

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, August 9, 1972

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

**POLICE PENSIONS ACT AMENDMENT
BILL**

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

PETITION: LEGAL AID

Mr. EVANS presented a petition signed by 52 persons alleging that legal aid available to poor persons was of inferior quality and that the administration of justice was being prejudiced. The petitioners prayed that the House of Assembly would pass the necessary legislation to allow all defendants prosecuted under the Social Welfare Act to be represented in court by a friend of their own choosing, provided that such representation was given free of charge.

Petition received and read.

**MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: INDUS-
TRIAL WASTE**

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yesterday, in reply to a question asked by the member for Stuart, I said that no industrial waste was discharged into the sea around the South Australian coastline. The figure of 7,000,000gall. had been mentioned, and I said that all of this, or practically all of it, was treated in the four sewage treatment works that served the metropolitan area, and that about 40,000gall. a week was placed in lagoons and treated properly.

This is still the case, but today it has been brought to my attention that a discharge of toxic industrial waste into the sewerage system is affecting the efficient operation of the Bolivar Sewage Treatment Works. The waste, which is believed to be a heavy metal, has put out of operation three of the four sludge digestion tanks at the works. As a result of this, sludge is being diverted to emergency lagoons, where it can be held and treated satisfactorily. However, I must give a warning that this could cause a local odour problem.

Because the three digestion tanks are not operating, gas production has almost ceased and the engines are running on fuel oil only.

This means a significant increase in operation costs of about \$200 a day. I have been told by the Engineering and Water Supply Department that, if there are no more toxic discharges, the tanks will be back in operation in about three to four weeks. Industry has generally been very co-operative in the past, and we have had very few large discharges of toxic waste.

Chemists at the Bolivar laboratories are trying to trace the source of the discharge that has put the tanks out of operation, as it is most important that further discharges be prevented. The people responsible for the discharge could well be unaware of the serious effect it is having. The Engineering and Water Supply Department would welcome any assistance in identifying the source and nature of the waste. The operation staff at Bolivar is available for contact 24 hours a day. I pointed out yesterday that some industries were required to pre-treat their waste before it was discharged into the sewerage system. At this stage neither I nor the department know the likelihood of failure to do this being the cause, but I appeal to industries to check their operations to find out whether (inadvertently, for example) they may have caused the problem that we now have at Bolivar.

QUESTIONS**PETROL SHORTAGE**

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Premier consider making available under permit supplies of petrol to those persons who have been stood down as a result of the fuel emergency and are now prevented from obtaining alternative employment by inability to travel to work sites and carry their tools of trade to these locations? The situation has arisen that growing numbers of workers have been stood down from their jobs because of shortages of materials or equipment to carry on present contracts. It is alleged that this situation applies particularly in the bricklaying industry, where supplies of bricks have been held up by petrol shortages affecting delivery services. It is claimed that, in some cases, workers are now finding it extremely difficult, and in fact often impossible, to obtain employment elsewhere because they cannot get to other work sites. In other cases, workers can get themselves to new sites by public transport but cannot get their tools on site. This, for instance, applies to tradesmen such as carpenters and plumbers. It is recognized that, once they get employment on a new site, they can draw supplies from their new

employer. It is the denying of the initial contact and their inability to get their equipment on to the site that is causing some distress.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will certainly examine the matter and see whether some special provision can be made.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Has the Premier's attention been drawn to the statement made by Mr. Ian Wilson and others, I think on television, about petrol being supplied to Broken Hill from South Australia and, if the Premier's attention has been drawn to the matter, what action does he intend to take in connection with it? It has been reported to me that this morning Mr. Wilson, the endorsed Liberal and Country League candidate for the Sturt District—

The Hon. D. H. McKee: He is also a Liberal Movement candidate.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: He is a member of the Liberal Movement. He has made a statement this morning based on information that has been given to him that, while South Australia is starved of petrol, tankers are running from this State to Broken Hill. I think that his statement says that unionists in Broken Hill are laughing all the way to the bowyers. I realize it is not possible to stop trade between States in any commodity because of certain constitutional provisions, but it does show that apparently the oil companies believe that they have more than sufficient petrol in South Australia under present conditions and are therefore able to supply Broken Hill as well, and without any restriction, as I understand it, being placed on the retail sale of petrol in Broken Hill or in any other part of New South Wales. If the Premier has heard of this situation, what action, if any, does he intend to take about it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The request of the Prime Minister of this country, whom the endorsed candidate for Sturt for the L.M. and the L.C.L. presumably supports—

Mr. Millhouse: Come on! Keep to the question!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member canvassed this matter in his question. If he does not like the answer, he will not get anything. The honourable member mentioned Mr. Wilson's candidacy, so let me deal with the whole of what the honourable member put to me.

Mr. Millhouse: I hope you will.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I shall; I can promise the honourable member that.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Prime Minister of this country requested the Premiers of the States to nominate officers to a national committee during the period of petrol restriction in Australia to rationalize supplies and ensure that the areas in short supply would be able to get some petrol. Broken Hill and Alice Springs are normally supplied with petrol from South Australia and, in return for our getting petrol from Portland and for a tanker into Port Pirie, we had to undertake to provide restricted supplies to Broken Hill and Alice Springs. Those cities would otherwise have been completely without petrol, even for emergency services. So, we agreed to do that. We got a *quid pro quo*; if we did not co-operate nationally, we would not get the supplies in here that are now in prospect for South Australia or the supplies into Port Pirie that are currently arriving from the *Mobil Australis*.

Mr. Millhouse: What's the restricted basis?

The SPEAKER: Order! Only one question at a time must be asked. The member for Mitcham is out of order.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The amount being supplied to Broken Hill has been agreed, as has the amount being supplied to Alice Springs. True, the Liberal Government of New South Wales has not applied the kind of restrictions that we have applied in South Australia in order to ensure priorities in petrol supply. Motorists and other people in dire need in New South Wales are spending all night outside petrol stations waiting for a drop of petrol and are following tankers from the refinery to retail outlets in order to get some petrol. That is what is happening in New South Wales, but it is not happening here. It is significant that the honourable member, when talking about the supply of petrol to Broken Hill, said that Mr. Wilson had said that unionists, and not other people in the community (apparently not doctors, lawyers, or shopkeepers) were laughing all the way to the bowyers. The political nature of the question is obvious. I do not know why the honourable member does not take up this matter with his colleagues in other States or with the Prime Minister.

Mr. Millhouse: What has all this to do with it?

The SPEAKER: Order! As the member for Mitcham has asked his question, I ask him to contain himself and to act in this Chamber in the way he would act in the High Court.

Mr. Harrison: He didn't do too well there.

The SPEAKER: The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not need to answer any further. The member for Mitcham is obviously playing politics, as usual.

Mr. CARNIE: Will the Premier do what he can to have petrol supplies in Port Lincoln released in order to supply Eyre Peninsula? I know that the Government plans to lift all restrictions as soon as possible, and I am not criticizing its handling of the petrol situation. However, the position in Port Lincoln and on Eyre Peninsula generally is that most, if not all, service stations and farmers had their supplies topped up by the companies concerned before restrictions were imposed in the country. In fact, the service stations in question have supplies that will last from seven to 10 days; most farmers have ample supplies; and 197,000gall. of petrol is held in back-up bulk storage. As the normal use of petrol from Port Lincoln, which covers all of Eyre Peninsula except Whyalla, amounts to 30,000gall. a day, the back-up storage will last for almost a week. However, because farmers already have ample supplies, substantially less than 30,000gall. a day would be used. Permits issued under the current restriction to people in those categories allowed to obtain supplies represent a total of about 2,500gall. a week in respect of Port Lincoln. I point out that due in port next Monday is a tanker carrying distillate and petrol. From the figures I have quoted, which I believe to be accurate, I believe that Eyre Peninsula has sufficient fuel to last for at least two weeks. As this tanker is arriving in five days time, I ask the Premier whether he will recommend to the committee, which I understand will be reviewing the situation tomorrow, that restrictions applying to Eyre Peninsula be lifted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We will certainly examine this matter. The problem involving Eyre Peninsula and the supplies held in Port Lincoln has been examined previously. While it is true that a tanker can berth at Port Lincoln rather earlier than one can berth at Birkenhead in order to discharge refined petrol, thereafter the possibility of supplies to Port Lincoln is a little remote. There will be a long period during which no tanker comes in, and there will not be any supplies to Eyre Peninsula. Therefore, the committee has been reluctant to recommend the complete lifting of restrictions on Eyre Peninsula at this stage. However, I will refer the honourable member's remarks to the committee immediately. As he has said, it will be meeting tomorrow morning, and it will examine the matter.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Has the Government considered opening additional centres from which petrol permits may be obtained? I have had complaints from people who have had to wait for many hours, and in some cases, because of their work, people have not been able to wait at police stations or at the State Administration Centre to obtain permits.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We have looked at this. The problem is that extra staff must be provided at each centre. We have used all the staff immediately available, whom we have given some short training on what must be done in the issuing of permits. I have asked the Public Service Board to provide additional staff immediately to try to reduce the waiting time. I very much regret the amount of waiting time that has occurred at some centres. The Public Service Board is working currently to try to increase the numbers of staff so that we are able to cope with the queues very much more quickly. I expect that by the time we are able to open further centres we will be hoping to have reached the stage where it is not necessary to have any centres at all. However, we are looking at this currently and the Public Service Board is working on it.

Mr. GUNN: Will the Premier consider broadening the permit system now in operation on Eyre Peninsula? I have been approached by some of my constituents who have had difficulties in obtaining permits. In two instances people needed permits so that they could take a sick member of their family to receive medical treatment. There appears to be some confusion among members of the Police Force in certain areas regarding the issuing of permits.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will refer this matter to the committee.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Premier say what is the gallonage of petrol which it has been agreed is to be supplied to Broken Hill from South Australia? My earlier question concerned the matter of the supply of petrol to Broken Hill from this State and, in his reply, the Premier said that it had been agreed to supply Broken Hill on (I think he said) a "restricted basis". When I asked, by interjection, what was the gallonage the Premier ignored that question.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: And rightly so. Interjections are out of order.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham must ignore that remark.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I therefore put this question to the Premier now, because I take

it that he would know the answer to it. It is of very great importance to the people of this State that they know how much of the petrol that we need so badly here is in fact going out to supply Broken Hill. Broken Hill is situated in New South Wales where, I can assure the Premier from my own observations last week, the situation is not at all as he tried to paint it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I therefore give the Premier the opportunity to reply directly to this question—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —which he avoided doing in his long provocative reply before.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not remember the precise figure. I was shown it at the time when there was a report to me on all gallonages in Australia. I shall obtain the figure for the honourable member.

Mr. Millhouse: By tomorrow?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, I will get it by then.

Mr. BECKER: Can the Premier say whether the Government intends to increase the number of authorized service stations that can receive petrol from oil companies in order to supply permit holders? A constituent of mine has three service stations, which are holding about 1,000gall. of standard petrol only. The nearest authorized service stations are about 2½ miles north and two miles south of his service station, and he has asked whether the Government intends to increase the number of nominated outlets.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The number of nominated outlets has been agreed with the oil companies on the basis of fair distribution between the outlets of each company in proportion to its share of the market and whether the centres can be supplied and serviced adequately. I hope that, as it will be such a short time before we remove restrictions entirely, there will be little point in providing additional outlets. However, I will refer the question to the committee.

Mr. BURDON: Can the Premier give the House any information on the reason why the Westernport refinery, and the Kwinana refinery in Western Australia, were kept working during the recent oil dispute? I believe that during the recent national oil crisis some refineries in Australia were kept in production. The reason why the people in the western part of Victoria and the South-East of South Aus-

tralia were able to receive petrol supplies at a time when people in the other parts of this State were unable to and why in Western Australia petrol supplies were maintained was that those two refineries that I have mentioned were kept in production.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Some of the oil companies were prepared to grant some negotiated improvements and conditions and, in fact, to pay wages above the previously specified levels. At those refineries the workers kept working. It was in the case of the companies that were completely intransigent by refusing to negotiate and insisting that the matter be dealt with only by arbitration and not by conciliation that there was a complete breakdown in operations. Unfortunately, that included the Mobil company in South Australia, which meant we had no refinery working; whilst some refineries closed in other States, others, such as Westernport and Kwinana, were kept working.

CANNING FRUIT INDUSTRY

Mr. CURREN: Will the Premier bring to the notice of the Commonwealth Government the appalling economic situation facing the canning fruit industry and request that urgent measures be taken to ensure that the financial plight of fruitgrowers is alleviated? I quote from a circular, which most honourable members have received, sent out by Riverland Fruit Products Co-operative Limited. After explaining the overall situation that has brought about the financial situation that the canners and growers are in, it states:

Despite a significant reduction of 1,808,000 basic cartons (16 per cent) in the 1972 season's production, for obvious reasons it would appear that the carry-in stock at January 1, 1973, will exceed that of the previous year . . . Faced with such a foreboding, it would surely be prudent for growers to give serious consideration to some voluntary method of decreasing production for the 1973 season, such as implementation of an effective realistic orchard regeneration programme. Whilst the canners have done everything within their limited power to impress on the Government (that is, the Commonwealth Government) the urgency of the industry's predicament, we feel that it is also imperative that growers should make the strongest possible representation at every conceivable level, and take every opportunity to acquaint those concerned with the desperate financial state of the industry and its urgent need of Government assistance.

Will the Premier take up this matter with the Commonwealth Government as a matter of the greatest urgency?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I shall do that.

FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE

Mr. PAYNE: Has the Minister of Works been able to come to any decision, in conjunction with the Flinders Medical Centre planning team, concerning the future access road to the centre? No doubt the Minister knows that the two streets concerned, namely, Rupert and Francis Streets, are situated in my district. The residents who live on the western side of the streets have been in fear since the announced acquisition of houses on the eastern side for the construction of the centre. Their worry is that their former quiet suburban streets will become a main thoroughfare for entry to and exit from the hospital.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member took up this matter with me early last month. I asked the planning team to examine the honourable member's proposal, and it now appears that a solution is possible along the lines suggested by him. The proposed access road which satisfies the needs of the residents of Francis and Rupert Streets and the medical centre is as follows:

Rupert Street: The existing road remains as a private service road to the houses, with no connection to the hospital roadway. It would also be desirable not to connect Rupert Street directly to South Road but to rely on the existing outlets via Wentworth and Franklin Avenues. Because of the shortage of space it is necessary to reduce Rupert Avenue to 18ft. in width and to move it 4ft. westwards by reducing the existing footpath reserve from 12ft. to 8ft. A plantation reserve of 8ft. will then be constructed to divide Rupert Street from the new four-lane roadway that is needed to serve the medical centre and university.

Francis Street: The existing roadway remains, but again because of the shortage of space it is necessary to reduce it to 18ft. in width and to move it westwards by 4ft. The existing connections to South Road via Milton and Matthew Streets and Franklin Avenue can remain. Again, there should be no connection to the medical centre road. A small turning circle will therefore be required at the southern termination of Francis Street. An 8ft. plantation will then divide this service road from the new medical centre roadway, which will be reduced to the absolute minimum at this southern end to ensure sufficient distance between the new road and the medical centre residential buildings.

The local residents will retain the quiet domestic environment which exists at present. In fact, it will be improved by the complete

exclusion of all through traffic which now uses Rupert and Francis Streets as a route to the university. The residents will also be separated from the medical centre by a densely planted plantation. On the other hand, the university and medical centre will enjoy a new multi-lane access roadway, separated from the local suburb and linked directly to South Road. These proposals obviously require a greater area of land than would be required for one roadway used jointly by residents and the medical centre but, by very careful design and by balancing the available green belt areas between residents' houses and the medical centre, I consider this solution to be feasible and a fair one to both parties.

EVERARD PARK

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Can the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Lands, confirm his approval of the action taken by Mr. B. H. MacLachlan in offering Everard Park to the authorities at cost? I have noticed that there are people who are ever ready to criticize Mr. MacLachlan. As a former Minister of Lands (and I know the Minister of Works was also Minister of Lands), my understanding is that Mr. MacLachlan is one of the outstanding lessees of the pastoral country. Anyone who visits his properties will see the efficiency with which he runs them, at the same time taking great care of conservation. It is an inspiring experience to see how Commonwealth Hill, which has been under his control since it was first developed, has been developed in such a fine way with regard to conservation. I ask the Minister whether he will confirm his approval, and that of his colleague, of Mr. MacLachlan's action.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will certainly take up the matter raised by the honourable member with my colleague; I do not want to speak on his behalf. I think that everyone in South Australia is delighted to think that Mr. MacLachlan has made the offer he has made to the Commonwealth Government, which has apparently accepted the offer. I think that this proves that Mr. MacLachlan was probably unaware that the Commonwealth Government was interested in purchasing the property for the Aborigines.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: It shows the value of public pressure.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: To my knowledge, and certainly to the knowledge of the member for Alexandra, this was a genuine offer. I am certainly delighted that this land will now be reserved for what I believe is its

proper purpose and that the Commonwealth Government, possibly after some initial errors in its handling of the matter, is now able to provide the money to set this property aside for, as I have said, what I believe to be its proper purpose.

WATER FILTRATION

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Minister of Works give me the information I sought a week or so ago about water filtration?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member knows that I have had this reply

for a while. Work is proceeding on the design of the Hope Valley water treatment works. This work will have a capacity of 60,000,000gal. a day and will serve a population of 230,000 people in the north-west suburbs of the city. Hope Valley was selected as the first works to be constructed because this reservoir supplies a generally low quality water, particularly following summer rains. The expected commissioning date for Hope Valley is March, 1976. The overall programme provides for the construction of all seven works over a 10-year period, with completion in 1983. The planned order of construction is as follows:

	General Area Served	Planned Commissioning Date
Hope Valley.....	North-west suburbs	1976
Anstey Hill.....	North-east suburbs and foothills.....	1977
Kangaroo Creek (Athelstone)	Metropolitan foothills . . .	1978
Happy Valley.....	Southern suburbs.....	1980
Chandler Hill.....	Blackwood, Belair.....	1981
Barossa.....	Gawler, Elizabeth.....	1982
Myponga.....	Christies Beach, Aldinga . .	1983

Water treatment works associated with new schemes (for example, Little Para reservoir) will be constructed as part of the overall scheme.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT FINANCE

Mr. RODDA: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport say why Government grants to South-East councils have been reduced? A recent meeting of the South-Eastern Local Government Association was told that, because of Commonwealth allocations, grants to the area would be reduced from \$1,250,000 to \$880,000. The Town Clerk of the Corporation of Naracoorte has asked me to take up this matter with the Minister in order to obtain some sort of relief from this situation. I understand the relevant Commonwealth Minister has said, in reply to approaches made to him, that there have been no reductions in Commonwealth allocations to this State and that any reductions that have occurred have been within this Government's jurisdiction. I should be pleased if the Minister would tell the House, if not today then soon, why this reduction in grants to South-East councils, which are experiencing stringent conditions because of increases in wages and costs generally, has occurred.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The sum made available by the Commonwealth Government for roadworks is determined under the Com-

monwealth Aid Roads Act, which has a life of five years and which sets out the sums available and the purpose for which they are to be spent. Regarding allocations within various categories, the honourable member will realize that far more requests are received than there is money available to meet. Accordingly, the Highways Department has adopted a policy, principally, of providing money in the area of greatest need. I think I should point out that some councils exist only because of the finance made available to them by the Highways Department, and this is the basis of the approach, in which I am currently involved, in relation to the redistribution of local government boundaries throughout the State. Regarding the South-East specifically, the money that is available has been allocated on the basis of the greatest need. Councils should not expect (although, I regret, they sometimes do), merely because they receive a grant of, say, \$100,000 this year, to receive \$100,000, plus an equivalent sum to cater for cost increases, next year. The basis on which we are approaching this complex problem is the need in a certain district. It is fair to say that, overall, the South-East has had a fairly good go from the Highways Department and, now that some of the greatest problems of the area have been met, it is inevitable that there must be reductions in the sums made available to it in future.

HOSPITAL COMMUNICATIONS

Dr. TONKIN: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked recently regarding the report on hospital communications?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Just before the Committee of Inquiry into Hospital Communications completed its report, the general Committee of Inquiry into Health Services in South Australia was appointed. As the latter committee covers a wide field of all health services in South Australia, the report of the inquiry into hospital communications was made available to Mr. Justice Bright, Chairman of the Committee of Inquiry into Health Services. It is not intended to take further action until the report of the Bright committee is received and considered.

TEA TREE GULLY WATER SUPPLY

Mrs. BYRNE: In the temporary absence of the Minister of Works, will the Attorney-General ask his colleague whether he can tell me the names of the streets in which are located the 22 existing houses and the 33 vacant allotments for which approval has been given to provide a water supply to serve the subdivision east of Haines Road, Tea Tree Gully, as referred to in correspondence from the Minister dated July 24, 1972?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will take up the matter with my colleague.

ANDAMOOKA WATER SUPPLY

Mr. GUNN: In the temporary absence of the Minister of Works, has the Premier a reply to my recent question about the Andamooka water supply?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, I cannot find it at the moment.

