

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, August 27, 1975

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

QUESTIONS

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

WHYALLA POLLUTION

In reply to Mr. MAX BROWN (August 5).

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The Broken Hill Proprietary Company Ltd. is proceeding with controls on emissions from the various sections of the Whyalla plant in order to meet the requirements of the clean air regulations, 1972. Several sections of the plant have already been modified to reduce emissions to atmosphere, and major works are to be undertaken in several other areas. The company has called tenders for the conversion of the basic oxygen steelmaking plant to a closed hood system, which was originally expected to be completed by the end of 1976. The Director-General of Public Health has been informed that this modification alone is expected to cost about \$9 000 000. Tenders for the proposed plant are being reviewed, but this is complicated by a legal dispute between the tenderers over patent rights. It is not known at this stage whether this will affect the proposed completion date for the work.

ST. AGNES PRIMARY SCHOOL

In reply to Mrs. BYRNE (August 19).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: All arrangements are in hand by the Education Department with the co-operation of the Principal of the Tea Tree Gully Primary School to have facilities at St. Agnes set up for occupation at the beginning of the third term in 1975, as an annexe of the Tea Tree Gully school for the remainder of this year. All children concerned, including the four only from the Hope Valley Primary School, have been advised and should enrol at St. Agnes at the time the school opens.

MANNAHILL TRAFFIC

In reply to Mr. ALLEN (August 12).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I replied to the honourable member on this matter on August 18, 1975.

AGRICULTURAL SCIENCE COURSE

In reply to Mr. VENNING (August 14).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The Education Department does still intend to purchase land for agricultural purposes for Clare High School. Agreement could not be reached with the owners regarding purchase price so that notice of intention to acquire had to be served on the respective owners. The matter is at present in the hands of the Land Board and, as acquisition must be completed within 12 months of service of notice of intention, the land will be owned by the Education Department by April 14, 1976.

MODBURY SEWERAGE

In reply to Mrs. BYRNE (August 13).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Previously I advised that to serve Grove Street, Radar Street and the adjacent area at Modbury it would be necessary to extend a trunk sewer through an area which is only sparsely developed, and through streets which are already served by a common effluent scheme. The position virtually remains unchanged. It is not practicable to construct a sewerage scheme to

serve the streets in question until there is subdivision of the areas which the approach sewer must traverse.

PORT ROAD

In reply to Mr. OLSON (August 6).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is not intended, at this stage, to make Port Road a clearway. Ample capacity and lanes exist for the traffic volumes which use the road. The congestion which could occur in the shopping areas as a result of double ranking has been referred to the Police Department for attention.

ALFORD PRIMARY SCHOOL

In reply to Mr. RUSSACK (August 13).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: It is agreed that the transfer of buildings to Alford from Snowtown and the demolition of the original solid construction building left the schoolyard in an unsatisfactory condition. Plans have been prepared by the Public Buildings Department for the upgrading of the yard including paving of certain areas at an estimated cost of \$10 000. Because of the heavy demand on finance for such projects, it is not possible at this stage to implement all of the plans which have been prepared. It is hoped that tenders can be called early in the 1976-77 financial year. It must be pointed out that it is not the policy of the Education Department to construct basketball courts in a schoolyard, but there is usually sufficient paved surface to enable the use of the area as a basketball court.

FIRE BRIGADE LEVIES

In reply to Mr. ALLISON (August 6).

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: It is not the intention of the Government to reduce the contribution of the local government bodies in Mount Gambier for 1975-76 or to review the basis for their calculation. On July 1, 1974, the contribution of local government bodies to the cost of running the South Australian Fire Brigade was reduced from approximately 28 per cent to 12½ per cent.

MEDICINE CONTAINERS

In reply to Mr. WOTTON (August 7).

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The continual admission to hospital of children suffering from poisoning by medicinal products is a matter of great concern. One-third of all poisoning cases admitted to the Adelaide Children's Hospital is due to ingestion of solid dose medication. Experimentation is continuing in an endeavour to produce an entirely satisfactory container, which, whilst child-resistant, is able to be opened by elderly persons without too much difficulty. There are several courses of action at present being undertaken, as follows:

1. The Standards Association is developing a performance test for child-resistant containers which is being circulated as a draft standard for adoption. It is understood that this follows closely English and American standards.
2. A container is under test in Australia which should be an improvement on those currently available,
3. Pharmaceutical manufacturers are proposing to pack in child-resistant containers drugs which are considered dangerous to children, namely, anti-depressants, paracetamol, aspirin, and iron tablets.
4. The packing of potent tablets or capsules in strip foil or bubble packs does reduce the risks of ingestion by a child.
5. The use of opaque containers will be encouraged as these do not attract children as much as the clear containers.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: WAGE RESTRAINT

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer):
I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The statement is on wage restraint. The two main problems that face us at present are inflation and unemployment, which are the two major problems facing all Governments in Australia. At the Premiers' Conference in August, 1974, I sought the co-operation of all Governments in the adoption of a series of measures that could form a viable anti-inflationary package. As a result of the discussion at the Premiers' Conference, five joint Commonwealth-State working parties were appointed to recommend practical methods by which wages and costs could be contained.

Subsequently, the Australian Conciliation and Arbitration Commission commenced the 1975 national wage case. In its decision of April 30, 1975, it decided in principle "that some form of wage indexation would contribute to a more rational system of wage fixation to more orderly, more equitable and less inflationary wage increases, and to better industrial relations, provided that consideration was part of the package which included appropriate wage-fixing principles and the necessary 'supporting mechanisms' to ensure their stability". The commission set out the wage-fixing principles it proposed to adopt as a basis for introducing wage indexation and invited submissions regarding those principles and the period for which they should operate. At present the commission is hearing those submissions.

It is not only my Government that regards the commission's decision as a most responsible one: a similar view has also been expressed by other State Premiers even though, in some cases, their Governments initially opposed wage indexation. The commission indicated that, apart from quarterly increases to compensate for price increases and yearly reviews to consider productivity increases, the only grounds which would justify pay increases are:

- (a) changes in work value, such as changes in the nature of the work, the skill and responsibility required, or the conditions under which the work is performed; this would normally apply only to some classifications in an award, although in rare cases it might apply to all classifications;
- (b) catch-up of community movements.

After that decision had been given, the Australian and State Ministers of Labour, and one of the working parties to which I referred earlier met to discuss the extent to which a uniform approach could be made by the seven Governments to the Australian Conciliation and Arbitration Commission in the adjourned hearing of the national wage case that commenced on July 29. All Governments have accepted the principles enunciated by the commission on April 30. My Government considers it to be of the utmost importance that the purchasing power of wages should be maintained and not eroded by increases in prices, and that in order to combat inflation, wage increases should be temporarily confined to quarterly adjustments, based on movements in the price index, apart from dealing with anomalies. This I realise means that for the time being grounds for seeking wage increases will be very limited, but unless something is done to contain the rate of inflation it seems inevitable that the number of persons unemployed will continue to increase. The Government considers it is preferable for there to be some wage (and price) restraint than for uncontrolled increases in wages to result in increasing unemployment.

As a result of Cabinet consideration of this matter, I have written to all Ministers requiring Government departments and instrumentalities to conform to the wage restraint principles of the Australian Conciliation and Arbitration Commission. The Minister of Labour and Industry has been authorised to intervene before State industrial tribunals in cases that affect State Government employees, to urge the adoption of the Australian commission's principles in all State awards. As soon as the Australian commission has given its decision in the current national wage case, the Minister of Labour and Industry will make application to the State Industrial Commission to apply the same principles as the Australian commission decides upon.

A Bill to amend the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act to repeal the provision of that Act relating to the living wage so there will be no impediment to quarterly adjustment being applied to employees under State Awards has recently been considered by the House. A separate Bill shortly to be introduced will require the Industrial Commission to certify that any industrial agreements must not be contrary to the public interest before an agreement can be registered.

QUESTIONS RESUMED**COMMONWEALTH BUDGET**

Dr. TONKIN: In view of the Premier's Ministerial statement just completed and his stated concern for the control of inflation and unemployment, his statement on wage restraint and wage indexation and his comment last week that he was disappointed with the Commonwealth Government's lack of stimulation for the private sector, is he willing to go further and support the Liberal Party's Budget proposals announced in the Commonwealth Parliament yesterday by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Fraser)? Since the Commonwealth Labor Government came to office in December, 1972, it has increased spending in almost all areas; in fact, Government spending in the past two years has increased by \$9 405 000 000, or 80 per cent. The resulting situation is one of economic chaos, and Australia has never been in the mess in which it now finds itself. The Commonwealth Treasurer's Budget, supposedly aimed at bringing the country back to a sound economic level, is a sham, because the private sector is virtually ignored.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, this is absolute debate; this is not an explanation of the question.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order.

Dr. TONKIN: I am sorry if the facts hurt the Premier but, in deference to you, Mr. Speaker, I will return to the facts and keep to them. It is generally conceded, and experts have said, that the most recent Commonwealth Budget will not encourage but will probably discourage private enterprise and will result in the closure of small businesses and other companies. Will the Premier urge the Commonwealth Treasurer to consider tax indexation and take heed of the Liberal Party's Budget proposals—

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the Leader is allowed to ask a question and then give an explanation of it by leave. The Leader is proceeding, instead of explaining the question he outlined at the beginning of his statement, to ask a whole series of interrogatories which are simply rhetorical questions, and that, in my submission, is not in order. The Leader is entitled to put a question and to explain it strictly in terms of that question only.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the honourable Premier's point of order.

Dr. TONKIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will continue by rephrasing the question as follows: is the Premier willing to support the Liberal Party's Budget proposals as outlined yesterday?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No: I will bitterly oppose them. During the last few days Opposition members have constantly questioned the Government about reductions in expenditure of moneys on which we rely from the Federal Government, and they have made attacks on the Government and the present Federal Government for reductions in total expenditure. In what has been outlined today by the Leader of the Federal Opposition, there will be a further reduction in expenditure in a whole series of the areas in which Opposition members have questioned this Government. Not only will we not have any provisions for decentralisation: none of the area improvement programmes will proceed, none of the urban and regional development programmes will proceed, and none of the programmes for urban improvement, which were submitted time and again by State Governments to Federal Governments at Premiers' Conferences when Liberal Governments were in power, will in future be financed, according to Mr. Fraser's statement. In fact, the cut-back in Commonwealth expenditure would be so severe that there would be a massive reduction in employment of both men and resources in Australia.

Mr. Venning: We'll win the next election, anyway.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader of the Opposition asks whether I will support a programme of that kind by the Liberal Party and the answer is "No". Such a programme would be utterly disastrous for Australia.

PETRO-CHEMICAL PLANT

Mr. KENEALLY: Does the Premier agree with the Leader of the Opposition's statement in today's *Advertiser* that a small petro-chemical plant should be built within the Adelaide industrial area? The Leader of the Opposition is reported to be asking for immediate steps to be taken to make the best use of liquid produced at the Cooper Basin, suggesting Port Adelaide and Port Stanvac as possible sites for this work. The report also states:

His (the Leader's) statement followed a meeting of the shadow Cabinet which has rewritten petro-chemical policy on advice from the Party spokesman for industrial development, Mr. Dean Brown. Mr. Brown visited T.C.T. executives in Britain in June before decisions were taken to scrap the Redcliff petro-chemical venture.

That may well be significant. Does the Premier agree with this proposal, having regard to the environmental factors involved (particularly as a result of the environmental investigations into Redcliff), the much vaunted decentralisation policy of the Liberal Party, and the obvious economic advantages of a site such as Redcliff?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government originally decided on the Redcliff site for the petro-chemical works on two bases, the first being in furtherance of the decentralisation policy of the Government that the resources of the State should be used to provide an additional major employment base in the northern cities. That was vitally important to employment in Port Augusta and, Mr. Speaker, in Port Pirie. The fact is that if such a plant is to be viable at all within the State it must be viable in that area. No reason based on its siting has been advanced by the companies in the consortium for deciding not to proceed at this stage with the proposals for the petro-chemical plant.

Dr. Tonkin: That's not strictly true.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is strictly true.

Mr. Gunn: It's not.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There was no suggestion made by the consortium that, if a site in Adelaide were chosen, a petro-chemical complex of the kind which it had outlined and which it said must be of a world scale in order to be economic would be possible within Adelaide. The consortium has told us clearly that the project is not viable, in present circumstances, under any conditions, whether in Adelaide or Redcliff. The question of siting is not the question whether the Redcliff complex goes on. The whole of the programme in relation to the sale of dry gas to New South Wales to make economical a liquids project was based on our having a resource to use for additional employment bases in the North of the State. The second matter related to the environment and how this plant should be sited. Contrary to statements that have been made irresponsibly by members opposite over a long period, no environmental difficulty in such a plant arises from the discharge of effluent or the discharge of fumes, provided the plant is designed in accordance with the criteria laid down by the Government.

Mr. Millhouse: How do you know that?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: A public inquiry came to that conclusion.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, the inquiry of the commissioners has clearly established this, and, of course, the fact has been established by honourable members, not in the Liberal Movement but in the Liberal Party, who have visited the appropriate plants in England.

Mr. Millhouse: Didn't you—

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Mitcham to order. The honourable Premier has the floor.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Two environmental factors make it impossible to establish a plant of this kind within an urban area, certainly within an area such as Port Adelaide or Port Stanvac.

Dr. Eastick: What sort of a plant?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: A petro-chemical plant manufacturing ethylene dichloride and caustic soda, because those are the only bases for such a plant so far advanced by anyone.

Dr. Tonkin: On what scale?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It does not matter what scale. If a plant of this kind is built, it will be very noisy; it does not matter how large the plant is, or how small. Moreover, it will have to flare, and when it flares it will light up the countryside for about eight kilometres around, with a considerable additional noise factor. While that is possible, of course, at a site like Redcliffs, which is about 24 km from any built-up residential area, it would be utterly impossible and unacceptable at Port Adelaide or Port Stanvac, or indeed anywhere within the metropolitan planning area.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Perhaps the honourable member who has advised the shadow Cabinet would like it amongst his residents at St. Georges. The suggestion that we could conceivably have proceeded with this plant on this basis is one of the most irresponsible and ill thought that I have yet heard from an inadequate Opposition.

FOOD PRICES

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I ask the Premier a question.

Dr. Tonkin: Let him simmer down first, he has whipped himself up.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I will give him an easy one.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to continue with his question.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Premier explain why Adelaide now has the singular distinction of having the dearest food prices in the Commonwealth? From time to time, the Premier has commented on the increase in the price of food in this State, stating that, although the increase was greater than elsewhere, the absolute cost of food was not the highest. We now have the unenviable distinction of the price of food in Adelaide being dearer than the price of food in any other Australian capital city. Attention was drawn to this matter in last evening's newspaper. The order of food costs in the various cities is as follows: Adelaide tops the list, and other cities in order of expense are Canberra (which was previously top), Perth, Hobart, Brisbane, Sydney, and Melbourne. In view of the sort of statement the Premier has made previously in this House, can he explain why Adelaide is now in this unenviable position?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I must confess that I was occasioned some surprise by the conclusions drawn by a newspaper correspondent, but I will get a full report for the honourable member.

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I direct a question to you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Goldsworthy: What about the Premier?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, the Premier has had enough this afternoon. He bowed out on the last one, so we will leave him alone, for a little while anyway.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, will you call together, as soon as possible, the Standing Orders Committee to review Standing Orders, especially Standing Order 57? While you were out of the Chair last evening, Sir, the Government suffered a reverse in this House for the first time during this Parliament (it certainly will not be the last time) and was defeated on a motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Mathwin: There wasn't much about it in the paper, was there?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, but that is irrelevant to my question. The Government was defeated on the motion that progress be reported during the Committee stage of the Public Purposes Loan Bill, and it immediately occurred to me, as I believe it occurred to members on both sides of the House (although perhaps members on the Government side would not admit it), that the question of the adjournment of the House came up. If it were not for the member for Playford, who was found asleep under a bush, the Government probably would have lost subsequent divisions that were called in this place. Standing Order 57 was amended, as you may have been told, during the life of the previous Parliament. I suspect that, in its amended form (and the amendment was drawn up by the then Attorney-General who was not really a Parliamentarian)—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Government is showing commendable loyalty to His Honour Mr. Justice King. I commend the Government for that but I stand by what I said, because this amendment has been—

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Question!

The SPEAKER: Order! "Question" has been called.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Who called "Question"?

The SPEAKER.: The honourable Premier.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Come on!

The SPEAKER: Order! "Question" has been called. I undertake to give the member for Mitcham my considered reply.

Mr. Millhouse: All I wanted was a "Yes" or "No".

SHEEP

Mr. BLACKER: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture whether the Government will develop a system of priority for the slaughtering of sheep under the 75c scheme introduced recently at Port Lincoln by the Government Produce Department? Since the inception of that scheme an increased demand has been put on the department's facilities, especially from a growing number of producers who have completed shearing. Consequently, the number of shorn sheep is increasing and the increased number of sheep being booked in for slaughter has meant that some producers cannot take advantage of the scheme. When processing sheep under the scheme, the output is determined by the number of fat lambs and locally killed stock to be treated. Output is also affected when boning is carried out under the scheme because knifemen are taken off the killing chain to man the boning room, consequently reducing the effectiveness of the killing chain. The number of available stock to be slaughtered under this scheme now appears to be at least double the number that can be handled effectively. As many areas of Eyre Peninsula are in the grip of a serious drought, people most in need of disposing of their sheep are unable to do so. Therefore, if a system of priority on a locality and needs basis could be determined and implemented, the assistance offered by the Government could be equitably utilised.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to consult my colleague about this matter because I realise the honourable member is concerned about it. In this morning's newspaper I noticed a report relating to problems that exist on Eyre Peninsula. Although I am sure that my colleague already has the matter in hand, I will pass it on to him and get a report for the honourable member as soon as possible.

RAILWAY SUPERANNUANTS

Mr. ALLISON: Can the Treasurer say what action has been taken or will be taken by the Government to ensure that South Australian Railways superannuants will not be adversely affected by the transfer of non-metropolitan railways to the Commonwealth Government?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In the letters of agreement which preceded the indenture and which were tabled in the Commonwealth Parliament, provision was made that no employee would be worse off or disadvantaged under the transfer. Arrangements are to be undertaken during the interim period that will ensure that, in the changeover, those who have advantages under the South Australian superannuation scheme do not lose those advantages in any transfer to the Commonwealth, or in arrangements that are made for future superannuation. That is the situation. Discussions are being undertaken with the groups of workmen and superannuants involved.

Mr. Millhouse: Why wasn't this made known before the election?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It was.

Mr. Millhouse: No, the Minister refused a deputation.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must call the honourable member for Mitcham to order. If making a series of interjections in the form of questions is maintained, that will reduce substantially the time available to all honourable members for questions. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Not only was this made known before the election: it was a specific part of the first election speech that I made during the election campaign, and that was at the railway workshops at Islington.

SOMERTON HOME

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Premier say whether any decision has been made in relation to the property on the Esplanade at Somerton Park, which is now owned and used at present by the Somerton Crippled Children's Home and which has to be vacated by December this year? I understand that the Government has been given an option on this property until the end of this month, and that so far the Government has given no indication of its intentions. As this property has to be sold and sold in time for those concerned, they hope, to move into the new accommodation at the end of this year, it is of paramount importance that something be done. I have brought this matter before the House in debate on several occasions and also during Question Time last year, pointing out the situation regarding the building, its amenities, the lifts, the heated swimming pool, and the bed accommodation there. It is ideally sited for elderly people, either as a home for geriatrics or as a day care centre for aged people. I ask the Premier whether any decision has been made.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Not that I am aware of, but I will get a report for the honourable member.

PRIVATE HOSPITAL COSTS

Dr. EASTICK: I ask my question of the Premier, as it involves a matter of policy regarding hospitals. What decision has the Government taken in respect of financial assistance towards the operating costs of private hospitals? Several hospitals that have been unable to fulfil the requirements of Medibank have now been designated as private hospitals, instead of recognised hospitals. At page 5, a document sent out by the Hospitals Department on April 4, 1974, over the signature of the Acting Director-General of Medical Services, states:

Public hospitals/recognised hospitals: Currently there are public hospitals and private hospitals. All existing public hospitals have been offered the opportunity to become recognised hospitals. Under the Medibank hospital programme there will ultimately be recognised hospitals and private hospitals. The situation might arise that an existing public hospital does not wish to become a recognised hospital or is unable to meet the requirements for recognition. While it is hoped that some short-term interim arrangements can be made should such an eventuality arise, in the longer term, the hospital would need to become a private hospital if the difficulty could not be resolved.

Then (and this is the important part in relation to my question of the Premier) the document states:

Although in the past it has not been general State Government policy to provide assistance towards operating costs of private hospitals . . . there has been no decision (as the situation has not arisen) in relation to the nature and extent (if any) of future State Government assistance to present public hospitals, which do not attain status as recognised hospitals.

Already, the hospitals at Keith and Kapunda—

Mr. Gunn: And Coober Pedy.

Dr. EASTICK: Yes, also Coober Pedy hospital and other hospitals. They have been identified as being unable to

meet the requirements. Indeed, most subsidised hospitals have failed to provide all the facilities for proper Medibank care. I ask the Premier, as a matter of urgency, what financial assistance the Government intends to give to these hospitals.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I think that the best thing I can do is get a full report for the honourable member on the Government's attitude in this matter. Although the matter has been before Cabinet, I do not think that the situation in the case of the two hospitals the honourable member has mentioned entirely accords with the position as he has put it.

