although \$64,962 was spent last year. Such increases have been evident in other departments, and it seems that Government motor vehicles now travel greater mileages. As the number of staff in the Minister's department has increased (and rightly so), there must be a need for more motor vehicles, especially in the Aboriginal welfare section. Is the department expecting vehicles to travel more miles than has been the case previously?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I have explained to the honourable member in relation to the Police Department that that was not the case and I gave him the actual mileage—I think, about 25 000 miles (40 228 km). I do not have a specific note regarding this matter; indeed, I do not believe that any policy has been adopted other than the same practices that have existed for some time concerning the turnover of vehicles. There was a carry-over from 1972-73 of \$33,400, involving vehicles which were ordered during 1972-73 but which were not delivered during that period. Consequently, the department under-spent in that year, causing the higher figure in 1973-74. It seems that the estimate of \$98,000 in 1972-73 was an over-estimate.

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Minister say whether this carry-over was associated with the \$3,000,000 reduced spending by the Government during the latter part of the 1972-73 financial year so that the State's expected deficit would be greatly reduced?

The Hon. L. J. KING: This general question should be directed to the Treasurer. Concerning the Community Welfare Department, there was no deliberate slowing down of delivery of vehicles. The funds were available to be spent and, if the vehicles had been delivered, they would have been paid for. The \$33,000 involved in this line could hardly play a significant part in reducing the figure to which the Leader has referred.

Line passed.

Minister of Community Welfare, Miscellaneous, \$892,400.

Dr. TONKIN: The allocation to the South Australian Council of Social Service has increased by \$2,500 to \$5,000, and I am pleased to see this increase. The sum of \$10,000 is provided for research grants, and I should like to know what projects the Minister has in mind to be undertaken. There is a marked increase in the grant to the Marriage Guidance Council of South Australia. I point out that both the Marriage Guidance Council and the South Australian Council of Social Service are important organizations in our community, and I am pleased to see their work recognized.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The increase in the grant to the South Australian Council of Social Service is of a continuing nature and is not simply a special purpose grant. I pay a tribute to the excellent work done by this service. Excellent assistance has been given to the department as well as to the co-ordinating of activities of other organizations, although I sometimes think that some of these organizations do not give the service the support they could give it, because there is a tendency on the part of many voluntary organizations to concentrate only on their own area of activity and their own problems and not to recognize the great importance of the co-ordination that can be achieved through the service. I hope the additional grant can assist the Council of Social Service to achieve its co-ordinating function more effectively.

The Marriage Guidance Council is also an organization engaged in important activities, because no welfare work is more important than that of the council in averting the breakdown of marriages and assisting in the preserva-

tion of the family unit. The increased grant to the council depends on certain problems regarding the council's internal organization, and these must be solved. I am in contact with the council in an effort to sort this out. Several research projects are foreseen, and to avoid delaying the Committee, I will give the honourable member this information later.

Mr. VENNING: To what does the grant to the Society of Sponsors refer?

The Hon. L. I. KING: The Society of Sponsors is a body which performs a most humane and useful function. It is a group of people who have set themselves up to adopt a certain child in a State institution just to sponsor that child and to take an interest in it. People take such children into their homes at weekends or during school holidays and take an interest in and a responsibility for them. The society has performed an excellent function and receives only a modest grant. The work is entirely voluntary, being more concerned with human relations, and the small grant assists with administration.

Line passed.

Fisheries, \$482,841.

Dr. EASTICK: I understand that applications have been called for the position of Director of Fisheries and that the sum of \$10,000 would cover his salary for less than the full period of 12 months. In the reorganization within the department caused by the creation of a Ministry of Fisheries, what will be the annual salary of the Director of Fisheries and how will this compare with the salary of the Director of Fisheries Research? The person who is nominally the Director of Fisheries Research is also, I understand, the acting Director of Fisheries for administrative purposes. If he were to move to the position of Director of Fisheries his expertise in fisheries research could be lost, although he would have some directive power.