FAMILY PLANNING

Mr. EVANS: Can the Attorney-General say what plans the Government has to help family planning clinics to be established throughout this State? The Family Planning Association and other groups help and counsel many people, but in most cases those organizations are short of accommodation, as well as finance. Bearing in mind the Bill at present before the House to change the abortion law, I think that it would be of advantage to members if they knew how much money, and in what areas, the Government intended to spend in future in this regard. Knowing this would help members in regard to making decisions in this House, and it would also help people in the community to determine their attitude to this law. Can the Attorney-General say whether extra money is being provided for this purpose and whether

premises are being made available to help those organizations that counsel people in respect of family planning; or, alternatively, does the Government intend to set up a new organization to help in this regard?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Government recognizes the great social importance of family planning assistance and has in the last year substantially increased the financial support given to the Family Planning Association and also the Catholic Family Planning Centre. Also, clinics are in existence at the Queen Victoria Hospital and the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. As to plans for the future, I shall refer the matter to the Chief Secretary, within whose Ministerial responsibility it lies, and give the honourable member a reply.

EGGS

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Premier ask the Minister of Agriculture when the Government intends to introduce a Bill for the control of egg production in South Australia? Although such legislation has been requested by South Australian producers previously, it has been held up by the Victorian Government's refusal to participate. However, that Government has now introduced legislation, and in view of the urgency of the problems of egg producers the Government should bring in legislation as soon as possible.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will get a report from my colleague.

JAMESTOWN SCHOOL

Mr. VENNING: In the absence of the Minister of Education, can the Premier say whether the Government intends to build a single-teacher unit at Jamestown in the current financial year? For some time correspondence has been forwarded by the school committee at Jamestown regarding this matter, and I followed it up with the Crown Solicitor's office about four or five months ago, but we have heard nothing further.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will get a report from my colleague.

TRIELLA JACKPOT

Mr. BECKER: Will the Attorney-General obtain from the Chief Secretary information on whether the Greyhound Racing Development Board will receive 1 per cent of the investment on the \$50,000 triella jackpot? I understand a jackpot, with a pool limit of \$50,000, is to commence at the greyhound racing meeting to be held at Days Road on August 17. In view of the amendment to the Lottery and Gaming Act during the previous session,

by which a racing development board was established, will totalizator operators be entitled to deduct the 1 per cent from the investment on this jackpot to assist with race-course development?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will refer the question to my colleague.

Mr. MATHWIN'S QUESTION

Mr. MATHWIN: I have a question to ask of the Minister of Works, but he is out of the Chamber.

ROAD MARKINGS

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether the research unit of the Highways Department has considered or is engaged in an evaluation of thermo-plastic and cross-linking plastic materials as an alternative to the currently used road line-marking material? It has been stated in a communication from a manufacturing group that there is considerable advantage in the use of thermo-plastic and cross-linking plastic material in regard to cost and efficiency compared to the normal paint material now used. As legislation was passed in this House to create a development and research unit in the Highways Department, I should like to know whether that unit is doing any evaluation work on such material.

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

FLUORIDATION

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Premier, in the temporary absence of the Minister of Works, give a reply to my recent question on fluoridation?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No adverse effects on the water supply system have been observed. The benefit of fluoridation in improving dental health in Adelaide is being monitored by the Public Health Department.

WINE EXCISE

Mr. CURREN: Will the Premier make further representations to the Commonwealth Government to have the wine excise removed completely in the next Commonwealth Budget? As all members know, the 50c a gallon wine excise was imposed in the 1970 Commonwealth Budget, but before this a protest was initiated in this House and forwarded to the Commonwealth Treasurer and Prime Minister protesting at the prospect of this excise being imposed. When it was imposed, despite the protest from those engaged in the industry (grapegrowers, winemakers and

wine sellers), it disastrously reduced the sale of wines. After being enforced for about 18 months, the excise was recently reduced, but most winemakers are demanding that excise on wine be removed completely in order to give the industry a reasonable chance to regain economic stability. Will the Premier consult the Commonwealth Government about this matter?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, I will. In fact, I protested today at the opening of new wine school premises in Richmond. A wide representation of the wine industry was present and agreed that the remainder of the excise should be removed immediately.

COORONG

Mr. RODDA: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say whether he or his officers are now considering the condition of the Coorong, which is reported to be a stagnant and receding waterway? I understand that many people who are interested in the Coorong consider that the drainage system now operating in the South-East, particularly Drain M, which now carries straight into the sea much of the water that normally makes its way into the Coorong through the Baker Range drain, has cut off the supply of water that normally flows into the Coorong, and it seems that the draw-off of water from the Murray River (which is necessary) has also cut off a supply from the Coorong system. As an investigation into maintaining a water supply into the Coorong area will be well advised, does the Minister contemplate considering this aspect of conserving this valuable asset before it is too late?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I have indicated the Government's concern about the condition of the Coorong, and members will recall that last year, because a lengthy study will need to be undertaken to determine how we can improve the present position of the water purity of the Coorong and what can be done in future to maintain that purity, and because it would be such a complex job, I said that I expected to refer it to the Committee on Environment for a special study, after it had finished its general report to the Government. Appreciating that such a study would take a long time and being aware that some changes were contemplated about the future of that committee as a result of legislation that would be introduced shortly, I took no such action. However, I assure the honourable member that I intend to call for a complete study of the Coorong and seek a

recommendation on how best we can improve the present situation.

M.V. TROUBRIDGE

Mr. CARNIE: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say why the Government, which now owns the *Troubridge* service to Kingscote and Port Lincoln and has approved a half-fare concession to Kingscote during the winter months, apparently in an endeavour to attract customers, has not granted a similar concession to Port Lincoln? Will the Government extend this concession to Port Lincoln, and, if it will not, will the Minister explain why?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The concession fare granted in relation to Kangaroo Island during the winter months was to attract the tourist trade and to provide an adequate facility for the island, mainly because it depended almost wholly on sea transport, although an air service operates. The same situation does not apply to Port Lincoln, because that area already has a road service, which is not enjoyed by the residents of Kangaroo Island. Also, the time taken for the return trip from Adelaide to Kangaroo Island is short enough for passengers to accept the facilities on the ship and good enough to attract customers. However, we are not certain that passengers would undertake a similar trip from Adelaide to Port Lincoln, bearing in mind the time factor and that the passenger accommodation is limited to seats only, no sleeping berths being available. It was with these thoughts in mind that the arrangements were made. However, I think that people in Port Lincoln (and presumably the honourable member is speaking with their knowledge and support of the proposal) are being short-sighted, because they enjoy a freight concession considerably greater than the concession enjoyed by the people of Kangaroo Island. We should not be too one-eyed about this matter, but should consider the overall position. I believe that the people of Port Lincoln enjoy a service that is valuable to them, because they receive a service that had been denied to them when the *Troubridge* was operated by private enterprise. I believe that the expressions of appreciation that I have received from people at Port Lincoln far outweigh the minor criticisms which I have received and which seem to be supported by the honourable member.

Mr. GUNN: Can the Minister assure the House that the reintroduction of the *Troubridge* service to Port Lincoln will not be used by the Government as a reason for

introducing restrictions on road transport to force people to use the *Troubridge* service?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am sorry, but I did not get the full intent of the honourable member's question. I know he was referring to the service that was introduced by the Government's taking over the *Troubridge*.

Mr. Gunn: Will it bring about any restrictions to road transport?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: We do not control road transport on the West Coast or anywhere else in the State, and I am at a loss to understand the import of the question.

Mr. Gunn: You do not want to understand it.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the honourable member wishes, I will look at his question in *Hansard*. If it makes any more sense then than it does now, I will attempt to answer it but, if it does not, I will ask him to ask his question again so that it can be understood.

THE BUDGET

Mr. BECKER: Can the Treasurer say whether the Government has considered the possibility of introducing Budgets into Parliament half-yearly instead of annually and whether, because of continued inflationary trends and spiralling costs, it would not be easier to submit to Parliament Budgets on a half-yearly basis with quarterly reports and reviews?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It would not be easier to do this. There are great difficulties about presenting the Budget and Loan Estimates more than once a year, particularly in view of arrangements we have with the Commonwealth Government and the Commonwealth Grants Commission and the way in which they structure their financial matters. The honourable member should remember that from time to time Supplementary Estimates are introduced into the House. That is the only way in which at this stage of the proceedings we can carry on.

SPEAKER'S RULING

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

Mr. MATHWIN: Mr. Speaker, I indicated to you earlier that I was not able to ask my question because the Minister of Works was not here. I expected that he would return.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MATHWIN: Can I ask my question now?

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister of Works was not in the House at the time and the honourable member said he wanted to wait until the Minister returned. I have called on the business of the day.

Mr. MATHWIN: But I want to ask my question.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MATHWIN: It is a matter of courtesy.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I take a point of order on this. Surely it is unfair for a Minister to be able to stay out of the Chamber during Question Time, which is bad enough anyway—

The SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The point of order is that the member for Glenelg had indicated to you that he desired to ask a question and, before he had the opportunity to ask that question, you called on the business of the day.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That is rubbish; it is untrue and you know it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is precisely what happened. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, on this point of order, to allow the member for Glenelg to direct his question to another Minister rather than that he should be robbed of his opportunity to ask his question by the absence of the Minister from this House.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Glenelg wanted to ask a question of the Minister of Works. He got the call and indicated that he wanted to ask his question of the Minister of Works, but the Minister of Works was not in the Chamber, and I called on the business of the day, in accordance with Standing Orders.

Mr. MATHWIN: Does this mean that you, Sir, are not going to allow me to ask my question of another Minister? I did it out of complete courtesy to the House and to you.

The SPEAKER: Order! Call on the business of the day.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I renew my point of order.

The SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My point of order is that you should, in these circumstances, in fairness to the member and to the House, allow the member for Glenelg to direct his question to another Minister. That is the point of order I take. I have explained it.

The SPEAKER: I cannot uphold that point of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I therefore move:

That the Speaker's ruling be disagreed to.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Anything to waste time!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must bring up his point of order in writing.

Mr. Mathwin: I had a rough deal last week. I get no protection in this place at all.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Glenelg must learn to contain himself. The honourable member for Mitcham has moved the following motion:

I move disagreement to your ruling in not allowing the member for Glenelg to direct his question to another Minister when you knew that the Minister of Works, to whom he had originally intended to direct his question, was still absent from the Chamber.

I did call on the honourable member for Glenelg, who indicated that he wanted to ask a question of the Minister of Works, when that Minister was absent from the Chamber. At no stage did the honourable member indicate that he wanted to direct the question to another Minister until such time as I had called on the business of the day.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I take it that I have the right to speak to the motion.

The SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: What you have just said reinforces the point I desire to make: that the Minister of Works had been out of the Chamber during Question Time for, I should think, at least half an hour (that is, for nearly half of Question Time). This is, in itself, a practice that I deplore and it is one that this Ministry has often indulged in. Ministers do not stay in the Chamber for the whole of Question Time; thus members on this side and members on the other side are robbed of the opportunity to put questions to the Ministers to whom they wish to put them. But that is by the by.

You, Mr. Speaker, knew that the Minister of Works was out of the Chamber. When you gave the member for Glenelg the call some little time ago he made clear that he desired to direct his question to the Minister of Works. He did what has been done on a number of occasions when this has occurred before: he was prepared to wait until the Minister returned. Surely even you, Mr. Speaker, would realize that he desired to ask that question today. It could not be otherwise. What did you do? You came to the end of your list of questions and, instead of doing what I should have thought one would expect you to do in all fairness (if not in courtesy), you did not even invite the

member for Glenelg to address his question to another Minister so that he could get it in today. As the Minister of Works did not return, I believe you should have done that.

I believe you were put in the position you were originally put in at the beginning of this Parliament to protect the rights of all members—not only those of members on the other side but those of members on this side as well. Surely it would not be stretching your duty too far for you to have invited the member for Glenelg to direct his question to another Minister. You know as well as we know that Ministers take questions for each other and that it is simply a matter, anyway, of the question being recorded in *Hansard* and of the departmental officer reading through the *Hansard* pull in the morning and extracting the questions relevant to his own department. Yet you did nothing. Even when the honourable member jumped to his feet after you had precipitately closed off Question Time you would not allow him to ask his question.

I do not desire on this occasion to reflect on the Chair but I do suggest that it was only a matter of common courtesy and fairness that you should have allowed the member for Glenelg to ask that question. If you had done that, this would have all been over 10 minutes ago. It is for those reasons that I have moved to disagree to your ruling, because I believe it to have been unfair and discourteous.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I second the motion, which involves me most deeply. I believe I was handled very badly in this place last week.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot refer to an earlier incident in this Chamber.

Mr. MATHWIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That is indeed a pity. I did tell you that I had a question and I admit I did say that it was to be directed to the Minister of Works. I have no argument about the fact that the Minister of Works was away on business, but I should have thought that, because I was willing to wait perhaps two or three turns to put the question, you, in your position as the Speaker of this House, might extend common courtesy to me. You knew I had a question to ask and you might have given me the benefit of the doubt and asked me whether I wanted to ask my question. I keenly watched the proceedings because I knew that questions were about to be finished. Although I may not look like an athlete, I jumped to my feet as quickly as possible, but I was not quick enough. I thought I had beaten the Clerk by

a short head to attract your attention and to indicate that I desired to ask my question. I claim that you treated me badly today, as you did last week.

The SPEAKER: In view of what the member for Glenelg himself has said, I should like to say that honourable members know that the method for calling questions in this Chamber is to hold up their hands. The honourable member for Glenelg said that he knew that questions were about to end, because the honourable member for Flinders had discussed the matter with me and had discussed it with the honourable member, waiting for the honourable member for Gouger to come in to take the first call. This happened. The honourable member for Gouger walked in before the member for Flinders could get around to making arrangements. I have stuck to the principle that members must raise their hands, not jump to their feet. The honourable member for Glenelg did not signify to this Chamber that he wanted to ask a question before I called on the business of the day.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I oppose the motion. The member for Mitcham has not cited a single Standing Order or ruling under which your ruling, Mr. Speaker, should be disagreed to, nor is there any such ruling or precedent to which he could refer. In fact, the method of obtaining the call of the Speaker for questions is, by convention in this House, by a private arrangement with members: it is not specified in Standing Orders. The honourable member had been given the call and did not signify he wanted another call in the absence of the Minister of Works. You, Mr. Speaker, called on the business of the day perfectly properly, and there is no basis for disagreement to your ruling.

Mr. Millhouse: Are you suggesting that I am not telling the truth?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Obviously the member for Glenelg did not indicate that he wanted another call. He himself knew that: he stood up after you, Mr. Speaker, had called on the business of the day. You called it on perfectly properly. There is no departure from that ruling and there can be no departure. It is a perfectly proper procedure.

Mr. CARNIE (Flinders): Certainly, Mr. Speaker, I checked with you about the number of questions left, knowing that the member for Gouger was not in the House. There were few questions left at that stage. I asked the member for Glenelg whether he had any questions in, and he said, "Yes, I have; I still

have a question in." It is not as you, Mr. Speaker, said, that I was trying to arrange for the member for Glenelg to get a question in, because he had informed me that he had one in. Immediately after that, you called on the business of the day, before the member for Glenelg had an opportunity to indicate or to do anything else. Obviously, the honourable member fully expected to be called again. I wish to correct the impression that you, Mr. Speaker, gave a few minutes ago.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I take it that I have the right to reply?

The SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In replying, I desire to canvass only two matters. The first is the defence of your ruling, Mr. Speaker, put up by the Premier. The Premier said I had not quoted one single Standing Order, precedent or authority to support my disagreement with your ruling. Then, in the next breath, he gave the complete answer to that by saying, perfectly properly, that in fact the asking of questions in this House is not governed by any Standing Order: it is convention and a private arrangement between you, Mr. Speaker, and the members by signal. In that case, you would not expect me to be able to cite any Standing Order, and the Premier knows that I could not. It does not detract from the point I have taken that he has put up such a specious defence. It is noteworthy that he did not canvass any of the matters to which I have referred in moving this motion of dissent from your ruling, Mr. Speaker. The most significant thing about his speech is what he did not say.

I come now to the second matter. You, Mr. Speaker, have already spoken twice in this debate—once before I spoke and again after I had spoken. However, I presume that you will speak again and, if you do, I should like you to answer one question I think you will answer, and I think the only way in which you can answer will give the clue to what has happened. If the Minister of Works had been in the Chamber before the end of Question Time, would you have called on the member for Glenelg to ask his question then? I believe you will have to answer "Yes" to that question, because that has been your custom in the past.

The SPEAKER: It is not my habit to answer hypothetical questions. The motion before the Chair is "That the Speaker's ruling be disagreed to".

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (15)—Messrs. Carnie, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Hall, Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse (teller), and

Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Noes (28)—Messrs. Becker, Broomhill, Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark, Corcoran, Crimes, Curren, Dunstan (teller), Ferguson, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, McKee, McRae, Nankivell, Payne, Ryan, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.

Majority of 13 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

SUCCESSION DUTIES

Mr. HALL (Gouger): I move:

That in view of the hardship caused by the unfair incidence of death duties on those who have inherited businesses or farming properties, the Government should this session introduce legislation to adjust and reduce succession duties to enable individuals dependent on those concerns to earn a reasonable living from them.

The subject of succession duties, which has engaged this House at various times in lengthy debate, has always exercised members' minds, depending on their political viewpoint and on how they appreciate the effect of these taxes on the community. This issue has been a contentious one ever since succession duties were first introduced in South Australia as a progressive form of taxation in the early 1890's. It is logical that those who have to pay this taxation resist paying it. It is inevitable that, in many instances, it is an inequitable taxation, being unfair to those who have to pay it. Because of the worst of these inequities, I move this motion today. Mr. N. J. Thompson of the Adelaide University has written an important paper, which he has published in the *Australian Quarterly* of March this year and which is entitled "The Dying Case for Death Duties". In it, he says that death duties are largely collected from the real assets of family firms, and that it is here that the economic repercussions are the greatest.

I am sure that all members know instances where individuals who have inherited family concerns have had difficulty in maintaining them because of the incidence of death duties. The result has been either a dissolution of an enterprise or the sale of some important aspect of it to gain capital to pay the taxes that have been levied. These instances, however, are only minor, indicating the underlying deeper problem, which is that every small business inherited must accumulate once every generation sufficient funds to pay death duties. On those businesses that are unable to adjust to

the rising cost structure in the community, this is an unjustifiable imposition. How are death duties justified? Mr. Thompson's article states:

The Australian colonies pioneered the introduction of progressive duties, largely as a device to reduce the power of the established squatter class. The surplus labour in the post gold rush era, together with the mid-nineteenth century concept of democracy, convinced our legislators that such a system of redistribution was an admirable goal of Government . . . Then, as now, taxation served as a weapon of Government policy.

In a paper written by Mr. Hodan and entitled "The Effects of Death Duties on Primary Producers" a number of justifications for death duties is listed. The first is called the benefit theory, whereby it is assumed that the Government has some right to this form of taxation because, through statutory provisions, it ensures that a bequest goes in the channels that the bequest sets down; in other words, it guarantees the rights of succession.

Another justification is the State partnership theory, which I have heard put forward in this House at various times, especially by the Minister of Education when he was a back-bencher. That theory is that the State is a partner with private enterprise in creating the wealth bequeathed. There is also a recoup theory that in succession duties the State can gain from those inheriting the bequest some of the taxes that it is stated have been avoided or evaded during the lifetime of the person who bequeathed the inheritance. The most significant of all justifications is the redistribution of wealth. Probably for those who are proponents of death duties the redistribution of wealth is the main justification used. In his article, Mr. Thompson states clearly:

There is essentially only one justification for the modern form of death duty, to redistribute unearned wealth.

The essential issue in relation to the motion I am moving is to ask how the State can redistribute unearned wealth, which is received as an inheritance contained in a family business or property, without gravely prejudicing that concern. The answer to that question is that the State cannot do that. Therefore, the smaller family orientated organization suffers through direct Government policy which depresses individual initiative and incentive. Mr. Thompson states:

Today the major death duty target is still the owner of land, though it also includes the other incorporated firms in our society. Modern technology demands a high capital-labour ratio, making the family firm very vulnerable to death duties. As a consequence,

the more financially astute firms engage the services of professional estate planners to advise them on how to best avoid this form of tax. Consequently, it is only the young, financially imprudent, or selfish, who die owing a substantial proportion of the family assets. Further, the very matter of the incidence of real life suggests that it is the more wealthy families who are avoiding death duties the most.

I know that Parliament has legislated for some concessions for primary producers, and these are helpful in some areas. However, they do not assist the family concern of a non-rural nature, nor do they adequately provide assistance on the rural scene. Let us also consider individuals in the community who earn a salary, without capital investment.

Let us take the case of a teacher. I am told that a teacher with a degree who has been employed for about 10 years can expect to earn over \$6,500 a year. A bank officer who has been employed for 15 years would earn, depending on whether he was at the senior end of the clerical scale or a young manager, between \$5,500 and about \$7,000, an average of more than \$6,000 a year. I am told that in his first year as manager of a bank a man would earn, with his housing allowance included, a little over \$7,000. Therefore, in both the cases to which I have referred these people earn over \$6,000. In both cases it is likely that, in addition to the salary they earn without capital investment, these people will have been educated, to a standard that enables them to adopt their vocation, at the expense of the State and therefore at the expense of the taxpayer, who has to support the State.