WOODVILLE SPASTIC CENTRE

Mr. EVANS: Will the Premier say whether he supports the Woodville council's decision to refuse consent to the Woodville Spastic Centre to build extensions costing \$500 000 at the Woodville Road centre? I consider that the question is a State-wide one, because recently an appeal was launched by the centre's Patron, His Excellency the Governor. The council has claimed that, if the extensions were built, a health hazard would be created, some trees would have to be removed, the building would be harmful to the environment and would interfere with the privacy of people, and there would be increased traffic in the area. I ask the Premier whether he supports the council's decision, or whether any action can be taken to deal with the matter.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not see how I come into this matter. The only action that I have taken in relation to the Woodville Spastic Centre is to support the centre's appeal.

Mr. Evans: You took action in relation to the shopping centre.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That matter came specifically under the planning authority. The fact is that there a provision was used to avoid the requirements of the Metropolitan Adelaide Development Plan. That is not the case in this matter. I do not know how the honourable member suggests that it is my Ministerial responsibility to express an opinion in this case. There are proper avenues through which to resolve the matter, and I believe that that action will be taken.

MOUNT LOFTY RESERVOIRS

Mr. ARNOLD: Will the Minister of Works say what potential remains for the construction of further reservoirs in the Mount Lofty Range, and whether a study has been undertaken to determine the value of the eastern side of the range as a watershed for future development in that area? Doubtless, every available site in the Mount Lofty Range should be developed for the conservation of water, particularly for the Adelaide metropolitan area, but I also consider that, in the event of Monarto proceeding in future, whatever water can be conserved on the eastern side of the range should be conserved for that purpose. I ask the Minister what studies have been undertaken and what potential there is for water conservation in the Mount Lofty Range in that area.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will obtain a detailed report from my officers for the honourable member. Of course, he would know that extensive investigations have been made over many years to fully exploit the potential of the Mount Lofty Range on the western side. Indeed, I think plans to cover the period to the turn of the century are in hand for the construction of further dams in that watershed. The honourable member would be aware that, in respect of the eastern side, an examination did take place,

with the development of Monarto, regarding provision of a small reservoir on that side. I think the best thing for me to do would be to have the question examined by my officers and to bring down a full report for the honourable member.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: ALLEGED STATEMENTS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I have sought leave to make this personal explanation because I believe that I was misrepresented in the House yesterday by the Deputy Premier when he imputed to me statements that I had not made. The Deputy Premier said yesterday, in relation to some remarks I had made last week, "The honourable member made a great play of this point last week and said I had withheld information from this committee," that is, the Public Accounts Committee.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Go on!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Deputy Premier wishes me to read further, and I am quite pleased to do so. "I am speaking from memory", said the Minister, but he may wish to check the facts, as I have done. At no time did I make that statement: in fact, I was misrepresented. What I said last week was that there was a deliberate attempt by the Government to stifle the activities of one of its Parliamentary committees, and I read from a letter.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: That is not true.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Well, let the Deputy Premier comment on accurate statements I have made if he wishes, but do not let him stand up here and deliberately misrepresent what I say, and then ask me to comment on the misrepresentation.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must bring to the honourable member's attention that he is making a personal explanation, and he must not get involved in debate.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: What I said was that this kind of letter was an attempt to stifle the proper role of a Parliamentary committee. That is the point I make. In no way do I detract from it. I have read the report in last Friday's *Advertiser*, and nowhere could the Minister possibly construe that I said he deliberately withheld information from the committee. I have sought leave to make the explanation so in future he will not be able to impute to me statements that I did not make.

PETROCHEMICAL COMPLEX

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): I move:

That this House view with grave concern the indefinite postponement of the construction of a petro-chemical complex in South Australia and the subsequent effect that this will have on employment opportunities; furthermore, this House condemn the South Australian and Australian Governments for their gross mismanagement of this development project and for their failure to uphold the A.L.P. State election promise of 1973, and call on the State Government to table immediately in the House all Government documents and correspondence relating to the petro-chemical complex.

This motion is extremely important for several reasons. First, it places on trial the South Australian Government for losing the petro-chemical plant for this State. I believe that, from the evidence that I will present, we will find that the South Australian Government and the Australian Government are grossly guilty of wilful mismanagement and gross incompetence in handling this developmental

project. Secondly, the motion is important because the Government is being judged on its ability to attract and develop new industries and create employment opportunities in this State. I have no doubt that, again, it will be found incapable of doing this. Finally, this motion is extremely important because it affects you, Sir, as the independent Speaker within this House. The motion will test whether or not you are prepared to show your independence or whether you are prepared to go along and support the A.L.P. Government on all policy issues. It is particularly relevant to you, Sir, because it affects your own electorate, particularly the employment opportunities within Port Pirie and Port Augusta.

I intend to break the debate into five specific areas. First, I wish to give a brief account of the technical aspects of the entire project. Secondly, I wish to show the effects of losing the project on the employment opportunities in South Australia, and also the other benefits that have now been lost. Thirdly, I wish to show the arrogance and gross mismanagement of the Australian Government, and particularly that of the Australian Minister for Minerals and Energy, Mr. Connor. Fourthly, I wish to put a case to prove the gross mismanagement by and subservience of the State Government, particularly on behalf of the Premier and of the former Minister of Mines (Hon. D. J. Hopgood). Finally, I will put a case on why the Government should table in this House all correspondence and documents in relation to this petro-chemical plant.

First, I will give a brief technical account. The Cooper Basin in the north of South Australia is very rich in hydro-carbons, which are present both as gases and as liquids. Methane is the gas, and it is best used as a domestic and industrial source of energy. Already it is available for such use in Adelaide and Sydney. The liquids comprising the other components make up a total of 45 per cent of the entire hydro-carbons in the Cooper Basin, which is equivalent to a known reserve of 313 000 000 barrels of liquids. The first component which is so important is ethane. It is used as a gas in a similar way to methane. There are other uses as well. If it is used as a gas, it has a commercial value of about \$15 a tonne at the well-head. If used for feedstock for a petro-chemical plant, its value immediately increases to \$50 a tonne. I believe a very important difference as to how this resource could be used can be seen from that: the value would be \$15 a tonne if used as a gas for domestic purposes and \$50 to \$60 a tonne if used as a feedstock for a petro-chemical plant. We then come to propane and butane, the next two highest hydro-carbons. These can be alkylated to produce some sort of motor spirits. That is exactly what the Commonwealth Minister insisted be done with them. This has been regarded by experts as totally inefficient and uneconomical to use these two gases or liquids. It could also be used as a domestic feedstock, and as such it has a value of \$15 a tonne. However, it can be used much more economically and much, more efficiently as a source for liquid petroleum gas. Currently, if it was exported to Japan, at the port of export in Australia it could obtain a price of about \$100 a tonne. Again one can see the difference; if it is used as a gas, it is valued at about \$15 a tonne and, if it is allowed to be exported, it can have a value of at least \$100 a tonne. Finally, we have the other fractions, which are regarded as crudes and which can be used only for refining into spirits.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member should address the Chair and not the gallery.

The SPEAKER: I must uphold that point of order.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am rather pleased that the Minister has pointed that out, because it is a habit I have learnt from the Premier, as he stands in his position and looks up at the gallery and scans around with his back to the Speaker. At no stage did I refer to the gallery. I mentioned Mr. Speaker throughout, so I am presenting my remarks to you. I continue after that superfluous and stupid point of order made by the Minister. The Redcliff plant, even if it had been completed, would have had an annual output of the following products. It would have produced about 510 000 tonnes of caustic soda; 624 000 tonnes of ethylene dichloride (this is used to produce P.V.C.); 142 000 tonnes of low density polyethylene; 160 000 tonnes of alkalated gasolene mixture (it had to be that, because that was the constraint placed on the plant by the Australian Minister); and 535 000 tonnes of crude oil. The project was to be developed by the Redcliff petro-chemical company. This is a consortium of Alcoa of Aust. Ltd., I.C.I. (Aust.) Ltd., and the Mitsubishi corporation, a Japanese company. The total investment in the project by the consortium was about \$1 000 000 000 on present-day values; this arose from an initial projected investment of about \$600 000 000. The Commonwealth and State Governments had indicated that they would need to invest about \$240 000 000 for the infrastructure, the gas and liquids pipelines, and for other purposes. A liquids pipeline was to be built from the Cooper Basin to Redcliff Point; this was to have a length of about 450 kilometres and was to come under either the State pipelines authority or the national pipelines authority. An additional gas pipeline about 100 km in length was to be built, and a spur line was to be built from the Cooper Basin to Adelaide line across to the Redcliff plant. Other infrastructure was to be built, including an additional power station, which would have used natural gas, housing, and other features that any large industrial complex would require.

I turn now to the losses that have been suffered by this State because that plant will not proceed. I think it important to assess the cost of the mismanagement by the State and Commonwealth Governments and the effects that this will have on the future development of this State. The two basic raw materials used in the Australian plastics industry would have come from this petro-chemical plant. The Australian plastics industry is valued at about \$700 000 000. There are about 900 Australian manufacturing establishments, and the industry employs more than 30 000 people throughout Australia. That gives some idea of the vast scope of the Australian plastics industry. I turn now to the trade balance and the effects that the project would have had on the trade balance for Australia. By 1981, if the project had gone according to plan, it would have reduced imports into Australia by \$234 000 000 in one year. It would have increased exports from Australia by \$99 000 000 and, therefore, it would have improved our total trade balance by \$333 000 000 in one year. That is the kind of advantage that Australia so badly needs. However, because of the mismanagement largely by this State and the Commonwealth Governments we will now have to forgo that improvement in our trade balance.

Employment is a most important area in Australia at present. Bob Hawke, the Federal President of the Australian Council of Trade Unions and the Federal President of the Australian Labor Party, has predicted that unemployment late this year or early next year could reach 500 000. Employment opportunities that would have been created by the plant can be broken into two areas: first,

the construction phase, which would have been from the present until about 1978 to 1980. During this period, there would have been a maximum of 3 250 employment opportunities during 1976, and the average level of employment during construction would have been 2 500.

During a period of increased unemployment, those figures are most significant. Another 1 000 would have been employed in fabricating shops throughout Australia producing equipment and the various things required to establish the plant. Therefore, at the peak during the construction phase, employment would have been created for more than 6 000 Australians, most of them near the plant. During the actual operations, the plant would have required a staff of about 1 100. In addition, there would have been a service staff of 350, and it has been estimated that those employees alone would have created another 1 450 jobs for people in other community fields. Therefore, during the actual operation of the plant (if this project had proceeded), there would have been further employment opportunities here for about 2 900 people.

Finally, the other great loss that can be recorded is the loss of revenues to the State and Commonwealth Governments. It has been estimated that the loss in revenue to the State Government now that the project will not proceed will be at least \$70 000 000 a year from the various forms of taxation and other Government charges.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: To the State Government?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: To both Governments.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: How do you work that out?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: If the Minister wishes to see a break-down, I suggest that he read some of the Redcliff reports, which have been available to me and to all other members. It seems that the Minister has not shown the courtesy to members or to the State, as Minister in charge, of reading the necessary reports.

Mr. Keneally: You don't know, in other words.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It is normal practice for members to quote a source, without being so abusive.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Davenport.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I suggest to the Minister that he read the following three reports, which, obviously, he has not read: the Redcliff petro-chemical booklet, copies of which were handed out to all members who attended the seminar in the State Administration Office; the progress report on environmental studies; and (this is the report that contains these facts, and particularly the fact I have quoted) the Redcliff petro-chemical development project report (S.A.D.E.C. 2) produced in October, 1974. There is no break-down in the figures I have quoted to the Minister. I quoted a joint figure of State and Commonwealth Government revenue of \$70 000 000.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You don't know what the break-down is?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I sum up by saying that, as a result of the loss of the plant, Australia and this State have lost a major industry and a considerable number of employment opportunities for so many people in a period of high unemployment.

Mr. Max Brown: Weren't you concerned about the pollution at this plant?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That was when the project was going ahead.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I will refer to the environment later, if given sufficient time. I have pointed out to

the honourable member (and this should affect him because he comes from the iron triangle) the loss of opportunities for employment in his district. I come now to the destructiveness, arrogance and gross incompetence of the Commonwealth Government and, in particular, of the Minister for Minerals and Energy (Mr. Connor). I believe that, if we need several villains in this case, it is he, the Premier and the Hon. Mr. Hopgood who are to blame for the loss of the project.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must refer to the Minister, and not to the Hon. Mr. Hopgood.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The former Minister of Mines and Energy. I will carefully document all the ways in which the Commonwealth Government has completely hindered and stopped this development project, and I will go through them in a systematic manner. First, the policies of the Commonwealth Government would clearly have forced Delhi Santos to set what would have been a high price for the hydro-carbon feed stock, for the plant, and I will list some of the Commonwealth Government's policies that would have forced that high price. First, it removed the 50 per cent subsidy for expenditure on exploration by petroleum companies. Secondly, the Commonwealth Government removed allowances to shareholders through taxation deductions for company finance invested in exploration. Thirdly, the 1974 Commonwealth Budget removed the depreciation provisions as regards taxation deductions. This one provision alone would effectively have increased the price of the gas by 25 per cent — that one point, let alone the other four points to which I have referred.

Finally, section 10 (7A) of the Income Tax Assessment Act was amended to force earlier payment of taxes by the company concerned, as well as by other petroleum companies. Those four policies introduced by the Commonwealth Labor Government since it came to office in December, 1972, have forced the Delhi-Santos partnership to increase the likely price of the gas. That became significant, because it was trying to negotiate a reasonably low price for that gas which eventually added to the considerable delays in finalising any agreement before the plant could proceed.

The second important policy of the Commonwealth Government that I think shows its negligence in this area is that which stopped exploration drilling in the Cooper Basin. No exploration wells have been drilled in the Cooper Basin for the last two years. One limitation on the project was the short supply of proven hydro-carbon reserves in the Cooper Basin. It is well known that there was a known supply for 10 years, a probable supply for 12 years and a possible supply for 20 years. However, I.C.I. and the other members of the consortium clearly stated that it was risky to proceed with a petrochemical plant with an investment of \$1 000 000 000 when there was a known gas supply for only 10 years. However, who stopped all exploration in the past two years? Other wells have been drilled to facilitate the production of dry gas, but no exploration well has been drilled in the Cooper Basin for the last two years. This relates back to the four policies of the Commonwealth Government I have already mentioned to show how it totally destroyed any incentive for the private company to explore for a further supply of hydro-carbons.

The third important policy of the Commonwealth Government and particularly of Mr. Connor that affected the future of the plant was Mr. Connor's insistence that propane and butane had to be alkalated to produce motor spirits. Alkalating propane and butane would result in a reduced income for the gas producers. If exported, they

could obtain a price of \$100 a tonne, but to use them to produce motor spirit would be both inefficient and uneconomic. The Commonwealth Government was condemned by its own members for making that policy. In a speech in the House of Representatives on March 6, Mr. Chris Hurford condemned the Commonwealth Minister (Mr. Connor) for that policy and asked him to reverse it.

The fourth point is that Mr. Connor insisted that the plant be at Redcliff Point. I will speak at some length about the location later in this debate, because it was raised by the Premier during Question Time, and I believe he has created an entirely false picture, as he so often tends to do. Forcing the petro-chemical plant to be constructed at Redcliff would have increased the cost to the consortium and increased the infra-structure costs and therefore the likely costs to the Commonwealth and State Governments.

The fifth policy of the Commonwealth Government which was against the best interests of the petro-chemical plant being established was that Mr. Connor insisted on a 51 per cent Australian equity within the consortium, despite the fact that this equity was held as minority shareholdings in Alcoa and I.C.I., two members of the consortium. If the majority of that Australian equity was held as a minority shareholding in those companies, it gave a meaningless Australian ownership in that consortium. Although there would be a 51 per cent equity, there would be no effective control through that 51 per cent, so what was the point of establishing that criterion when it was a meaningless proposition to put forward? My careful analysis of the figures produced by members of the consortium indicates that the effectual Australian ownership was only 33 per cent of the shareholding, and that is a minor shareholding and could not in any way dictate an effective control.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: How did you get that figure?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: That is taken from the Australian shareholding within the three companies in the consortium, from figures they produced and if the Minister is careful and diligent enough to read this report—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Do they use that figure, or do you? Come on, be honest.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I have developed that figure.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Tell us how you arrived at it and stop being dishonest.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I did so by taking the shareholding of the companies and working out the effective Australian shareholding where they could express a majority point of view, and that is exactly what I have done. They have quoted the figures in this report, and the Minister is again indicating that he has not done his homework on this subject.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You cannot answer a simple question on how you arrived at a figure without giving garbage in return.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I suggest, if the Minister is keen to know my source of information, that he can go out and find it out for himself, because he obviously does not know the facts.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I want to know how you arrived at the figure. It is a perfectly reasonable question.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I just sat down and did some logical and simple sums and worked out what was the effective Australian control in this consortium. We now find that the Minister now responsible for that project

has not done that elementary work. He accepted the figure and suggestions of Mr. Connor, yet he has not sat down and looked at the effective Australian control within the project.

Mr. Millhouse: I suppose as things now are it would be a futility for him to do any work on it.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I think it would be: I think it is a futility for the Minister to do any work at the best of times. He has already lost Monarto.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to stick to the debate.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: That is only the first of the points concerning the 51 per cent Australian equity requirement of Mr. Connor. Possibly it is a point just as important, because it might have affected why the I.C.I. Alcoa and Mitsubishi consortium was granted the project instead of Dow Chemical. How significant this fact was we will never know. It could have been ultimately of no significance at all, but it could have been significant. In no way would I like to reflect on the ability and technical expertise of I.C.I., Alcoa or Mitsubishi. I believe they are all reputable companies with tremendous information and knowledge of the subject.

However, it was well known that Dow Chemical originally put in a proposal for this project and had a lead of about 18 months over the consortium. It had done an environmental study, as is obvious in the reports if one reads them from cover to cover or if one even reads them. The delay in the project affected the cost of the whole project, and I will speak later about the importance of this delay and the effect it had on the subsequent failure. If the 18 months is important, it is at least possible that Dow Chemical could have completed the entire project before the effects of inflation eventually destroyed its economic viability. I again refer to a speech made by Mr. Hurford in the House of Representatives on March 6. He also made a request of the Commonwealth Minister (Mr. Connor) to allow Dow Chemical to resubmit its proposal for the project, and I again ask the Minister to refer to that speech. I have dealt with this entire concept put forward by Mr. Connor of a 51 per cent Australian equity, and the effect that had on the future viability of the plant.

The sixth policy of the Government, where I believe it showed gross mismanagement, was that it caused excessive and unnecessary delays in the commencement of work on that project. I will give some of the reasons for this delay, caused by the Commonwealth Government. First, I have referred to the fact that it stipulated it should be the I.C.I. consortium rather than Dow Chemical Company that should proceed with the plant. I agree that there was much doubt whether that would have affected the ultimate result. The second important point which caused delays was the failure of the Commonwealth Government to guarantee a price for motor spirits. This meant that the Delhi-Santos partnership could not set a price for gas and liquids coming from Cooper Basin, and one of the last parts of the agreement still to be reached was an effective price for gas and liquids.

Evidence of this (and perhaps the Minister would like to read this as well) is a statement by Mr. John Bonython quoted in the *Advertiser* on September 24, 1974. I think that statement clearly states that Commonwealth Government policy was the reason for the failure to reach an agreement on the price of the hydro-carbons. The Commonwealth Government also failed to establish a suitable diameter for the pipeline (and this delayed the project) and failed to establish a transmission cost for gas and liquids

through that pipeline. The Prime Minister, on August 6, 1974, 18 months after the project had been formally announced publicly by the Premier, announced suddenly that the Commonwealth Government wanted an inter-departmental inquiry with 10 Commonwealth Government departments to consider the feasibility of the entire project. Therefore, 18 months after the project had been announced, at the point when it was hoped to start construction work, suddenly the Prime Minister wants this inquiry. If that had not completely ruined and at least further delayed the entire project, on October 1 the Commonwealth Minister for Minerals and Energy (Mr. Connor), asked for a public environmental inquiry, again 18 months after the chance had occurred to set up such an inquiry.

I believe those two inquiries were extremely important in causing a further delay in the initiation of work on this project, and this delay allowed the costs to inflate to the point where the plant was no longer economical. In all six policies, the Commonwealth Government (and particularly Mr. Connor), has shown complete incompetence and arrogance to South Australia; it has shown a genuine desire to want to stop that petro-chemical plant, no matter what the cost to the Commonwealth and to South Australia. The unfortunate part is that Mr. Connor has committed these atrocities under the so-called banner of buying back the farm and protecting the farm, whereas in fact they are the results of the actions of a bloody-minded fool.

I turn to the fourth area—the ineffectual and weak administration and the gross incompetence of the State Government, and in particular the Premier, and the former Minister of Development and Mines (Mr. Hopgood). The case here is somewhat briefer and simpler. The State Government set down conditions as to where the petro-chemical plant should be situated. I will deal with this matter at some length, as the Premier raised it during Question Time. The four sites originally selected for an in-depth study were: No. 1, Port Stanvac; No. 2, the Port Paterson, Redcliff, Port Pirie area; No. 3, Osborne, Torrens Island, and Dry Creek; and No. 4, Ardrossan. Those were the four sites that were considered. As history shows, Redcliff Point was eventually selected as the site for the petro-chemical plant. Why Redcliff Point was selected is clearly documented in the *Redcliff Petro-chemical Development Project Report* (report No. 2) released in October, 1974.