Will the two positions be parallel in the matter of remuneration, realizing that there can be only one overall director? I understand the growing importance of the fishing industry, and the information provided to the Government by the industry has led to the implementation by this Government of the new approach to this subject. While leaders of the industry sought to create the position of Director of Fisheries Research, I do not think they intended to paint into the corner the person they acknowledge as having been most important in their interests. I refer to Mr. Olsen, who was the Director of the department before the Ministry was created.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Fisheries): The purpose of the change is to strengthen administration at the top level; instead of one top level position there will be two. The Director of Fisheries Research is on a salary equivalent to that received when he was Director of Fisheries. That salary has been adjusted in the general salary changes that have taken place only recently, so to that extent the Estimates are a little out of date. The Director of Fisheries will probably be on a higher salary; applications have been called and are being processed. It is entirely open to the Director of Fisheries Research as to whether he should apply for that position.

The general purpose of the reorganization is to strengthen considerably the research function carried out within the department, recognizing that such function plays an essential role in the development of proper management policies, especially management of fisheries. With that in mind, the Director of Fisheries Research will have direct access to the Minister although in a broad sense his activities will still be subject to the overall direction of the Director of Fisheries. While it should be possible always for the Director of Fisheries Research to make directly to the

Minister recommendations affecting his section of the department, one must recognize that the motivation for fisheries research is not a pure research motivation, but a motivation to assist with the development of appropriate policies in fisheries management. As it will be the Director of Fisheries who will be primarily responsible for the policies of management, or for recommending those policies to the Minister, in a broad sense he will be responsible for the work carried out in the research branch of the department. However, if we are to develop in that area an effective research effort, the people involved must be given a fair degree of independence.

We will not get effective research if the researchers are subject to day-to-day direction by administrators and to continual interference with the way in which they carry out their job. Researchers, whether in fisheries or agricultural research, are peculiar people, which means that the administrative arrangements must be such that, while the Director of the department and the Minister are able to control the broad lines of work undertaken in the research area, a reasonable degree of independence and opportunity for the exercise of initiative is permitted to the research officers.

Dr. EASTICK: The sum of \$10,080 obviously will not purchase any large vessels. One of the main recommendations from the industry to the Government was that a research vessel should be made available in areas where there is urgent need for continued investigation. Does the allocation of \$10,080 mean that redevelopment of the department has not advanced to the stage of considering the procurement of a research vessel? Is the equipment that is being purchased designed to fit in with the overall programme of a major research vessel?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The provision to which the Leader refers is for the replacement of worn-out boat motors and hulls where these items and equipment are nearing the end of their useful life, and also where equipment is shown to be dangerous for actual usage. In addition, the department is endeavouring to equip all country and metropolitan inspectorates with suitable vessels and radio communication. This allocation provides for the purchase of three new small boats to replace existing vessels, and for the provision of radio transceivers for all vessels that are not equipped with methods of communication. Therefore, this provision is concerned with matters relating to fisheries administration. In the Loan Estimates, \$146,000 was provided for boats and facilities. That provision is for a much larger vessel that we hope will be available to the department within the next month or two. An additional sum is provided for research vessels to be purchased.

Dr. Eastick: In the \$89,000?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Yes. It is in those areas that the main provision for vessels for research purposes is to be found.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: There is another provision here for the production of films by the South Australian Film Corporation. What sort of films will be produced and where will they be used?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: This provision is so that we can order from the corporation a short film on the managed fisheries of South Australia.