A person who wants to earn a similar sum in a business of his own would have to invest many thousands of dollars. It would be conjecture to say exactly how much. Members opposite would have some idea of how much investment would be needed to earn \$6,000 a year in a business concern. How much would have to be invested in primary production to earn \$6,000? It is generally conceded that primary producers earn much less than 6 per cent on capital investment, so that the very minimum needed to earn \$6,000 from an investment would be \$100,000. For a successor, whoever he may be, to inherit a family concern or a primary-producing property, a considerable amount of duty must be paid, regardless of the concession paid to primary producers. There may be no intention, from generation to generation, to sell that enterprise and realize on its cash value.

The direct comparison between those who receive a salary and those who are in their

own business leads to the conclusion that many businesses, which yield no more (they often yield much less) for their proprietors than salary-earners receive, must pay huge capital taxation to enable those concerned to earn a living. Others in the community, who earn a similar, if not a better, living and who have been helped to enter their vocation by taxation revenue, do not have to pay capital taxation for that opportunity.

Other cases would bear a similar relationship to the cases to which I have referred, and to give instances and figures now would only be to belabour what we all know. A large-scale investment is required at an ever-mounting scale for a business to make a return that will match what the salary-earner in the community receives. The inequities of this are demonstrated by the following extract from the article to which I referred previously:

The cold statistics of the Commissioner of Taxation show us that less than 13 per cent of all male deaths in recent years have had net estates of sufficient value to even enter the estate duty statistics. Further, a closer examination of the duties paid by industry groups clearly indicates that the greatest amounts of death duties are collected in those industries where the unincorporated firm predominates, such as in farming and retailing. For an example, on its own, the farm sector consistently paid between 30 per cent and 40 per cent of all estate duty collected during the 1960's. By contrast, this group made up only 6 per cent of the total tax population, and paid 6 per cent of the tax (income).

Obviously, these comparisons show a tremendously inequitable situation loaded against those who desire, in the main, to get nothing more than the type of living available to the ordinary salary-earner in the community. The writer came to these conclusions:

The greatest hardship is caused by the lump sum nature of death duties on real assets, whether these be a family home and its contents or a 1,000-acre wheat farm, or the local dry-cleaning factory. It is suggested that the transfer taxes on real assets be replaced by an annual tax on wealth.

The idea of an annual tax, to replace the once in a lifetime disruptive effect of death duties, is certainly worth deep consideration. Its implementation would, as far as the farming community is concerned, be somewhat ironic at a time when we on this side are advocating the complete abolition of land tax. However, it would have to be seen in a different light and be related to the tax that it would replace. I am sure that, although a specific annual charge would be far more acceptable, there is a better and more helpful way of solving this problem—the suspension

of death duties while the enterprise that is inherited is the basis of the living of those who operate it. Under such a system, death duties would not be collected until the property or business had been turned into cash assets and distributed as investments apart from the original purpose of the bequest. The tax would not be cumulative from generation to generation, but would be calculated on the ruling rates prevailing when the assets were realized.

There is precedent for such a move. Section 12c of the Land Tax Act allows people who own rural properties adjacent to continue to pay land tax at the much lower prevailing rural rate as long as they declare their property. They can therefore continue unaffected in their enterprise as long as they continue to be primary producers. I remember when that legislation was introduced, and I know how effective it has been in relation to certain individuals and how beneficial it has been to the State. This land tax legislation enables these properties to continue to be operated in that fashion. It does not, however, prevent their being sold at high prices.

When a property is sold, the vendor must pay the Government a sum equal to five years previous land tax at the high rate of valuation. In that way, there is a counterbalance in the legislation that safeguards the Government's interests. I realize that there is not a direct and specific relationship between that legislation and the suspension of death duties. There is, however, a relationship in principle. Death duties could be suspended on that substantial area of a property or business that provides its owner or owners with a living until the enterprise is converted into other forms of assets. At that stage, the taxation could be collected. However, before the Government could get busy working out the details of a scheme (which I believe ought not to be that complicated), it would have to adapt itself ideologically to this situation.

For all the legislation which deals with social issues, which provides consumer protection, and which in numerous other ways affects individuals in the community, the Government cannot neglect its role of encouraging individual enterprise and initiative in business. It is this, in our type of free society, that has brought a renewed and invigorating influence into our society and has kept us separate from the totalitarian types of Government. In the instances that I have put to the House today, it is simply a matter of the Government's restoring equity in an area where the initial

introduction of the taxation concerned has resulted in its operating in modern times in the opposite way from what was first intended.

The large enterprises in the community generally look after themselves better than the owner-operated enterprises. Let us do something for the small man in this day and age of the large and successful corporation. The Government's defence against taking the type of action I have recommended would obviously be the cost to the State. However, the Government has this year received enormously increased Commonwealth allocations, and it cannot sustain itself on one of the most inequitable of all taxation systems, founded on its own legislation which attacks a selected few in the community.

The Government should take heed of this motion and re-examine the legislation which, like much taxation in the past, has been aimed at those who have been subject to bequests of unearned and large-scale wealth, and turn the effect of that legislation away from where it is now affecting those who are struggling to earn a living and, indeed, who are not earning a living as good as that of the salary earner in the community.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I second the motion *pro forma*.

Mr. CARNIE secured the adjournment of the debate.

OCCUPATIONAL THERAPISTS BILL

Mrs. STEELE (Davenport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for the registration of occupational therapists, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

Mrs. STEELE: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I have not, in the time I have been a member of Parliament, introduced many Bills. It gives me much pleasure to introduce this Bill, because it is associated with an organization with which I have had a long personal connection. I am happy that, before I leave this place, I will at least have seen the South Australian Association of Occupational Therapists established as a registered body, which is a dream which many occupational therapists in this State have cherished.

The struggle to bring legislation of this kind before the House has quite a long history and goes back to 1961, when the few occupational therapists who then were practising in South Australia decided to form an association, the ultimate objective being the establishment of a school of occupational therapy in this State. In 1964, because for a long time I had had

an interest in this development, I was approached to convene a steering committee that would bring to fruition this resolution of the occupational therapists. I gladly accepted this, because I was greatly aware of the need for South Australia to have its own school of occupational therapy. At that time we depended on the few graduates of schools in other States who, not having been absorbed into schools and hospitals in their own States, were willing to come to South Australia. However, they would come for only a short period and then would return to jobs in their own State, having gained valuable experience, or they would marry and, for the time being at least, be lost to the profession.

I pay a tribute to the occupational therapists for the tremendous amount of pioneering work they undertook not only in establishing the need for this kind of development in South Australia but also in drawing up a course of instruction and preparing the syllabus by which occupational therapists in South Australia would be trained if such a school was established. The committee, of which I was Chairman, comprised several leading citizens in South Australia who, like me, were convinced that we must have our own occupational therapy school. These people were pleased to serve on this committee.

At first, we thought our approach would be to the Adelaide University, through the Minister of Education, to find out whether the university would take the responsibility for initiating a diploma course in this discipline. However, that happened at a time when the university was divesting itself of undergraduate courses and already it had had preliminary discussions with the Institute of Technology to take over the school of pharmacy. At about the same time the physiotherapists also had been told that they probably could see the time not far distant when they would not be a part of the University of Adelaide.

The whole question of paramedical disciplines looked as though it would be one with which the South Australian Institute of Technology would have to deal. At the time, I was a member of the Council of the South Australian Institute of Technology. Very proudly, I can claim to have been the first and only woman ever appointed to the Council and I am sad that I am no longer associated with it. I was in the happy position of being able to exert some influence on my fellow Council members so that this matter might be brought much more quickly to their

attention. The institute had almost accepted the responsibility for taking over the pharmacy department, making it a viable discipline within the orbit of the Institute of Technology. The physiotherapists were at that time in a state of flux and I persuaded the Council of the institute to appoint a subcommittee to inquire into the whole question of paramedical disciplines.

About 18 months before then, I, with Dr. Donald Dowie, who was then head of St. Margarets Rehabilitation Centre and a member of our committee, had waited on both the Minister of Health and the Minister of Education, asking them whether they would accept the case that we had prepared on behalf of the occupational therapists and present it to the Government for consideration. I am sorry to say that nothing at all transpired from that.

The Institute of Technology appointed me, for my pains and interest in this situation, to be Chairman of this subcommittee and we took evidence from several people associated with the Physiotherapists Board and the faculty at the University of Adelaide. We also received representations from other minor disciplines. The report of this subcommittee was then presented to the Council of the institute, which, in turn, presented it to the then Minister of Education (Hon. R. R. Loveday), and again nothing happened. This was extremely disappointing for all the people who had worked so hard over a long period.

In 1968 we came into office as a Government, and I acted very quickly. One of the first things that I did when I became Minister of Education was deciding that the time was opportune for me to push forward with the inquiry into paramedical disciplines, which was so badly needed in South Australia. With the agreement of Cabinet I appointed a committee representative of all the various paramedical disciplines, under the chairmanship of Dr. Shea, then Director-General of Medical Services.

That committee had a checkered career, because at that time so many things were happening in the medical field that Dr. Shea was frequently going overseas to investigate matters. However, it was considered that the first priority was that of the physiotherapists and, when this question was resolved, I asked that the inquiry into the establishment of a school of occupational therapy be treated as the first priority, and this was done. The other paramedical discipline that had a fairly high priority was that of medical technicians

and technologists, and this question was also resolved.

Finally, the report was submitted to me about six months before we left office and immediately I approached the Council of the Institute of Technology, asking it what opportunities there would be to establish this school in 1970. Of course, the Council's main difficulty was that the institute's submission for the triennium already had been presented to the Australian Universities Commission for the Commonwealth Government's consideration, and there were no funds which could be allocated to establish the school of occupational therapy, which would be a department of the Institute of Technology. At that stage nothing very much happened.

Then, late in 1969, I, anxious to get this matter off the ground, asked the President, the Director, and the Assistant Director (Academic) of the institute to come to see me in my office at Parliament House with Dr. Shea. They did this and I told them that the Government was most anxious, as I was, to see this school established as soon as possible and I said that we would make available funds for this purpose, provided that the institute proceeded almost directly to the appointment of a Director of the school and that the institute would be willing to start the school in March, 1971. My attention has been drawn to the fact that it is nearly 4 o'clock. I move:

That Standing Orders be so far extended as to enable Notice of Motion: Other Business No. 2 to be disposed of before Orders of the Day: Other Business are dealt with.

Motion carried.

Mrs. STEELE: Shortly after the Government of the day had indicated its willingness to make funds available, we went out of office; nevertheless, the machinery had been set in motion, and in March, 1971, following the appointment of Miss Bearup as the Director of the School of Occupational Therapy within the Institute of Technology, the school commenced operations. I am pleased to say that next year the first graduates will leave that school. The school is at present established in the quarters once used by nurses at the Glenside Psychiatric Hospital, and it is hoped later, as part of the long-range plan of the Institute of Technology to establish a school of paramedical disciplines on land held for that purpose next to the Royal Adelaide Hospital, that the school will then be situated in that building.

The school is now a going concern, from which we will be able to draw our own

graduates at the end of next year. This is important, because for a long time South Australia has been in the rear guard of the States that have established such schools. New South Wales was the first State to establish a school of occupational therapy, followed by Queensland and Victoria and finally, a few years ago, by Western Australia. Therefore, until 1971 we were lagging behind the other States in regard to establishing a school which would provide us with graduates from this discipline and which we could expect to provide some continuity of services in our own hospitals, institutions and other organizations that employ occupational therapists.

I think it was in 1962 that the Playford Government instituted a system of cadetships based largely on the system applying in other disciplines involving engineers, draftsmen, veterinary surgeons and others. The Playford Government introduced this system so that girls could undertake occupational therapy courses in the schools established in other States, that is, Victoria and Western Australia, which were the only two States whose schools were willing to accommodate girls from South Australia. One of the big claims made in relation to establishing a school here concerned the fact that girls had to go to another State for training. The parents of the girls concerned were often loath to let them go to other State capitals, where no actual provision was made for the girls' living accommodation, and many parents at the time considered that this was a risky procedure.

Now, however, girls can undertake this course in our own school without experiencing any such difficulties. It is a matter of great pride for the occupational therapists in South Australia and for me personally (because of my association with this matter) to know that we now have a school operating in this State. That being the background of the Bill, I now proceed to deal with the main provision, which relates, of course, to registering occupational therapists. This Bill is drafted along lines similar to those Bills dealing with the registration of people in other disciplines or with matters requiring registration and administration by a registrar. Therefore, from that point of view, it is a fairly stereotype measure. However, the important thing is that at last we now have a measure that will allow occupational therapists in South Australia to be registered. This is a great step forward and it will naturally enable us to meet more adequately the demands for occupational therapy services.

The idea of occupational therapy today is far removed from the idea that existed just after the last war, when occupational therapists were people who occupied the leisure time of hospital patients who had been injured in some way, helping them to while away the time. However, occupational therapists are now recognized as professionals, as are physiotherapists and speech therapists, as well as all the other people who make up the rehabilitative teams in our hospitals. Unfortunately, South Australia has been late in recognizing that people who come from the paramedical disciplines have a part to play in rehabilitation. Some thought that occupational therapists were used only in repatriation hospitals during and after the last war, but today, bearing in mind the increasing number of accidents on the road, in homes and in industry, I consider that occupational therapists, who work under instructions from doctors, fulfil a useful and important role. They go through a rigorous course. They provide properly planned therapeutic activities for people who have been injured in some way or other and their purpose is, by therapy, to encourage a patient to use a limb or some other part of the body that may have been injured in any kind of accident. I now deal with the formal description of the various clauses.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 sets out the definitions used for the purposes of the measure. Clause 4 establishes the Occupational Therapists Registration Board of South Australia as a body corporate. Clause 5 sets out the manner in which the board is to be constituted. Clause 6 provides that the terms of office of a member shall be not more than three years and also provides for the terms and conditions under which members shall serve, for the appointment of deputies of members, and for the removal from office of members and also for vacation of office by members. Clause 7 provides for a quorum of three members and also for the conduct of meetings of the board.

Clause 8 validates acts of the board notwithstanding any vacancy in office of a member of the board or any defect in his appointment. Subclause (2) of this clause provides appropriate protection for members of the board. Clause 9 provides for the appointment of a registrar to the board. Clause 10 provides for the assets of the board and the application of its funds. Clause 11 sets out the circumstances in which a person may seek registration as an occupational therapist and is in general self-explanatory. In this clause

provision is made for the registration of persons who have had considerable experience in occupational therapy although they have no former qualifications in the matter. Applications from persons in this category must be made within six months of the commencement of the Act proposed by this measure.

Clause 12 provides for investigation by the Registrar. Clauses 13, 14, 15 and 16 deal with inquiries by the board, and clauses 17 and 18 provide for an appeal to the Supreme Court. Clause 19 provides that, subject to the exceptions in the clause, no person may use the title "occupational therapist" unless he is registered under the measure. Clause 20 provides for summary disposition of offences. Clause 21 provides a general regulation-making power. In commending this Bill to the House I pay a tribute to the Parliamentary Counsel, who has been of great assistance to me and also to the South Australian occupational therapists.

The Hon. L. J. KING secured the adjournment of the debate.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (ABORTION)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 2. Page 500.)

Mr. BURDON (Mount Gambier): Last week I mentioned that several petitions containing about 40,000 signatures had been presented in connection with this Bill designed to tighten the abortion laws. Those members who support the Bill do so, I believe, basically for only one reason: that the law at present takes inadequate account of the foetus and that any passing whim or fancy will suffice as legal justification for the destruction of that foetus in the future if some steps are not taken to exercise restraint. No-one (and I want to make this clear) would object to the termination of a pregnancy if the life or health of the mother were threatened by the continuation of the pregnancy, or if by the continuation of her pregnancy this was likely to occur. However, it must be pointed out that there is also a serious risk to the woman who undergoes an abortion, more particularly if that abortion is performed after a period of 12 weeks of pregnancy.

I believe that the period allowed in Sweden is 20 weeks (and the clauses in the proposed amendment provide for a 20-week period), in Norway it is 14 weeks, while in Finland and Denmark it is 16 weeks. Properly legalized abortion took place in the Scandinavian countries at an earlier period of time than anywhere else in the world. It has been pointed

out that the complications following abortion in both mental and physical aspects are increased considerably when 12 weeks of pregnancy is exceeded, and figures which will be given to this House by a colleague will bear out my remarks.

For centuries we have treated the foetus as an object with rights and as an object of respect. I believe we should not abandon that tradition of respect for what I regard as a human life, nor should we regard the termination of a human life in the same way as we would regard tonsils removed, a hernia repaired, or an appendix removed. I believe that the question of one's morals is one's own responsibility, and that a breakdown of morals is cause for concern. It concerns me, however out of step I may be in today's society, but one of the reasons advanced by those who oppose the Bill is that there is no legislative need to guard against a gradual decline towards abortion on demand, partly because the law has no effect on morals and partly because, if such a change takes place, then the law must follow it.

These arguments most certainly can be refuted. The law must certainly affect the morals of society. One of its greatest (and probably its most important) functions is its educative function. True, an attempt to impose prohibitions upon society sometimes proves fruitless. There are many reasons why this could be so—lack of enforcement agencies, lack of rational argument justifying the prohibition, and so on; but it is very different to assert that the law has no effect on social morals when what it most likely does is the reverse of prohibition, where it permits that to which people are generally opposed. People learn their morals in many ways, but I suggest we would be foolish to underestimate the vital role of the law in moulding the society for which it exists, and freedom from legal restraint must indicate to many that there is little to be said for moral restraint, either. We then reach the situation where, if social habits change, social law should not lag behind; for instance, if wife beating is condoned by a majority of people then the law should be amended to make wife beating legally permissible. What a situation we would have then!

Mr. Clark: It should be made compulsory.

Mr. BURDON: My colleague suggests that it should be made compulsory. I do not know how he will get on when he arrives home tonight. There is still dignity in human life, there is still dignity in preserving the life of

the unborn and preserving the right of that life, for the further dignity of man.

Some of the matters I have spoken about this afternoon are provided for in the Bill. I publicly opposed the introduction of the Act in the first place. I will not say that it should be completely rewritten or that it should be abolished. I believe the Bill contains certain points on which I have made myself clear, but I ask members, in all seriousness, to vote for the second reading so that the various clauses can be considered in Committee. In that way something good may emerge to give the majority of members a basis on which to give a considered judgment as to the merits or otherwise of the proposed amendments. On that basis, I support the second reading.

Mrs. STEELE (Davenport): I oppose the Bill. Much as I respect the personal beliefs which motivated the member for Playford to bring in this Bill, I nevertheless consider it to be most retrogressive legislation. I want first of all to remind the honourable member that he is talking about women, female human beings, not cyphers, not cold statistics, but women, those members of the human race who conceive, who bear the pangs of childbirth, who succour the young, who nurture, guide and influence the future generations of our race. She is one of the participants in the act of intercourse, but what of the man who is the other essential to the act of consummation?

I wonder how often a girl or woman is cajoled or persuaded, often against her better judgment, to complete the sexual act. Of course, I know there are members of my own sex who set out to "get a man", but either way it is always the woman who pays, who has to face and suffer the consequences of that moment of indiscretion; the nausea; the long months of pregnancy; the discomforts of childbearing; and then the final act of giving birth. In so many cases the man (in the case of the unmarried mother) is not around when the child of the union is born. He has "opted out" of facing the consequences, of being ready to accept and shoulder his share of the responsibility. We all know that all too often the girl or woman is left high and dry, deserted, to face the future alone and deal with the consequences of what has been a shared act.

And yet the member for Playford coldly and logically, in the best legal tradition, obviously thinks of a woman wanting an abortion, a woman often in desperate and valid

circumstances, as wanting to avoid the outcome of something she has brought upon herself. The punitive attitude (I am sorry to say) of too many men (and sometimes women) of "She's got what she asked for" or "She asked for it—now she's got to put up with the consequences" does little credit to people who are looked upon as sound-thinking, responsible citizens. There will, of course, be some who will say I am playing on the emotions. I make no apology for doing so. I hope my speech will be the answer to the cold lucidity of the mover of this Bill, because if some degree of emotion does not enter into this subject then there is something wrong with all of us.

In his explanation of the Bill the honourable member several times said that members of Parliament did not understand the implications of it (with particular reference to section 82a), when they were debating the Bill in 1969. This I refute, for I cannot remember any legislation of social significance whilst I have been in this place which has been more thoroughly probed, discussed and debated than that particular Bill. It was the subject of wide public interest. On introduction in 1968 it had been, as the House knows, referred to a Select Committee which sat over a considerable period, interviewed many witnesses, many of them respected authorities from here and interstate, and studied a great deal of written evidence on the matter. The public then had six months in which it was able to study the printed report which was freely available. Intensive lobbying occurred and the galleries were always filled to capacity during the passage of the Bill. The legislation, introduced by the Attorney-General of the time (then and now the honourable member for Mitcham), won for South Australia a high degree of public approbation for its realistic and human approach to the whole subject of abortion. Without any doubt at all, the present Act represents the considered view of the South Australian Parliament in 1969.