Perhaps the Minister and the Premier should both read those reports before they make further statements. The report clearly indicates on pages 15 to 19 that the main reason why Redcliff Point was selected was because of the unemployment problems that were likely to exist in the Iron Triangle, and there is no doubt about this. About 2½ pages of that report are devoted to the effect this project would have on the Iron Triangle. Other likely effects of the petro-chemical plants were referred to, particularly the effects on the environment. The main grounds on which Redcliff was selected, as opposed to any other site, was the need to establish employment in the Iron Triangle area. This afternoon the Premier has suggested two reasons why that site was selected, and they basically back up what was stated in the report. The first reason was the decentralisation of industry.

The Premier said it was important to create employment in that area, and to take employment opportunities away from Adelaide, and that is the fundamental basis of the Premier's argument today. What is the point of putting a projected petro-chemical plant at Redcliff, which does not exist, which is not economic, and which creates no employment, rather than establish a smaller plant here

in Adelaide, or in fact a larger plant elsewhere in the State. I will refer to the statement made by the Leader of the Opposition yesterday to which the Premier referred. I have spoken about the increase in costs to the consortium in locating the plant at Redcliff Point. From my experience in England at the main headquarters of I.C.I. petro-chemical plant at Wilton, I can say that the plant at Redcliff was more than one-third smaller than the plant that was about to be built at Wilton. Although both plants were projected to be built at the same time, the one at Wilton was being built at a lower cost than the one here. An important reason for this is the very high location cost of the plant at Redcliff.

These increases in costs are many and varied. I cannot go into them all, but one was the type of protection to the environment that required a closed cooling system for water; this was expensive and caused higher maintenance costs. It is unique that the seawater in that area has a one-half per cent higher salt content than that normally found in seawater, and this requires additional maintenance costs. There were also increased costs to the Commonwealth and the State Governments because of the establishment of largely new infrastructure. I have already referred to the figure needed to be invested, \$240 000 000, most of which could have been avoided if the plant were built in Adelaide.

If a smaller plant had been built in Adelaide, one cost would have been larger: the additional liquids pipeline from where it left off at Redcliff to be continued to Adelaide. I am assured by technical experts who have been involved in the construction of such a pipeline that the additional cost would have been very small, compared to the additional location costs of building that complex at Redcliff. Therefore, on economic grounds, it could logically be argued that it would have been more economical to build a petro-chemical plant in the Adelaide metropolitan area rather than at Red Cliff Point. The Premier then referred to the other reason why the plant was to be established at Red Cliff Point by saying it related to the environment, that the plant was extremely noisy and that it created pollution from light. I believe sites exist in Adelaide that are far enough removed from any sort of residential area where the plant could have been located on a smaller scale without inconvenience by either noise or light pollution.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Where?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DEAN BROWN: On the scale of the projected plant sites existed in the Port Stanvac area or, more especially, in the Port Adelaide area near Dry Creek. It is incredible that the Premier should throw up as a reason for locating the plant at Red Cliff Point the effect it would have on the environment. A more delicate environmental location could not have been selected for a petro-chemical plant than at the top of Spencer Gulf, where the entire South Australian prawn fishing industry is located.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Who said so? You?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Locating the plant in the Botanic Garden next to the Royal Adelaide Hospital would have created no greater environmental danger than would locating the plant at the top of Spencer Gulf.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The Government totally disregarded the prawn and fishing industries in the entire gulf area. That fact is obvious from the various Government and company reports that have been prepared on the

project. The Leader of the Opposition said yesterday that if a large scale petro-chemical plant did not proceed the next best alternative was to construct a small plant, which should be sited close to the Adelaide industrial area, the crudes being refined at Port Stanvac. The Leader's statement clearly indicates that, if a plant was to be built in the Adelaide area, it would be a small plant; in fact, it needed to be a small plant. Such a plant would have overcome the uneconomic points that were involved with the Red Cliff Point site.

The Deputy Premier has a smug look on his face. I wonder whether he realises what were the results of discussions I had in England with I.C.I. Those discussions were completely open. The company was adamant that a site in Adelaide would have been far more economic than the site at Red Cliff Point, a belief that was borne out by newspaper reporters who visited the English plant and who were told that the most economic site for a petro-chemical plant was in Adelaide. Why was the plant discontinued? Because it was no longer economic! It was a State Government decision, backed up by the Commonwealth Government, that forced the plant to be located at Red Cliff Point. Why? Because both Governments were concerned about creating employment in Labor members' districts.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Davenport has the floor.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I have placed before the House a case showing that there is a valid reason for establishing a small petro-chemical plant in Adelaide now that it is recognised that the Redcliff project is totally uneconomic and there is no chance, according to the consortium, of proceeding with the plant. There is a case for examining the feasibility of establishing such a plant in the Adelaide metropolitan area. The only reason against its establishment is the bloody-mindedness of the State Government, which decided, against the better judgment of members of the consortium, that the plant had to be established at Red Cliff Point. The Premier on two occasions in this House (and this is borne out by *Hansard*) deliberately created the impression that it was the consortium that wanted the plant established at Red Cliff Point. That is not true. It was the State and Commonwealth Governments, against the better judgment of the consortium, that wanted the plant established at Red Cliff Point.

The first point against the State Government in mis-managing the project was its insistence on the plant being located at Red Cliff Point. The second point against it is that it initially selected Dow Chemical, which had carried out for about 18 months advanced technological work on the project, and then allowed the Commonwealth Government to step in and insist that I.C.I., Alcoa, and Mitsubishi should construct a plant. I have already indicated how I believed that would affect the ultimate result, but one does not really know what effect that would have had. It was a State project; the State Government selected the company, but allowed its Commonwealth colleagues to force it to change consortia. It was this 18-month delay that escalated the cost of the project from an initial \$600 000 000 to \$1 000 000 000. I reiterate (and this is not a reflection on the present members of the consortium) there was a chance that one of the partners might have been able to produce the plant faster than the existing consortium.

The third area where the State Government was negligent was its weak and ineffectual administration of the whole programme and particularly in allowing the Commonwealth

Government to dictate terms about how the project should proceed. I have already outlined the policies laid down by the Commonwealth Government about this project and how the State Government succumbed in relation to all those policies. I could go through, as I have done in the past 48 hours, about 200 newspaper articles and *Hansard* reports that clearly indicate how the State Government had its hands and feet tied by the Commonwealth Government. The State Government, which is here for the benefit of the State and not for the benefit of its Commonwealth colleagues, has meekly bowed to the wishes of Canberra, the result being that South Australia has lost this project and the employment and associated investment opportunities that it would have created.

On August 14, 1974, the Premier said in this House (and I ask the member for Stuart to listen to this) that the future of the Redcliff petro-chemical project now rested with the Commonwealth Government. It is a damnation of our State Government that, on such an important project, the Premier was willing to hand the whole project over to the Commonwealth Government and to entrust its entire future to be in its hands. That action shows a weakness by our State Government and an unwillingness to stand up and fight its Commonwealth colleagues. It damns the recent election campaign slogan of "When Dunstan fights, South Australia wins". He was not willing to fight on this issue.

The final aspect of my motion relates to the tabling of all relevant documents and correspondence relating to the petro-chemical project. If that material were tabled, it would well and truly be shown how ineffectual and weak our State Government had been, and would show the extent to which Mr. Connor (Commonwealth Minister for Minerals and Energy) and the Commonwealth Government have deliberately, at all stages, tried to stop a petro-chemical plant being established in South Australia. I believe that the reason why the Commonwealth Government took such a policy decision is that it wanted to establish a petro-chemical plant on the north-west coast of Western Australia some time in the 1980's. The Commonwealth Government did not want the South Australian plant to proceed because it would have created an embarrassing situation for it, as it would have meant Australia had two petro-chemical plants with a market for only one plant. The Commonwealth Government was hell bent on setting up as many inquiries as possible to take away as many incentives as it could to ensure that the Redcliff petro-chemical complex would not proceed.

Mr. Millhouse: It put up as many barriers as it could.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Yes. It put up barrier after barrier and finally succeeded in ruining the feasibility of the whole project.

Mr. Millhouse: Like the Myer shopping complex at Queenstown.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: At the 1973 State election the Premier promised South Australians that we would have a petro-chemical industry of which we could be proud and which would create employment opportunities. Two and a half years later the State Government, as it has done on so many other issues, completely mismanaged the entire project. That Government has been willing to bow to pressure from the Commonwealth Government and, now, unfortunately, it has lost that project to South Australia. That loss will never be fully accounted for by this State.

I do not think anyone can really appreciate the significance of what has happened as regards State Government

revenue, Commonwealth Government revenue, employment opportunity, and new industrial development created in this State. Therefore, I believe that both the Commonwealth and the State Governments must stand well and truly damned for their mismanagement of the entire project.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy): I should like to say a few things this afternoon in immediate reply. First, one of the unpleasant features of being a member of this Parliament is that occasionally one must put up with the trash (and I use the word advisedly) epitomised by the member for Davenport.

Mr. Millhouse: That's a good beginning!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Almost any case that is put involves distortion, the use of personal abuse, and a refusal to interpret in any straightforward or honest way the questions, propositions, or statements put. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that early in the honourable member's remarks he stated that he was moving this motion particularly because of your position and that he regarded this as a test case for you. However, much of his argument regarding the State Government dealt with that Government's responsibility for losing Redcliff, allegedly because of the location of the plant on Spencer Gulf rather than in Adelaide. Apparently, that is meant to be the point that puts you, Sir, to the test.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: That's right.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member, on behalf of the Opposition, showed that the Opposition opposed decentralisation, because the main point made on the question of location was that location at Redcliff involved extra Government infrastructure, extra Government expenditure in providing the necessary ancillary facilities. We at the State level were willing to contemplate such expenditure and we also wanted support from the Australian Government in that direction, but apparently that expenditure on infrastructure at the Government level to encourage decentralisation and give a stimulus to the Spencer Gulf area is wrong, according to the Opposition, and is condemned by it. This afternoon we had one of the best demonstrations of the attitude of members opposite to industrial decentralisation in this State: they oppose it. Members opposite oppose any action by government, particularly if it costs money, that is designed to assist the development of industry in the country areas of the State. Perhaps those who represent the South-East ought to take some recognition of the kind of attitude that the member for Davenport has put this afternoon, because if that is his attitude about Spencer Gulf he probably will express the same kind of attitude about the South-East of the State and about the willingness of government to spend money on infra-structure to support development there.

The member for Davenport kept referring to the location of a smaller plant in Adelaide. I have not had it shown to me by anyone that a smaller plant would be as economical as would be a larger one. In every case I have seen that has been put regarding the establishment of a petro-chemical industry, the point has been made that the plant must be of a significant size to justify it economically. In other words, there are significant economies of scale, and a smaller plant will involve a higher unit cost of production than will a larger plant.

At no stage did the member for Davenport indicate in any way that he was aware of that economic argument, nor did he try to define what he meant by a smaller plant in Adelaide. How much smaller would it be? What would be the difference in capacity? We were not told those

things. All we were told was that there would be as much chance of environmental damage if the plant was located in the Botanic Garden, next to the Royal Adelaide Hospital, as if it was located on Spencer Gulf.

Has the honourable member heard of Brixton? Does that name ring a bell with him? Does he remember the explosion at the works there? Does he remember that the explosion occurred on a Saturday afternoon, which was very fortunate, because the entire population of the office block would have been killed if the explosion had occurred not on a Saturday afternoon but during normal working hours? I.C.I. claims that the reasons for that explosion are understood and that account can be taken of them, and the necessary action could be taken to safeguard the community from any kind of repetition of that incident, but there is always some level of danger in a petro-chemical complex.

Dr. Tonkin: Or in an oil refinery.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Yes. There is always the heed for some degree of isolation of such a complex from any centre of population, and I hope that the member for Davenport will not repeat the kind of stupid statement that he has made this afternoon. That honourable member apparently thinks that the Port Stanvac refinery is not near people. It is near people, and the pollution from light that occurs when a petro-chemical plant flares is of significant magnitude.

Mr. Dean Brown: Have you seen one?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: No, I have not, but the Premier has and he has reported on what he and the member for Davenport have seen. The member for Davenport would not live near such a project. We could be quite sure of that. He would not put up with living near a petro-chemical plant and with the pollution from light that occurred at such a plant, nor would he ask any of his electors to do that in any circumstances.

It seems to me that it is a reasonable proposition for any community, particularly if the major part of the initial cost is to be borne by government, to locate a plant such as this in such a way that any noise, light pollution or possible environmental damage is minimised, and, if that location involves a programme of decentralisation, the community, if it is committed to decentralisation, also must be willing to commit itself to some of the additional expense involved in a decentralisation programme.

Do the honourable member and other Opposition members want to suggest that in Whyalla there are no costs to the South Australian community? What percentage of the State's funds has gone towards providing housing, schools and hospitals in Whyalla? Should we not have done that? Should the State not have provided that infra-structure? If there is to be industrial development by Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited at Whyalla and the State is willing to foot the bill regarding infra-structure, why should we not do the same kind of thing in regard to Redcliff? What responsibilities have we for the people of Adelaide that we do not have for the people of Port Pirie and Port Augusta?

I come now to the next point. Mr. Bridgland and the other members of the consortium came to my office. The meeting commenced at 10.30 a.m. and it was about 3 p.m. before I finished the discussion and consideration with members of the consortium. During luncheon we discussed one or two other matters. The two main points made by Mr. Bridgland, that caused the deferment by I.C.I. and its withdrawal at that stage from the project, were

inflation in building costs, and therefore in the amount that it would have to invest in the project, relative to any expansion that it estimated was likely in the price of the products the plant would be selling.

This is always a relative matter, as I am sure the honourable member for Davenport would appreciate. It may well be that, if the price of the product is expected to go up by more than the price of building the plant, inflation will actually expand the expected profit and not the other way around. In this case, because of the relative rates of inflation in Australia compared to those overseas, the accepted rate of inflation in the building of the plant would exceed any compensating effect on the price of the product to be sold. That was the first point.

The second point was the supply of feedstock. It is true to say that I.C.I. was less willing to take a punt on the future supply of feedstock than was Dow Chemical Company. They were the two points given, and I asked Mr. Bridgland and the other members of the consortium, "Would your decision be any different if the plant were to be located in Adelaide, at Dry Creek, or about five or six kilometres north of Port Adelaide?" and the reply was "No." For a smaller size, the cost of production a unit would be higher. Whatever the size, if it were uneconomical to construct a full-scale petro-chemical plant, it would be even more uneconomical to construct a smaller-scale plant. That was the reply given by Mr. Bridgland and representatives of the consortium. If the plant was to be a goer, they would have preferred the cheapest site, but our responsibility as the Government is to all of the State. Apart from that question, Mr. Bridgland indicated that the consortium would still have withdrawn, even if the site of the plant were altered. That means that the first allegation that has been made against the State Government is completely without foundation.

My final point is that the Premier has been accused of meekly bowing to the Australian Government and of refusing in any way to fight. That is simply not the case. Many times, even in this House, the Premier has expressed himself quite forcibly on this matter. I can recall when the initial argument arose over the 51 per cent Australian equity, and we could not get any reply from Mr. Connor about what Australian equity was adequate other than the answer, "As much as you can get." He would not give a figure, and the Premier expressed himself forcibly on that matter. Several times the Premier and the then Minister of Development and Mines fought vigorously in their dealings with the Australian Government over this matter.

The member for Davenport's remarks involved a deliberate misinterpretation of a quotation that he took from the Premier. It was obvious that the Premier was saying, "We have pushed for a decision but, until we get a decision, we can move no further." The member for Davenport has interpreted that statement as the Premier's saying he was meekly bowing to the Australian Government. I throw it directly back into the teeth of the honourable member, and say it is an outright lie by him. I believe that some matters the honourable member has raised about the Australian Government deserve further investigation by me, and I therefore ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Electoral Act, 1929-1973. Read a first time.

Mr. COUMBE: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This short Bill seeks to overcome an anomaly that exists in the Electoral Act. This position was no doubt caused by an oversight in preparing the extensive amendments to the Act in 1973. Following those amendments, a common roll was adopted for elections for the Legislative Council and the House of Assembly. Unfortunately, in the rush of legislation following a conference between both Houses, no alterations were made to section 110a of the principal Act to allow it to apply to Legislative Council elections.

Section 110a provides that, where an elector believes his name should be on the roll for House of Assembly elections and discovers that this is not the case, he may approach the Returning Officer to have his vote recorded in the prescribed manner. Unfortunately, this facility does not apply to electors who wish to vote for the Legislative Council. Obviously, as a common roll is now used, this right should be available to all voters. Many complaints were received at the recent election, and confusion obtained, when electors for the Legislative Council found at the polling booths that their names had been removed from the electoral roll for a variety of reasons, and they could not claim a section vote.

This Bill seeks to rectify this position. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 110a of the principal Act by deleting all references to Assembly districts and subdivisions and refers to the elector's present place of living. I commend the Bill to members.

Mr. DUNCAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (MINISTERS)

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Constitution Act, 1934, as amended. Read a first time.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

In moving the second reading of the Bill, I appreciate the co-operation of all the other Parties, namely, the Liberal Party, the Labor Party, and the Country Party, in allowing the Bill to be considered today and, hopefully, passed through this Chamber. It is, of course, the same Bill as the one which I introduced in the last session of the last Parliament and which was unanimously supported by the then members of this place. It was then quite unceremoniously rejected at the second reading stage by a majority of members in another place. The significance of mentioning that is that, if that procedure is repeated on this occasion, it will allow the use of section 41 of the Constitution regarding deadlocks between the Houses. I do not think that that will happen this time but, if it did, the deadlock provisions could be used.

The sole object of the Bill is to provide that, in future, Ministers need not come from the Legislative Council. Ministers may be members of the Legislative Council, but there will not be the requirement which, in effect, there is now that some Ministers must be members of another place. The Liberal Movement believes that the other place should be a House of Review, and for it to be a true House of Review there is no need for Ministers to be members of it. Indeed, in pure theory it is rather more desirable than otherwise that there should be no Ministers in the other House, because the practice is for a Bill to be introduced in the House in which the Minister responsible for it sits. Now, it is impossible for the Legislative Council to act as a House of Review if a Bill originates in that Chamber. So, it is in pure theory desirable that all Bills should originate in the

House of Assembly. The Bill simply amends section 65 (1) of the Constitution which provides:

The number of Ministers of the Crown shall not exceed 11.

I do not intend to touch that. Subsection (2) provides:

The Ministers of the Crown shall respectively bear such titles and fill such Ministerial offices as the Governor from time to time appoints . . .

I do not propose to do anything about that. However, the next part is what I want to delete, and it states:

. . . and not more than eight of the Ministers shall at one time be members of the House of Assembly.

Another amendment was added in 1965 regarding the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Lands (a trifling amendment, I have always believed), and I will not read that. The part I want to delete is the passage I read a moment ago. As honourable members will see if they read that section, at present constitutionally all members in the South Australian Government could come from the Legislative Council but, in no circumstances, can more than eight Ministers ever come from the House of Assembly. Of course, we could have any balance between that number, so long as the total number from another place did not fall below three. The other alternative would be to have a Ministry of only eight, all of whom could then come from the House of Assembly. That is an utterly absurd situation, and one that has been insisted on by another place for a long time. The object of the Bill, by amending section 65 (2), is to leave the position completely open so that as many Ministers as are considered appropriate at any time may come from either one House or the other. The Bill was, as I have already said, unanimously supported by members in this place on the last occasion it was before us. I have given that short explanation only to let new members know what the Bill is about. I look forward again to unanimous support for the measure and for its speedy passage.

The SPEAKER: As the honourable member has indicated that he wishes the Bill to proceed today, it will be necessary that he move for the suspension of Standing Orders.

Mr. MILLHOUSE moved:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the Bill to pass through its remaining stages without delay.

The SPEAKER: I have counted the House and, there being present an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House, I accept the motion. Is the motion seconded?

Mr. BOUNDY: Yes, Sir.

The SPEAKER: For the question say "Aye"; against "No". I hear no dissentient voice and, there being present an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House, the motion for suspension is agreed to.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I support the Bill.

The SPEAKER: The question is "That the Bill be now read a second time". For the question say "Aye"; against "No". The Ayes have it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker; this is a constitutional Bill.

The SPEAKER: The point is taken. Ring the bells.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I rise on that point of order also, and point out to you, Mr. Speaker, that section 8 of the Constitution, which refers to Constitution Bills, refers only to the constitution of the Houses; it does not refer to the constitution of the Executive. This section, as

in the sections of the Constitution Act, refers to the Executive and not to the constitution of the two Houses and, therefore, in my submission it does not require a constitutional majority.

The SPEAKER: I point out to the honourable Premier and other honourable members that we are adopting the same procedure as was followed the last time this Bill was presented to the House. As the Bill amends the Constitution Act and provides for an amendment to the constitution of the Parliament, its second reading requires that it be carried by an absolute majority. In accordance with Standing Order 298, ring the bells.

The bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: In accordance with Standing Order 298, I now count the House. I have counted the House and, there being present an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House, I put the question. "That this Bill be now read a second time". For the question say "Aye"; against "No". As I hear no dissentient voice, and as there is present an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House, the motion is agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

The SPEAKER: I declare the second reading of the Bill to have been carried by an absolute majority, and the Bill may now be further proceeded with.

Bill taken through Committee without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham) moved:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

The SPEAKER: As this is a Bill which amends the Constitution Act and provides for an alteration of the constitution of the Parliament, its third reading requires to be carried by an absolute majority. In accordance with Standing Order 298, I order that the bells be rung.

The bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: In accordance with Standing Order 298, I now count the House. There being present an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House, I put the question "That this Bill be now read a third time". For the question say "Aye", against say "No". As I hear no dissentient voice and there being present an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House, the motion is agreed to.