Mr. Becker: That will be a good film! We are a wake-up to what's going on with the film corporation.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am sure the honourable member embarrasses everyone by his ridiculous behaviour. This film will assist greatly with regard to our education and training programmes for officers of the department who

are concerned with managed fisheries. The member for Hanson may not think that these fisheries are significant. I am sorry he has that point of view, which I do not share.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I notice that the salary provision for the Director of Fisheries has been reduced.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable Minister has already explained that.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I am leading up to my question. When does the Minister expect the Director to be appointed?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I think that applications for the position have now closed and been processed. If there is a suitable applicant for the position, the precise time of the appointment will depend on the ability of the person to disengage himself from what he is already doing. If the successful applicant comes from another country or another State, he will have to make arrangements to travel to South Australia, so that obviously the appointment of a South Australian would mean that the new Director could start work much earlier. However, there are other difficulties. For example, the requirement of the University of Adelaide (and most universities have a similar requirement) is that a lecturer or professor can strictly be released only after giving six months notice as at June 30. Therefore, it is not possible to give an exact time when we expect the Director to be appointed.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I am pleased to see an increase in the allocation for transfer to the Fisheries Research and Development Fund. What will be the objective of this research? What new line in the fishing industry is it hoped to develop from the research?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The sum of \$89,000 provided here is not the total sum that will be spent on research during the current financial year, as there are additional giants from the Commonwealth. Furthermore, some of the salaries money provided in these Estimates is for the appointment of new research officers. The salaries component of people employed in the Fisheries Department is not included in the allocation for transfer to the Fisheries Research and Development Fund. The main areas proposed for research this year relate to prawns, for which \$20,000 has been allocated; this is mainly for contingency operations and capital purchases, but it does not provide for salaries. The only salaries component involved in the \$89,000 would be where we used some of the funds, for example, to engage fishermen by contract to do experimental trawling for prawns. However, where the research is being undertaken within the department, the Fisheries Research and Development Fund money is for contingency and capital purposes and not for wages and salaries. In addition to the \$89,000 allocation, \$31,000 is to come from the Commonwealth Government to be used for rock lobster research. The sum of \$7,000 will be used on research into fresh-water fisheries, additional expenditure on the completion of the artificial reef and expenditure on an ecological study of Redcliffs. The sum of \$39,000 will be used for experimental and developmental work by commercial fishermen under contract; that sum relates particularly to the matching support being granted by the Commonwealth Department of Primary Industry to provide assistance to shark fishermen who have been put in difficulties as a result of Victoria's action in regard to the mercury content of shark.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Can the Minister say whether applications for the appointment of a Director have closed and, if they have not closed, when they will close?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will obtain the precise date for the honourable member.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I would appreciate additional information on the department's research policy and on the ultimate object.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The main object with regard to research projects in the managed fisheries or in the scale fisheries is to gain additional information regarding the life cycle of prawns and rock lobsters so that more effective management policies can be adopted. For example, we need to know where the prawn breeding grounds are located and what is the pattern of movement of prawns from the juvenile to adult stage. We have already instituted a programme of tagging prawns, many of which have already been returned to the department. We pay a certain sum for tagged prawns but, if any member on this side produces a member of the Opposition with a tag on him and claims 50c, I assure him that he will not be paid. The Auditor-General would no doubt insist on commenting.

Dr. TONKIN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman: I do not think that the Minister should reflect on the member for Mitcham in that way.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I did not.

Line passed.

Minister of Fisheries, Miscellaneous, \$4,000—passed.

Hospitals, \$64,721,243.

Dr. TONKIN: Regarding the \$51,000 allocation for the Flinders Medical Centre in relation to administrator, nursing administration, administrative and clerical staff, I am heartened by this evidence of new appointments, as I take it, for the staffing of the hospital. Can the Minister say whether this allocation applies purely to the nursing administrator and other senior appointments, or is it expected that some of the more junior appointments will be made?

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): I will obtain the information for the honourable member.

Dr. TONKIN: This year's \$165,000 allocation for domiciliary care staff is more than double last year's allocation. Domiciliary care is an important part of community health, and it appears that these services are to be expanded. Can the Minister say whether the existing services will be expanded or whether new services will be established?

The Hon. L. J. KING: My information is that the development will take place in the western districts, but I am unable to say whether the allocation will be used to expand existing services or whether new services will be provided. No doubt the honourable member is aware that 50 per cent of this allocation is refunded by the Commonwealth Government.