Gallup polls, then and since, have shown there is considerable liberalization in public opinion. The latest polls, in April, 1972, showed that seven out of 10 Australians think that abortion should be legal if the mother's health, physical or mental, is in danger. Polls show increasing support for elective abortion.

The member for Playford would, by his amending Bill, have us return to pre-1969 conditions despite the fact that what the South Australian Parliament did then is justified by

the increasing number of countries (the number is 46), which are introducing into their Statutes a more liberal interpretation of abortion laws. Half the world's populations live under abortion laws more liberal than our present law in South Australia.

I suggest that, despite the opposition on moral and religious grounds (and I am prepared to acknowledge that these are quite sincerely held), this Bill will be defeated because there is increasing support for the principle that women have the right to decide what they want to do with their lives. The Act, as it stands, insists on proper documentation and confidential notification and the signatures of two legally qualified medical practitioners. This presents women seeking an abortion with the opportunity to properly discuss with their doctor a matter of grave importance, not only to them but to their families. That they do not always get what they seek I shall elaborate on later. I believe the majority of women are insistent that this right, which was won for them by the legislation of 1969, shall not be taken away.

The last 80 years has been notable for two major advances in the interests of women: the right to vote (late in the last century), and in the past few years a more liberal approach to abortion. Both have been achieved only after a long and oft times painful struggle. For many women associated with female suffrage and abortion reform, this has been achieved only at the cost of personal sacrifice and suffering. In general, in the past, there has always been opposition at every stage of the slow process by which increases in personal freedom have come about. In particular this is so when the freedom sought is for women. And when the freedom has had a bearing on sexual behaviour the opposition from a minority has been fierce.

As our South Australian reform is based largely on that of the United Kingdom it is advantageous to study the background to abortion law reform in that country in the years from 1931 to 1967. Incidentally, some of the most prestigious names in the medical, legal, scientific and political professions in England are found amongst those who worked for that reform. Until 1966, nine Bills were presented either in the House of Commons or the House of Lords. They suffered a variety of fates until Mr. David Steel introduced his Bill into the Commons. Indicative of the interest in abortion reform was the fact that Mr. Steel's Medical Termination of Pregnancy Bill obtained a second reading by 223 to 29 in July, 1966. It was not, however, until

practically a year later that the third reading passed by 167 to 83. It was finally given Royal Assent on October 27, 1967, the Act coming into force in April, 1968.

The struggle had lasted 36 years. It had the support of hosts of influential organizations like the strong Co-operative Women's Guild, the National Council of Women, National Conference of Labor Women, the Family Planning Association and the Faculty of Labor Lawyers. Over the period their resolutions favouring liberalization of the abortion laws were passed at conferences time and time again. I found of particular interest the statement issued in 1966 by the Roman Catholic Bishops of England and Wales:

Catholics do not demand that their own convictions should be imposed by law upon all citizens but they are concerned that doctors, nurses and others who may be affected by the proposed legislation shall not be asked to act against their own consciences.

Now here in South Australia, it cannot be said that the list of supporters for abortion law reform is so star studded but, as members know, our present legislation is based largely on the United Kingdom Act and there are informed people here with strong convictions on the subject whose support was solidly behind the Government's move in 1968 to introduce liberalization of the laws relating to abortion and for its subsequent referral to a Select Committee, the report of which led to legislation being passed by both Houses of Parliament. Those same people and organizations are rallying again now as this hard-won reform is threatened by those who would have South Australia revert to the restrictive legislation existing prior to 1969.

And, may I say in passing, any kind of restrictive legislation is discriminatory. It works against the poor, not against the wealthy; and for obvious reasons it works against the country woman, not against the urban woman. I have received most heartening support for opposition to this Bill by letter, by telephone and from personal contact with people in the community. One letter, members on the Government benches might be interested to know, came from the Australian Railways Union signed by the State President, State Secretary and two State organizers. We know that some religious bodies and/or groups are basically against abortion, that others are opposed to the underlying principles involved, and that there are those who want to halt, at all costs, what they see as increasing permissiveness. On the other hand, I have received a letter from the

Director of Christian Citizenship of the Methodist Church (Rev. Keith Smith) which I would like to read to the House. The letter states:

You will be aware that in 1969 the conference accepted the recommendation of a commission which had studied this matter thoroughly. The result of their work was a qualified endorsement of the legislation as it had been outlined at that time. In addition, the commissioner's recommendations for the introduction of specific preventative measures were also adopted. The conference proposed the establishment of family planning clinics, courses in human relationships (sex education) in schools and increased welfare aid for pregnant women.

As Minister of Education from 1968 to 1970, I was strong in my appeal to officers of the Education Department to establish such courses in South Australian high schools. I initiated a course for parents that was held under the auspices of the Adult Education Department. The letter continues:

It should be pointed out that the conference in supporting these proposals did not pass judgment on the morality of abortion as such, but only on the question of whether the law should be changed. At the last conference a request was forwarded to this department for a study of the effect of the legislation. A committee has almost completed its work and the general trend of their thinking is now apparent. It can be briefly summarized in the following way:

1. Changing the law will not solve the problems which have arisen: there is little doubt that there have been problems in the administration of the legislation and some inconsistency in its application. We do not believe that the problems associated with legal abortion will be overcome by means of change in the law. Instead, we believe that any undesirable trends will best be curtailed by the force of public opinion. Furthermore, we have serious reservations about any further liberalization of the law.
2. More information about abortions is needed: deficiencies in the present system have become more apparent following the publication of Dr. Aileen Connon's report in the Australian Medical Association journal in September of last year, in which information regarding the patients presenting for abortion at Queen Elizabeth Hospital and Queen Victoria Maternity Hospital was thoroughly analysed. The failure of 82 per cent of patients to use contraception is only one factor which has emerged from that survey. That survey covered only half of all patients presenting for an abortion in South Australia. We believe that much more information needs to be collected in regard to all requests for abortion, so that the com-

munity as a whole may have a better factual basis on which to assess what is taking place.

Recently, the Executive Minister of the Congregational Union in South Australia (Rev. M. F. Sawyer) was quoted in the *Advertiser* as saying that his church was conscious of defects in the present legislation but would not support any move to repeal or amend the present Act which would make it more difficult for women to obtain legal abortions. He went on to say that knowing the background of abortion situations, whether women or girls used contraceptives or not, was just as important as knowing their medical condition before and after the operation. It would be disastrous to make "panic decisions" on the present law while there was an absence of human details.

The Mallen Committee appointed by the Minister of Health in 1970 "to examine and report on abortions in South Australia" has presented two reports, but no restrictive proposals of any consequence have been recommended by this committee. Because I considered that it was important to see and hear at first hand what is happening in one of our public hospitals, last Friday I visited the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and spoke to Professor Lloyd Cox, Professor of Obstetrics and Gynaecology at the University of Adelaide, and the recognized authority in this field in South Australia. Members will recall that he was one of the most important witnesses to appear before the Select Committee in 1968-69. I learned that in order to reduce pressure at the gynaecological clinics and to relieve the burden of extra work imposed on the staff, a separate clinic to deal with abortions had been set up. This had worked well and had eliminated many of the difficulties of administration.

Patients were admitted during the night previous to their abortion and usually stayed one or, in some cases, two nights after the operation: the time varied. Abortions are performed under ideal conditions, and the aim is that they shall be carried out by the eighth or ninth week after the last menstrual period. Professor Cox was quite definite in his discussions with me that it is too early yet to alter the law, and that it would be quite harmful to do so at present. He went so far as to say that there would be chaos if we went back to pre-1969 conditions. However, I shall read the letter that Professor Cox has written to me in which he reviews the working of the present Act and his attitude to the amending Bill

introduced by the member for Playford. It is dated August 3, and it states:

Dear Mrs. Steele,

I am writing to you as the member for the electorate in which I reside. I understand that today Mr. T. M. McRae is presenting a Bill to the South Australian Parliament which would amend the present Criminal Law Consolidation Act regarding abortion law. I would like you to know that the terms of the Bill as publicized in the press would, in my opinion, cause very great difficulty both for patients and for the medical profession. The difficulty in determining what would be a substantial risk which would contribute to illness either bodily or mentally in a patient extending during pregnancy and for 42 days after childbirth, would be great.

The present law makes the situation reasonably clear. The two doctors form an opinion in good faith that the continuation of the pregnancy would cause more harm than its termination. Any legal attempt to define what a substantial risk is would lead to many variations in the interpretation of this by doctors, with the result that some patients would be denied abortion by some doctors and readily offered it by others. This would be an unsatisfactory state of affairs.

I think it is fair to say that for the present Act, while it has produced many difficulties for the medical profession, particularly in assessing and treating an additional number of applications for termination of pregnancy, the general results have been satisfactory. As far as can be determined there are very few, if any, abortions being performed by unqualified practitioners. The maternal mortality due to abortion has diminished, and complications resulting from abortions do not appear to have been any worse than was predicted.

In my evidence to the Select Committee which considered the proposed abortion law reform, I stated that I believed that the recommendations were moderate, safe, and could not be criticized on scientific or moral grounds. From my observations of the working of the Act, I had no reason to alter these opinions in spite of the additional workload that has fallen on me and my colleagues in the teaching hospitals. I believe that the problem of unwanted pregnancy requires further attention by way of family planning and family life education, and that these aspects should receive the most attention at the present time. Altering the Act in 1972 will not improve matters.

Yours sincerely,

(Sgd.) L. W. Cox, Professor of Obstetrics
and Gynaecology

In an earlier letter, dated July 27, 1972, Professor Cox in reply to a letter from Dr. Hackett said much the same thing. I think I should read that, too, for it is important, and it states:

Dear Dr. Hackett,

I should be disappointed if measures to restrict legal abortion to seriously ill women only became operative again. In spite of all the problems that have occurred as a result of legalization, I believe the measure has been

very worth while. The greatest problem (apart from the number of cases and difficulties of assessment) is that of women being seen promptly by their doctors and the abortion being performed as early as possible, if it is necessary. Complications observed when abortion is performed later in pregnancy are much more serious.

If any alteration is to take place to existing legislation I believe it should be directed towards expediting abortion while the pregnancy is less than eight weeks gestation, that is, 10 weeks from the last menstrual period. It is not possible at present for all women requesting consultation to be seen within one week at the teaching hospitals. Each week delayed after the eighth makes the operation more difficult and complications more frequent. If facilities could be made available whereby highly trained personnel could see and if necessary treat applicants without any delay, there could be benefit in liberalizing the present law in these early pregnancies. At the present time, while existing services are unable to provide a fully effective service and while there is still a strong emotional bias in individuals either for or against abortion, I think it would be wiser not to alter the present law.

I also met and discussed the present situation with the social worker attached to the abortion clinic. She said that there were plenty of cases refused, and in no sense was "automatic abortion" being offered at this public hospital. In fact, "it is interesting to note that at two of the hospitals where careful confidential records have been kept, not only of those being granted abortion, but of those applying for it and who were refused, 50 per cent of the applicants were judged to have insufficient reasons". That observation is taken from an article by Professor Cox written for the *Current Affairs Bulletin* of November, 1971. The social worker spoke to me of the tragic difficulties faced by many women. Some women with already large families and facing yet another pregnancy had been deserted by their husbands. "These were in a particularly disastrous situation," she said. She agreed that the number of young girls seeking abortion was increasing, and spoke of the need for family advisory clinics. As the Reverend Keith Smith said in his letter, this is yet another reason why we should leave the Act as it is: two years is not long enough in which to collect all the information necessary for a proper assessment. Only now, four years after the introduction of the new laws in the United Kingdom, do the British authorities consider they have the factual information to enable them to make any sort of judgment about amendments to their legislation. All the authorities from whose letters and statements I have quoted, and the social worker at the abortion clinic at the Queen Elizabeth

Hospital, stress the great need for public education.

Professor Cox in his letter of July 27, 1972, goes on to stress the great need for public education. The Reverend Keith Smith says much the same thing in his letter to me of August 2, 1972:

Counselling facilities are needed at all major hospitals. We believe that the most serious weakness in the present situation is the absence of competent and compassionate counselling for all of the women who seek an abortion. Not all medical practitioners have the time or the training that is necessary for this to be done. We feel that there is a strong need for paramedical services to be provided, such as the appointment of social workers.

Present "Sex Education" is inadequate. We believe that abortion is only one of several problems which are widespread in the community at the moment which have as their common factor a misunderstanding or abuse of human sexuality. This situation has its origin in inadequate training and education among children and in the lack of continuing education in adulthood. . . . Obviously, this must begin with a human relationships course in the schools which does much more than give children "the facts of life". For these reasons we consider that no amendment to the law is appropriate at this time.

The Second Annual Report of the Mallen Committee (for the year 1971) has this to say:

The committee considers that it has a duty to point out that the establishment of more family planning clinics or the more ready availability of contraceptive measures should have an effect in reducing the incidence of abortion. The education of the young, with the help of courses in human relationships and family life as are presently conducted at many schools, should, in the long term, help to reduce the number of ex-nuptial pregnancies. The responsibility for education lies primarily with families and also with those involved with education in the community. The present backing of voluntary organizations such as the Family Life Movement and the Marriage Guidance Council is commended; and greater emphasis should be placed there in the future.

To finish the quotations on the need for wider and more public education in this field, I quote from the latest publication of the Abortion Law Reform Association of South Australia, which makes this point:

Only wide public recognition of this will bring the community to the point where it demands adequate family planning clinics and contraceptive advice, and education at all ages towards sexual responsibility. This cannot be achieved quickly—indeed, not for years. Only when it is achieved will the number of unwanted pregnancies decrease and when they do abortion figures will level out. In the meantime abortion is a necessary social measure.

It should be noticed that the introduction of the Abortion Act in 1971 did not result in

less interest in family planning but just the opposite. It is only since then that family planning clinics have begun to develop in South Australia.

It is quite obvious, however, that, if these agencies are to compound their efforts in the interests of the community, then Governments must provide extra and adequate finance. Also, it is quite untenable, when we study all aspects of this social question, that the Commonwealth Government should still persist in a rating of 27½ per cent sales tax on contraceptives—this in an age when the "pill" is accepted practically universally. It surely cannot be sustained that contraceptives are luxuries at a time when population levels are rising all over the world and when over-population is recognized as the greatest threat to civilization.

On Friday I also talked with a 19-year-old girl now 11 weeks pregnant. She was one of that increasing number I have just referred to in the 19 to 24-year age group who are "shopping around" in their determination to get an abortion one way or another. She also falls into the category of those who will get it even though it will be bordering on the deadline of "dangerous abortion". But what of those who earnestly seek it but are refused? They go on to produce illegitimate children, enter into "forced marriages" or, in the case of married women, add unplanned children to their families. An extensive follow-up in Sweden of the children of women refused abortion has shown them to exhibit more defects, alcoholism, psychiatric disorder and delinquency than other children, and these were not the children of women who had strong grounds for abortions, for Sweden had a liberal abortion law at that time.

Now let us examine in detail the restrictive subsections of section 82A. Paragraph (a) (iii) (A) speaks of abortion necessary to prevent injury to "the mental health of the pregnant woman". This sounds fair enough. It is not far different from the existing law. It allows doctors some latitude in interpretation of "mental health", which we all know is the concern of all doctors, many other professional workers, lay people, and is equally as much the concern of members of Parliament. If the Bill said only this (and this is what statements in the press have led the public to believe is all it says and what many well meaning persons supporting the Bill have supposed it to say) there would be little to worry about. But subparagraph (iii) (B) is added. It is equally a requirement, not an alternative, mind you. The word "and" is

there, not "or". The section in subparagraph (iii) (B) says the woman must have a "mental illness" already to be even considered under this section.

Let us notice that the Bill leaves in the "foreseeable future" section of the present law. The Bill pretends to some liberality. What relevance has the "foreseeable future" when the woman has to be mentally ill before she even starts to qualify? And what is "mental illness", as Mr. McRae sees it? The woman must be "dangerous to herself"—suicidal.

Psychiatrists agree that very few pregnant women are in this category. Suicide is a very definite risk in some few pregnant women—perhaps less than 1 per cent of women aborted under our present law. Dangerous "to others" he says. Where are these women in the community? Not one woman aborted in South Australia in the last two years may have fallen into this category. Probably there are only one or two women dangerous "to others" amongst all the patients in our major State psychiatric hospitals at this time other than those in the one criminal hospital. This is not conjecture: it has been carefully checked. Then we see women needing "restraint". What is restraint? Is it the restraint of the strait-jacket? A straitjacket has not been used in a State psychiatric hospital for many years.

No woman is in restraint in our psychiatric hospitals in the sense of being locked up all the time except in the criminal section of one of them. Restraint is sometimes used in our general hospitals for an elderly demented woman. Her hands may be tied to her bed to prevent her injuring herself by flailing her arms about or by falling out of bed. Is it this woman, 30 years beyond the child-bearing age, to whom Mr. McRae is referring? The words "dangerous to herself or to others" come straight out of the Mental Health Act, wording unaltered for a generation and applying specifically to persons certifiable as being mentally defective under that Act. But perhaps Mr. McRae is not so rigid in his categories after all.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs. STEELE: I am sorry—I mean "the member for Playford". The two or three women each year who might get an abortion by being certifiable are not the only ones he would have us allow abortions for under his Bill. If there is a substantial risk a woman will need "psychiatric supervision or treatment" for the rest of her pregnancy and some period longer than 42 days afterwards. The phraseology of the Bill is much more tortuous than

that. It seems unlikely that Mr. McRae expects any doctor other than a psychiatrist to be able to make such a judgment. He apparently expects that every woman seeking an abortion will have to be seen by a psychiatrist. This House wisely rejected the suggestion of some members in 1969 that specialists only be the doctors making decisions under our law. If it is wise, it will reject that again. Waiting time to see a psychiatrist can be up to six weeks, at times. Does Mr. McRae want those few abortions there would be under his Bill to be done dangerously late or does he want a bottleneck through which only a trickle of women could hope to pass, however great their need might be? I do not think we need to impute the first alternative to Mr. McRae—I am sorry! I am transgressing again.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member should refrain from calling the member for Playford by name.

Mrs. STEELE: I realize that and I apologize most humbly. As I was saying, I do not think we need to impute the first alternative to the member for Playford, but, nevertheless, dangerously late abortions would in part be the outcome of a provision such as this. But in any case, what doctor, be he a psychiatrist or not, will be able to form an opinion about such a matter as this? I believe the aim of this provision is to make doctors so uncertain that they will scarcely be able to recommend any woman for an abortion, whatever her need for it may be.

These are the implications of this Bill. It is grossly restrictive and reactionary. It would set our State back behind all others in Australia and, of course, behind the 46 other countries in the world that have liberalized their abortion laws. Perhaps this is what the member for Playford really wants us to do, despite whatever else he may say. His personal views would be in line with that. We should not be side-tracked by the honourable member's emphasis on mental illness and psychiatry. Even when we are spending time on the outlandish phrases of his Bill we are being led astray from our objective. Perhaps that also was his aim or the aim of his advisers or his unconscious wish. Even as we decry the ill consequences of accepting this Bill we are being led astray. We should not be spending our time being concerned with "mental illness" and its possible treatment; we should not be concerned with psychiatry. Our aim should be to preserve the good health of women, the good "mental health" they have, which they may lose if they are forced by a

law we might make to continue a pregnancy not in their best interests, which could be traumatic for them, or which could force them into situations of lifelong unhappiness. We must be interested in health and happiness and quality of life.

The loss of mental health is not automatically mental illness. It can mean loss of certain qualities of life and well-being. It can mean an inability to cope with life. Sometimes it can be lifelong unhappiness. Can lifelong unhappiness be equated with good mental health? Can the woman who enters unwillingly into a forced marriage because she is pregnant (and regrets it all the rest of her life) be in good mental health? Is the woman who is forced by circumstances to give up a child for adoption and then wonders which child in the street she sees is hers and where he is, or what has happened to him or whether she should have kept him and tried to care for him despite the difficulties—is she in good mental health?

The probability of the loss of mental health in a woman can be predicted by doctors and also by other professional people such as social workers. But the loss of mental health is not always treatable. It is not always remediable. All the resources of our trained professional people and their helpers may be of no avail in the face of the anguish of women in distressing circumstances. The “psychiatric supervision or treatment” which the member for Playford requires may be not only not effective but inappropriate and irrelevant. To make the need for such treatment and supervision a necessary requirement before a woman can be considered under this Bill and then for “a period exceeding the period comprising the anticipated balance of the duration of the pregnancy . . . and 42 days thereafter” before a woman may be allowed an abortion is grossly irrelevant to the real crux of the matter, which is the welfare and mental health of women.

The member for Playford is implying that the alternative to mental health is mental illness. Actually, the opposite to mental health is mental ill-health, not mental illness. Even though there is now a tendency for fewer women under 20 years of age to marry solely because of pregnancy, the United Kingdom divorce rate in 1960 per thousand married women five years after the marriage was as follows. In 1960 the rate was 9.1 in those marrying aged less than 20 years; 4.5 in those marrying aged 20 to 24 years; and 2.8 in those marrying aged 25 to 29 years. In 1969 the equivalent figures were 20.8, 9.8 and 6.5. At

10 years after marriage the 1969 figures were as follows: 15.2, 7.4 and 4.3.