Bill read a third time.

The SPEAKER: I declare the Bill to have been passed with the requisite absolute majority.

INDUSTRIAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 20. Page 375.)

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): Last Wednesday, I had just started my explanation of the Bill relating to an amendment to the Industrial Code in relation to shopping hours. I had said the present situation at the east end of Rundle Street shows the anomalies, absurdities and injustices of the present early closing provisions in the Industrial Code. I will now illustrate what I have in mind by quoting from a pamphlet which was put out by a group called the "Down Town Traders" (spearheaded I think by Mr. Gordon Rose), and part of which is as follows:

Do you realise (hat certain shops can open but cannot sell their goods (for example Decade Handcrafts at 242A Rundle Street), while others cannot open, but can sell their goods (for example A. J's. Leathering, 254 Rundle

Street)? Fishing tackle and bait can be sold after 5.30 p.m., but a fishing tackle shop cannot open after that time. Do you realise that of the 25-odd shops that opened last Friday only six were not permitted to by law? The majority are entitled to open without the restriction of the Early Closing Act.

The same group of traders put an advertisement in the *Advertiser* on August 8, part of which is as follows:

The fight being conducted by the Down Town Rundle Traders is on a moral issue. They simply want the moral right to free trade in a free enterprise society.

The present system having failed, I can see no alternative to allowing traders to make up their own minds when they open and when they close. It is also in accord with my political philosophy of liberalism that people should be allowed the greatest degree of personal freedom and, therefore, responsibility. They should be allowed to decide for themselves such matters as trading hours, and not be told what to do by being trapped in a system which is as artificial as it is absurd.

I am confirmed in that by the reply to my Question on Notice last week. The Minister of Labour and Industry (who no doubt will be opposing this Bill from what he said) concluded his considered reply to my question about the prosecution of certain of the Rundle Street traders as follows:

The Government stands firm on its policy of equal trading opportunity for shops—

I do not know quite what that means but it sounds all right if it is not analysed—

and thus will not tolerate small groups of shopkeepers attempting to gain a trading advantage over other shopkeepers.

That was his answer to my Question on Notice. It was certainly not as strong as the answer he gave to my question without notice asked earlier in which he committed absolutely his Party and Government to opposition to this measure by, first, welcoming the question, and then saying, in the course of a long answer, that the people concerned (and I had asked him about these Rundle Street traders) had made no attempt to speak either to him or the Premier. That might have been a point well taken, but he ruined it by going on to say:

I am not suggesting they would have got much sympathy, anyway.

He ended his reply by saying:

Regarding the final question about trading hours, the Government does not intend to do anything about extending trading hours now or in the future.

The language of finality should not be the language of politics (I think that is an adaptation of something Disraeli said). I have often heard it put in another way, that the word "never" should not be used by a politician. I suggest that the Minister was foolish to commit himself so definitely (and thereby the Government) to no change either now or in the future. That shows the Government's attitude, but I point out to members that others in the community do not share a conviction that the present legislation is good. Mr. Beerworth, S.M., who was appointed by this Government as the industrial magistrate, when he was dealing with these cases, is reported as saying in the *Advertiser*, under the heading "S.M. calls for early closing change":

The whole issue of early closing was screaming for a sensible approach and change, Mr. W. C. Beerworth, S.M., said yesterday.

The report continues:

Mr. Beerworth said he would have to agree with the views by their counsel, Mr. I. W. Kilgariff, who said the charges should be regarded as "trivial". "I am inclined to agree with Mr. Kilgariff and I cannot for the life of me understand the Act," Mr. Beerworth said. "I don't know.

These art shops—arts and crafts shops—what is the difference between an antique frock and buying a studded belt which could be qualified as an offensive weapon in certain circumstances?”

Mr. Max Brown: Coles and Woolworths understand it fairly well.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is right; as the circular states, one can buy fishing tackle but a fishing tackle shop cannot open. The report continues:

“If Foodland opens you can buy certain types of cooking things, but you cannot buy spices to put with it. In other words, you can buy water, but you cannot get a cup for the water and in these things. The whole thing is screaming for some sensible approach and change but we have got to accept the law as it is.”

Of course, he did have to accept that law as it was, and he imposed what he regarded as appropriate penalties. I admit that I have changed my view on this particular matter over the years. Until these recent events, I had been looking for some compromise which would allow for probably longer and more flexible hours for shopping, but still with some control. When I was Minister of Labour and Industry that was a line I pursued, but without any success. Then we had the referendum in 1970. The question, which I think we all now agree was quite idiotically phrased, was debated for some time in this House. The way it was phrased, and it was for the metropolitan area only, was as follows:

Are you in favour of shops in the metropolitan planning area and the municipality of Gawler being permitted to remain open for trading until 9 p.m. on Fridays?

I must say that I voted “Yes” to that, for what it was worth. The result, overall, was a small majority against, but the result was also extraordinarily uneven. In some areas (and members opposite particularly will not forget this), there was a strong vote indeed for late night shopping. In others, there was a strong vote against it. I believe that not only have I changed in my view, but there has been a considerable change in opinion in the community since then. I am not the only one to feel no longer bound by the results of the referendum. I remind the Minister and other honourable members that the Government, despite the referendum, made several attempts up to 1972 to change the law, but two Bills, I think, failed to pass both Houses of this Parliament. On Channel 9 in March, 1972, the Premier said (and I have a transcript of his speech):

And it became apparent, as it is still apparent, that there is a very real demand for Friday night shopping. Then, towards the end of it, when he was putting the Government's case for a change he said:

The Government believes that Friday night shopping is something that a great many people want, particularly people with families in which both husband and wife work. That is the Premier's view, or it was in 1972. His Minister of Labour and Industry, in reply to a question without notice, totally committed him and his Government against any change whatever now and in the future. I have quoted what the Premier said publicly only a few years ago.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: It's not all he said.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, it is not all he said, but that sums up the theme he was putting to people at that time. He tried hard to get Bills through this House. I believe there has been, in any case, a considerable change of opinion on this and other matters regarding times of working since 1970, and particularly since 1972. Let me remind members of one change we have had: the introduction into the Public Service, by this Government, of flexitime. If flexitime is to be encouraged in the Public Service, and also in private industry (as we have heard

from members of the Government), why not in trading hours as well? Why should that be an area where flexitime simply cannot be tolerated? The answer to that question is a very difficult one for members of the Labor Party. I leave them to give it, if they can.

I will sum up what I have to say on this point by saying that people are now far more prepared for freedom of trading hours than they were a few years ago, and if that means competition in business then why not have competition in business? It is something that I certainly want to see. The philosophical part of this argument, was well summed up a couple of weeks ago by Max Harris in his *Sunday Mail* article. I will say I approve of all he said. I do not ever enjoy being compared to the Premier, and that is what he did (favourably to me, of course).

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Because you come out badly.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I did not come out badly in this article. Perhaps I had better read it in view of what the Minister has said.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: I've read it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: He referred to the stubborn wowsership of the establishment in power. The article states:

Yet here we have Robin Millhouse doing a progressive young Dunstan act with his private member's Optional Trading Bill. And we have the Premier reacting exactly after the fashion of Sir Thomas Playford. The Premier is doing a Sir Thomas, mumbling about “waiting for a consensus” and generally side-stepping the issue with a demonstration of not very fancy footwork.

I think the Minister of Labour and Industry is more responsible for that jibe than the Premier himself. The next bit is right, as follows:

Yet optional trading will and must come, just as 10 o'clock closing and licensed restaurants had to come back in the bad old days.

He gives two reasons for that:

Optional trading is in accordance with the liberated ideals Dunstan has had for the State since the year dot. The article then states:

The second reason is that optional trading has to do with civil liberties. The individual has the right in a democracy to freedom of speech, religion and work. This right should not be the gift of the Dunstan or any other Government. If Joe Blow can work out an arrangement with his union employees that satisfies both groups of individuals, then it's nothing to do with the Government or its gigantic army of bureaucrats. The individual, employer or unionist, should be able to do his own working thing.

Then he asked the following question (and I invite honourable members opposite to say whether the answer he gives to his question is right or wrong):

Then what is the powerful factor that forces the Premier against his known libertarian nature to do a Playford in relation to the Millhouse Bill? It is, alas, a case of the union tail wagging the Dunstan dog.

I invite honourable members opposite to deny or confirm that. What has been the experience in other States on this matter? I had some inquiries made by my Parliamentary Secretary about this. In Victoria, a change in the law was made a few years ago, and now there is, in principle, freedom to trade between Monday morning and lunchtime on Saturday. There is a prohibition on Saturday afternoon, except for used car premises, which can trade until 6 o'clock and on Sunday. Would any of the dire consequences that have been suggested by the unions and the Government occur here if we were to introduce such measures? Certainly I have not heard of any, and I do not know of any. In Tasmania there is, likewise, substantial freedom of trading hours; people fix their own hours for trading.

Mr. Venning: What about Venice?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know about Venice; it is a long time since I have been there. In New South Wales there is one night of late shopping a week: Thursday night in Sydney and Friday night in other parts of the State. Have there been any of the dire consequences—this enormous increase in cost—that we are told will occur? Of course, there have not been. We have only to look, as I have, at the way in which the Consumer Price Indices for the various capital cities have changed in the last few years to see that there have been no discernable changes in Melbourne or Sydney because they have less restrictive trading hours (in Melbourne, virtually unrestricted trading). That is an absurd argument to use, yet it is one that is widely used.

I turn now to the opposition that has been expressed to this Bill. As one might expect, Mr. Edward Goldsworthy, Secretary of the Shop, Distributive and Allied Employees' Association, has written a letter about it. I know Mr. Goldsworthy has other troubles of his own with his Commonwealth body.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: What's that got to do with this Bill?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Absolutely nothing. I am sorry if I have hurt the feelings of the Minister. Mr. Goldsworthy has authorised a circular letter, which is headed "Factors against extended shopping hours", and which states:

The principal arguments against extension of trading hours include the increased cost factors which will necessarily mean higher prices for consumer goods, a dislocation of working hours for employees in the industry and longer working hours for management. Additionally, other service industries, e.g., public transport would be adversely affected. The adverse effect would be that the traders would have a few more customers. Mr. Goldsworthy continues:

The pressures placed on marriages and children by mothers having to work extended hours in order to obtain a reasonable living would, in many cases, lead to grave family problems and cause a resultant breakdown of the basic family unit.

He ignores altogether the opportunity that families would have to shop together, which is an advantage. The circular continues:

Public transport would have to be replanned to accommodate the changed travelling pattern of the general public. This would involve the State Government in additional expense for both bus and rail transport. At the present time there is no public transport to some outer metropolitan areas after 6 p.m. which means that such transport would have to be provided or those employees who live in those areas would be forced to relinquish their present employment.

That would be a plus, not a minus. Mr. Goldsworthy concludes (and this is typical of the conservatism of so many in the trade union movement) by talking about smaller shopkeepers, but what interest he has in them I have yet to ascertain. He concludes by saying:

The investigations of Parliamentary committees about the turn of the century amply illustrate this point.

Mr. Goldsworthy, to bolster his case, goes back to investigations of Parliamentary committees about the turn of the century. So much for Mr. Goldsworthy. I understand that retail traders have issued a statement against longer trading hours and have referred to the increased costs that would be involved. The traders didn't approach me, perhaps because they believe the situation is hopeless. I have received two letters of protest about this aspect of longer trading hours; the first is from the manager of a shoe store in Rundle Street who informs me that I have completely misunderstood the problem, and the second letter is from a Bellevue Heights resident who works in a

used car business and who believes that his family life would be disrupted if longer trading hours were introduced. Conversely, I received a message from someone who pointed out that extended trading hours on Sunday would be of advantage to Seventh Day Adventists and the Jewish community.

The most significant aspect of this matter arose last Thursday when I appeared on the channel 2 television programme, *Today at One*. When I got there I found there would be a telephone poll after I had been interviewed on this subject. I ascertained that by 2.10 p.m. the channel had received about 40 telephone calls representing about 50 people, because some calls were apparently from couples. Without exception, the calls were all in favour of extended trading hours and there was not a call—

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Some of your supporters, no doubt.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I did not know telephone calls were to be encouraged.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Ha, ha!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the Minister is foolish enough to take refuge in that assumption, he is more foolish than I thought he was. Telephone callers were unanimously in favour of extending trading hours.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: There's never been a unanimous poll.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister can make what he likes of the situation; I am simply telling him what has happened. All the Bill really does is delete from the Industrial Code provisions which used to be in the Early Closing Act and which were inserted in the Industrial Code in 1970 to control the hours of trading for shopkeepers. I need not explain in any more detail than that. The Bill is short, to the point and embodies a principle.

In conclusion, I emphasise that the Bill does not necessarily mean a change in trading hours. Shopkeepers will have a discretion whether they continue to trade at their present hours of business or whether they wish to vary them. I venture to say trading hours will be changed only if a trader believes that his customers want hours other than those now operating. Mr. Chick Hanson (who I understand was a liberal candidate at the recent election) in a letter in this morning's paper states:

I suggest that the start of trading hours for big stores and small businesses be changed to mid-day, with 9 p.m. closing.

That is fair enough. If that is what people want, why not let them do it? If shopkeepers want to do it, let them do it, because I would not fetter them in any way. I am willing to try out this matter as an issue if a by-election is held in the Districts of Playford. Ross Smith, or anywhere else.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: You want to be careful we don't take you on in Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If there were a by-election in Mitcham, I would not be a candidate.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: You look out we don't switch the preferences there.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That would not worry me two hoots, because a Labor Party candidate's preferences do not count.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: They might next time.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is up to the Government whether it wants the Liberals to get ahead of it. I am happy to take on the Minister and the Government on this issue

in any by-election that might be held, and I have referred to two likely seats where it could happen. If the Minister wants to take up this challenge, let him do so. I believe trading hours should be a matter of discretion for commerce and industry and should not any longer be controlled as they now are in so absurd and artificial a way by legislation that I should like to see repealed.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT secured the adjournment of the debate.

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, 1935-1974, and the Police Offences Act, 1953-1974. Read a first time.

Mr. DUNCAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

In substance, it is similar to the Bill that I introduced in 1973 to provide for amendments to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act and the Police Offences Act. The comments that I want to make in my second reading explanation are, in substance, the same as the comments that I made on that occasion. I see no reason to change my comments, because the situation that applies now is effectively the same as that which applied in 1973. I will refer in my opening remarks to the only matters on which my comments are different from those in my earlier second reading explanation.

The matter of law reform in the way in which the criminal law deals with homosexuals has been subject to further and continuing discussion in the community at large, and I want to place on record my opposition to some suggestions that have been made recently, because I think it important that members realise the very strong views that I have on this subject. The first thing to which I want to refer is the question of homosexuals who are living together adopting children. I find that quite abhorrent, and I oppose it strongly. I believe that every other member would do likewise. Further, suggestions have been made that homosexuals should go into schools to discuss their attitudes, and I do not support that in any way.

This Bill 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 greater prominence, at the expense of other provisions in the Bill.

Members opposite will be quite familiar with the history of the Bill that was introduced previously. It was passed without a dissenting voice in this Chamber and went to the

other place. It was considered there and, on the first occasion on which it was voted on, one member failed to vote and the Bill was defeated.

Mr. Millhouse: It was a member of your Party, I think.

Mr. DUNCAN: A member of our Party did not vote and, as a result, the Bill was defeated. On the second occasion new provisions in the Constitution had come into existence and, although the vote on the floor of the Chamber resulted in there being a majority of one for the Bill, the President of the Legislative Council exercised his deliberative vote and voted against the Bill. That tied the vote in the Upper House and, accordingly, the Bill was negatived. I have a lengthy second reading explanation, and I do not want to delay the House by reading all of it. At this stage, I seek leave to have the remainder of the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

REMAINDER OF EXPLANATION OF BILL

As I have said, the measure provides a code of sexual behaviour that rationalises 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 in 1972, resulting from a Bill introduced in another place by the Hon. Murray Hill. Following that legislation, the legal position in respect of homosexual acts is 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 only three years since the murder of Dr. George Duncan and the inquest which established that his death resulted from victimisation 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 this matter was last before the Parliament both daily newspapers in South Australia indicated support for the measure. The *Advertiser* has again indicated strong support. Although the general awareness has increased and 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 an 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 or sexual orientation 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 the purpose of male prostitution would constitute a brothel, attracting the same penalties as would premises now used for practices involving females.

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.

Summarising, the Hon. Mr. Hill's liberalising 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 recognise 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.

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 homosexual 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 heterosexual 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, I ask how would married men respond to a law enforcing celibacy upon us. Would we be deterred? I doubt it. Since homosexuals have similar compulsions but 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 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 homosexual 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 schoolmistresses 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.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) moved:

That this debate be now adjourned.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (9)—Messrs. Allen, Dean Brown, Chapman, Goldsworthy (teller), Gunn, Rodda, Russack, Vandepier, and Wardle.

Noes (36)—Messrs. Abbott, Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Coumbe, Duncan (teller), Dunstan, Eastick, Evans, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Kenally, Langley, Mathwin, McRae, Millhouse, Nankivell, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Tonkin, Venning, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, Wotton, and Wright.

Majority of 27 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I take it that we are in the second reading debate?

The SPEAKER: That is so.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I oppose the Bill on several grounds, the first of which is that today was the first

indication I had that it was intended to pass this Bill this afternoon. I understand that the mover of the Bill may have had a conversation with the Leader of the Opposition some time yesterday, and that it was agreed that the Bill would be put to the Opposition today and discussed. Today was the first indication I had, however, that the member for Elizabeth intended to put the Bill to the House today. That would be the first reason for my not supporting the Bill. The member for Elizabeth then moved to have the second reading explanation incorporated in *Hansard* without his reading it. We are told that it is the same as the previous Bill; today was the first indication I had of that.

We have many new members in the House, and this is an unreasonable course of action. I suggest that the member for Elizabeth is trying to jump on what he sees as a topical issue. That is the only reason I can see for his trying to shove this Bill through the House against normal procedure. There are new members in the House who may have had a copy of the second reading explanation given to them some time today, but even that is in doubt. They are being expected to come to terms with this Bill, make up their minds about it, and cast a sensible, considered vote on it today. It is unreasonable for the member for Elizabeth to seek for his Bill a privilege that is not, to my knowledge, accorded to any other measure of this significance.

I thought, when I got hold of the Bill for the first time today, that it may have been possible to amend it. However, after a hurried consultation with the Parliamentary Counsel and others, I found that there was no time, anyway, to discuss any amendment with those who may have cared to support it. Therefore, time prevented me from doing this. Obviously, a Bill cannot be amended until members see its clauses and are satisfied that a suitable amendment can be moved. As we did not have the Bill, this course of action was not possible. It is clear that the community is divided in its views on this Bill. Acting as spokesman for most of the people in my district, I know that, if I was to gauge the feelings of my constituents regarding this Bill, those feelings would be another reason for impelling me to vote against it. As a result of speaking to many people in South Australia, I know that there is much opposition to this Bill.

I must point out that I am speaking with notes that I have prepared in about the last half hour. Representing the Leader of the Opposition, I had the opportunity of attending, in an official capacity, a church service last Sunday evening. It was not a church of my own denomination, but it was quite clear to me that the overwhelming feeling in that community was one of opposition to this Bill. The correspondence that has come to me from various church denominations, to take one section of the community, indicates a great division of opinion on the measure.

I intend to vote against the Bill. The arguments put forward previously, which have not been advanced at all today, are not sufficiently compelling for me to support the passage of the Bill, and I have already enunciated other reasons in relation to the time scale in which the member for Elizabeth wishes the Bill to be put through the House which also compel me to oppose its passage, even if I could be convinced of its merit. I had considered having amendments drafted to the Bill, but that has not been possible. For those reasons I am not willing to support the passage of this Bill through the House.

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): I recall quite clearly the last occasion on which the member for Elizabeth

brought before this House his proposal to amend the Criminal Law Consolidation Act to allow persons to involve themselves in homosexual practices in private places. I am aware that this proposal encompassed people who consented to such activities, and that it clicked off at that point. His Bill was not designed to allow free and total homosexual practice throughout the community, and I appreciate the limits imposed. I opposed the Bill previously before the House. I have not had an opportunity to see the second reading explanation referred to by the previous speaker, and I believe that few members on this side, if any, have seen it. However, if we accept that the second reading explanation of the member for Elizabeth is exactly in accordance with that produced previously, then so is my attitude to it exactly as applied previously.

To my knowledge, no evidence has been brought forward to sustain my having any other view; in fact, the evidence I have collected in the meantime merely further reinforces my attitude on this subject. I shall refer, first, to the evidence fed to me from the community, and on such social issues I believe it is only fair and reasonable that we set out to collect evidence of the attitude of the district each of us represents and to reflect that attitude on such subjects in this place, if possible. I can only confirm that that attitude has been consolidated within the community, an attitude opposing the free practice of consenting or any other persons in such activities.

I turn now to the definition of "homosexuality", which was brought to the attention of the Royal Commission set up in Western Australia. The text reference brought to the attention of the Royal Commission was one on sex education entitled *Towards a Healthy Sexuality*. It was written from the viewpoint of secular humanism, and therefore any suggestion that Christian values are implicit does not arise. I shall quote a few of the paragraphs in an attempt to convey to the House the definitions that were incorporated in that text, as follows:

In homosexual behaviour, the individual has sexual relations with or emotional attachment to a partner of the same sex. Overt homosexual behaviour includes:

1. Mutual masturbation by two individuals of the same sex;
2. Sodomy, which is used to describe anal intercourse between two males. Pederasty is another term for anal intercourse with minors.