Dr. TONKIN: Regarding medical superintendent (part-time), lecturers (part-time), professional and technical staff at Port Lincoln Hospital, this year's allocation of \$13,000 shows a marked increase on last year's \$7,281 actual payments. As I presume that this increase relates to the appointment of additional professional or technical full-time staff, can the Minister tell me what staff has been appointed?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I am unable to give the honourable member that information, but the extra allocation will be almost entirely taken up in maintaining the existing level of services; it is almost entirely due to salary increases.

Dr. TONKIN: As I cannot accept that the salaries of the medical superintendent, lecturers, professional and technical staff have almost doubled, will the Minister obtain that information for me?

The Hon. L. J. KING: Yes.

Dr. TONKIN: Is the Minister satisfied that the allocations for the Port Adelaide venereal disease clinic and the Royal Adelaide Hospital venereal disease clinic are suffi-

cient to cope with the increasing incidence of venereal disease?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will ask whether the Minister thinks any adjustment is needed, but I am sure that the inclusion of this amount in the line indicates that he thinks it adequate. Regarding the Port Lincoln Hospital, of the amount of \$13,000, an amount of \$11,000 is for the purpose of maintaining the existing level of services and for salary increases. An amount of \$2,000 is to fill a vacancy.

Mr. BECKER: I take it that the provision of \$851,000 for the Dental Superintendent and dental and clerical staff at the Royal Adelaide Hospital will provide for a general increase in salaries. However, can the Attorney say whether the figure includes provision for an increase in the number of dentists at the hospital? I understand that there is a considerable waiting list, and I should like to find out what is the present delay for those able to avail themselves of the services of the dental clinic.

The Hon. L. J. KING: There will be an expansion of service, and additional dentists and other staff will be employed. Of the amount allocated, \$811,000 is to maintain the existing level of services and \$40,000 is to fill vacancies and for the development of new services.

Dr. TONKIN: There is a new provision of \$138,000 for Ru Rua Nursing Home and I, and I think most other people, welcome the development. Can the Attorney say when it is expected that Ru Rua Nursing Home will be ready for occupancy and when the first patients will be admitted?

I refer also to the provision for Strathmont Centre, from which patients at Ru Rua Nursing Home will come. There has been an increase in the provision, and I should like to know when these people will be transferred over.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I cannot give the exact date but I have information that, at Ru Rua Nursing Home, the Medical Superintendent, the Matron, and the lay Superintendent will commence during this financial year. As I do not know at what date and cannot work it out easily from the figures, I shall obtain the information.

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Attorney tell me whether it is intended to appoint an Assistant Director of Mental Health Services?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I have not that information, but I shall get it.

Mr. BECKER: Can the Attorney say what is the present waiting time for people entitled to use the services of the dental clinic at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, whether this time has been reduced during the past, say, three years, and what action is in hand to reduce the time further?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I am sure that that depends on the nature of the service. The member for Bragg will appreciate that an elective type service would have a greater waiting time than other services. I do not know whether it is possible to stipulate waiting times for particular services. It may be possible to provide some estimates, and I shall ask the Minister whether he can do that.

Dr. EASTICK: The provision for domiciliary services is about four times as great as the expenditure last year and the provision for the domiciliary care staff is about twice as much as the expenditure last year. Can the Attorney say what additional services have been provided or will be provided during 1973-74? One of the initial two services was opened at Murray Bridge and more recently it has been suggested that a unit will be opened or has opened at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. In view of this increased activity, I should appreciate information about what services are now in operation.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I do not have the details, but I will obtain them.

Line passed.