These statistics show that the divorce rate is double for those marrying before 20 years of age, compared with those marrying after 20 years of age. The cost to men, women, and not least of all children of the marriage in terms in loss of “mental health” by breakdown of such marriages does not have to be emphasized to be recognized. The Bill is going to add to the number of those marrying before the age of 20 years—not by choice but by the force of circumstances. It is the forced marriages in the younger age group that are probably the basis for much of their breakdown. A psychiatric follow-up survey has been carried out by an Adelaide psychiatrist and social workers on 154 women one month and six months after their abortions. It has shown little or no serious after-effects. About 56 per cent of the women assessed at six months gave every indication that they were in better mental health at that time than they were six months before they had their abortion. These findings are generally consistent with psychiatric opinion.

Let me also answer a recent claim by one who objects to the reformed abortion law in South Australia that the Act has led to a “pregnancy explosion among the unmarried”. However, examination of the illegitimacy rates in different Australian States suggests that the explosion he refers to is much more apparent in the other States, which have not reformed their laws. Throughout Australia 8.30 per cent of births were illegitimate in 1970. The figure for 1971 was 9.29 per cent—a rise of 1 per cent. In New South Wales the increase was 1.4 per cent, in Victoria the increase was 0.59 per cent, and in Queensland the increase was 0.83 per cent. All States, with one exception, show these large increases. The exception is South Australia, where the illegitimacy rate is lower than the average for Australia, and has remained steady. It was 7.58 per cent of births in 1970, and 7.75 per cent in 1971—a change of only 0.17 per cent.

“The law’s interference with the private actions of an individual should be kept to a minimum, and a woman’s decision to have her child or not is perhaps the most personal action of all.” With this extract from a leading article in the *Advertiser* I wholeheartedly agree, because it seems to me that what those here in South Australia who are opposed to the 1969 Act (and who now wish to introduce amendments to restrict it) completely overlook is the welfare of the woman and the effect on

her and on her family when it is threatened by an unwanted pregnancy. I cannot help wondering what would happen if this House was composed of 45 women and two men, instead of the other way round. Would this Bill have ever seen the light of day? Certainly it would have received very short shrift.

When one comes to think about this critically one is almost forced to the conclusion that in general men have given only superficial consideration to the question of abortion. They have not, in my opinion, looked at it in depth. I see a real "carry over" from the long held idea that women are the weaker sex, to be protected, to be considered incapable of looking at abortion as other than a way out of bearing their proper responsibilities. They see women as the child bearers, the "bringer-uppers". Men (though they are part of the sexual act and equally responsible for the outcome) still, I believe, consider they should hold this mastery over women. Until men just try (even though they might do it reluctantly) to see abortion from the woman's angle, pro-abortionists are going to have to fight every inch of the way to break down these age-old prejudices. Some men are beginning to see the light, thank God, and I at least am grateful for those who show themselves to be on the woman's side—in this place—and for the growing number of those in the community who see the need for liberalization of the laws relating to abortion. Strangely, the Australian and New Zealand College of Psychiatrists, predominantly a male organization, passed the following resolution:

That a majority of the membership of the Australian and New Zealand College of Psychiatrists supports the view that there should be an alteration in laws on abortion so that legally qualified medical practitioners are free to exercise clinical judgment in this as in other matters.

The following is an extract from a speech by Germaine Greer:

A woman who has an abortion may or may not suffer guilt. I know of no woman who has ever contemplated an abortion who has not considered it very carefully, and quite painfully. I know of many women who perhaps would have had children if they thought the society would have allowed them to do so. For some of us do cry for the right to bear as well as the right not to bear. But if these women have confronted the problem and have come to the decision that, in justice to themselves and to other people with whose lives their own life entangles, this pregnancy must be terminated, then it is the sheerest hypocrisy to abrogate her right of decision, to a board of psychiatrists or doctors or hospital counsellors or whatever they are (footballers, plumbers)—

it is the sheerest hypocrisy to abrogate her decision, because the board (the doctors, the two psychiatrists, whoever they are) do not really take responsibility for the action. They take symbolic responsibility. They say, "No, no, we don't think this abortion is necessary, go ahead and have the child; we are doing the right thing for you on your behalf." But they never have to actually go through with the consequences of that moral decision.

The member for Playford says that he represents no group and intends only to have the law changed back to what it was in 1969 and clarified. His Bill represents an attempt by those who do not believe in abortion in any circumstances to change our law so that few women indeed would qualify in South Australia for legal abortion. To close my remarks, I want to quote from the report presented to the Government yesterday and put into the hands of all members. In this report, Dr. Ian Furler, who investigated for the Government the abortion laws and practices in Europe and the United States of America, makes the following conclusions:

(1) Our present law is good and should not be extended to abortion on request or restricted for the reasons stated.

(2) Restrictive abortion penalizes the poor, and leads to the growth of illegal abortion. Countries with the highest abortion rates have often very restrictive laws. Abortion on request probably leads to an increase in the unwanted pregnancy rate.

(3) From statistics presented it would appear that abortion before 10 to 12 weeks gestation is safer than the continuance of pregnancy in many cases. Abortion after 12 weeks is four times more dangerous than before and may be more dangerous in most cases than continuation of the pregnancy.

(4) Present methods of application and registration should continue.

(5) More social counselling should be provided for both pre-abortion and post-abortion management. It would also help statistics.

I have spoken very much from the heart. As I felt strongly on this subject, I devoted many hours to compiling the speech I have just made. I only hope that members who have been in the Chamber while I have been speaking have listened carefully to what I have said. If members have not heard me or pondered what I have said, perhaps they could read my speech and study it closely.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has a minute left in which to complete her speech.

Mrs. STEELE: With those few closing remarks, I definitely oppose the Bill.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): When this legislation was originally introduced, my Party was in Government and I then voted

against the legislation. I have no reason to change my opinion on this occasion from what it was then. I plead with members, irrespective of the views they may hold about this Bill, to allow it to pass the second reading so that it can be dealt with fully in Committee. Clause 2 provides:

2. Section 82a of the principal Act is amended—

(a) by striking out paragraph (a) of subsection (1) and inserting in lieu thereof the following paragraph:—

(a) if the pregnancy of a woman is terminated by a legally qualified medical practitioner in a case where he and one other legally qualified medical practitioner are of the opinion formed in good faith after both have personally examined the woman—

(i) that the continuance of the pregnancy would involve a risk to the life of the pregnant woman and that such risk would to a significant extent be greater than if the pregnancy were terminated;

(ii) that—

(A) the continuance of the pregnancy would involve risk of substantial injury to the physical health of the pregnant woman;

(B) such risk would be greater than if the pregnancy were terminated;

and

(C) the injury or its effects, if it occurred, would persist for a period exceeding the period comprising the anticipated balance of the duration of the pregnancy, the consequent child-birth and forty-two days thereafter;

(iii) that—

(A) termination of the pregnancy is necessary to prevent injury to the mental health of the pregnant woman;

and

(B) continuance of the pregnancy would involve a substantial risk that it would contribute to the mental illness of the woman to the extent that she would be dangerous to herself or to others or to the extent that she would be in need of restraint or regular psychiatric supervision or treatment for a period comprising the anticipated balance of the duration of the pregnancy, the consequent child-birth and forty-two days thereafter;

(iv) that there is a substantial risk that, if the pregnancy were not terminated and the child were born to the pregnant woman, the child would suffer from such physical or mental abnormalities as to be seriously handicapped,

and where the treatment for the termination of the pregnancy is carried out in a hospital or a hospital of a class declared by regulation to be a prescribed hospital for the purposes of this section;

(b) by striking out from paragraph (b) of subsection (1) the passage “where he is of the opinion, formed in good faith,” and inserting in lieu thereof the passage “where he and one other legally qualified medical practitioner are of the opinion formed in good faith after both have personally examined the woman”;

(c) by striking out from subsection (3) the passage “such risk of injury to the physical or mental health of a pregnant woman as is mentioned in subparagraph (i)” and inserting in lieu thereof the passage “any risk of a kind referred to in subparagraph (ii) or subparagraph (iii)”;

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Is the honourable member reading out the Bill as it is contained on members' files?

Mr. VENNING: No, I am dealing with the amendments as they affect the Act. The first part of these amendments deals with the conditions under which an abortion can be performed, and there are then amendments dealing with the onus of proof. I believe these alterations to the present legislation are necessary. The Bill then deals with a reduction in the period of pregnancy in which abortions can be performed. I believe that amendment to the legislation is most important. For these reasons, I support the Bill.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I sincerely congratulate the member for Davenport on her speech. I well remember (and her speech today made me remember it even more forcibly) that when the original legislation was introduced in 1968 we were anxious to refer it to a Select Committee that would reflect all shades of opinion in this House. I personally believed that it was absolutely essential that, from a House that contained at that time 37 men and two women, at least one of the women should be a member of the Select Committee. Although it is all very well for us men to consider this matter, to theorize about it, and to come to conclusions, in the very nature of our beings we never have to face what women may have to face. I have never regretted the suggestion that the

then member for Burnside and Minister of Education (Mrs. Steele) should be a member of the Select Committee. I believe we have heard from her today the sort of speech that only one other member of the House could possibly give. Conversely, outside this Chamber about one-half of the people of the State could give that type of speech. For that reason as well, it was a most valuable, significant, and helpful speech.

I oppose the second reading of the Bill. In saying that, I do not avoid the fact that I have on occasion in the last couple of years expressed some alarm and perturbation about the figures, which have been released every six months, showing the number of operations which have been performed and the grounds on which they have been performed. I have said publicly that I have been alarmed because of the high number of abortions that have been performed, apparently on psychiatric grounds. Although I have some reservations about the working of the law as it now stands, they are not sufficient to persuade me to support the second reading of the Bill, let alone any further stages of it.

I wish to say something about the attitudes which have led to the introduction of the Bill (I do not mean only the personal outlook of the member for Playford and of others who support him). As the member for Davenport said, when this Bill was debated in 1968, and particularly during the next session in 1969, it created the most intense interest amongst members. It was, I think, the longest debate on a single clause in any Bill I have ever known (I would be surprised if it were not the longest debate on any clause ever debated in this Parliament). Not only did it create that interest amongst members: it also created intense interest among those who came day after day to listen to the debate (the galleries were full, as the member for Davenport said) and in the community generally.

That was what we as members of the then Government wanted, because we regarded it as a most significant matter for Parliament to debate. The strange thing is that those who were strongest in their opposition then are the very ones who are the strongest in their opposition today. I do not mean only members in this House (there has been a considerable change in the membership of the House) but of people outside. For example (and I am sure he will not mind my mentioning him by name), Pastor Overduin, who is

one of the leading figures in the Right to Life Association, told me a few weeks ago that he was utterly opposed to the Bill in 1968 and 1969 and that he was here every day to listen; even today, there are those in the gallery who were here during those debates. So I think that it is really (and I hope I am not being unfair to anyone) the same people now who are opposed to the law and supporting the Bill as were opposed to the Bill in 1968 and 1969.

I know that the member for Playford was not then a member of this House, nor was the Attorney-General. They have both come in since and have expressed, from the time when they first spoke here, the strongest opposition. It is obvious from what those gentlemen have said, and from what, in particular, the member for Playford said in his second reading explanation, that, if he could, he would prohibit abortion altogether, or virtually so. The Bill does not go as far as he or some of those who think as he does would like it to go. I was not present last week to listen to the member for Playford make his speech but, naturally, I have read it carefully since. It seems to me that he has based his case for the introduction of the Bill not so much on his own fundamental objection to abortion (although that shows through, as I have said) but he has tried to base his case on the assumption that, in 1969 when this Bill was debated in this Chamber as then constituted, there was a misunderstanding of the significance of what we were doing. I do not believe that that was the case.

As the member for Davenport has said, and as I have mentioned, no Bill has received a closer or longer scrutiny than the 1969 Bill. The then Deputy Leader of the Opposition (now the Minister of Works and Deputy Premier) fought every phrase in the clause—not only the clause itself, but every phrase of any significance was fought over, gone over, explained and analysed. We came, after debate, to a considered decision on it. Yet we find the honourable member, at page 484 of *Hansard*, saying:

It is my belief that members misunderstood the significance, especially the legal significance, of the changes then proposed.

At page 485, he went on to deal with what he called the central provision in the Bill. Although I am content to adopt his phraseology about the central provision in the Bill, I remind honourable members that this provision was the subject of debate in 1969,

when the then Deputy Leader of the Opposition moved, among other things, on this subclause to strike out "greater risk" and insert "serious danger". This appears at page 2596 of *Hansard* for October 29, 1969. He canvassed in his speech the very question the member for Playford canvassed in his recent speech, whether an abortion was not always safer than a natural pregnancy and childbirth. So, let the member for Playford not say that these things were not considered in this House and were not raised and gone over in 1969. The following is what the then member for Millicent said at that time:

As this provision is now worded, we are considering whether there is a greater risk in a woman's continuing a pregnancy than there would be if the pregnancy were terminated, and I take it that the termination would be performed in the safe period before 12 weeks. I do not think anyone in the medical profession would deny that, even for a healthy woman, possibly greater risk is involved in continuing with a pregnancy for the full term than in having the pregnancy terminated before 12 weeks. I think that members generally intend that, where there is serious danger to the life or the mental or physical health of a woman, pregnancy should be terminated. However, I do not believe honourable members desire this comparison.

He raised the matter and it was debated. Although I cannot find the reference in *Hansard*, I remember saying that, in my view, if that defence were ever put up in the criminal court, no jury would ever accept it. The House rightly or wrongly accepted the view I put. However, whether I was right or wrong, this matter, which is one of the central points in the honourable member's speech in support of the Bill, was certainly before members in 1969.

The member for Davenport has referred to a number of letters which she and other honourable members have received. I had intended to refer to them, but she has already referred to them—the letter from the Department of Christian Citizenship of the Methodist Church and the letter from the Congregational Minister (Rev. G. W. Pope), both of whose churches supported the Bill in 1968 and 1969 by resolutions of their assemblies, as a number of other Protestant denominations did. Professor Lloyd Cox also sent me a copy of the letter he sent to the member for Davenport and, as the honourable member has already quoted it in full, it is not necessary for me to do so. I had his permission (as I am sure the member for Davenport did) to use it. Professor Cox was at that time one of the most significant and influential of the witnesses that

appeared before the Select Committee. He is a man who is occupied professionally with these matters, and I believe his opinion on the working of this Act is of the greatest significance to us when considering this Bill.

I will not refer to any of the other letters: all honourable members have had letters, both pro and con. I regard the three cited by the member for Davenport as perhaps the most valuable I have had, although there is another letter to which I will refer shortly. The member for Mawson last week referred to the recent public opinion poll, of which he gave details. The member for Davenport also referred to it this afternoon.

Surely it is significant that there has been virtually no change in the general public's view on this matter in the last two or three years, except for the slow growth (which was referred to in the Gallup poll finding) of those who believe in abortion on demand. I make it clear, as I did in 1968 and 1969, that I am not one of those who believe in abortion on demand. Abortion is a serious step to take and should be taken only for the gravest reasons. That is the only change in the outlook in the community that has taken place in the last three or four years. I think we can take it from that poll that 69 per cent or 70 per cent of the people of Australia favour either provisions such as we have or substantially the same as we have in section 82a of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act.

As the member for Mawson said last week, this fact was mirrored in this House and in another place when the Bill was being considered there. Leaving aside those things (because, as members of Parliament, we should not be entirely or absolutely influenced—nor are we—by opinions expressed to us or generally in the community), let us turn to the two reports that have been made by the committee headed by Sir Leonard Mallen to oversee the working of legislation. That committee was set up by the Hall Government only a few weeks before it went out of office because we believed that, in the very nature of this legislation, a body should be charged with the specific responsibility of watching how the legislation was working. We set up the committee of medical practitioners because under the Act the medical profession has been given (though it is not particularly willing) the responsibility for making decisions in matters of abortion.

Surely it is of the greatest significance to us, as members of Parliament, that in neither of

its reports has the Mallen committee recommended a change such as the member for Playford recommends in this Bill as the central and most important change in the law. That is the very body that one would expect to recommend a change, and it is the body to which we should look for a recommendation for change in what is the central provision of the law. Of course, the member for Playford has added in his Bill a number of what can be described as peripheral matters that have emerged from the Mallen committee's report. I refer, for example, to the matter of abortion in case of emergency, when we provided that only one medical practitioner need form the opinion. Strangely enough, the honourable member has not included in his Bill what I would have thought would be the first thing to include; I refer to the residence clause, which is obviously in an unsatisfactory condition. He did not include that despite its being one of the first recommendations in the Mallen committee's report.

Mr. Clark: But you will remember that that was argued extensively at the time. I am not saying that unkindly.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: True, the residence clause was argued, but I am not talking about that aspect of the clause. The part that is so obviously wrong (and I will go so far as to say "silly") was the amendment inserted by the Legislative Council on the last night of the session, which we accepted at the time on my recommendation to get the Bill passed—the period of time when a woman must have been resident in South Australia. That provision is obviously wrong. It was, however, a small enough point to let go at the time for the sake of getting the Bill passed, but it is a point that I would have thought anyone who was trying to amend the law would take the first opportunity to correct. Then there is the matter of the conscience clause for medical practitioners, and the reduction of the period from 28 weeks to 20 weeks. All these things are set out and have been included in the honourable member's Bill.

There is nowhere in either of the reports to which I have referred a recommendation for altering the grounds on which an abortion should be permitted. Those are, of course, the central provisions in this Bill. The member for Playford is therefore introducing the Bill without the authority of or a recommendation from the committee which was set up by the previous Government and which has been continued by the present Government to do the very thing that should be done—to oversee

the working of this Act. Of course, the same thing as happened in the United Kingdom is happening here: our experience has been parallel to that of the United Kingdom, as one would expect. In July, 1969, a Bill was introduced into the House of Commons to repeal the English Abortion Act. That legislation was introduced under the 10-minute rule and, after about 15 months experience in England, that Bill was defeated straight-out on that rule in the House of Commons. Our experience with the introduction of this Bill parallels that situation. Last week, when the honourable member spoke, he did not have the advantage of the latest statistics on abortions performed in this State. I had, I think, on the day the honourable member gave notice of his intention to introduce this Bill, asked a question of the Premier.

Mr. McRae: It was curious that they came out the day after the introduction of the Bill.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The honourable member can say that and draw whatever conclusions he likes. I was not here last week, when the Premier apparently let the Opposition Whip (Mr. Evans) know that the answer was ready, as a result of which the Whip kindly asked the question on my behalf. I know nothing more about it than that. The figures were apparently available publicly on the Thursday, and the *Hansard* pull was certainly waiting for me when I returned to South Australia on Friday. The figures are of the greatest significance. One of the things that has concerned me about the working of the Act has been the apparent continual increase in the number of operations performed as time has passed. I made an estimate (which was only a guess) before the Bill came into operation that about 1,000 operations would be performed in the first 12 months. From memory, it was about 1,400 and then the figure doubled. I take much comfort from the figures released last Thursday. Surely the member for Playford is not suggesting that his own Government should not have released those figures.

Mr. McRae: I said they were issued the day after I introduced the Bill.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I suggest that the honourable member take that up: it is a squabble about which I am not concerned. The significance is that there was no real increase in the number of abortions performed. This is apparently the situation. The last part of that reply states:

Abortions notified for the period January 1, 1972, to June 30, 1972, totalled 1,271. Of this

number 27 terminations were performed in the period January 7, 1971, to December 31, 1971. The correct number of abortions performed in the first six months of 1972 is therefore 1,244 and 2,546 in 1971.

In other words, the figure for the first six months of 1972 is about half the number for the 12 months period of 1971, and I am extremely pleased that the trend of continual increase in the number apparently has stopped. I hope that the position continues as it is now and that the figures have levelled out. I ask honourable members to consider those statistics when deciding their attitude to this Bill, because one factor that would have persuaded me to support some change in the law was the continual acceleration, and now that has stopped.

It has been said that, because of this Act, we have abortion on demand. Medical practitioners have assured me that many women who request an abortion are refused by medical practitioners, in terms of this Act. That is as it should be and as it was intended.

Dr. Tonkin: Indeed, some of those women are helped because of their approach.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: As the member for Bragg has interjected and as we foresaw in 1969, the fact that there has been a law of this kind in operation in this State has encouraged women to seek help. They may go in the first place to seek an abortion but, once they are told that they cannot have one, the approach puts them in touch with those who can help them during pregnancy and afterwards. That is one thing that is happening in this State that we hoped would happen. I turn now to the provisions of the Bill. I have a personal note from a senior medical practitioner who lives in my district, in which he states:

Dear Robin,

I consider the Bill to be presented by Mr. T. M. McRae is quite unacceptable. The position was difficult enough before the present law was passed. Mr. McRae's Bill would be quite hopeless.

He was, of course, referring to the provisions of the Bill. As I have said, in this legislation we have given the medical profession the responsibility of deciding whether an abortion should be carried out. The medical profession did not want this responsibility. Dr. Steele, who was President of the Australian Medical Association in 1969, made that clear and he gave evidence to the Select Committee. There is no other body by whom the decision can be made, in my opinion, and Parliament accepted that view.