This reference is most disturbing. It disturbs me that, when researching the subject of homosexual practices, witnesses should bring forward such references, bringing to our attention that minors can (not necessarily shall) fall into this category of homosexual practice. The reference continues to deal with the third point, as follows:

3. Cunnilingus—

a term I had never previously heard of, but it is described here in defining homosexual practices, and it is the "oral stimulation of the female genitals by another female". I shall not proceed further with the reference, but that is the tenor of the evidence brought forward in trying to define homosexual practices. It goes on to make detailed reference to the practices that take place between homosexual females and homosexual males. Without further reference, I can assure the House that the whole explanation in this part of the evidence is in itself disturbing. It merely adds to the disturbance I experience when this subject is raised or when any suggestion is made that such practices will become established in our social community.

I shall not go over the ground I covered during the previous debate in this House. We can take it that, as the second reading explanation is similar to that presented on the previous occasion, then my attitude remains generally

the same. I wish to make quite clear that neither on behalf of the community nor on my own behalf am I prepared to support, condone, or in any way promote homosexual practices within the community at large, in private or in any other places, where there is any suggestion of a possibility that such practices may extend beyond that point.

My concern is especially for the minors in our community. I think adults should be sufficiently responsible to look after themselves, but I do not think that in any circumstances we should enter into a situation where there is the slightest risk of minors being subjected to (or even at risk of being subjected to) approaches from persons who, in my personal opinion, are quite warped. I could make reference to the sickness as described by previous speakers in this House and in other places. If it is a sickness I say we should treat these people, assist them, and lift them up in society as much as possible, but the legalisation of the practice in my view in no way makes it right.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I must say from the outset that I oppose the Bill introduced by the member for Elizabeth, and I realise that this matter attracts considerable discussion in the community. On the last occasion this matter was before us, other members and I received much correspondence with regard to the proposals of the member for Elizabeth. After considering those proposals, I was reinforced in my opinion that we should do nothing that would allow homosexuals to practise in any way at all. On this occasion, I have received a letter from Reverend S. J. Harris, soliciting support for the proposal now before us. I cannot accept that proposition, but I endorse the attitude expressed in the submissions which have been made to all members and which were prepared by the Community Standards Association with the Festival of Light. I entirely endorse the comments made by Dr. Court and his colleague, and I think it only appropriate that some of the matters contained in the submissions be placed before the House. I do not believe that people should support or oppose a measure of this kind without giving it the most careful consideration.

I have discussed this matter at great length with some of my constituents and in other parts of the State, and most of these people oppose the measure. I do not hold any personal animosity toward the member for Elizabeth for adopting the course of action he has adopted, even though I believe that it is undesirable and not in the best interests of the community at large to have introduced this measure. I will quote from the paragraph headed "Implications of Further Reform", and I think that these matters should be considered by us and by the community before the Bill is passed. I think it is unwise and not in the best interests of the community that this measure should be rushed through the House, because a matter of this nature ought to be properly considered by the public at large, even though a similar Bill was debated in the House previously. We now have new members; there are new members in another place; and, as homosexuality is a highly emotional issue, the Bill should not be rushed through the Parliament. This is what the organisation states, and I entirely agree with it.

It would be anti-compassionate to those many homosexuals who are genuinely distressed.

I agree with that comment. The report continues:

It would be anti-family as the activists recognise very well. It would be anti-social in terms of public health, as the evidence of venereal disease shows. It would be reactionary, taking us back to pre-Christian days, when immorality was a characteristic of pagan societies.

I also agree with those comments. I will now quote from the result of a survey that was referred to in the report from which I have quoted and which was compiled, I gather, by Mr. Wilson, in 1971, as follows:

22 per cent thought homosexual practices should be legal; 63 per cent thought homosexual practices should not be legal—

a large majority against the course of action the member for Elizabeth has taken. The results of the survey concluded:

12 per cent were unsure; 3 per cent no answer.

That is clear evidence that this matter should not be proceeded with. I believe that, if a poll were taken today, a similar reaction would be shown by the public at large. I believe that the member for Elizabeth has jumped on the emotional band wagon without properly considering the measure or the long-term effects that will flow from an amendment to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act if it is carried into law. I therefore oppose the measure, and will call for a division if necessary.

Mr. WARDLE (Murray): In opposing the measure, I will outline my reasons why. I, too, object to the measure being proceeded with today. All we knew from the Notice Paper was that the member for Elizabeth would introduce a Bill to amend the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, and I think that the least he could have done would be to canvass members and say, "I am going to introduce the Bill. It will be exactly the same as the measure I have moved before. I intend in my second reading explanation to say the same as I said previously when introducing it", so that at least Opposition members would have known this Bill would be identical to the previous measure. Even if the honourable member had taken extracts from his second reading explanation and distributed them to members, particularly Opposition members, it would have indicated that fact to us.

I believe that members are not well prepared, because they do not have the necessary material before them and, now having realised that this Bill is identical to the one introduced previously, they have not had time to research the second reading explanation made previously. However, seeing that explanation would not have changed my view. This is a vital issue. The issue is far more important than the emphasis given to it today. What I cannot understand is the haste today. Why should the Bill have to be introduced today and be passed this afternoon? About 50 minutes remain for private members' business this afternoon and, as far as I know, the member, in explaining the Bill, did not say why it was so imperative that it should be passed through the House today. If it has taken all this time to introduce the Bill today, surely another fortnight after the show recess will not hurt. We have been given no reason why the Bill must be passed today. Is the Bill to coincide or be caught up with other legislation, or is there some reason why it must go to another place today or tomorrow?

I do not think that any of those reasons are valid. We have not been told why the Bill must be passed through the House today. The whole proposal is a negative affair. If there is difficulty or trouble, or if there are real problems among homosexuals (I have sympathy for those who have a genuine problem in this regard), why does the Bill not take constructive measures for rehabilitation, treatment and selection, and why is the whole remedy not directed towards something far more positive than anything I can find in the Bill (or what I presume is in the Bill, because I have not read it)? Time has not permitted me to read the Bill; it has just come to us, having been

placed on our desks about a quarter of an hour or 20 minutes ago. The whole proposal is negative. If there has been one issue in my district in the last eight years on which many of my constituents have expressed a strong opinion (including the presentation of several petitions), it is this issue.

The member for Eyre referred to statistics showing the community attitude on this matter, although I am not sure where the statistics were collected. Apparently a Gallup poll or some other poll was conducted somewhere in the world on this issue, the result being that about 60 per cent of the people questioned were not in favour of any change. I am satisfied that, in any poll conducted in my district, the number of people holding a similar attitude would be higher than 60 per cent by far. Therefore, I have an obligation to those constituents who have expressed strong opinions to me on this issue with regard to the law remaining as it is. From my own point of view, apart from that of the majority of my constituents, I oppose the Bill.

Having already stated that many of my constituents have approached me on this matter, I point out that these expressions of opinion came not only from middle-aged and older persons in the community but also from a remarkable number of younger people as well. That is an important fact, and any poll seeking to gauge the opinion of people will show that many young people are interested in seeing the law remain as it is. I believe that any element of persecution that homosexuals may feel has existed in the law was removed when this matter was dealt with by Parliament in 1972. I believe section 79 of the Act was amended, and that amendment removed any grounds that the people concerned may have had for saying that they were being persecuted under the legislation.

I believe this provision contains a defence in the case of a charge of homosexuality in private amongst consenting males. This was the difficulty previously regarding the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. I believe that any persecution element existing in the law was removed by the amendment carried at that time. Since the amending legislation was passed in 1972, how many males have been prosecuted in South Australia for engaging in homosexual activities? Does any honourable member know of any prosecutions? Have there been any prosecutions? Evidently there has been none and, if that is the case, what is the real problem? Where is the area of difficulty? How are these people facing problems regarding the law? How is the law not allowing them to do what they want to do?

I believe these are legitimate questions. How many prosecutions have been undertaken since the law was amended? Having asked that question, I think the record will reveal the answer. So far, no good fundamental or basic reasons have been put before Parliament in any speech as to why the existing law should be altered.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Certainly not today.

Mr. WARDLE: True, today's exhibition is baseless, as far as rushing this Bill through the House is concerned. No honourable member has put forward a case for this or given any reason why the Bill should be rushed through. No case has been made out why members should not have the opportunity to re-examine the Bill previously introduced. I believe that the passing of this Bill will give some people the opportunity to seek further changes in the law, and I can foresee a time when enthusiasts will seek to have the age of consent lowered from 21 to 18 years. I believe that this situation applied in Britain, but I point out that

the lowering of age limits leads one to ask where it will all finish. The same situation has developed regarding drinking in public bars. It is difficult to police the law regarding the age of drinkers, and once the age limit is lowered further it becomes even more difficult.

I believe that there are activists in the community in favour of the practice of homosexuality, and there are people who are intent on breaking down the normal family situation. In Australia, we believe in a life-style revolving around the husband, wife and family as the basic unit, upon which the character of this country has been built. I believe that this is a most important issue. It is an issue in which every responsible member in this House should be interested and involved. The family unit, I believe, is a basic and fundamental part of the life-style in this country.

I see wedges used to give people certain opportunities. I believe that the law in this country has been altered to the degree where it now protects homosexual behaviour in private. I do not see any attempt to break up the family unit as being anything other than unnatural. No professional opinions have been advanced to indicate the desirability or necessity of further widening the criminal law to allow activists and other people who seek to dispose of the basic family unit be free to inflict their practices on the community. Many young people who have not been out in the world long enough to form their philosophies, opinions and basic convictions are subjected to pressure from all sorts of activists. By changing the law to comply with the sentiments involved in the Bill, we are leaving many young people wide open to the practices of older people in connection with some important moral issues. Like most other members, I have received from the Community Standards Organisation a document that reveals a sensible and moderate approach. I appreciate the study and groundwork that have been done in preparing this document, and I appreciate the references that have been quoted. It is obvious that many people have spent much time in researching the subject. I should like to quote the following paragraph from the document:

The influencing of teenagers to accept homosexuality through the schools and by distribution of literature has already started. Extension of this follows logically from any further change in the law. In the light of this we do not ask that the law shall enforce morality, but we do believe the law can reinforce morality and should do so in relation to homosexual acts. If the Parliament still believes that the proposed private member's Bill should be supported, we draw attention to the need to make specific provision to ensure that: (a) young people are not subject to seduction; (b) the homosexual life-style is not actively promoted in schools; (c) homosexual marriage is not promoted in S.A. since it is contrary to the definition of marriage as contained in the Family Law Act, 1975.

I oppose the Bill because no-one has proved that there is a great need to change the law at this time. The persecution, if any, that existed does not exist now.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I wish to set the record straight in connection with my situation as Opposition Whip. I apologise to the member for Elizabeth if there has been a misunderstanding. I believed that the Bill was in an identical situation to that of the Bill of the member for Mitcham. I thought I had communicated that it was identical to the Bill introduced previously by the member for Elizabeth. Arrangements were made so that we could possibly get the Bill through this afternoon and so that the member for Goyder and the member for Light could at least get their Bill introduced, so that it could be made an Order of the Day for the future. If there has been a misunderstanding, it appears that I have failed to communicate.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): This issue has caused me more anxiety than have most other issues that have come before this House since I became a member a long time ago. I cannot for the life of me see the point of a number of speeches that have been made this afternoon in opposition to the Bill. I cannot believe that, by delaying this Bill for another fortnight, any of us will vote any differently from the way we will vote today if a vote is taken. The member for Murray threw out a challenge about prosecutions that have occurred since the law was changed in 1973. His argument cuts both ways. If there have been no prosecutions since 1973, why should the law not be changed, so that there will be no possibility of prosecutions in the future? One can argue in that way just as rationally as one can argue in the other way.

There are strong arguments, particularly on religious and moral grounds, against doing anything to condone homosexuality. These arguments now, as always, weigh heavily with me. On the other hand, there are strong arguments in favour of the Bill; for example, the argument that homosexuality between consenting males is not the business of the criminal law, just as adultery is not now the business of the criminal law and just as lesbianism is not a crime, nor has it ever been in this State. We cannot make people moral by legislation. All these are strong arguments in favour of the Bill.

I guess each of us has considered this matter over a long period; I certainly have. I have read literature on it and searched my own conscience. The latest information I have received on the subject is the Western Australian Royal Commission's report, which seems to favour the principles of the Bill. A constituent of the member for Goyder summed it up as well as anyone can. The honourable member has mentioned this point to me several times. A lady of advancing years said that, as she understood it, homosexuality is contrary to the law of God, but she will leave it to Him to do the judging and she hoped that He would be more merciful with us than we are with each other. I regard homosexuality as sinful and repellent. However, I supported the second reading of the Bill when it was previously before this House; at that time the second reading was carried without a division. Many of the members who have spoken in this debate today were here then. I intend to support the second reading again.

Mr. RUSSACK (Gouger): I oppose the Bill. I am sorry that there was confusion this afternoon in connection with the procedure adopted in the presentation of the Bill, because this very important matter needs considering. I accept the point made by the member for Mitcham that possibly we would not change our minds in a fortnight. However, I vividly remember, when I was in another place three years ago, what happened when this Bill was dealt with then. Many people with high academic qualifications sought out members of Parliament and had private conversations with them. I am sure that what was said then and what is revealed in literature and communications now are totally different in many aspects. At that stage the family and the conduct of parents were claimed to have a big bearing on a child's becoming a homosexual. However, I have recently seen this point discounted by others. So, there is a change of attitude in many respects.

This is a matter of conscience, and I would personally vote against the Bill. Over the past three years at least, I have had discussions with many people in my district. As a result, I believe that I will be voting in accordance with the wishes of most of my constituents if I oppose the Bill.

What worries me about this measure is that it could cause a progression towards this sort of behaviour in future. It is now a defence for consenting adults participating in homosexual acts. That protection arose as the result of overtures made by activist groups. Certain publications, which could be described as pornographic, suggest that people could visit a certain address where they would be educated in the techniques of homosexuality. If this practice is allowed to continue homosexuality will progress to even a wider area. If my memory serves me correctly the member for Elizabeth said that if participants in a homosexual marriage could adopt children it would be abhorrent. I, too, believe this and genuinely believe that the basic unit of our society is the family; the family life most of us have enjoyed. With legislation such as this, society could move away from normal family life. I have received a letter from the Metropolitan Community Church (formerly known as Christ's Community Church) which states:

It is a social issue, not a political one—

I accept that philosophy—

and I pray that you will consult your conscience on August 27.

I have consulted my conscience, which tells me that I must oppose this measure. I do not want to take the matters raised in this letter out of context, but if I do I am sure the meaning will not be distorted. The letter continues:

It is universally accepted now that homosexuality is not an "illness"—it is a natural variation in mankind—something which has occurred since the dawn of time.

The letter refers to "the dawn of time". That would take it back to the Creation, but I doubt the statement made in the letter. Personally I believe there is a God and that at the dawn of time homosexual acts were considered to be unnatural. The letter continues:

There is no threat that people can be turned into homosexuals.

On the contrary, I believe it is possible and believe that the people so affected can be helped. In fact, I have much sympathy and concern for people affected in this way and do not criticise them or point a finger at them. However, I am sure they can be assisted and helped, so it is up to us to do all we can to provide that sympathetic concern for them.

I cannot accept that homosexual acts are anything but unnatural; they are not physically and mentally correct. People involved in such acts need assistance. I know the genuine intent of the member for Elizabeth, and I know what provisions the Bill contains, but I am concerned that the Bill could open up a wide area for abuse. Therefore, because of my own personal feelings and beliefs and because I believe that the majority of my constituents would oppose the measure, I intend to oppose the Bill.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): There is not much I want to say about this measure. The Bill is abhorrent to me. I suppose I must commend the member for Elizabeth for trying to get the measure through. The procedure that has been adopted can only be described as steam-rolling legislation through the House. If the honourable member is to grace the Treasury benches soon, I suppose he must use the impetus of his ability to get this matter through.

I am speaking to this Bill because I do not want to cast a silent vote. Several people in my district have expressed strong views against this type of legislation. However, some activists have spoken in favour of it. The member for Elizabeth, by this Bill, wishes to widen the definition of "common prostitute" to include any male person who prostitutes his body for fee or reward. If it is not free I suppose someone must pay for it.

The definition of "rape" is to be widened to include a male person. The inclusion in the definition of those two matters brings homosexuality within the bounds of the law. My colleagues have said most of what can be said about this measure. I find the measure abhorrent. Few of us in this Chamber wear returned servicemen's badges. As a young man in the Army I served my country in the Middle East and the United Kingdom. Out of sheer curiosity, because I was a young man and because I could have been killed at any time, I visited homosexual colonies and saw lesbians and the male of the species performing certain acts. I can see the Minister for the Environment smiling, but it would have taken the smile off his face had he seen some of the commercialised acts that were perpetrated there. No country could be proud of that sort of activity. It seems that some people pay much money to see that sort of act. My colleagues have spoken about the effects of homosexuality on the family and how the family is the hub of the nation. Homosexuals could perhaps be described as being biological misfits.

The members for Murray and Gouger spoke about the necessity for treatment of these people. I certainly support those views. I do not, however, agree with the views on this matter of my former colleague and my friend the member for Mitcham. This Bill does not appeal to me at all. I oppose it.

Mrs. BYRNE (Tea Tree Gully): I shall state my attitude to this Bill, which contains several different provisions, most of which have never been mentioned. So far, the only aspect that has really been emphasised concerns homosexuality. Every member in this place knows I am not a lawyer but, as I understand the present law, women can live together and involve themselves in any mutual sexual activity without attracting the sanction of the criminal law. Men, however, cannot do so: it is an offence for men to commit sexual acts together. If they do, they can be brought before the courts and have to defend themselves in public by proving that they are adults, that the acts were committed in private, and that they consented.

This seems to me to be discrimination against men, and discrimination on any ground, and on the basis of sex, is wrong. Therefore, for the reason given, I intend to support this Bill, although, if I voted in accordance with my personal beliefs (and this Bill is contrary to those as far as my religious beliefs are concerned), I would vote against it. However, on social issues like this, I do not think I should let my personal beliefs influence my judgment.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): I oppose the Bill.

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): Much has been said this afternoon. I must say I am impressed with the way in which members on both sides of the House have respected the opinions voiced. We on this side of the House respect each other's opinions also, and that is something that is fine in Parliamentary debate and is much to be desired. Several times in this House I have made clear my attitude to this matter. I do not condone homosexuality, nor can I personally understand the motivation for homosexual behaviour. Nevertheless, I believe that homosexual behaviour is a product of both heredity and environment; it is something over which those people who are genuinely homosexual have no control. For that reason and speaking medically, I must support this legislation.

The reasons, and the deeper reasons behind them, are freely available for all members to read in *Hansard* from my previous speeches, but I make the following points. This change in legislation will not alter in any way the law relating to the distribution of pornographic material

in our community; it will not change in any way the law relating to indecent behaviour or indecent assault, and I believe the law in relation to these activities should be applied as vigorously as possible to protect society. These are the ways in which family life can be threatened.

Also, I hold no brief for those young people who, allegedly espousing the homosexual cause, go into the schools, distribute pornographic material, and act in a totally and absolutely reprehensible way. I will not support that in any circumstances. These people should be subject to the law that presently applies, and decent citizens should lay complaints and the law should be followed through in respect of those activities. This change in the law will not change that aspect of our community life and ensure that our family life will therefore be protected.

Equally, I believe that people who are homosexuals, who are inoffensive and hurt no-one, and who conduct their activities in private should be protected from victimisation and saved from the blackmail and other stand-over tactics that I know occur now. They have an equal right to freedom and to live their lives as long as they do not interfere with other people. They should not be victimised or interfered with by the law. I support the Bill.

Mr. DUNCAN (Elizabeth): Various comments have been made in this afternoon's debate about the manner in which this Bill has been introduced in the House. I should have thought that the comments of the Opposition Whip, the member for Fisher, would clarify the situation; and I hope they have done so. All I want to say is that I thank honourable members for the way in which they have conducted themselves this afternoon. I have listened with some interest to the comments they made in debate, and I respect their right to hold the views they do. I appreciate that this is an emotional matter, and is one where there are divergences of opinion in the community. I believe (and I hold this belief deeply) that this Bill is fundamentally right, that it is proper that it should go through, and that it should have been put before this House. I hope honourable members will support it.

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (31)—Messrs. Abbott, Allison, Arnold, Becker, Boundy, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Coumbe, Duncan (teller), Dunstan, Eastick, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Keneally, Langley, McRae, Millhouse, Nankivell, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Tonkin, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (12)—Messrs. Allen, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Goldsworthy (teller), Gunn, Rodda, Russack, Vandepeer, Venning, Wardle, and Wotton.

Majority of 19 for the Ayes.

Second reading thus carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 21 passed.

Clause 22—"Procuring the defilement of person under eighteen."

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Is the effect of paragraph (b) merely that the age of majority is reduced from 21 years to 18 years in relation to the Act?

Mr. DUNCAN: Yes.

Clause passed.

Clauses 23 to 31 passed.

Clause 32—"Power on information for rape, etc., to convict of indecent assault or common assault."

Mr. CHAPMAN: I believe that, by eliminating the ordinary heterosexual relationship and allowing homosexual practices under this clause, we are creating a situation, where a partnership is involved, in which two people can

live together. I ask whether couples living together in such a homosexual partnership should be entitled to the same allowances regarding tax allowances, house loans, etc., as would apply to a heterosexual couple.

Mr. DUNCAN: I know the honourable member is being facetious, but clause 4 provides that the definition of "rape" will include *penetratio per anum* of a male person without his consent. The effect of that is that it is important that, where now the court has power to convict of indecent assault on an information for rape, that should apply also to a male. The effect is that the words "of a male" are put in, and the provision now relates to actions regardless of sex.