Public Health, \$2,849,000.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Can the Attorney say whether the reduction in the provision under the heading "School dental" compared to the amount voted and the expenditure last year is caused by a reduction in staff?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The 1972-73 figures included a provision for school medical personnel. Expenditure was greater than the estimate, as some expected staff vacancies and delays in recruitment did not eventuate. Provision is made in the current year for existing staff, plus an additional 16 dental therapists who will complete their training in 1974 and six students who will graduate at the end of 1973. Provision is also made for an increase in the number of trainees from 16 to 48 in February, 1974, and consequent increased staff.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Will consideration be given to sharing the practices of school dentists and dental therapists in relation to the treatment of children and adults in country districts? I make this plea as a result of considerable difficulties that have been experienced on Kangaroo Island, the people of which have had the services of a school dentist only. Because this sector of patients has been lost, there has been insufficient trade to attract a medical or dental officer to the area. I understand that councils and other organizations called for applications for a dentist and that a couple of years ago the local community engaged a dental officer and helped him financially to set up practice in order to enable him to serve adults in the area. However, it was still not sufficiently attractive for that person to remain in the area, and the community is again in an embarrassing situation regarding dental treatment. I mention this matter on behalf of the people in the area, who must fly to Adelaide and incur air fares in order to obtain dental treatment.

The Hon. L. J. KING: Many difficulties are involved in the honourable member's suggestion. Dental therapists are trained for this work, and they operate under the supervision of a qualified dentist. I should think difficulties would be involved in their performing dental work for which they would not be trained and for which no dentist would be responsible. This would be breaking new ground, and I do not know how it could fit into a school dental scheme. However, I will refer the honourable member's remarks to the Minister.

Mr. CHAPMAN: A point that could assist the Minister is that it has been suggested at least once that the Government, in its efforts to serve the children to whom I have referred, may consider extending a contract to a private dentist to serve schools so that the trade would not be shared between two dentists.

Dr. TONKIN: I refer to the line dealing with epidemiology, the allocation for which has increased by 33 per cent. This is important but, with the changing incidence of disease in the community, can the Attorney tell the Committee at which disease we are aiming in this respect?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The allocation includes a provision for increased staff for venereal disease control.

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Attorney say whether consideration has been given to the institution of a programme aimed at reducing the incidence of hydatids in humans? Many

public health organizations throughout the world, and certainly in other parts of Australia, are devoting their attention to the need to overcome the incidence of this disease in humans. The matter would necessarily be initiated by the Public Health Department, although some of the activities in this area would be undertaken by other organizations, particularly in the agricultural field. Is the department mindful of the activities of other public health services and does it intend to increase its activities in this area?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will obtain a report for the Leader.

Dr. TONKIN: I suggest that a programme of public education and perhaps community vaccination against smallpox could be undertaken. There have been several scares throughout the world recently regarding this disease, and there is no doubt that Australia is by no means isolated from this sort of epidemic, especially when one considers today's modern means of air travel. Although immunization certificates are compulsory, it is not unknown for these to be not in order and, therefore, for a person not to have a valid immunization certificate. This is an important matter, as the number of people in the community who are not vaccinated against smallpox is far greater now than it was about 25 years ago when the risk was smaller.

Line passed.

Minister of Health, Miscellaneous, \$10,387,383.

Dr. TONKIN: It is extremely difficult when looking through the appendix to which the "Miscellaneous" item refers to single out any one of the many institutions that appear there and all of which are doing valuable work in the community. However, I should like to refer to one. This evening I have been attending a meeting of Alanon, with whose work I am impressed. This organization which does not request Government assistance is completely self-supporting. However, the Government assists its activities indirectly through the Australian Foundation on Alcoholism and Drug Dependence and through the Alcohol and Drug Addicts Treatment Board. I know that the vote for the latter is \$184,600 this year compared to \$125,900 spent last year, and that the former is to receive its recurring grant of \$2,000, which has remained unchanged. Is the Minister satisfied that the allocation to both these organizations is sufficient?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Can the Minister say why the allocation to the Home for Incurables has been reduced dramatically from \$860,000 to \$480,000?

The Hon. L. J. KING: It is considered that additional revenue from increases in pensions and Commonwealth nursing home payments warrants a substantial reduction in this grant.

Line passed.

Schedule passed.

Clauses 1 to 8 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 11.54 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, September 20, at 2 p.m.