The medical profession has been willing to shoulder the responsibility which, after all, it was shouldering before the law was changed. Under the common law, it was a matter of a decision by medical practitioners. Of course, in this respect we tightened up the law in 1969. Theirs is the responsibility to interpret the provisions of the law, and, therefore, we have put ourselves in the hands of the medical profession in that interpretation. I consider that that is why so many operations have been performed on psychiatric grounds. That was not what was expected, but it has happened.

How many medical practitioners could genuinely and sincerely interpret this Bill? What are we asking them to do in this Bill? I refer now to the language of some provisions, because it is inexact and vague and has no precise meaning. As my medical friend has said, the Bill would make the position quite hopeless. I will not mention that doctor's name but the honourable member may look at the letter if he wishes and he will see the letterhead and the significance of it. New subsection (1) (a) (i) provides:

That the continuance of the pregnancy would involve a risk to the life of the pregnant woman and that such risk would to a significant extent be greater than if the pregnancy were terminated.

What on earth does "to a significant extent" mean? Each of us has his own ideas of what that phrase means. How could we expect a medical practitioner, or two medical practitioners, to come to a conclusion and how could we expect the profession to come to a consistent conclusion about what "to a significant extent" means? A legally trained person cannot do that, so why should we expect the medical profession to interpret a phrase of that kind?

Dr. Tonkin: A medical witness certainly would not give such an opinion in a court.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Certainly not. That is one of the bad phrases in the honourable member's Bill. As the member for Adelaide said last week, between the placita the member for Playford has not used either the conjunctive or the disjunctive and, as one reads this literally (although it is impossible and he cannot possibly mean it), all the conditions must be fulfilled. They are not alternative but are cumulative. I cannot believe that the honourable member meant that, but he has not used the conjunction "or". Placitum (ii) (A) provides:

(A) the continuance of the pregnancy would involve risk of substantial injury to the physical health of the pregnant woman;

What on earth does "substantial injury" mean?

The member for Playford knows that that phrase has no precise meaning and that it would cause doubt and concern to everyone who had to interpret such a provision. The phrase has no meaning and, therefore, it ought not to appear in an Act of Parliament if that can possibly be avoided, as I consider that it can. These are the worst two examples in the Bill. I say that in fairness to the honourable member, but they are the gist of the whole Bill. I do not consider that we, as members of Parliament, should accept language of this kind. I know that the honourable member has had to use it because he cannot think of anything better.

In my view, it would be far better to leave the law as it stands. Although the medical profession may not like the responsibility, it has been conscientiously interpreting the law as Parliament passed it in 1969. If this Bill became law, the position would become hopeless and would make the task of the medical profession impossible. The member for Adelaide raised other matters last week. The term "42 days thereafter" is not the period of lactation as I remember it in our family a few years ago.

Mr. Payne: You should know.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I can remember. A woman normally breast feeds a child for longer than that, as far as I can remember. Usually she did it until the first teeth came and there were a few nips. That is when breast feeding was abandoned, and that was a long time after 42 days. Why has the honourable member included the provision regarding that period? I do not know what is the magic about that.

Perhaps I need not say any more about the Bill. In my view, there are patent flaws in it, apart from any wider considerations. The member for Davenport referred to Dr. Furler's report. Again, perhaps the member for Playford draws some sinister conclusion from the fact that it was distributed to members in this place only yesterday but it is again, in my view, something of great significance, and I hope all members in this place will read it.

I have not had a chance to go right through the report but, like most of us, I suppose one looks to the back to see the summary or conclusions. If one starts at page 51 and goes through to page 58, I think one finds the substance of the report there. What does Dr. Furler say at page 58? What are his conclusions? I think the member for Davenport quoted them, but let me quote them again, as follows:

1. Our present law is good and should not be extended to abortion on request or restricted for the reasons stated.

That is precisely the position I take. I would not favour any extension of the law, and I oppose any restriction of it. The report continues:

2. Restrictive abortion penalizes the poor, and leads to the growth of illegal abortion.

That prompts me to say that I feel that the example given by the member for Playford last week of the rich woman shopping about and getting legal advice, and so on, was so far fetched as to be ridiculous. This report is correct: it is the poor that are penalized. The second paragraph continues:

Countries with the highest abortion rates have often very restrictive laws. Abortion on request probably leads to an increase in the unwanted pregnancy rate.

There are 11 recommendations, the last being:

Family planning and sex education facilities should be extended, but this will be the subject of a further submission . . .

I heartily accept and endorse that, and I wish more had been done in this State in the last couple of years along that line.

Mr. McRae: Why aren't you supporting the other part?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am not supporting it, because I think that what the member for Playford himself has called the central provision is so bad as not to allow me to vote for the second reading so that I can support the peripheral provisions. In my view, the core of this Bill is bad, and it is not saved by its other provisions, which the honourable member has taken from the Mallen report. If a Bill had been introduced containing merely the peripheral provisions, I would have had no hesitation whatever in supporting it but that, of course, was not the object of the member for Playford in introducing the Bill. He cares only about what he calls the central provision and that, in my view, should not be supported, even at the second reading stage. For those reasons, I oppose the Bill.

Mr. CLARK (Elizabeth): I have followed this debate with much interest, and I had intended to speak at some length but, having changed my mind, I will now speak only briefly. I consider that it has been made abundantly clear to the House by all members who have spoken in this debate that they have strong convictions regarding abortion, and I believe this is a good thing. I consider that we are not very worth while if, on such a matter as this, we do not have strong convictions. My personal strong convictions are in

favour of the Bill, and one of the reasons why I do not wish to speak at length here is that I believe that a Bill such as this is different from one that is based on political considerations rather than on moral or conscientious considerations. Although I think I could have some unkind things to say about opinions expressed by certain members, both on my side and on the other side, regarding this matter, I believe that it is better if not too much of that type of argument enters the debate.

I am pleased to say that on this measure there has not been the type of interjection and argument that we sometimes hear in debates based largely on political matters. I was impressed by the speech made by the member for Davenport; it was a good speech, and it is good that a woman's point of view should be expressed so eloquently, but (and Sir Thomas Playford often used to say "but") I could name several women who could just as eloquently and convincingly express a woman's point of view that was completely opposite. That is the big trouble with this type of argument. As I say, most of us have convictions about it; I have convictions, although they are not religious convictions, and I admit that it would take much convincing for me to adopt a contrary point of view. In other words, the member for Davenport impressed me, but she did not convince me.

I listened with much interest also to the member for Mitcham's speech and, although I had to leave the House for a few minutes, I heard most of it while I was outside the Chamber. Again, I was impressed by his speech but not convinced by it. It was a good speech from the honourable member's point of view, but it is a point of view that I do not share. The member for Mitcham still believes that abortion is a most serious step, and I am reminded that back in 1969 (February 19, to be exact), he said:

... whenever there is an abortion we are either bringing to an end a human life or at least (and this depends on one's point of view) the potentiality of a human life, and such an action should not, in my view, be taken without the gravest reason.

Those remarks were made by the member for Mitcham, when Attorney-General, completely sincerely. My main objection to the present legislation, and my main reasons for supporting this Bill concern the figures quoted this afternoon by the honourable member. The honourable member expressed concern about those figures, although he appeared perhaps less concerned about the figures released concerning the last six months. As I cannot

share his feelings regarding those figures let us look again at them: in 1970, 1,440 legal abortions were performed; in 1971, the number rose to 2,546; and for the first six months of 1972, 1,244 legal abortions had been performed. One has only to do a little elementary arithmetic and to double that figure to realize that it represents a slight decrease on the previous year. However, it still means that over 2,000 legal abortions will be performed this year.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Have you any figures on illegal abortions?

Mr. CLARK: No. In the 2½ years since the original legislation was passed, we know that about 5,000 legal abortions have been performed. Apparently some members look at those figures without much concern, but I cannot. The figures represent the potentiality of 5,000 human lives that have been lost to this State. I have studied this matter carefully and cannot convince even myself that these 5,000 abortions in South Australia should all have been necessary. We have been told that, before any amendment is made to the Act, we should wait and see what happens: we should give the current Act a really good test. However, while we are doing that waiting and testing, more and more abortions are being carried out and, in my opinion, many of these abortions should not be performed.

It must be realized that 5,000 lives have been snuffed out, not illegally but legally under the terms of the Act. I suggest that many abortions are not necessary and that the 5,000 is far too many. The amendments introduced by the member for Playford block up several small loopholes and, although it has been suggested by some members that the passing of this Bill will mean a return to pre-1969 conditions, obviously that is incorrect, because these amendments certainly do not do that. They tidy up several small loopholes and would not satisfy anyone; they do not satisfy those people strongly pro-abortion (we have seen that), and they do not satisfy the people who are strongly anti-abortion.

Why did the member for Playford introduce this Bill at all? My reply to that question is the same as his: the amendments were introduced because the honourable member hoped to improve the present situation. I ask all members, even if they believe that they cannot support the amendments, to support the second reading so that the amendments can be thrashed out thoroughly in Committee. Indeed, the work done by the member for Playford deserves at least that much recognition and,

in supporting this Bill, I ask members to support the second reading.

Mr. HARRISON (Albert Park): I oppose the Bill. I have come to this decision after long and careful consideration of the numerous letters, telegrams and telephone calls that I have received and personal interviews conducted both at my home and in this House regarding the Bill. I wish to thank those constituents who sent me books and reports both for and against abortion, and also the various organizations for the statistical information they have provided. As a result of my careful study of these reports, I can conscientiously say that, in voting against the amendment, I have carried out the wishes of the majority of my constituents. I wish also to thank specially the women who offered information regarding their having been aborted, their experiences, and their denials that the law, as it exists, does not provide abortion on demand.

Mr. CRIMES (Spence): I strongly oppose the second reading. In so doing, I congratulate all members who have spoken on this matter, no matter which approach they have made to the Bill. I especially congratulate the member for Davenport, because I believe that the weight of a woman's view on this matter is worth 20 times that of a man's view, as this is a matter that should be entirely resolved by the members of that sex most affected by the provisions of the Bill.

Although I support the present Act, I should not be averse to going further than the provisions of the Act as it at present stands. This is a matter that should be determined on an individual basis between the woman concerned and her medical adviser. To view this matter in its proper perspective, we should look at the historical background of the treatment of the female sex by the male sex. We currently live in what is termed a "permissive" society. But this is not something that has suddenly arisen: it is something that has been built up over a long period, the blame for which can be laid on the kind of society that has existed in the past, the responsibility for which is to be placed with the male sex. In other words, when we look at past societies, we must say that they were men's societies in which women had little or no status whatsoever. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 pm.]

FRUIT FLY (COMPENSATION) BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 8. Page 568.)

Mr. FERGUSON (Goyder): Other important Bills concerning this matter have been introduced, because we are concerned to keep this State free of fruit fly. I do not intend to delay the House further, because I know that many people are waiting to claim compensation. I support the second reading.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): It has been suggested that there should be an Australia-wide attack against the fruit fly menace rather than each State trying to eliminate problems that are generally caused by infestation from other States. Perhaps the Minister could raise this matter at the next meeting of the Agricultural Council.

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

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from August 8. Page 598.)

First schedule.

Highways and Local Government,
\$3,900,000.

Mr. EVANS: The sum of \$800,000 has been allocated for roads and bridges, and the council involved would appreciate receiving grants concerning some roads in my district, particularly Acklands Hill Road and Blacks Road from Coromandel Valley to Flagstaff Hill. The Acklands Hill Road carries much traffic, particularly to a golf club, but it is also used by local residents, who have to use it to travel to and from work and get their supplies to perform their normal farming activities. Also, under the Highways Department programme, there is no mention of work to be carried out on the Old Belair Road or on upgrading the main road to Blackwood and Belair. Has the Minister any knowledge of that? By letter, I have made many requests to him about the Blackwood-Belair area. I have not received replies but hope to get them soon.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Can the Minister say whether the apparently interminable operation of the Noarlunga bypass will ever be terminated? It is now three months later than the last estimate the Minister gave

me and it still looks as though there is much to be done before traffic can use it.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Roads and Transport): At this stage, because of protocol, I cannot give the honourable member a specific date. I have a docket on my desk connected with the official opening, and in due course I am sure he will receive an official invitation to attend on that auspicious occasion.

Mr. McANANEY: The Highways Department was allocated \$1,000,000 the year before last, and that money has not yet been spent; there is still a substantial credit balance. Can the Minister explain why this \$800,000 has been allocated for roads and bridges when the department already has unexpended Loan funds?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I cannot give the honourable member an answer at the moment, but I will get the information for him.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I, too, refer to the allocation of \$800,000 for roads and bridges. There was no estimate for 1971-72 and no actual payment but I am aware of bridgeworks proposed under the Highways Department schedule for 1971-72, and in particular two bridges on the Kapunda to Truro road. Whilst they may not come under this allocation, they will undoubtedly come within the roads and bridges construction programme, either from Revenue Account or from the Loan Estimates. Can the Minister explain why bridgeworks that were to be proceeded with last year were not proceeded with? Was there a reallocation of funds for some other purpose? In this \$800,000 for roads and bridges, is there any money for the new bridge to be built over the Light River south of Kapunda?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I cannot answer the Leader's last question. I have not the programme in front of me, but he has been provided with the works schedule, so I imagine he would already have looked at this and discovered that is it not on the programme. The obvious reason why the money was not expended is that much of the design and planning work for the Highways Department is considerably behind construction. In other words, as it is necessary to plan and design a project at least two or three years in advance, that is probably the reason for it. I will discuss the matter with my officers and obtain this information for the honourable member.

Mr. COUMBE: Although this matter is not mentioned this year, can the Minister say whether his department is doing any planning

for the replacement of the old Albert bridge, which is adjacent to the Zoological Gardens and which I understand will be part of the replanning of metropolitan Adelaide transport? I am aware of the Adelaide City Council's obligations in this regard, but is the Minister's department co-operating with the council's officers in planning for the replacement of this bridge, which, because of the realignment of some of the streets in North Adelaide and the increased traffic volume, is producing a dangerous bottleneck?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Close liaison exists between the Highways Department and the Adelaide City Council. I do not know the priority of this bridge, but I will obtain the information.

Dr. EASTICK: Regarding public parks, the Treasurer said that a fund had been established as a result of increases in land tax. In addition, the Loan Estimates provide for \$300,000 to be made available for public parks. Can the Minister say what is the programme for public parks that are to be established?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The \$300,000 in the Loan Estimates is for public parks to be established under the Public Parks Act, and a similar sum has been appropriated for several years in the past. I cannot give the details of actual locations. However, response from local government over recent months has been far in excess of finance available, not only in land acquisition but also in the development of some public parks. An undertaking was given several years ago that the two 20-acre parcels of land at Marion (an area originally designated as south-western districts hospital land and the land immediately behind it) would be dedicated as public parks and transferred to the Marion council. The Government negotiated and eventually succeeded in transferring the first 20-acre block, previously specified for the south-western districts hospital, to the Road Safety Council for the establishment of the Road Safety Centre. However, a provision in those negotiations was that a replacement of similar land should be made available to the Marion council. This is being done, under the provisions of the Public Parks Act, by acquiring 20 acres of land which is immediately opposite and which is currently owned by the Municipal Tramways Trust. This land will be transferred as a public park virtually in exchange for the land promised to the council by a former Government.

Mr. HALL: This year \$800,000 is allocated for roads and bridges, whereas nothing was

allocated on this line last year. The department must therefore need this sum of money for a new purpose. Will the Minister say whether any of this money is related to the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan or what he has in mind regarding the \$800,000?

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: It's all there.

Mr. HALL: If it is, it will be the first time. Will the Minister say whether this provision in any way relates to the take-over of David Shearer Limited by Horwood Bagshaw Limited, which seems to involve the purchase of land occupied by the latter, or whether this \$800,000 is involved with the M.A.T.S. plan, which he has previously said has been postponed for 10 years (or perhaps it is nine years since he made his last announcement).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is 8½ years, 18 months having passed since I stated the Government's policy on the M.A.T.S. plan, and the Government does not deviate one iota from that. If the honourable member refers to the explanation of the line "Roads and Bridges", he will see that the provision of \$800,000 has been made for a transfer to the Highways Fund, which will supplement \$600,000 to be provided for the Eyre Highway.

Mr. FERGUSON: Will the Minister say whether the sum allocated for roads and bridges has taken into account the construction of culverts and bridges that will apparently be needed on the road from Two Wells to Port Wakefield? This work was abruptly brought to a halt last year when it was learnt that the Lower Light River had overflowed. Has provision been made for that work and for completion of the road?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Obviously, the honourable member did not hear what I told the member for Gouger. The \$800,000 is to supplement the building of the Eyre Highway, for which to this stage, regrettably, the Commonwealth Government has not provided the finance.

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister explain why money to finance the building of the Eyre Highway is being arranged through the Electricity Trust?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If honourable members read all the documents, they will see the complete answer. The Government accepts that the building of the Eyre Highway is of significance to South Australia and of national importance. We are using every possible resource to achieve that objective. We hope that the Commonwealth Government will accept its responsibility and provide the

finance. Already that Government has been making noises about providing \$600,000,000 to build interstate highways.

Mr. Gunn: Do you oppose that?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the honourable member keeps quiet, he may learn something. It seems that the Commonwealth Government is now acknowledging its responsibility in this area. However, because of the constant refusals that the State Government has received, we have decided to proceed, hoping to get financial benefit in future but not waiting until we get it.

Mr. McANANEY: Why is it necessary to provide the Electricity Trust with \$3,000,000 of Loan funds so that it can lend money to the Highways Department for the Eyre Highway? Why not lend the money direct to the Highways Department?

Mr. MATHWIN: Is the reduced allocation for the south-western suburbs drainage scheme this year being made because the scheme is about to be completed, or is there another reason?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The scheme is virtually reaching completion, and that is the reason for the smaller provision.

Mr. McANANEY: Surely I am entitled to a reply to my question.

Mr. HALL: Mr. Chairman, I think the member for Heysen has made a pertinent point, and this is the only time that we can gain information on this important topic. He wants to know why the money must go on a circuitous route to the Highways Fund. It is rumoured that the Minister is about to step into the Treasurer's place, in any case, and he ought to know these things.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. Clark: He's not going to start another mug Party, though.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There is nothing here about Parties. The honourable member for Gouger.

Mr. HALL: I support the request of the member for Heysen for information on this matter.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Obviously the member for Gouger is so bereft of matters to raise that he is trying to make something out of a rather foolish question of the member for Heysen.

Mr. McANANEY: I take exception to the Minister using the word "foolish", when I have asked an intelligent question.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I cannot uphold the honourable member's objection. The honourable Minister of Roads and Transport.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I regret that I have offended the intelligence of the member for Heysen by suggesting that he has asked a foolish question. First, let me assure the member for Gouger, even though it has nothing to do with this debate, that I have no intention of ever becoming Treasurer. The member for Gouger, who is a former Treasurer of this State, and the member for Heysen, who regards himself as the economist of the Opposition, both know about the restrictions and financial terms as between the State and the Electricity Trust, and both know that what they are suggesting is just not possible within the financial arrangements of the State.

Dr. EASTICK: Referring to "Public Parks", I ask the Minister whether it is intended to create a fund that will carry over from one year to the next. I appreciate that negotiations initiated in any one year are not always finalized by the end of that year. I am interested to know whether the \$300,000 provided, plus any revenue received by the department, will be used to create a fund in respect of the future purchase of an area, such a purchase currently being beyond the resources of the State.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: There is no significance in the word "future". This is a continuing fund created under the Public Parks Act and there is carry-over of certain debits or credits from year to year. I hope that the sum we have allocated for this year will be insufficient to meet the demands of local government in this regard.

Line passed.

Lands, Irrigation and Drainage, \$3,220,000.

Mr. EVANS: I refer to the proposed net payments of \$334,000 for national reserves. Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say whether the Government has considered the purchase of the Craighurn property of over 2,000 acres now under dispute regarding zoning regulations of the Mitcham and Meadows councils. Many people believe that this area should be acquired and used as a national reserve. I estimate the value of the property to be over \$6,000,000, yet only \$334,000 has been allocated in these Estimates for the purchase of national reserves.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister of Environment and Conservation): The purchase of the Craighurn property as a national park has not been considered by the Government.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The proposed payments for national reserves are \$400,000. I have heard criticism by the Minister of past policy, which he described as "unplanned or unco-ordinated acquisition of reserves". Although there is probably some justification for what he has said, it has also been pointed out that the acquisition of reserves has been unplanned in the past out of necessity. Former Ministers of Lands, whose job it was to acquire reserves when they thought it necessary, all acquired land when and where they could, not without thought but not according to a master plan. They realized that South Australia was deficient in reserves and that they had to acquire land as fast as possible: for example, they had to obtain scrubland before it was destroyed. This problem faced the Ministers of Lands of both Parties.

We now have many reserves and I believe that about 10,000,000 acres is held as reserves in South Australia. Some old parks no longer qualify for the status of a national park, but the land is still held, although much of it was obtained by a transfer of Government land into a national park. Much money was spent in buying land, but in the Adelaide Hills and in the South-East parks were expensive to buy.