Mr. CHAPMAN: This allows a situation to occur where those males can live in partnership under the same roof, as applies in the existing situation of married heterosexual couples living together, and the question is whether the same privileges will apply to those male couples in the circumstances that I have explained. Several privileges extend to couples living together as people live together in marriage and, if this Bill passes, it will allow this situation to be quite legal and it will allow single males to live together, practice homosexual acts, and, for all intents and purposes, be a couple within the common terms. In such circumstances, would the couple qualify for the entitlements ordinarily applying to any other couple who are not legally married but who are living together?

Mr. DUNCAN: The Bill in no way deals with that situation, and the matter raised by the honourable member has no relevance to this clause, which deals with the situation of persons charged with rape being able to be found guilty or convicted of indecent assault or common assault. It in no way refers to the relationships of homosexuals living together.

Clause passed.

Clauses 33 to 36 passed.

Clause 37—"Interpretation."

Mr. CHAPMAN: I am sure the member for Elizabeth is aware of my concern in this area. I had intended to ask whether homosexual couples would be allowed to adopt children, as well as other questions, but perhaps my first question could be answered. It relates to the position of consenting males living together, whether or not they are carrying on homosexual acts, and enjoying premises quite legally following the passage of this Bill. Would homosexual couples enjoy the privileges ordinarily enjoyed by a married couple or by a heterosexual couple living together?

Mr. DUNCAN: At the moment it is quite possible for two male persons to live together in a house, and the Bill does not alter that situation. The matter raised by the member for Alexandra is a separate question. The Bill affects the criminal law, and not the relationships or the rights and wrongs of people living together and claiming tax deductions for male spouses of males, or anything of the sort. As the Bill deals with the criminal law, I cannot see that the matter raised has any relevance either to this clause or to the effect of the Bill in general.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (38 to 40) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

[Sitting suspended from 6.8 to 7.30 p.m.]

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 19. Page 350.)

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): The Bill seems reasonably straight-forward and the second reading explanation

is brief. From inquiries I have made the Bill does not seem unreasonable. The loophole the Bill seeks to close is in connection with the transfer of property or monetary consideration by way of gift. Apparently, it has been possible to break the gift up into several separate transactions, thus avoiding duty. This loophole should be closed. The only other provisions relate to a slight increase in the stamp duty on certain transactions. It would be rare that there be a decrease in this area, but the increase, as referred to in the second reading explanation, is not large. The remaining provisions simply bring the law into line with the position obtaining in Victoria and New South Wales. I see no point in speaking at length on the measure; we support the Bill.

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

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from August 26. Page 472.)

First schedule.

Lands, Irrigation and Drainage, \$5 300 000.

Mr. ARNOLD: Last evening in the absence of the Deputy Premier, I asked the Minister of Transport whether he could ascertain for me the progress that had been made on the rehabilitation of the Waikerie area new irrigation distribution system. Does the Minister of Works now have that information available?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I am sorry I do not have the information, but if action has not already been taken within the department to obtain the information for the honourable member I will see that it is obtained.

Line passed.

Woods and Forests, \$6 200 000.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am not clear about the way in which the operations of the Woods and Forests Department are delineated in the Loan Estimates, which attribute to the department working expenses of \$9 028 000. Then there is the reference, "Less sawmill working expenses, felling and hauling mill logs, and portion of administration expenses to be met from other than Loan funds, \$16 137 000". Working expenses are charged against the Loan Account, but then a subtraction of working expenses seems to be made. I do not understand the bookkeeping.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: That would be met from revenue.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Minister explain why working expenses are charged to Loan Account, and then \$16 137 000 is subtracted? This is a Loan Account balance that does not appear in other places that I have detected thus far in the Estimates. It seems to me that included in the \$16 137 000 would be the working expenses, so I cannot see the sense of including them and then deducting them.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: In an attempt to give the overall picture of the operation of the day to day working expenses, these expenses are shown and then subtracted, because wages and salaries would be paid from general revenue, not from Loan. The total picture is shown because it is one of the operations supported by the Government. This is a Government department that pays money back into general revenue from the profits it makes during the year. An attempt has been made to give the total picture of the operation and subtract from it the normal working expenses. If I am wrong in my assumption, I will obtain the necessary information for the honourable member.

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): Will a balance sheet in respect of the department's operations be made available?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: An annual report.

Dr. TONKIN: A sum of \$100 000 is provided for the re-equipment of the log mill at Mount Gambier and another \$100 000 is provided for automation equipment for stacking and de-stacking. Can the Minister elaborate on what sort of re-equipment and equipment this is? Is it full-scale re-equipment or replacement?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It would not be a full-scale operation. As the honourable member would know, the Mount Gambier operations are greater than that. I think that the sum for re-equipment would be about the amount usually provided for depreciation of equipment.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am not clear about the position. As a member of a Parliamentary committee that inspected sawmilling operations in the South-East, I saw one of the most difficult and unattractive jobs in the process in the de-stacking of timber. Does the allocation here involve a genuine attempt to obtain automated equipment to improve the morale of the employees?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As it is for re-equipment, it does not appear that it is to be used as the honourable member has suggested. I am aware of the operation to which he has referred and the tedium that is involved. I do not know of any method that has been invented to replace the physical effort involved in the stacking and de-stacking of timber. I take it that the allocation of \$100 000 is to provide for the replacement of equipment that already exists. The honourable member has seen this operation, which I believe is a good operation and one which is of great value to the South-East. I am sure the members for Victoria, Mount Gambier, and Millicent will agree with me on that. The sum of \$100 000 referred to by the Leader and his deputy is for re-equipment.

Mr. Goldsworthy: There are two lines, each involving the sum of \$100 000.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will have departmental officers examine what the honourable member has said and get the information for him and, if new equipment is involved, we will check whether it is for the purpose suggested by the honourable member.

Mr. RODDA: Provision is made for maintenance of existing forests, and preparation and purchase of land. The sum of \$22 000 is allocated for the control of the Sirex wasp, and control is most important to ensure the continuing foundation of forest reserves. What percentage of its forests is the department able to allow to reach a stage of optimum maturity? What plantings will be made this year? What amount of land preparation has been undertaken for planting? What new land will be included in forestry projects this year?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member has raised interesting points and, although I cannot give him a detailed answer now, I can say that it was only on Monday, or the Monday before, that Cabinet agreed to a recommendation by the Minister of Forests for the setting up of an expert committee to consider the long-term afforestation needs of South Australia. The committee, which will include members of the Woods and Forests Department and others, will be concerned with population forecasts and resultant future demands. It will be looking 30 to 40 years ahead so that it will be able to give the Government some idea of the sort of plan it should adopt regarding afforestation and softwood supplies in the

South-East. This matter is in hand currently, as about \$3 000 000 is involved in the maintenance of the forests and the development of new forests. Regarding the specific questions asked, I will obtain that information for the honourable member.

Mr. EVANS: Is the national Sirex wasp fund still operating? What financial contribution will be made by South Australia in this financial year to the fund? From 1968 to about 1971 plantings of pine in South Australia increased to about 2 450 hectares a year, but last year plantings dropped to about 1 900 hectares. It is expected that only 2 000 hectares will be planted in 1975-76, yet the demand for this timber is increasing nationally. Why has there been this decrease in plantings?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: If the honourable member examined the document he would see that \$22 000 is provided as South Australia's contribution to the Sirex wasp fund. Although we have had no problem in relation to Sirex wasps in South Australia, it is extremely important that we contribute to the national fund to ensure that the wasp does not become a problem in South Australia from the other States. Concerning plantings, one difficulty is not so much the lack of money but the lack of available land on which to increase the size of plantings. Over the years there has been much criticism from certain sectors in the South-East about the taking of pastoral land for forestry purposes. Primary producers have said that their land was too good to be used for forestry purposes, and that argument has ensued over several years. The reduction in the new plantings is related to the area of land available and the amount of land the department can purchase. I will have the matter checked by the department, and let the honourable member know about it.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Does the Government intend to plant and cultivate pine forests on Kangaroo Island and, if it does, what will be the area and location involved and when will the programme commence?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to obtain the information for the honourable member. Some time ago, when I was Acting Minister of Forests, I referred to the Minister for the Environment a proposition put to me by the Conservator of Forests about purchasing land on Kangaroo Island for afforestation purposes. I remember at that time asking the Conservator how far it was intended to go if the initial bid to purchase land was successful. Of course, one must have a viable unit—between 2 400 ha and 4 000 ha. I do not know how suitable is the land on Kangaroo Island. Large areas of the South-East are not suitable for pine planting, because of the nature of the soil.

Mr. WOTTON: An exceptionally large sum seems to have been allocated for felling and hauling mill logs. Does the provision include wages, or do wages come under working expenses?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: This is an attempt to give an overall picture. Later in the Loan Estimates the honourable member will see the item "Less sawmill working expenses, felling and hauling mill logs". They include wages and other expenses. A deduction of \$16 137 000 is made because that sum comes from general revenue.

Mr. ALLISON: The area of actual pine planting in the South-East last year was 400 hectares down on the proposed plantings. The provision for purchases this year is \$300 000, as against \$450 000 last year. Should we assume that we are ahead of the programme, or are the plantings and purchases behind what is required?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: A committee has been set up to look at the long-term plans. I think (I say "I think" advisedly because I cannot speak with great authority in connection with the department) planting is restricted by the availability of land. The department has some idea of the land likely to become available for this purpose. The honourable member will probably find that I have answered his question during the whole discussion on this line. I will ask the department to check the points he has made and see whether there is any further information that will help him.

Mr. EVANS: Has each State significantly decreased the amount it contributes to the Sirex wasp fund? Is this a sign that we have the problem under control? How much money do we have in the national fund?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will get the information for the honourable member. There has never been Sirex wasp in this State, thank God. We have always contributed to the national fund because that helps to keep the wasp out of this State. I take it that the reduction has resulted from the fact that the wasp is virtually under control in other States. I will find out and let the honourable member know.

Line passed.

Railways, \$11 000 000.

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Minister state exactly what the position is in regard to the work on the duplication of the track from Brighton to Port Stanvac and on the extension to Christie Downs? Further, to what extent does the electrification programme depend on availability of Commonwealth funds? When will the electrification work be commenced?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport): Improvements to the urban public transport system have always depended almost exclusively on the support forthcoming from the Australian Government. Regrettably, when we called a special meeting of the Australian Transport Advisory Council in Adelaide prior to the opening of the rail link between Whyalla and Port Augusta in, I think, October, 1972, the then Commonwealth Minister for Transport (Mr. Peter Nixon) could not give the State Ministers any assurance whatever. Since then, however, we have had a completely new approach to public transport, from which approach South Australia has benefited tremendously. We have been able to hasten our progress. I am sure the Leader is interested, although he is spending all his time talking to his colleagues after asking a question. I hope he was genuinely interested. There is no doubt that the progress we make in upgrading our public transport system will depend in the future, as it has in the past 2½ years, on the financial support forthcoming from Canberra.

Dr. TONKIN: I was listening most carefully to the Minister's reply.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You were talking to your colleagues.

Dr. TONKIN: The Minister has not said a word; he has said nothing whatever of value, and we ask him again to answer the questions we are asking.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am sure the Leader will excuse me if I regard him as singular, not plural; he said that he wanted answers to the questions "we are asking". I thought that the Leader was the only member who had asked questions on this subject. He accused me of not saying anything. I am confused, but that is not surprising. The position about the duplication of the line onwards from Brighton—

Mr. Venning: Next question!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If members opposite are not interested, I will not continue.

Dr. TONKIN: It is apparent to everyone in this Chamber that the Minister will not give a straight and clear answer. That is not uncommon, but either he does not know the answer or he is deliberately withholding information from this Committee. I give him one last chance to give a straight answer to the question: what is the progress made on the duplication of the track from Brighton to Port Stanvac and the extension of the railway line to Christie Downs, and when does the Minister expect that the electrification of that line will commence?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am pleased to give the Leader an answer. I sat down because the member for Rocky River asked for the next question, and obviously I had to resume my seat. That is a clear example of the lack of support given by the member for Rocky River and the member for Davenport to the member for Bragg, who was elected by one vote as the Leader, to oust the member for Light.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Minister must keep to the line.

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Minister give an unequivocal answer to the important question asked by the Leader, instead of equivocating and trying to wriggle out of giving an answer? Will he give me, if he wishes, the information sought by the Leader, and tell us when this electrification work is likely to commence and when he thinks it will be completed?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: That is not even the question that the Leader asked.

Mr. Coumbe: But I have asked a question.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Does the honourable member want an answer to that question and not to the question asked by the Leader?

Mr. MATHWIN: On a point of order, I think the Minister is deliberately evading the question. I ask, Mr. Chairman, that you rule that the Minister give some answer to the question.

The CHAIRMAN: No point of order is involved.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: My reply to the member for Torrens is that at this stage the electrification is not within the approved programmes of the Australian Government. Although it has agreed in principle that there should be electrification, no provision has been made in the current Commonwealth Budget. Accordingly, we shall be resuming our application in the 1976-77 Budget, when we hope we shall get support for the electrification scheme.

Mr. Coumbe: If there is a change of Government in Canberra you will get support.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The previous Liberal Government refused funds for public transport, and it took a Labor Government to provide funds for the urban public transport system so, if there is a change of Government, we shall have no hope at all; we shall go back to the old system of getting no funds for anything under a Liberal Government.

Mr. RUSSACK: I refer to the line dealing with stockyards and station yards, for which \$1 125 000 is provided. For new freight vehicles the amount is \$1 738 000, and the amount for improvements to freight vehicles is \$92 000. What is the position regarding these vehicles now that the agreement has been ratified? I take it that the stockyards would be non-metropolitan: if they are in the metropolitan area, they could be at Dry Creek. I

understand that under the agreement all freight vehicles used by the non-metropolitan railways will go to the Commonwealth Government and, where the vehicles are used for both metropolitan and country purposes, an agreement will be reached. What is the position about the expenditure of this money for these items when the agreement becomes effective?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The question does nothing more than consolidate a view I have had for a long time that few, if any, members of the Opposition took the trouble to read the agreement or the legislation. If they had, they would have known that the legislation, which has now been passed by both Houses of this Parliament, provides that from July 1 an interim period will commence, during which period the South Australian Railways, as an organisation, will continue but will be subject to such directions as are necessary from the Australian Government or from the Australian National Railways; it will continue as if the transfer had not become effective. Later, the whole thing will become effective. In the interim, there will not be a vacuum, and provision is made in the Loan Estimates to ensure that it will not occur.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Treasurer say whether the \$4 500 000 voted for the duplication of the track from Brighton to Port Stanvac and the extension of the railway line to Christie Downs will be available from the Loan Account this year; and, if so, what is the reason for the delay in the electrification of that line?

Mr. Coumbe: While the Government is collecting its thoughts—

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: On a point of order, do I take it that no-one on the Government side is willing to answer my query?

The CHAIRMAN: The Minister does not have to answer if he does not desire to do so.

Mr. COUMBE: To try to help the Government out of the dilemma while Government members collect their thoughts, I refer the Minister to the \$1 493 000 provided for plant, machinery, motor vehicles, and sundries. Last year the provision for this item was \$348 000, and I should like the Minister to explain why this significant increase has been made, remembering that we are now talking mainly about non-metropolitan railways.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: There is a backlog regarding works, and provision is made for that. If the honourable member would like details of the specific works involved, I should be pleased to get them for him.

Mr. Coumbe: I'd like the reason.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The reason is that a backlog must be caught up. That is why additional funds are being made available. The reason is contained within the general context of the individual works, and I shall be pleased to provide those.

Mr. Coumbe: The increase seems steep to me.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I suppose it does, but the backlog must be caught up. The complete answer will come in the details that I have assured the honourable member I will get for him.

Mr. NANKIVELL: The Minister has referred to the present situation, stating that we are in a transitional period and that we will be carrying on as though nothing had happened until the final transfer of the railways takes place. Has he any doubt about the matter? I have read in the Loan Estimates papers that we expect to get \$6 500 000 for this and expect to get two-thirds of the expenditure on public transport. Is there any possibility that our expectations will not be realised?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: No, there is not.

Mr. EVANS: Can the Minister say how much money has been paid to the Engineering and Water Supply Department for contract work carried out by that department on the Christie Downs extension?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I have not the actual amount, but I will get it.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: We well remember the construction of an expensive passenger terminal at Outer Harbor. I read with interest and amazement that a tractor driver who mowed the lawns there had to change his clothes so that he could show the people through the plush new passenger terminal and then change back into his overalls and get back on the tractor. I think it was the Deputy Premier who stated that trips to the Pacific islands would start from Outer Harbor and hordes of people would go on these trips for a holiday in the grass skirt country. However, that did not eventuate, and the tractor driver is back on the tractor.

Mr. Harrison: The *Arcadia* left Outer Harbor on June 16 this year for a trip, and the *Fairsky* left recently. You don't watch the shipping movements.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: What will be the scale of use of the railway facilities now proposed for a container terminal for Outer Harbor?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I suppose that, when each of us leaves this Parliament, someone will write an epitaph on him. Certainly, someone will write an epitaph on the member for Kavel as being the knocker of South Australia.

Dr. TONKIN: This evening we have heard an extraordinary performance by the Minister of Transport. He has taken at least three answers to beat around the bush and finally has stated that the electrification of the Christie Downs railway is not on the list of approved projects for this year. He has systematically avoided answering directly any questions asked by members on this side. His answers have been vague, and he has resorted to personal attack and generalities. His performance has been appalling, and it is with some regret that I find myself obliged to move:

That the line "Railways, \$11 000 000" be reduced by \$200. I realise that the Government will now be rounding up forces. The acting Whip is on the way already, but the Minister's performance this evening has been disgraceful. Not only that, the performance of the Treasurer, who has been sitting alongside the Minister for most of this performance, has been equally disgraceful, because he has shown clearly that he knows nothing. Certainly, he has not volunteered to help the Minister of Transport out of his dilemma. It is apparent that the Minister of Transport does not know the answers to the questions we have asked or that he has deliberately withheld them. His conduct is entirely reprehensible. What is the point of having these documents and having the Minister concerned with the department available to answer questions when he shirks his Parliamentary and Ministerial responsibilities and will not answer? Tonight, as is his custom, the Minister has used many words to say virtually nothing. His record in this House in the field of transport is appalling. I remember an occasion three years ago—

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The honourable member is moving to reduce the line by \$200. We are in Committee, he is obliged to deal with the line before the Committee.

Dr. TONKIN: That is what I shall do.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! This is a little wide, as it is a vote of no confidence, and I will allow the Leader to continue.

Dr. TONKIN: Some three years ago we had cause to examine the replies given by the Minister of Transport over a period of 12 months to specific questions asked from this side. If I remember rightly, one question related to the Glenelg tram service—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I want the Leader to keep to the line dealing with the railways.

Dr. TONKIN: The matter of the extension of the railway line to Christie Downs has been raised in this House over a considerable period. It has been a matter of intense concern. Tonight the Minister has told us that the electrification of the line will not be able to proceed because funds are not yet available from the Commonwealth Government, as it is not on the list of approved projects. The electrification of that line was the subject of a promise at the recent election, another pie in the sky promise made by this Government and not now being honoured. The Minister's record is not good. We have seen his activities recently in handing over the country rail services to the Commonwealth, but that has not yet been reflected in the documents before us. It should be. No allowance has been made for that in any other way. We ask how far the duplication of the track from Brighton to Port Stanvac has gone, and the Minister says he does not know.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I did not say that.

Dr. TONKIN: He did not say anything, and we are entitled to assume that he does not know. Judging from the activity on the other side, I think I have said enough to support the motion.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport): Unfortunately for his good will, the Leader of the Opposition has got all het up over absolutely nothing.

Dr. Tonkin: That is exactly what you said, too.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Let us trace back what has occurred tonight; perhaps the member for Hanson can advise his Leader, being a former shadow Minister of Transport who was sacked. The Leader asked about the progress being made on the duplication of the track from Brighton to Christies Beach. I got up to answer that question, and suffered interjections from the member for Rocky River, who said the next question should then be asked, so I sat down. Subsequently, the member for Torrens said he wanted to ask the question the Leader had asked. He asked when the electrification was to occur, and I gave him a complete answer.

Mr. Coumbe: You didn't answer the other one.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The member for Torrens did not ask the other one, and I drew to his attention that he was asking only part of the question the Leader had asked. Then we had "Mr. Knocker", the Deputy Leader, who wanted to rubbish the Outer Harbor terminal. He is always rubbishing South Australia.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! This matter concerns the railways.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The honourable member asked a question about the railways facilities for the container terminal at Outer Harbor, using that line to knock South Australia.

Mr. Goldsworthy: I asked for information. I did not get it.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Whatever information has been sought has been given where facilities have been provided. If the Leader and members opposite are interested in the progress made on the duplication of the track, that information is available. It has been made available to the press, and I cannot see why it should not be available to

the Leader and other members opposite. That track will be duplicated by January of next year.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You chose not to answer that.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: That information is public. If Opposition members are so intent on the destruction of South Australia that they wish to move in this way, let them go ahead and show their hypocrisy.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): Earlier this evening I heard some performance going on in the Chamber so I decided to come in, as a matter of interest, although they were not my lines that were being dealt with, to see what was going on.