However, as a result of this activity the present Minister of Environment and Conservation is in a much stronger position than was any previous Minister of Lands because, in addition to the 10,000,000 acres of national parks there would be between 30,000,000 and 50,000,000 acres of this State that is not occupied. I do not advocate that all that land should be made national parks, but for the first time the Minister is able to choose land for acquisition with far more discrimination. Has the Minister a co-ordinated plan for national parks? If he has, is he working to that plan, or has the plan not yet been prepared? I understand that one of his most urgent duties when he became Minister of Environment and Conservation was to originate a plan to co-ordinate what he considered was unco-ordinated acquisition.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The impression could be gained that I have criticized the actions of the late Hon. Mr. Quirke, the Hon. Mr. Corcoran, and the member for Alexandra who have held the portfolio of Minister of Lands and who were responsible for the purchase of lands for national parks. I did not criticize their actions, but I suggested that they had purchased the land that was suitable for national parks when it became

available and was offered to the department. I am pleased with what they have done, because it has placed us in the position where we now have more than 100 national parks in this State representing what I consider to be a comprehensive concept of the State.

My point is that we can now be far more selective in our future purchases of land for national parks. While it is not good enough for us to continue with the past policy (which I have not criticized) of purchasing land before it can be bought elsewhere and cleared and therefore lost forever to the State, as we have this comprehensive coverage we should see to it in future that, before we purchase additional land for national parks, it is in those areas of the State and contains those features that we do not have in other national parks so that we can continue to ensure that the whole State is represented in our national parks. We should also ensure that all our national parks are adequately serviced and properly fenced so that adjoining landholders do not suffer the problems of animals from the parks affecting their properties detrimentally and, more importantly, that members of the public are thoroughly aware of the locations of these parks and the facilities provided so that they can derive the fullest enjoyment from them.

Mr. Evans: What about making a charge for their use?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I will deal with that in a moment. It is fair to say that, if we were to approach people in the street, probably not one of them could give the names or locations of 10 national parks in this State. While we have them, we also have the responsibility of telling the people where they are and what features they have for their enjoyment. It is intended to follow the suggestion that we look at the State as a whole, see where we are lacking in representative areas, and pay special attention to ensure not only that a comprehensive cross-section of the State is preserved in our national parks but also that those areas within metropolitan Adelaide are added to so that we can relieve the Belair National Park, the one closest to Adelaide, of the burden of so many visitors, for over 1,000,000 people visit it each year. It is conveniently situated near Adelaide and has all the attractions that people want of a national park. The vast number of visitors has undesirable side effects—the presence of so many cars, and so many people walking over the park and tending to destroy interesting features of it.

We should consider an alternative area to relieve the Belair National Park of some of its visitors. This will mean that we shall require land near Adelaide. The problem is that it is more highly priced there than it would be in a remote part of the State. So, once we have fully considered this (it is only a month that the new National Parks and Wildlife Act has been in operation), we may have to spend one year's allocation of funds for national parks in purchasing one area to supplement Belair. That decision will be made in the light of all the circumstances I have referred to.

The member for Fisher, by question this afternoon and by interjection just now, asked about charging people to use the national parks. What the honourable member said this afternoon was probably correct: it could well be that we are the only State that does not charge for entry to national parks. However, we do make a nominal charge to people who use the camping facilities at various national parks and who camp overnight, but we do not charge admission to enter the national park itself. This matter has been considered by the Government on several occasions, because it would be a source of revenue, as suggested by the member for Fisher. Such money could well be returned to the National Parks Service to pay for removing the rubbish left by visitors, general maintenance, and providing additional facilities for visitors. However, it is this Government's philosophy that national parks are for the people of the State and that no-one should be denied the opportunity to visit them. If a charge were made, it might prevent some people from visiting the parks.

Mr. Evans: Couldn't people afford a 50c charge for their motor vehicle?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: There is likely to be an element in the community, such as the family man, who may be able to afford a car and the petrol to get to a national park but be discouraged from visiting the park because he has to pay an entrance fee. The Government considers that it would be better to forgo this revenue and to give every member of the community the opportunity of visiting our national parks.

Dr. EASTICK: What is the Government's attitude toward making barbecues available in national parks? It has been said that greater use could be made of certain parks, in summer in particular, if people were able to go to central points where gas barbecues or something of that kind were provided.

I am also interested in the line that provides \$200,000 for the purchase of specialist equipment for the Mapping Branch, whereas last year \$143,000 was allocated for the same purpose. Last year, \$300,000 was appropriated, whereas expenditure amounted to \$286,729. However, it is not possible to determine whether there has been an underspending on mapping equipment, whether there was any actual expenditure on mapping equipment, or whether the payment of \$286,729 refers to other expenditure in that general area. Can the Minister indicate the nature of the equipment, whether this is the end of the programme, and whether the \$200,000 relates to the same sum provided last year, and any general detail of that nature?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: South Australia, like other States, provides gas barbecues in areas which are covered and which can be used at all times of the year. This is an aspect about which I have spoken to the Director of National Parks and Wildlife. As has been previously announced, the advisory committee intends soon to provide management plans for all parks so that all these facilities and other management activities can be properly co-ordinated. This matter is at present being considered. I think the Deputy Premier would be better able to answer the second part of the honourable member's question.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): The Leader is probably aware that the Mapping Branch of the Lands Department is to be established in the new Government Printing Office building at Netley, and equipment is progressively being purchased, particularly in relation to photolithography. Part of the allocation for this line will be used to purchase that equipment. As I do not have the exact details, I will get them for the Leader.

Mr. VENNING: Is it planned that any money will be set aside under this line for the development of the Heysen trail?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: No finance is provided under this line to purchase properties to develop the Heysen trail. Such expenditure would be incurred under the State Planning Office line. Considering the amount of work still to be done before final details of the Heysen trail are completed, no provision will be necessary in this financial year.

Mr. McANANEY: Although I fully support the expenditure of money on public parks, I am concerned at the disgraceful state into which the Government has let the Cleland

Reserve get. Perhaps the only good aspect is that African daisy has such a hold that it will choke out the salvation jane there. When the wind blows in this area, nearby graziers must spend many hours and thousands of dollars trying to free the area from this infestation. It is therefore the Government's responsibility to clear up this matter.

The Senior Weeds Officer in the Agriculture Department has stated that African daisy is not a problem on agricultural land. Surely he could experiment in this area and ascertain whether top-dressing would be one way of solving the problem. Although I have asked the Minister many questions on this matter in the last 18 months or two years, he has not come forward with a satisfactory solution to this serious problem.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I have often told the honourable member that the Government is as concerned as he is about the problem of African daisy throughout the State. It is not easy to find a solution to this problem. When replying to the member for Alexandra, I made the point that in recent years we have (quite properly) used our available finance to secure land for national parks in those parts of the State in which they were badly required. A reasonable proportion of this State is now set aside as national parks. Perhaps now we should be changing our priorities, and concentrating more on increasing the management and manpower aspect rather than purchasing additional land. I concede that some areas have not been maintained properly, but we have acted correctly in giving priority to land purchase. Now we can change the priorities and put manpower in the parks to deal with the matter that the honourable member has raised.

Dr. EASTICK: I should like to know where the amount of \$100,000 provided under the new item "Preliminary investigations and design" in connection with irrigation and reclamation of swamp lands will be spent. Has it anything to do with Murray New Town and the reclaiming of swamp lands, or does it deal with a totally new project?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It has nothing to do with Murray New Town, but I have not any information other than that in the documents. I will inquire of the Minister for Lands and give the information to the Leader as soon as possible.

Mrs. STEELE: I am pleased to hear the Minister say that he considers that the Government now has a good representation over the State in the different kinds of national parks. I wonder whether, when officers of the

department go overseas, it would not be in the best interests for them to look at the national park service in America. I was impressed by the service that those parks give to the public. Each park has its intrinsic value because of such things as a historical background or geological, geographic or botanical interest. Contrary to what the Minister has said, an admission charge is made. Centres are built into the environment and people flock to them. In addition, much literature is issued about the parks. As some of our national parks are about the size of some in America and hold similar interest, we could learn much if our officers saw them and brought back information on them. The condition of some of our national parks leaves much to be desired, and members of the public need to be educated in this regard and reminded that these parks represent part of their heritage. I think that it would be most advantageous and that we could gain much valuable information if some of our officers who are responsible for developing and managing parks could see what is happening in America, especially concerning the provision of camping facilities. Having obtained much literature on these matters during my visit, I should be pleased to give it to the Minister if he wishes.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Having heard the honourable member's earlier remarks about her visit to national parks in the United States, I point out that, through the National Parks and Wild Life Advisory Council, we have established liaison with the American authorities, and I am pleased to tell the honourable member that next month the Director of National Parks and Wild Life (Mr. Lyons, who is a competent young officer) will be attending a world-wide convention of national parks officers at Yellowstone and will be visiting other national parks. No doubt he will derive immense benefit from this visit and will return with much valuable information.

Mr. EVANS: Visitors to the Belair National Park pay to use the tennis courts, ovals, golf course and barbecue facilities, and, on that basis, I believe there is every justification for charging a fee in respect of people who take motor cars into the park. I have recently received a complaint about loud speakers being used on the ovals by people conducting picnics, and this disturbs local residents. In addition, as the local council receives no rates in respect of the park, local residents are indirectly penalized. It is only fair that the people who use these facilities should pay for their use. A

50c charge for each car would not be unreasonable. The Minister has admitted that we have insufficient finance to maintain national parks in the manner we should like, which surely justifies the imposition of an admittance charge. There is also a problem with noxious weeds, and we could carry out an international tour in our national parks by showing the many exotic weeds from other countries that we have growing in our national parks. Indeed, adjoining house and property owners lose from this situation in three ways: first, there is interference with their way of life; secondly, there is the extra cost of keeping noxious weeds under control; and, thirdly, there is the extra cost involved because no rates are payable in respect of national parks.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I do not want to repeat what I have said regarding an entrance fee being charged for national parks, but I am concerned to hear that there is a nuisance to residents from amplification from ovals. We permit the use of amplifiers at ovals provided permission is sought from the national park authorities, but that permission is granted only on the basis that the amplification will not annoy others in the park or nearby residents. I should be happy to forward any complaint from residents to the national parks authorities so that action can be taken to ensure that the people concerned do have an opportunity to use the ovals concerned again if they offend in this way.

Mr. HALL: I refer to "Lands Department-buildings, plant etc.". I understand that the Lands Department is responsible for weights and measures in South Australia. Expenditure in this area is raised to \$400,000 from the proposed \$300,000 and actual payment of \$286,000 last year. We are in a transitional period regarding metric conversion, which is expected to be completed by 1976, but little information is provided regarding the change-over. Is capital expenditure involved in the building programme or plant and equipment involved in metric conversion?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The former leader should know that, although the Lands Department is responsible for weights and measures in this State, the departments really involved in expenditure on metric conversion do not include the Lands Department.

Mr. Hall: Which departments are they?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Engineering and Water Supply Department, the Public Buildings Department, the Railways Department and the Highways Department.

Mr. Hall: What about calibration equipment?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Reference was made to plant and buildings, and I am sure that the figure mentioned by the honourable member does not involve expenditure directly relating to conversion to the metric system. At Thebarton an extra building may have to be erected for the Weights and Measures Branch.

Mr. Hall: That is what I am asking.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will ascertain these details for the honourable member, but I thought he said that there would be a tremendous expense in this regard. There will be, but not on plant and buildings. We may need extra equipment for the conversion, but I do not think the Weights and Measures Branch (although it is interested in this) will require extra buildings in order to effect the change from the present system. However, I will inquire about the situation in regard to that branch.

Mr. RODDA: In the park that the Minister of Works opened at Naracoorte the vegetation is so thick that tourists cannot see the kangaroos and emus. Perhaps some provision could be made to allow tourists to walk through the park and see the animals without interfering with them. Also, what arrangements have been made to fence areas from which the animals trespass on adjoining land? I suggest that fencing should be placed high on the priority list.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have the greatest sympathy for these animals, because I believe that they should not be locked in an area so that people can gaze at them. However, if this is not done perhaps our children and many people in this State would never see some of our native animals. When I opened the park at Naracoorte, I said how interested this Government was in providing national parks, and I also said that a national park should be not a small area but a large area that cannot be spoiled or interfered with by people intruding from outside its borders. Often, such intrusion spoils the native habitat of the animals. We cannot achieve the ideal unless we completely isolate them.

That park was developed under a different concept from that of national parks as we know them: it was developed from a grant made by the Tourist Bureau, which was responsible for national pleasure resorts. It is now to be taken over by the Minister of Environment and Conservation. I take it that the policy at Naracoorte will be no different from

that operating at the Cleland reserve, where there is a thinning out not only of vegetation but also of animals that tend to breed prolifically. I am sure the honourable member's remarks will be taken into account, because the department considers what is said by honourable members.

Fencing has always been a concern of the department. There is no change in policy but more emphasis will be placed on it. The materials will be provided by the department, and the adjoining landholders will be required to do the fencing. The Minister of Environment and Conservation will be able to add to what I say, but the emphasis is changing; we can now devote all our resources to the management of the national parks, which will, in effect, mean that we shall be able to step up the fencing programme in the national parks; but it is still a programme on which there is a heavy demand so inevitably it will be some time before we can satisfactorily see to all the national parks. We are trying to do so as quickly as possible with the resources available to the Government.

Mr. HALL: The Minister has given a most unsatisfactory answer to the question I put to him about the investment that would be required in the changeover to the metric system of measurement.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I thought you were talking about it from the point of view of plant and equipment.

Mr. HALL: Now that the Minister is able to discern what I mean, he will understand that within his jurisdiction is an important part of a department, having great responsibility to consumers and people who depend on commercial transactions. As I understand it, three basic measurements are involved—length, quantity and weight. The Minister's department will have to check those three measurements with sophisticated equipment, which will be expensive. I would appreciate it if the Minister could get for me some estimate of the cost to his department of the changeover to the metric system.

Mr. GUNN: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say whether it is intended to continue fencing in the hundreds of Hambidge and Hincks in the coming financial year? I ask this because adjoining property owners are experiencing trouble as a result of straying vermin.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: We have a fencing programme from year to year, but we are unable to supply fencing as quickly as we

would like. I will obtain the specific information the honourable member requires.

Mr. WARDLE: I, too, am interested in the cost of the equipment that will be required for metric conversion.

Line passed.

Woods and Forests, \$3,200,000.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Minister give me the details of the land purchases to be made for afforestation and timber milling? Considerable areas of land have been taken up by the Woods and Forests Department in the Adelaide Hills, in the Gumeracha district council area, and in the Chain of Ponds area and over towards Williamstown. This highly productive land is used mainly for agricultural purposes, but one of the effects of taking up this land is that it reduces the rate revenue to the local council. I think the Gumeracha council lost over 30 per cent of its former ratable land to the Woods and Forests Department. Forestry is a profitable operation to the Government. In this it is in competition with private enterprise, which pays council rates. I instance the Gumeracha council in particular, and seek details of where these land purchases will take place. I assume there will be continued purchases in this area. Loss of rate revenue is becoming more and more important to many local councils.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No doubt the honourable member will appreciate that I cannot say where specific purchases of land will take place, but it will be purchased when and where available in forestry areas. The South-East is probably the most important softwood forest area in the State, if not in Australia. The problems raised are well known to me, because councils in my area have problems similar to those of the Gumeracha council. However, I point out that the Woods and Forests Department, in those areas at least, has contributed substantially to the cost of construction and maintenance of roads used by logging trucks, ratepayers and other citizens in the area.

I will ascertain the department's intentions, although it will probably be able to say only that it will buy land when it becomes available. The same applies in the South-East as in Gumeracha: land suitable for agriculture is purchased for afforestation. Many people in my district, who have as agriculturists been bitterly opposed to the extension of forestry, have been averse to offering their land for sale to the department.

A good argument could be developed regarding the economics of forestry as opposed to

agriculture even on good land. I have noted the honourable member's remarks, and I appreciate the points he has raised, particularly in relation to rate revenue in small council areas. The Minister of Local Government has often said that there are too many small councils in this State and something will eventually have to be done about the matter. Perhaps in that area lies an answer to this problem.

Mr. EVANS: Unlike the member for Kavel, I believe that agricultural land that is already developed should be used for afforestation, because agriculture is becoming a doubtful venture whereas forestry is a profitable business, and we are paying out huge sums of money to other countries for timber. In the undeveloped areas the trees are normally eucalypts, and native birds and animals eat either eucalypts or honey. Conifers are no good to honey-eaters and, indeed, they discourage our native birds and animals from living in the area. I hope the Minister will persuade his department to use not undeveloped land in its native state but developed land for forestry purposes.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: When seeking details from the Minister about where these purchases were being made, I did not say that I was necessarily opposed to afforestation, which is a profitable form of primary production. I did not imply that uncleared land should be cleared for afforestation. I was instrumental in getting leasehold land at Birdwood declared as a reserve to prevent forestry coming into the area. The rate revenue of the Gumeracha council is affected to a far greater extent than that of any other council in this regard. I am interested in knowing where land is being purchased, because the position is becoming critical.

Dr. EASTICK: I have somewhat similar views to those that have been expressed about the loss of revenue. It has been stated publicly that there is difficulty in obtaining sufficient land in the South-East for further development. The department would have surveyed the potential future development, and it knows that the availability of Commonwealth Government funds, which this year are \$200,000, depends on maintaining a certain acreage of planting. Can the Minister give the results of this type of survey? Also, can the Minister explain the reduction in the amount available to control the Sirex wood wasp? Have the control measures developed successfully and are only mopping up operations required in future?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I cannot give the Leader the detailed information on the survey now, but I will obtain it for him. Regarding the amount provided for control of the Sirex wood wasp, that is probably because of a national arrangement to which this State is a party. The Sirex wood wasp has struck in other States, and we have been fortunate in that regard. The Government would not countenance a reduction in the amount made available for this type of work, unless the reduction was recommended by the national body.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: In his explanation, the Treasurer states that work has commenced on the reorganization of the wood preservation plant at Mount Gambier and that the \$100,000 proposed this year should be sufficient to complete the project. The timber preservation plant at Mount Gambier is apparently operating profitably, a surplus last year of \$123,700 having been credited to the State mills. Advances have been made in the technique, and the use of preserved timber, especially for fencing posts, has been developed to the extent that there is little risk of competition, unlike the situation concerning case-making, etc.

I can only presume that this matter has been carefully worked out in advance and that the \$100,000 proposed will be well spent. However, the preservation plant at Wandilo is losing money, and I do not know what is intended here in future. Will the Minister inquire about these matters and obtain details of the volume of output from the various timber plants and of sales over the years, as well as what is expected in future? Also, I should like to know whether the Minister will establish a record for his Government and commend the Commonwealth Government for the \$200,000 that is being allocated this year. I hope he will not say that this is inadequate or miserly, or in any way discredit that Government.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I should like to establish that record for the honourable member: we are grateful to the Commonwealth Government for its part in this matter, although I think a little urging was required at the time. I am indeed impressed by the tremendous progress that has been made in respect of the wood preservation system, whether the treatment includes the use of impregnating materials or creosote. In addition, laminated beams have been developed and used successfully not only by the Public Buildings Department but also now by com-

mercial interests. Machinery is at present being installed in the State mill at Mount Gambier to produce laminated beams. The Public Buildings Department has recently introduced a new design of school known as Elmcon, involving the extensive use of radiata pine. Indeed, the use of this timber was one of the reasons for this new design.

Mr. Coumbe: Is it treated timber?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes, it is impregnated radiata pine, and I hope that this design will be acceptable to the public. It is a design that can be used in the same way as the Samcon design is used, and it enables the rapid construction of a functional and most attractive school. As I say, this development has occurred primarily so that radiata pine can be used. I will obtain the other information sought by the member for Alexandra.

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Minister of Works ascertain what acreage of pine may be planted this year, compared with the acreages planted in the two previous years?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will get the information for the honourable member.

Mr. VENNING: Is this timber a fire hazard, or does impregnation reduce the hazard?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Every measure has been taken to ensure that there is no fire risk. Not only is there a cement floor but also other innovations have been introduced to eliminate the fire hazard. I will obtain a detailed report on the construction and the work that has been done.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: There has been much antipathy towards the construction of wooden school buildings in this State. In regard to Elmcon buildings, this was at its height during—

The CHAIRMAN: Discussion of school buildings on this line is out of order.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I should appreciate details regarding the Elmcon school and its use of radiata pine.

Line passed.

Railways, \$7,900,000.

Mr. COUMBE: The sum of \$500,000 is provided for the betterment of main lines. Following the report of the special investigating committee, which was set up for this purpose, the allocation last year was \$875,000. Is this programme at a stage where the Government is now able to spend less money on it, or is the Government reducing the amount of work being done in this area of safety, which is so important not only on our freight lines but also on our passenger lines? Last year the allocation for rolling stock was

\$4,600,000, whereas this year it has been reduced to \$4,260,000. As this reduction does not take into account increases that have occurred in wages and the cost of materials, will there be any reduction in work at the Islington workshop?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Roads and Transport): Much of the rolling stock required for operations has been renewed in recent years, and we cannot go on building equipment that is not needed. Last year \$997,000 was required to purchase new locomotives, whereas this year the balance remaining is \$74,000. This reduction has a profound effect on the overall allocation, but does not represent any reduction in the quantity of work. Concerning the betterment of main lines, in the early stages large sums were provided for stocks of sleepers, base plates, ballast and, more importantly, equipment, but the equipment has now been obtained and is operating. The betterment of main lines will continue but the capital expenditure required is not so great. There will be no run-down of effort in this regard.