Mr. Goldsworthy: What was your comment?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member will listen I shall tell him my comments on the performance; I assure him of that. I sat here to try to find out what it was that the Opposition was carrying on about. I have never seen such a miserable piece of utter inadequacy, confusion, and play-acting as I saw in this Chamber—and I am a member of Actors Equity. I looked with bemusement upon the carry-on of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition about the shipping terminal at Outer Harbor, which has got absolutely nothing to do with the line before the Committee, but he carried on in this vagary for some considerable time. After the Deputy Leader had finished this descant upon the Committee's activity, the Leader worked up a head of steam and let it off in a shower of the most sententious humbug I have yet listened to in this House. He said precisely nothing relating to the matter before the Committee.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. In this Chamber this afternoon the Minister of Mines and Energy raised a point of order regarding speaking to the gallery. He reminded the Speaker that all remarks should be addressed through the Speaker or the Chairman, but I noticed that the Premier, in his usual habit, was speaking to the gallery.

The CHAIRMAN: No point of order is involved. I have allowed considerable latitude in debating this line, but I ask honourable members to come back to the line. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I hope that I am faced in the same direction as the Leader of the Opposition was, slightly inclined to the left! The position regarding this State's railways is that information which has been available to the Committee and to the public is full. The Committee has been deprived of nothing in the way of information, and this motion and the carry-on regarding it are completely unnecessary. I suggest that the Committee get on with its work.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I had not intended to come into the debate. I have listened with some amusement to it so far, and, after what the Treasurer has said, it is necessary for some answer to be given. The fact is that the Minister of Transport brought this motion on himself. What he has not realised (the Premier realises it, but he will not admit it) is that he cannot bluster, ignore the point, and insult people when the Government has not got the numbers.

The CHAIRMAN: I hope that the honourable member will come back to the line.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Indeed I will, and to the motion and the reasons for it.

The CHAIRMAN: I have asked honourable members to do that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is why the Leader of the Opposition moved the motion, and I think that he was right in doing it. The Minister cannot be a little tin God if he has not got the numbers to back him, and that is the position of the Labor Party now. It is different from the position it was in during the last Parliament, and the sooner it realises it the better. If the Minister had been courteous at the beginning and given a direct answer—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member is not speaking to the motion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —this motion would have been through an hour ago.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member must resume his seat.

Mr. Millhouse: Are you standing up, Sir?

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the honourable member to keep to the vote for the railways, and I hope that he will do that in the future. When the Chairman calls an honourable member to order, he is obliged to sit down.

Mr. Millhouse: You stood up, Sir.

The CHAIRMAN: I did not stand up.

Mr. Millhouse: Didn't you? It looked as though you did. That's the point I'm making, and the sooner the Government wakes up to it and realises that it must take the House gently, the better.

The Committee divided on the motion:

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

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

Pair—Aye—Mr. Evans. No—Mr. Jennings.

The CHAIRMAN: There are 22 Ayes and 22 Noes. The votes being equal, I give my casting vote to the Noes. The question therefore passes in the negative.

Motion thus negatived.

Line passed.

Marine and Harbors, \$8 780 000.

Dr. TONKIN: I refer to the line "container ship berth" and the harbor works associated with it, and ask what progress has been made on the berth and whether it is having a detrimental effect on the small boat basin and the yacht squadron harbor. To what extent is this site being beautified? Is tree planting proceeding? Is anything being done to landscape the area?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Marine): Much progress has been made on this container berth, which should be ready for operation about the middle of next year, when the total sum of \$7 000 000 will have been spent on its construction. The Leader will be aware that about 275 ha has been reclaimed in addition to the 323 ha on the other side of the grand trunkway. This is valuable land, indeed. Industry will be encouraged to develop or establish in this area, because I am sure that I am correct that the real future of the port to serve Adelaide is in this area. This is because we will have a berth capable of handling vessels up to 100 000 tonnes at any time, irrespective of tides. Of course, that position will apply when dredging now under way is completed.

So far as the berth is concerned, I hope this will be completed by the middle of next year, and in relation to dredging (achieving a 40ft. depth at low tide), that will be achieved within the next two years. Concerning the beautification of the area, the beautification which the Government and I are looking for is the establishment of industry in the area. We have had a number of inquiries from industries which are likely to establish there as a result of the creation of the container berth. Honourable members may ask what the future will hold regarding the container berth. Again, I can say only that it is a little of the chicken and the egg situation because, without the container berth, we could not get the traffic that we could attract in relation to container shipping.

Honourable members are probably aware that the Western Australian port of Fremantle has been described as having a difficult future, and honourable members will also probably be aware that the South Australian Government has made representations to the Australian Minister for Transport in relation to the development of a land bridge scheme, which would be centred on Outer Harbor and which would mean that a container ship would off load its container cargo here, and from Adelaide the containers would be transported by rail or road (especially by rail) to the other States. Because South Australia is the central State, because we have such a vast area in the immediate proximity of the container berth in terms of hectares, which no other capital city port in Australia has and which is one of the most valuable assets that we have (it is one that we want to look after), it is important that the container berth is well under way.

I hope that the berth will be completed by the middle of next year at a total cost of about \$7 250 000. That sum includes not only the construction of the container berth but also the provision of the cranes associated with it. I hope that in turn this facility will attract the sort of trade that we believe it will. Indeed, the Government would not have taken the decision it took, and I am sure that the Public Works Committee, which examined the project, would not have recommended it if it did not believe that there was potential for future development.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It is a pleasure to have a Minister now who is willing to answer questions and who will attempt to give some information to the Committee, because it was in connection with the container berth and associated facilities that a Minister who has just left the Chamber saw fit to abuse me and tell me nothing. However, I am disturbed by the Minister's answer and his reference to the chicken and egg situation. This project will involve the expenditure of over \$7 000 000. Other facilities at Outer Harbor also cost millions of dollars.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: \$1 000 000.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: A large sum, anyway. It is a fact that overseas passenger vessels have continued to by-pass Adelaide as a port of call, because it is dead steaming time, and it appears that the same reasons that have influenced the passenger vessels could also apply to container vessels in influencing them to by-pass Outer Harbor. Much container traffic goes through Melbourne. In view of the Outer Harbor passenger terminal history and the expenditure of \$7 000 000 on a chicken and egg operation, it appears to be an unstable basis from which to operate. Does the Minister confidently expect that this major project will attract the sort of activity necessary to justify this expenditure? Could we be in the position where a grave error of judgment has been made by the Government, as appears to have been the case in relation to the passenger terminal?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I accept the doubts that have been raised by the Deputy Leader. I would like him to talk to the Director of the Marine and Harbors Department and his officers, who advised not only me but also the Government. They also gave evidence before the Public Works Committee. I think the member for Mallee by way of interjection referred to our keeping up with the Jones's, and I take that statement as a reflection on the ability of the officers concerned. The honourable member suggested that we had to have a container berth because every other State had one but I assure him that that is not the case. The member for Kavel referred to the passenger terminal, but if he refers to *Hansard* he will find in past years that much criticism was aimed not only at the Labor Government but also at the Liberal Governments about the atrocious facilities existing at Outer Harbor, especially when migrants were coming to Australia in greater numbers.

My predecessor in office, but one, the member for Torrens, was an advocate of this scheme, and I believe he would have proceeded with it. The honourable member would be less than fair if he did not agree with that. I do not think I can be fairer than that. We desperately needed new facilities for this purpose. Although I cannot accurately predict what the future holds, I hope that, given sufficient time, passenger services will again become fashionable and, in addition, immigration will again become necessary. We will then see the facilities used in the way that we originally visualised. I would like to see the facilities used to the fullest extent, but that is not possible at present.

Regarding the container ship berth, I point out that we constantly have hundreds of thousands of tonnes of container freight being transported by rail to Melbourne, to go through the port there. If that freight goes through the berth, the new facility will attract containers into this State. My advice is that the lost sailing time in the gulf will not be a consideration. I want to prove that our judgment is correct and that very good use will be made of the container ship berth. There is sufficient room for another four or five berths of the size of the one now being constructed. From a long-term viewpoint, the future lies at Pelican Point, rather than at Port Adelaide. People will ask, "Does that mean that Port Adelaide will die?" Of course, it does not mean that. There are facilities at Port Adelaide for conventional shipping, but we must realise that the type of shipping has changed radically in the last decade in respect of the size and draught of vessels and the equipment to handle their cargoes. The decision we have made regarding the container ship berth is sound, and the work being done there will serve the future needs of the State.

Mr. VENNING: Will the provision of \$1 775 000 cover the completion of the bulk loading installation at Port Lincoln? I want to pay a tribute to Mr. Sainsbury, with whom South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited has had much to do. If he is left alone and not pressurised, he is a great asset to our State.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am pleased to hear the honourable member say that, because Mr. Sainsbury is due to retire relatively soon. He has been one of the architects behind the container ship berth. The facilities at Port Lincoln resulted from a committee's report, and I point out to the honourable member that the provision of \$1 775 000 will enable the work at Port Lincoln to be completed. We will then have spent more than \$7 000 000 there. Port Lincoln is one of the best natural harbours in Australia, and I hope that the facilities are fully

utilised. The Director has told me that the facilities will be opened, to the best of my recollection, either for this harvest or early in the new year. I will obtain a report on Port Lincoln for the honourable member.

Mr. COUMBE: I refer to the provision of \$2 152 000 for the container ship berth. Apart from the piling, work must be done on the wharf apron. Does the provision cover all the work on the wharf or only part of it? Further, does it cover the crane facilities that will be required? When refrigerated containers are landed, they must be plugged in to an electricity supply. To what extent will the provision cover these facilities?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It will be possible to plug in refrigerated containers. The concrete apron is well advanced. I believe that the crane will cost more than \$1 200 000; this is for a cellular-type ship. We were anxious to get two cranes but the necessary funds were not available. We hope to get two cranes eventually. As far as I am aware, the provision will be sufficient not only to purchase the crane but also to complete the construction of the container berth itself. I will have the matter checked for the honourable member and I will let him know.

Mr. BLACKER: The Treasurer referred to the installations at Port Lincoln for bulk grain loading and phosphate rock loading. What is meant by "rock phosphate loading installations"? Are any other pieces of equipment or facilities to be provided at Port Lincoln?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I cannot tell the honourable member offhand but I will obtain from my officers a report and let the honourable member know.

Mr. COUMBE: I refer to the North Haven development, for which \$40 000 is set aside, with an offset of \$60 000 and a credit of \$20 000 remaining. This Committee should be informed of the financial arrangements between the department and the developers of the North Haven project. At this stage, it looks a promising and attractive proposition which, if carried out properly, can be a great asset to the State.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I was appointed in 1970 by the Government as the Minister responsible for liaison between the Government, West Lakes Limited, and North Haven. As Minister of Marine, in connection not only with North Haven but also with West Lakes, I have been responsible for land purchase adjustments, and so on. I do not know exactly what this money is for; I have not the details with me but will find out and let the honourable member know. I imagine it would be an adjustment of some sort of the original bill. It is not a contribution to the cost of the earthworks or the construction of the boat haven, because that is the responsibility of the A.M.P. under the indenture. When the project reaches a certain acceptable stage, I take it over from there, but we are not associated with it at this stage.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I, too, would appreciate that information from the Minister.

Mr. GUNN: As regards fishing havens and the amount of money to be spent at Franklin Harbor and Port Lincoln, I understand approaches have been made to the Minister about facilities now available at Thevenard and their inadequacy for the fishermen when they bring in their boats for survey. On many occasions they cannot get on the slip. Can the Minister get a report for me on that? Does the Government intend to upgrade those facilities?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will get a report for the honourable member. I cannot recall any submissions

about fishing vessels being made to me in respect of Thevenard. We are trying to establish priorities. We check the length of time that applications have been in, the necessity, etc. I cannot recall any recent representations in relation to Thevenard but I will let the honourable member know what the situation is and the state of the priorities for fishermen in that area.

Mr. NANKIVELL: As regards the container berth, some of what the Minister has said is correct. However, as the Public Works Committee at the time made special reference to the inaccuracy of the estimated cost (which, in 1972, was \$4 900 000), will the Minister get a report from the Harbours Board detailing how the additional \$3 000 000 cost in those three years has been accounted for?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to do that. The honourable member may find that in that report there is no mention of the crane.

Mr. Nankivell: It is \$800 000.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: That has almost doubled from the time it was recommended until now. I do not have the actual figure in my head, but this crane has increased considerably in cost. The honourable member will find that normal cost escalation will take care of the \$3 000 000.

Line passed.

Engineering and Water Supply, \$62 900 000.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I seek information about the construction of the Little Para dam. Can the Minister give details of the proposed completion date for the dam and the total cost of its construction?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am not certain of the total cost but I have been considerably worried this year to ensure that the Little Para dam construction continues. The financial programme has been so tight that we have had to consider the possibility of closing that project, but we all wanted to avoid that if possible because it would cost about \$700 000 to close it down. We have decided that that must be avoided at all costs and have examined ways and means not only of cutting expenditure in other sections of the operations of the Engineering and Water Supply Department but also of putting pressure on the Treasurer to get additional funds to carry on with the project. We have until the end of this month to be certain whether we shall receive funds from the Australian Government under the national water programme. We have applied for them and hope that we shall get something from that source.

Mr. EVANS: How much did you expect to get?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I think it will cost \$2 200 000 this year to maintain it and that the cost will increase to about \$5 000 000. I will find out the total cost for the honourable member. We expect to know by the end of this month whether we will get the assistance we applied for under the national water programme. We think we will not get it, in the light of cuts that have been made, but if we do not get it, we have taken action to see that the programme will be completed, I think by early 1977, and this will avoid the need for water restrictions that otherwise could have been expected in places such as Elizabeth.

The Hon. E. CONNELLY: Through the limited channels available to me in discussion of the Loan Estimates, I take the opportunity to raise a point in relation to the city of Port Pirie, for which \$508 000 has been provided in the item "Country sewerage". I assume that this provision is made to complete the proposed programme that is under construction at present and, whilst I am pleased that this

amount has been allocated to continue this work, I point out to the Minister that we hope that a much larger amount will be provided in the next Estimates.

Mr. Evans: You'll get it!

The Hon. E. CONNELLY: If the present programme that is proposed to be completed soon is left at this stage, a large section of the city will be densely populated and unsewered. I am sure that all members realise the division that would be caused in any city if a large section was unsewered while the remainder was sewerred. A week before the opening of this Parliament, we were pleased to have the Public Works Committee come up to take evidence regarding the section of the city to which I have referred. The Port Pirie council went to great lengths to impress on the members of the committee the need to sewer this area, and I think we went to great lengths to show that the council had undertaken a project at tremendous expense to itself and with funds from the Commonwealth Government to improve the drainage generally in this area, thereby making the sewerage project one that could be constructed without the tremendous handicap that would have been placed on the Engineering and Water Supply Department if this drainage scheme had not been undertaken.

I bring to the attention of the Minister and the members of the Public Works Committee, if I put them in the right order, that I appeal to them to give serious consideration to the proposal and make a favourable recommendation to this Parliament. That being the case, I should hope that in the next Estimates a further sum would be allocated for this area in Port Pirie so that the job of sewerage our city can be continuous and, as this section is phased out, the other section will be commenced.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am very proud to think that the member for Pirie has directed to me, for the first time from the floor of the Chamber, something concerning his district. In contrast with the cynical remarks from the other side that the member would receive everything he sought for Port Pirie, I am pleased that the honourable member has said that the Public Works Committee met the Port Pirie council on the matter a week before this Parliament met. Of course, the new scheme was under way before the recent election.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Honourable members may laugh: the member for Alexandra probably thinks that overnight we pop up plans, specifications and designs for sewerage half a city. I assure him that that is not the case. The design branch of the Engineering and Water Supply Department takes many months to complete this complicated task.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Did Mr. Phelan give evidence to the Public Works Committee?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not know, and I am not interested in whether he did or did not, but I assure honourable members that the member for Pirie was, as far as I am aware, well to the fore and made sure that his voice was heard in the matter as the voice of the Mayor of Port Pirie. I am aware of the proposition that was placed before the committee. I understand that only one area is of concern and I think that, in regard to a final decision on that area, advice is awaited from the Australian Government about some overall plan that that Government may have for the development of this region. I assure the honourable member that the amount mentioned in the Loan Estimates is only for continuation of work, and he would appreciate that the mere fact that money

is provided for this purpose does not mean that a larger amount will not be spent to keep the programme going, because it is not an economic proposition to stop an operation such as this.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: If we stopped the operation in Port Pirie completely this year and took all the men and equipment away to do something else, and if we went back and did more work in two years time, the member for Kavel would be quite right in criticising us for doing that. I assure the member for Pirie that every consideration will be given to the matter that he has quite properly raised so far as the city of Port Pirie is concerned.

Mr. RUSSACK: I express appreciation at the fact that provision has been made for country waterworks projects in the hundred of Tickera (\$190 000), Moonta Mines (\$64 000), and Paskeville, Kadina and Wallaroo (\$378 000). I have communicated with the Minister over the years concerning these matters. To what stage will the money in this year's Estimates bring the plan? Will it be spread over several years? What is the present estimate of the whole project, and when will it be finished? I am pleased to hear the Minister say that the figures in these documents are not necessarily the amounts that will be spent, but that those sums may be increased.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will get the report the honourable member has requested. I do not know offhand.

Mr. EVANS: While expressing satisfaction with what has taken place in Port Pirie, I must say that the Public Works Committee looked at the project in the Mitcham Hills about 10 years ago. I shall take the Speaker (the member for Pirie) on a visit to the Hills and perhaps he may be able to bring some new evidence to bear if the programme is not upgraded. Can the Minister say why, in the case of country projects, a set amount is stated for each area, when this is not done in the case of metropolitan projects? Can the Minister say how much money is to be spent at Coromandel Valley, or on the Mitcham Hills or the Blackwood project in the forthcoming year, and how much was spent in those two areas in the past financial year?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have not got the information, but I will get it for the honourable member. Although I am not certain why the metropolitan areas are not designated, I think perhaps it is more difficult to define.

Mrs. BYRNE: I am pleased to see that the projects at Hope Valley and Anstey Hill are going ahead because, like all members, I receive complaints regarding the quality of the water supply, and this work is essential. The Minister informed me previously that the Hope Valley water treatment plant was programmed for commissioning in 1977 and that the Anstey Hill works was listed as the next for construction. Is this work continuing according to the expected programme?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am pleased to say that it is. We received \$9 600 000 from the Australian Government for this work, although \$8 500 000 is referred to in the Loan Estimates. Part of this Commonwealth money must be repaid and part of it is a grant. The Anstey Hill works is well under way. The project was before Cabinet last Monday and will be placed before Executive Council shortly for referral to the Public Works Committee. That is in accordance with the programme, and so it will be on time.

Mr. EVANS: In the previous three years the amounts spent in the Blackwood area were specified as \$390 000, \$400 000 and \$490 000. This year slightly more than the Budget amount was spent to keep up with inflationary trends. More than two-thirds of the unsewered houses in the metropolitan area lie within the District of Fisher. The situation is most serious, because green slime flows in the gutters. While accepting that the Minister cannot give a figure, I ask that he upgrade the project so that an area, parts of which have been subdivided and developed for 60 years or more, can receive consideration in advance, perhaps, of some of the more recently established areas. The people in my area have suffered an injustice. Will the Minister have the projects upgraded to catch up the leeway, otherwise we will still be waiting for sewerage in this area in 1990?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member has constantly raised this matter in this House and with me, as well as in the adjournment debates and at every other opportunity. I know the problems and I know he is not exaggerating, but I am governed by the priorities placed on the money available. I know certain members are sick of hearing, "We can upgrade it here if the council can downgrade it there," but that is part of the problem, and the other part of the problem is the cost involved. I do not want the honourable member to think that for political reasons I have ever interfered with any recommendation the department has made to me in relation to work to be done in that area. Nothing is further from my mind, and it has never happened. I will see whether anything can be done to upgrade the project, although I doubt it. We have received the same amount this year from the Australian Government as was received last year, but it will not represent the same scale of work.

Dr. EASTICK: On March 9, 1971, as reported at page 3834 of *Hansard*, I sought information from the Minister about statements made just before that time relating to the improvement in sewerage in towns associated with watersheds going into reservoirs and also to certain facilities along the Murray River. On July 13, 1971, at page 22 of *Hansard*, I sought further information regarding Williamstown and Lyndoch, Williamstown being close to the South Para reservoir. The Minister said that it had been decided to put money into these projects so that there would be a better quality of water. Subsequently, the Public Health Department has undertaken some of the survey and design work for these sewerage arrangements. In some instances, the decision to have a full sewer system has subsequently been changed, and an effluent drain system substituted.

At one time, the Barossa council was asked to prepare a scheme for Lyndoch and Williamstown and, subsequently, the Public Health Department took over the responsibility for the Williamstown end and the council became responsible for Lyndoch. There was to be a common pond between the two towns, but later it was found that that might not be in the best interests of the project. What has happened to that sewerage scheme for the towns in the watershed area? Is some of the money in this line associated with the project and, if it is not, where will the money come from for this project and what programme does the Government intend to follow for this scheme?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Some result has been obtained, but possibly not at Williamstown or Lyndoch. Common effluent disposal schemes were introduced by the Public Health Department and the councils. The funds provided for this method of effluent disposal emanate from councils in the form of a subsidy to the council,

which undertakes to supply a common effluent system to the towns for which it is responsible. The subsidy applies only if the cost of installation exceeds, I think, \$30 a unit, and over and above that sum the Government is responsible for making up the difference in cost.

Dr. Eastick: That was the scheme that had gone for some years before your announcement about the watershed areas.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No, this was the first time it had ever been done, and it followed an incident that occurred at Lake Albert. After a visit there I announced the initial scheme. Meningie has a costly common effluent scheme. Mount Pleasant embarked on this type of system before we announced the scheme, and we brought it on. Its system cost about \$44 a unit.

Although there may have been common effluent schemes, they had not been subsidised by the Government before my announcement. We then subsidised the councils. Many towns along the Murray River and in watershed areas could be adequately served by common effluent schemes rather than by deep drainage, and this would be a saving not only in installation but also to the people using the scheme. As I am uncertain of the position at Williamstown and Lyndoch, I will inquire for the honourable member. The source of these funds is local government, and the body responsible for certifying the design, is the Public Health Department, which is required to assist councils in drawing up designs for this type of work. Of course, the department cannot do every town in the State at once. Towns are treated in turn as the application is lodged and the priority is placed on it, and the department helps when it can.

Dr. Eastick: Was the original announcement in respect of schemes in the watershed area?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Initially it was and then, because of problems at Clare, I think, and other towns, we extended it throughout the whole State. We said at the time that we could not service every demand immediately, but that they would have to be programmed.

Mr. VANDEPEER: I seek information on the sums of \$57 000 for Kalangadoo, \$6 000 for Millicent, \$23 000 for Robe, and \$107 000 for the South-East iron removal plants.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will obtain a detailed report for the honourable member. Regarding Kalangadoo, the money is for initial work in connection with the water supply. In Millicent, the money may be for replacement. The money for Robe is for extensions. Iron removal plants have been installed at Kingston, Robe and Beachport because of problems there. I am not certain of the area to which this expenditure applies; it could possibly be Beachport.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I must say that the District of Fisher seems to get a raw deal in respect of sewerage works. The proposal to filter the metropolitan supply was first mooted by the Liberal and Country Party, and the Labor Party took it up. Since then, an investigation was made to extend the scheme to the Morgan-Whyalla supply because of the amoebic meningitis case that was discovered in a swimming pool in that area. As a result of approaches I made earlier, I was led to believe that the investigation would be extended to the Barossa Valley water supply. Can the Minister say how far the investigation has proceeded?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will let the honourable member know.

Mr. WARDLE: Will the Minister provide me with information concerning the allocation of \$46 000 in relation to water supply projects at Murray Bridge?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I cannot offhand, but I imagine that it is for normal expansion or replacement. I will find out for the honourable member and let him know.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I can find no allocation of funds to provide a water supply to American River. However, it appears that after about 10 years of requests the Victor Harbor community was granted a sewerage scheme, and work was commenced in 1971-72, when \$330 000 was allocated. In the following years similar large sums were also allocated for this project, yet only \$25 000 is allocated this year and only about half the area is now sewered. I was interested to hear the Minister's comments in relation to the completion of projects by the department before moving its equipment to another location. Only a few weeks ago Victor Harbor residents who petitioned the Minister's department on this matter were assured that the plant and equipment at Victor Harbor would not be shifted from the areas in need until the projects were completed, and this could have alarming implications. Can the Minister explain why the miserable sum of only \$25 000 was allocated to this project for the next 12 months?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member may say that only half the Victor Harbor area has been sewered, but he would find that that statement is in conflict with the view expressed by departmental officers.

Mr. Chapman: It's only between the rivers that it has done anything.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Perhaps the areas that are left do not give the desired return required under the policy. I am not aware that the department is pulling out from that area. A certain percentage return is required by the department before it sewers any area and, although I do not know from local knowledge or from any other knowledge whether this is the case, it may be that the area referred to by the honourable member as being half of Victor Harbor falls into that category. Perhaps only \$25 000 was allocated this year for that reason. I point out to the honourable member that, if an assurance has been given by the department that it will not pull out its equipment and other facilities until the position is determined and any work remaining to be done is completed, I am sure that policy will be adhered to. However, when the honourable member says that only half the town of Victor Harbor has been sewered, I ask him to take into account the points I have made.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I understand that certain works are still to be carried out on the Tailem Bend to Keith main in conjunction with the Commonwealth Government, which makes funds available for that project. I believe that the work was undertaken under the provision for extension services and minor works. Can the Minister say whether this is so, and can he give any details of what work is scheduled to be carried out in this coming year?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes. The honourable member discussed this question with me the other day in relation to the Australian Government Budget. He noted that \$80 000 had been made available for the main from Tailem Bend to Keith for 1975-76. Evidently, during 1974-75 some extension to mains was carried out on the Tailem Bend to Keith scheme. These cases were restricted to areas subdivided from properties already supplied, but where the mains did not extend far enough to cover the severed land. Supply to the new title was still subject to

adequate return on the provision of finance under the Act by the Commonwealth Government. As all the moneys under the provisions of the Act had not at this stage been expended, it was considered prudent to have a nominal sum set aside for similar requests that might occur in 1975-76, as well as covering expenses involved in a booster pumping station required on one of the branch mains, and carried over from 1974-75. Departmental expenditure is covered by the provision under miscellaneous works.

Mr. MATHWIN: I seek information regarding the amount of \$1 100 000 provided to complete the trunk main from Darlington to Port Adelaide. When is it expected that this work will be completed? What is the situation regarding the Seacliff storage tank, which I understand has been completed?

Mr. Evans: It hasn't been paid for.

Mr. MATHWIN: My Whip has answered that question, but what is the expected completion date of the pipeline?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not know, but I will find out, but probably the member for Fisher is right.

Mr. ARNOLD: What is the position regarding effluent disposal stations in relation to boats on the Murray River?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It is about two or three months since I actually dealt with anything involving those facilities. I do know that moneys have been provided and that some stations have been built.

Mr. Arnold: Are they operating?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not know. The legislation involved has not yet been brought into effect; it largely depends on these facilities being available. I will obtain an up-to-date report as soon as possible for the honourable member. The Minister for the Environment has been on my back about the same thing.

Mr. Arnold: What has been happening to the sewerage?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The same thing that has applied for the past 150 years.

Mrs. BYRNE: I refer to the allocation for sewerage of new areas. Is any money allocated under this line for the sewerage of non-sewered areas in the Tea Tree Gully District? In asking this question I point out, mainly for the benefit of members opposite, that there are still areas in the Tea Tree Gully District that are not connected to the Engineering and Water Supply Department sewerage system. In fact, all the sewerage areas are not connected to Engineering and Water Supply Department deep drainage. In our district we also have common effluent drainage schemes, to which some of the houses are connected.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I must be consistent. If there are unsewered areas in the Tea Tree Gully District, it is not the honourable member's fault. There are unsewered areas in the Coles District too. I will consider the points raised by the honourable member and give her an up-to-date report. I move:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 10 p.m.

Motion carried.

Mr. RODDA: Requests for indirect services have been made from people in the hundred of Archibald and the hundred of Stirling, north of Keith. The Engineer-in-Chief has replied that it has not been possible to meet the requests, because the lateral mains are over-committed. What relief can be given to these people, and can steps be taken to extend the main, so that the people will get the water supplies that they need?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to take up the matter for the honourable member. I do not

think any provision has been made for this matter, but I will see whether there has been any change in the situation since the last report.

Dr. TONKIN: The question of water quality and water discolouration in the eastern suburbs has been raised in this place many times, but each time the Minister of Works tells us that although the water looks like mud it is entirely safe to drink.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Do you dispute that?

Dr. TONKIN: I have not sent a sample to the laboratory for culture lately, but I am sure that we can trust the departmental officers. On behalf of the residents of the eastern suburbs generally, I ask when is it likely that water filtration plants applicable to those suburbs will be commenced and when the residents will have water that is not only pure from the biological viewpoint but also aesthetically pleasant and fit to drink.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I cannot tell the Leader whether the whole of the eastern suburbs will be supplied with filtered water initially. I assume the Leader is thinking of the areas serviced from Hope Valley. Those areas will have filtered water early in 1977; from memory, I believe that about 60 000 people will benefit. The second plant, at Ansteys Hill, will be in operation late in 1978. By 1985, or perhaps a little earlier, the whole of the metropolitan area will have a filtered water supply. I believe that 10 stations are involved and various parts of the metropolitan area will be brought into the scheme progressively. I will get a report for the Leader. I would not like to say that the whole of the eastern suburbs will have filtered water initially; initially it will be only the areas serviced from Hope Valley.

Dr. EASTICK: Some old towns between 80 km and 90 km from Adelaide have been fairly extensively worked in recent years by real estate agents and people seeking house blocks. I refer particularly to Kapunda. These towns have areas that were subdivided some years ago in anticipation of earlier development. Many people are commuting from such towns to Adelaide. The blocks have not been developed in 50 years or 60 years, and the local councils now have the responsibility of doing all the developmental work. The Engineering and Water Supply Department cannot demand of the subdivider that services be placed so that water will be available to people in these areas. The only water supply they can get is an indirect service. The Kapunda council has written to the Minister saying that, in one subdivision that has been sold in recent months, there will be 20 properties each of 0.4 ha. The only means of providing water to these properties is through an indirect service by a water pipe along the footpath of the council road. The council believes that that is not in the best interests of the area. There will also be a cluster of 20 water meters where the lines leave the main. The Minister will be aware of this problem in several areas. Although I know it has been past policy that in all new subdivisions the work is to be done, has the Government looked at this problem? Is money provided in these lines to overcome the difficulty and do away with the provision of water only by an indirect line? If this problem has not been considered by the Government, will the Minister assure the Committee that it will be and that a considered reply will be brought down in due course?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am aware of this problem, which occurs in many parts of the State: the member for Fisher and the member for Heysen know

of it, too. Some of this money will be provided for some extensions. Whether or not Kapunda is specifically provided for I do not know, but I will find out and let the honourable member know.

Mr. BOUNDY: I refer to several lines under "Country waterworks". I thank the Minister that several projects in my district have been included—hundred of Hall and Stow, \$229 000; Mount Rat, \$69 000; Paskeville, Kadina and Wallaroo, \$378 000; and Two Wells, \$229 000. All of this money is for upgrading works, completing tanks, and the like. I refer also to the line dealing with extensions, services and minor works, for which \$2 489 000 is proposed. Does this money include some provision for extending reticulation facilities to existing coastal towns, shack areas and new subdivisions that are being planned and provided in my district for tourist purposes? I refer particularly to Balgowan, which hitherto was a small coastal trading port and which has now gained some prominence as a tourist resort. It has been trying for many years to get reticulated water. There is an obvious need for that service, both for health and for other reasons.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not know whether specific provision has been made for a reticulated water supply for Balgowan; I do not think it has, but I will have the matter examined, and also find out whether or not any provision has been made to service the coastal towns referred to, particularly those becoming prominent for tourism. There are some problems, and the honourable member is aware of them, especially in respect of shacks, but I will get a report for him.

Mr. VENNING: Last year \$3 500 000 was provided under the Commonwealth sewerage agreement, but there is no such line in the present Estimates. Will the Minister explain what has happened to that agreement? Does it not exist now?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: We have received from the Australian Government for this financial year for works in connect with catching up with the backlog of sewerage works an amount of \$5 700 000. Why it is not shown here I am not certain; I think \$4 500 000 is shown somewhere. In fact, we received more than we bargained for in these Loan Estimates; we received exactly the same amount as last year.

Mr. EVANS: I wish to raise three matters. First, can the Minister say whether his department will continue the programme of buying land in the water catchment areas of proposed future reservoirs, such as Clarendon and Baker Gully? Also, can he estimate how much money was spent on the acquisition of land and building the adit tunnel and other works at the Clarendon dam? Secondly, is any consideration being given to putting what is called the Stirling metropolitan area under metropolitan water rating instead of country water rating, which is 25 per cent higher? Thirdly, the Minister has moved to start a new treatment works in the Stirling area, to sewer the Stirling area. Although I represent that area, I believe the need there is not as great, so far as community living is concerned, as in the Blackwood, Coromandel Valley and Belair area.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I cannot give a general statement of policy on the purchase of land for proposed future dams, because certain conditions obtain in certain cases, but each case is treated on its merits and will be looked at. I shall be happy to examine the other two matters raised by the honourable member and give him a report.

Mr. WOTTON: I express my gratitude for the sewerage work being carried out in the Balhannah and Hahndorf area, and I trust it will continue. I am particularly concerned that there is no mention of a reticulated water supply to the Callington, Strathalbyn and Hartley area. The Engineering and Water Supply Department has initiated an inquiry into this problem, but many requests have been made over the years for research in that area. The quality of the Bremer River is deteriorating rapidly. Will the Government look into the matter and, if possible, report what progress has been made?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member is correct in saying that the Bremer River is deteriorating rapidly, and the position is causing the Government some concern. The member for Murray has made representations to me on this matter on several occasions. Recently, he introduced a deputation representative of the people not only from Callington but also from Woodchester and Hartley. They stressed strongly the need for something to be done there. We are trying to attract, through the national water programme, some money from the Australian Government. In connection with that, a study has been undertaken involving the sociological benefits that would accrue to that district as a whole from an adequate water supply. We have to convince the authorities. I have asked for that inquiry to be expedited, and a senior officer in the department was dealing with the matter. I will ask him what progress has been made and let the honourable member know.

Mr. ALLISON: I realise it is improbable that, of the \$198 000 proposed for country sewerage works and the \$2 448 000 for extensions, services and minor works, any money will be available for Mount Gambier, especially as it has not been named. However, is it possible to make money available from the \$1 664 000 proposed for preliminary investigations and miscellaneous items for an examination of the Mount Gambier outfall with a view to reducing considerably the pollution on South-Eastern beaches?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: That matter has been the subject of intensive inquiry. I cannot say off the top of my head what stage it has reached. I will consult the department on that, but I will give the honourable member the latest information on the matter. I assure him that the matter of the outfall has been investigated because of concern expressed not only by people in the area but also by the Fisheries Department and our own officers about whether the present method of discharge of effluent into the sea is satisfactory. As I think the honourable member would appreciate, any alternative method would involve large expenditure but, if that must be, in order to maintain the quality of the environment, I guess we must face up to it.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister obtain for me a report on what work is proposed on the Karoonda extensions this year and what the works programme will be for the next two or three years? It is not listed, but I assume that probably the pumping station referred to is for Karoonda, and that other works are provided for in the line relating to extensions, etc.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will be pleased to obtain a report.

Mr. BOUNDY: Has any provision been made for the recycling of Bolivar water for use by market gardeners in the Virginia area?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Consultants are studying this matter at present. The study is not near completion,

although the progress being made is in accordance with the schedules that the consultants have given us. I am not certain when the study will end, but I hope that it will not take much longer, because one thing that has frustrated me since I have been Minister of Works is the number of inquiries, tests, and things done about the recycling of Bolivar effluent. It is vital to the existence of the northern Adelaide Plain that we find a use for that water.

Line passed.

Public buildings, \$107 500 000.

Dr. TONKIN: Many projects are listed in this line, particularly alterations and additions to the Royal Adelaide Hospital, for which \$2 540 000 is provided. I should like the Minister to give me some idea of the area in which the money will be spent. Further, I understand that progress on the Flinders Medical Centre is advancing well and that work is still on schedule, but I should be grateful if the Minister could tell me whether it has been possible to catch up on the delay caused by the concrete strike some time ago. I understand that it has been. I should also like to know whether the work proposed at Glenside Hospital in the psychiatric sub-acute wards is a continuation of work started last year and, if it is, what is the total amount to be spent. Further, the need for additions to the Modbury Hospital seems to have arisen fairly soon after completion of the building.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not know the details about the Royal Adelaide Hospital, and I will get them. For the Flinders Medical Centre, \$19 560 000 is provided this year. I understand that 300 beds will be available at the beginning of next year and that that work is on schedule. I hope it remains so. I am not aware of the details regarding the Glenside Hospital, but I will get a report for the Leader.

Mrs. BYRNE: Although I was told in March this year that there were plans further to develop the delivery suite at Modbury Hospital and also that expenditure was proposed for a second X-ray room at the hospital, I do not know whether they are the additions that are referred to in the Loan Estimates, and I should like that information. Recently, when I asked the Minister a question about whether the planning and subsequent building of the hospital included provision for a room to be used by the Meals on Wheels service, I was told that they did not.

I have noticed that the Northern Community Hospital has had a room incorporated for the use of the Meals on Wheels service, and I think that, when hospitals are being planned, if it is proposed that meals are to be served from them, consideration should be given to incorporating such rooms in the planning. I realise that this may not be necessary at Modbury Hospital, because of the frozen food service being implemented, and I should like an explanation from the Minister on how that service will operate.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The operation of the frozen food factory is a matter for the Minister of Health. I only build the building, which will cost about \$7 000 000. I think that the tender was let recently. I imagine that provision of the factory certainly would have an effect, and probably that is why the room has not been provided at Modbury Hospital. I shall be pleased to ask my officers to consider the matter again, but I, as Minister of Works, only operate for a client. In this case the client is the Minister of Health, and he would decide whether such a room would be provided. The member for Tea Tree Gully and the Leader have asked other questions about extensions to Modbury Hospital, and I will get the information sought.

Mr. EVANS: When will work begin on the new Belair school site? When will the rooms requested in the Crafrers school be available? When will other classrooms, apart from the dental clinic, be available for the Belair school? When will the Bellevue Heights school be commenced (it is needed just as urgently as the Flagstaff Hill school)? When will the Coromandel Valley school be rebuilt (it is inadequate, and when the former Minister of Education visited the school some 18 months ago he said that a new school would be needed; it was to have been well under way before now but the plans were changed)? The Coromandel Valley South school—

The CHAIRMAN: These schools are not listed in the Loan Estimates.

Mr. EVANS: There is a general expense at the end, and I take it that it covers these schools, and that is why I am asking these questions. Many of the schools in my area that are waiting do not seem to be considered at all.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Education): Any predictions I may give tonight can be only in fairly general terms.

The CHAIRMAN: These schools are not listed in any way at all in the Loan Estimates.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I am happy to endeavour to accommodate the honourable member.

The CHAIRMAN: That is not the point at issue. They are not listed, and so they are out of order.

Mr. EVANS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the Flagstaff Hill school is mentioned, as is the Belair school, and I have referred to both schools.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: In relation to the redevelopment of stage 1 of the Belair Primary School, it is not possible for me to give a definite indication as to when we can go to tender. It is expected that documentation will be complete by the end of this calendar year. The Flagstaff Hill Primary School is in my district, but I imagine children from the District of Fisher would attend it. I made a public announcement earlier in the year that it would be possible to go to tender in October or November next. This is a solid construction school, so it is not expected to be available for use until the beginning of the 1977 calendar year. There may have to be some slight delay in the calling of tenders because of the reprogramming of our capital works programme following the reduction in the amount of money available for capital works which we are obtaining from the Schools Commission, although I do not expect any major delay. Any remarks that I may make this evening must be regarded as general estimates, but I shall undertake to get more specific answers in each case, even where I appear to have given a reasonably specific answer, and they will be available for honourable members in writing.

The Hon. E. CONNELLY: I am delighted to see that \$1 338 000 has been allocated for the development of Port Pirie Hospital, a base hospital and training hospital urgently in need of redevelopment. I am equally delighted to see the inclusion of an air-conditioning system, which is most essential in a climate such as that of Port Pirie. While the amount allocated will complete the present project, I am pleased that sufficient funds will remain to start the development of the second stage, leading me to believe that this will be a continuing project until it is completed. I appreciate, too, the funding made available to Risdon Park school, and I assume that this will complete the project. The school was built 20 years ago when every building constructed was of a temporary nature, and it

has been necessary to demolish all the buildings and to rebuild in permanent construction. Port Pirie High School would be one of the oldest high schools in the State and, whilst I am aware that there has been limited redevelopment, I take it that the sum to be allocated will complete the building now under construction. Can the Minister say whether this reconstruction will be continual or whether the funding now available will be sufficient only to complete the present project?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I think I should get a report for the honourable member on this. The additions type B to Port Pirie High School were expected a short while ago to be available towards the end of this term or early next term, at a total estimated escalated cost of about \$600 000. It is not clear to me whether that is the total programme originally laid down, but I imagine it would be, and that the honourable member's question arises from the fact that there is some delay which means that the project appears still to be incomplete. The only other information I can give the honourable member is in relation to the further development of the school, which is not ready to go to tender.

Dr. TONKIN: Glen Osmond school has had a raw deal in recent years. There has been some difficulty with the school yard, with the accommodation now being relieved by the building of new classrooms, but there is a problem associated with the headmaster's residence which, until recently, was occupied by the master. It was the subject of some detailed planning at the end of last year to incorporate it into the general school complex. When the resident master left, instead of being used as further extensions to the school, the school library and other office accommodation, the residence was made available to a country teacher on a special course in Adelaide.

The matter of the acquisition of further land and property has also arisen. The Savage property next door on the eastern side of the school property facing Fisher Street was available for sale recently. Unfortunately, the sale has gone through to another buyer and the Education Department has been unable to acquire it. Other projects have been put forward in Moorhouse Avenue and Rossington Avenue to provide extra access to the school. Those houses could have been used if the acquisition had gone ahead to accommodate the teacher from the country who is now occupying the residence which the school needs for a library and other facilities. What is the up-to-date position with regard to this school?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: It is not possible off the top of my head to give the current position, but I will obtain a full report for the honourable member. One of the areas in which it has been painfully necessary to make cutbacks in our original programme is in the acquisition of land. We regard land acquisition as particularly desirable, especially in the older suburbs of the metropolitan area where previously schools were built on quite inadequate areas of land by modern standards, often falling well short of the magic 10-acre mark. In some cases, even road closures would be desirable if it were possible to obtain accommodation from the local council. It has been necessary for us to make considerable savings in this aspect of the line, and this is one of the factors that prevented us from making the acquisition in question which, I agree with the Leader, would have been most desirable.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.33 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, August 28, at 2 p.m.