Mr. McANANEY: Can the Minister say what types of vehicle the new freight vehicles will be?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Louvre vans, open waggons, container flat waggons, and motor vehicle waggons—\$974,000 in all.

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister say whether the \$210,000 for new residences is for new housing or whether it is to continue the upgrading of existing housing for country railway employees? How much would it cost to bring ail such housing up to a reasonable standard?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The figure appearing in the Loan Estimates is for 20 new houses altogether.

Mr. HALL: The estimated expenditure on railways this year amounts to \$7,900,000. It is not an expenditure that occurs once and for all but it recurs annually. This enormous sum is to be spent on a system that makes record losses every year and the taxpayers know that nowadays about \$20,000,000 will be taken each year from other forms of revenue to support the railways. This expenditure of nearly \$8,000,000 adds to the yearly responsibility that the Railways Department has of meeting interest charges. Each year we consider an extension of this huge deficit. What has the Minister to offer in his long-term planning? He has been deplorable in his attitude to the road transport system.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! We are dealing with railways and that will be the only matter under discussion.

Mr. HALL: I would not want to enter into a discussion of the road system.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member would be out of order if he did.

Mr. HALL: I have no intention of referring to the Minister's failure in the road system.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I rule that remarks dealing with the road system are out of order.

Mr. HALL:; Here, nearly \$8,000,000 is to be spent mainly, I take it, on existing track. We in this State are not taken into the Government's confidence in its long-term planning. When the system is losing \$20,000,000 a year, we in Parliament, as representatives of the people, should know what the Government intends to do about it. Where is it heading with this expenditure? Can we expect every year to face a vote of \$8,000,000, \$9,000,000 or \$10,000,000? Is this to be taken over or is the Minister simply to offer us a short-term explanation? What are the Minister's intentions to rejuvenate the railway system, not on an annual basis but on a plan of extended operation?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The honourable member knows as well as I do that the deficit problems in respect of our railways are no different from those of the Victorian, New South Wales or Queensland railways, or of any other State in Australia, and I need not stop at Australia. No railway anywhere returns sufficient revenue from the fare box to meet its running costs. The honourable member also knows that the system which has been applied over many years (even long before he was born) of providing finance for railway operations is that it has all been Loan moneys. As a result, the Railways Department is paying about \$8,000,000 a year back to the Commonwealth Government because we have been able to borrow the money that South Australian taxpayers have provided to that Government. This is the farce of the present financial arrangement, and Opposition members know that virtually no grant moneys have been made available to the railway systems of Australia. The only grant moneys that have been made available have been for rail standardization, and these moneys have been made available as a result of legislation introduced by the Chifley Labor Government. No honourable member could deny that.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I will not allow a general debate. As the present debate is on

railway finances and the Loan Estimates, all remarks must be confined to the estimate of \$7,900,000 for the Railways Department.

Mr. HALL: Would the Minister like to see this allocation replaced by a grant from general revenue?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Yes.

Mr. HOPGOOD: I seek information from the Minister regarding the allocation of \$496,000 for a railway from Port Stanvac to Christie Downs. The initial announcement of this project, which was accompanied by legislation introduced last year, was well received. The local people thought that this was little more than an intention until the gold started to flow. Now, it appears that the gold will start to flow. I am sure this is a good example of forward planning along the lines being sought by the member for Gouger in relation to the future of our suburban railway system. Will the Minister say how much this \$496,000 will buy? Also, what will be the situation regarding the end of Sheriffs Road and the problem of getting the railway line under that road? For instance, will a tunnel, bridge or cutting be used? Will the Minister furnish a report on the projected short-term planning of this scheme?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall be pleased to do so.

Mr. VENNING: Although I realize that rail standardization is in the long term a Commonwealth responsibility, will the Minister say whether it is expected that any of this \$7,900,000 allocation will be used on standardization in this State?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: There is no provision in the Loan Estimates for standardization, which is a separate project, details of which have not yet been finalized. I hope that the committee appointed to investigate the matter will finalize its investigations soon, that subsequently an agreement will be drafted and signed, and that ratifying legislation will be introduced in this Parliament and the Commonwealth Parliament.

Mr. CUMBE: Can the Minister assure the Committee that some of the rolling stock to be used on the northern line is suitable for bogey exchange or that it will eventually be adaptable for use on the standard gauge system when it comes through to Adelaide?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I cannot personally give that assurance, although I understand that that is the situation. I should prefer to seek that assurance from the Railways Commissioner. I assume the honourable member is referring to the broad gauge stock which, as

far as I am aware, is capable of simple adaptation.

Mr. HARRISON: I am interested in the allocation for progress work on new locomotives, passenger vehicles and freight vehicles, improvements to freight vehicles, sundry rolling stock items, and so on. I ask the Minister for an assurance that this work will be confined to the railway workshops at Islington and, possibly, those at Peterborough and Port Lincoln.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Yes, it will be.

Mr. HALL: Many people have been concerned about the efficiency of the railways. A department that spends so much money would need a recurring study of its efficiency.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Loan Estimates were open for discussion at the second reading stage. We are now dealing with specific items in Committee, and the procedure provides for discussion along those lines only. If the honourable member wanted to debate the Railways Department, he had the opportunity in the second reading debate. He cannot do that in the debate on a specific line. Any debate must be on the specific items on page 7 of the Loan Estimates.

Mr. HALL: I am concerned that the expenditure of nearly \$8,000,000 is carried out efficiently, because any reduction in efficiency would be a wastage of the capacity to carry out the items listed. Is any investigation in progress, or does the Minister contemplate any investigation by responsible authorities outside the Railways Department on how this expenditure is dealt with?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I assume that the honourable member has been so embroiled in other matters that he has not been paying much attention to recent statements in this Chamber and newspaper reports. I have made several statements that the Government has appointed a special investigating committee to consider the operations, efficiency, etc., of the South Australian Railways and I have been receiving reports from time to time, I will give the honourable member the names of the three gentlemen who are conducting the inquiry. The Chairman is an engineer in the Highways Department who was formerly an investigating engineer with the Public Service Board.

Mr. EVANS: If the main line between Adelaide and Melbourne could be upgraded, perhaps by tunnelling to shorten the distance, the trip could be so speeded up that people could leave Adelaide at, say, 10 p.m. and arrive in Melbourne on the Overland in time to conduct business at 9 a.m. If the track could be

upgraded and curves removed, as well as more modern trains being used, I believe the service could be improved considerably. In addition, I, think that, if the Overland express left Melbourne later and also left Adelaide later, the railways would receive considerably more revenue and increased patronage, including business people who would be interested in saving on hotel accommodation and cheaper fares compared with air fares. Can the Minister say whether the Government has considered upgrading the track and speeding up the service to Melbourne?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I presume that the honourable member is referring to the route from Adelaide to Murray Bridge.

Mr. Evans: In particular, yes.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: That is the only section where any significant change can take place. However, I should have thought that he would know, from the discussion between the Director-General of Transport and Liberal Party members of this House, that one of the numerous projects of the Transport and Planning Development Branch includes reviewing the situation concerning that section from Adelaide to Murray Bridge.

Mr. McANANEY: I ask the Minister why \$700,000 is provided for new passenger vehicles and also what type of vehicles are involved. I cannot see the purpose of this, bearing in mind a loss of \$9,000,000 in running expenses involving passenger services. In other States, bus services are being substituted and transport systems are being modernized, thereby cutting losses, and we should follow that example. I cannot see the need to continue operating passenger services when we should be investigating the use of other modes of transport not only in country areas but also in the city. Having had the advice of a brilliant man from, Canada, I believe it is time we updated the system.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The honourable member will be delighted to know that we are not providing trains that will be running to Strathalbyn or Victor Harbour. In fact, we are providing 13 suburban non-power cars.

Mr. GUNN: Can the Minister say whether the allocation in respect of railway rolling stock includes the provision of hopper-bottom wheat waggons? Does he expect that more of these will be purchased in the future?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: In the details I outlined previously, I said that grain hopper waggons were involved.

Mr. McANANEY: The Minister said that provision was made for flat-top vehicles

for carrying containers, and many of these are used by the railways. However, if a container port is established here, with a consequent loss of freight to the railways, will consideration be given to modifying the vehicles in question and using them for other purposes?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Yes.

Line passed.

Marine and Harbors, \$5,585,000.

Mr. CUMBE: First, does the sum provided for land acquisition refer to the Birkenhead project, and is acquisition for that project nearly complete? Secondly, \$800,000 is provided this year for further construction work on the new passenger terminal at Outer Harbor, which I am sure will be a credit to South Australia. However, I ask how much this passenger terminal will be used as it is now much more economic for large passenger vessels to bypass South Australia and go directly to Melbourne, whence Adelaide-bound people can return by rail. Not only are fewer migrants coming to South Australia, but also fewer passenger vessels now come to this State and the difficulty encountered during disembarkation will no longer be so great.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Marine): The short reply about land acquisition is that it is \$40,000 worth, but I will obtain details about the land acquisition involved. Neither the honourable member nor I know whether the passenger terminal will be used, but I have sufficient faith to believe that it will be.

Mr. Coumbe: I certainly hope that it will be.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I believe it will. The new terminal replaces an obsolete cargo shed, provides new custom facilities and amenities for waterside workers, all of which were in a shocking condition and had to be replaced, whether or not a passenger ship called at Outer Harbour. The Chandris Line recently told the Government that it would use Outer Harbour as a terminal port during a series of cruises that the company would conduct from September this year. That action indicates to me and the people of South Australia that cruises are becoming more popular than they have been in the past, and we hope that this situation will develop so that we will be able to use the facilities that we are building at Outer Harbour. If the migrant intake is reduced considerably (but I do not believe it will be, because we are a developing nation) the passenger terminal is available for other uses. The important thing is that the terminal had to be replaced, as the honourable member

well knows. I do not regret the decision to go ahead with it, and I am sure South Australia will not lose as a result of that decision. It will be a good terminal. It will be a reasonable front-door entry into South Australia, and I consider that the money spent is justified.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am partly reassured by that information but it seems that the situation at Outer Harbour has gone from one of inadequate facilities to the other extreme. However, it is not the lack of facilities at Outer Harbour that stops people coming to this State: it is rather the fact that it is more economical for ships to bypass Adelaide and offload passengers in the Eastern States. The Minister thinks that this terminal will attract people to the State, that the Chandris Line will stop at Outer Harbour in the course of its tours. When will the terminal be completed? Very little has happened there lately. On a recent visit I saw the steel structure there that I had seen on a previous visit, with nothing much added to it. If the Chandris Line is expecting an immediate benefit, it will be disappointed. How far will this \$800,000 go towards the completion of the terminal?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The \$800,000 will complete the structure but I do not know the exact date of completion. However, I will let the honourable member know.

Mr. VENNING: It is estimated that the Government will spend \$1,500,000 this financial year to improve facilities in order to bring Port Lincoln up to the standard of a "super" terminal. I understand that already the completion date of this project has been put back 12 months. The estimated cost of the project is \$7,050,000 and, at this rate of expenditure, it will be some time before it is completed. What has happened in the early stage of this project that the work is running a year behind schedule?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member's statement has no basis in fact: the project will be completed on time.

Mr. CUMBE: I was not trying to denigrate the Outer Harbour terminal, as I am aware of the wretched conditions that existed there hitherto. I was expressing concern regarding the future use of this terminal, which is being built at a cost of over \$2,000,000. I was heartened by the Minister's comment regarding the Chandris Line, of which I have some knowledge. When speaking, I did not know of this inquiry, and I am glad to hear of it.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It will happen in September.

Mr. CUMBE: I am pleased to hear that because I know that every line has been bypassing Port Adelaide. I hope the terminal will be ready for use by the end of 1973. I was expressing concern that, for an outlay of \$2,190,000, we get adequate use for the State.

Mr. EVANS: Can the Minister say what area has been acquired by the Housing Trust and the price paid for the land at West Lakes?

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

Mr. GUNN: As \$330,000 is allocated for minor works to upgrade facilities at jetties, can the Minister say whether any of this money is to be spent on upgrading facilities for the fishing industry at Venus Bay and Streaky Bay? Last season, there was a tremendous increase in the tuna catch in those areas.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No provision is made for that purpose.

Mr. CARNIE: Regarding fishing wharf facilities at Port Lincoln, I received a telephone call today informing me that people who have tied their boats to this wharf near the slipway in recent bad weather were told to remove them from that position. Although these people are grateful for the work that has been done on the major wharf facilities at Port Lincoln, they ask whether some extra accommodation could be given to the fishing industry there. The work to which I have referred was done three or four years ago, since when the number of boats at Port Lincoln has increased. The Minister may laugh, but this is indeed a serious matter.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Who is laughing?

Mr. CARNIE: I am sorry; I gained the impression that the Minister was laughing.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member is wrong if he thinks he can make political capital by returning to these people and telling them that the Minister merely laughed at him. I have received deputations from these people.

Mr. CARNIE: I merely raise the matter of wharf facilities for fishing boats at Port Lincoln.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am aware of the problems raised by the honourable member, which we have examined and about which we have spoken to the people concerned. Indeed, we have discussed also the problems facing the Government in this respect. I appreciate the point the honourable member

has raised but I do not appreciate his making the point that I laughed at what he said, merely so that he can run back to the people involved and tell them that I laughed at him.

Mr. Carnie: The Minister knows me better than that.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I hope I do.

Line passed.

Engineering and Water Supply, \$32,650,000.

Mr. EVANS: During the second reading debate I raised the matter of the proposed Clarendon reservoir. The Minister knows that many people are concerned about their properties in this respect. The Minister said in his second reading explanation that \$254,000 was being provided for the purchase of land in catchment areas at Chain of Ponds, Hope Valley and Mount Bold in order to protect metropolitan water supplies from possible pollution. However, he said nothing about the acquisition of land for the Clarendon reservoir, but that may have been an oversight. As I know of at least one property owner who is willing to make his property available to the Government, will the Minister say whether his department still intends this financial year to acquire properties when owners are willing to put them on the market?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I do not want to give a categorical assurance to the honourable member that this is so, although I believe it is. The allocation of \$254,000 is for the purchase of land for the protection of existing reservoirs. In the past, although no allocations have been made in the Loan Estimates for this purpose, land has been so purchased. If people, knowing that a reservoir is to be built in their district, wish to sell their property because they consider its value will decrease, the Government will certainly discuss the matter with them. Indeed, this aspect has been considered in the purchase of several properties recently. I will get the information for the honourable member. I am not trying to push him aside or convince him I am doing something I am not doing.

Mr. EVANS: I accept the Minister's comment and I understand that there is doubt about the Clarendon reservoir. In the past, his department has acquired land where there has been a willing seller. The Minister has mentioned Loan funds in reply to a question. His most recent reply (*Hansard* of July 26 last, page 245) states:

Its actual construction phase is at present shown in departmental budget planning to commence in 1976, but this may be brought forward, subject to the availability of Loan

moneys and the requirements for rational work sequences.

Can the Minister give more information, because I fear that this reservoir could be as long as eight years away? If that is so, serious consideration must be given to the matter of properties in that area. The position is important to people in the area, and the document states that the Commonwealth Government is making more money available.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member has asked me an impossible question. If he had had any experience in Government, *he* would know that departments plan on a five-year basis as a rule. The position can change from year to year and, if I told the honourable member this evening that the project would commence in 1976 (as I have said current thinking indicates), I would be nothing short of a liar. I do not know whether it is eight years away. The best I can tell the honourable member is that our assessment, based on all the information we now have, as I have told the honourable member in the House, is that it will be 1976. I am telling the honourable member what I know to the best of my ability. If my department, from which the information comes, was not telling me all that it knew, I should be surprised.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Minister of Works give any information on the acquisition of land for the reservoir to be constructed on the Little Para River? Can he say when it is likely that work on the reservoir will commence and whether land acquisition may commence this year?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It will be some time before land is purchased in this area, but I will check with the department on this matter and let the honourable member have as accurate a report as I can give him. I do not blame the honourable member or the member for Fisher for being concerned about various matters, but I hope that they understand that the Government must plan a long way ahead. Although it is right and proper for the Government to indicate its long-term intentions, I point out that we cannot always say exactly what will happen and when it will happen. I do not try to deceive anyone in these matters: I try to give as much information as possible to the people specifically affected.

Mr. CARNIE: Can the Minister say how the \$43,000 provided in respect of the Lincoln Basin is to be spent?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will find out for the honourable member.

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Minister indicate what is the general policy regarding the work of the Engineering and Water Supply Department?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member must seek information on a specific line. I am not going to allow open debate on the general policy of a department.

Mr. COUMBE: May I speak to the line involving proposed payments of \$31,925,000?

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member may seek information on any specific line, but I am not going to allow open discussion on the policy of a department.

Mr. EVANS: Which reservoir will be built first—Little Para or Clarendon?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have ruled before that Loan Estimates specify certain expenditure, and members can seek information on items contained in the Loan Estimates. Information sought outside of that is out of order. I call the attention of members to Standing Order 156, which I will apply if members persist in repetition.

Mr. McANANEY: When will the Murray Bridge to Onkaparinga main be completed? As there has been little rain in the catchment area this year, additional pumping facilities may be required.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: We will finish in the next calendar year and we shall be able to pump from it in October, 1972.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: When will the Lobethal sewerage project be completed?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will find out for the honourable member.

Dr. EASTICK: What is the reason for the changed costing structure for the Gawler sewerage works? It has been previously stated that costs will be \$3,620,000, but in this document \$3,260,000 is provided. Is this a transposition of figures or is there some other reason for this sizeable reduction in the overall cost of the scheme? In 1971-72, \$400,000 was made available for the project and we see now a further reduction to \$300,000, yet just as much work is to be done, because there are still many areas in the town that are not sewered even though I accept that the system is to be gradually implemented over a six-year period. Will the amount of work undertaken be reduced and will this mean a postponement of the completion date of the project?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will get a report for the Leader.

Mr. MATHWIN: The Darlington main and the building of a reinforced water tank at Seaclyff involves the main going down Brighton

Road to the West Lakes scheme. Will this work be completed in this financial year?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

Mr. BECKER: Is it intended that water pressures west of Tapley Hill Road will be improved by the building of this main, and will the water pressure east of the main in the Novar Gardens area be improved, or will the main be used solely for the West Lakes scheme?

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

Mr. EVANS: The sum of \$1,308,000 is provided for the sewerage of new areas. One of the projects included in this provision is the Christies Beach and Noarlunga District Sewerage Scheme, which is estimated to cost \$1,490,000 and on which \$880,000 had been spent to the end of June last. The Morphet Vale and West Reynella areas have been completed and work will continue at Christies Beach and Port Noarlunga. In a new area in Blackwood, trunk and supplementary mains have been and still are being laid. Is that area included in the new areas, and will the programme continue as originally planned? Also, why is there to be a country sewerage scheme in the metropolitan area in Coromandel Valley?

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

Mr. BECKER: Is the \$1,172,000 provided for further work on the scheme to increase the capacity of the Glenelg Sewage Treatment Works for the final section of the work that has been undertaken over the past 12 months?

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

Dr. EASTICK: The sum of \$1,000,000 has been provided for house connections under "Metropolitan Sewerage", and this is the figure that has applied in previous years. A recent statement attributed to the Minister was to the effect that there would be an increase in the cost of house connections, and I understand that with this additional cost a loss is incurred on connecting sewerage to a house.

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

Mr. NANKIVELL: Can the Minister say what work is to be done with the \$17,000 allocated to Lameroo and Pinnaroo waterworks?

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

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister obtain a report on the appropriation of \$800,000 required for work on providing roads, storm-water drainage, water supply, and sewerage facilities in that portion of the old Islington

Sewage Farm area that is being developed for industrial use? Also, in consequence of the applications that have been received by the Government for this land, will the Minister ascertain whether there is any real demand for the land now?

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

Mr. BECKER: Will the sum of \$20,000, provided for cement lining *in situ*, complete the cement lining of mains in the metropolitan area, so that the dirty water that we receive from time to time will disappear?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No.

Line passed.

Public Buildings, \$48,675,000.

Dr. TONKIN: I refer to the line "Linear accelerator and accommodation, \$75,000". Can the Minister tell me what progress has been made in providing this accommodation? It was the subject of some questioning in this Chamber over 12 months ago, when an assurance was given that the work would be put in hand immediately.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I will get a report.

Dr. TONKIN: I next refer to the psycho-geriatric ward at Glenside Hospital, where \$550,000 is to be spent on replacing the existing psycho-geriatric ward, the site of which is to be used for the proposed Australian Mineral Development Laboratories. Can the Minister tell me when that will be completed and what will happen to the existing building? Is it suitable for use by A.M.D.E.L. or is it to be demolished?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will get a report for the honourable member.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I seek information in respect of major additions to the Tanunda Primary School and the Nuriootpa High School, and additions to the Botanic Garden Department and to the McNally Training Centre, and also about the new chest clinic, on which \$350,000 is to be spent. How will that money be spent? Finally, can the Minister give details of how the \$180,000 is to be spent on dental clinics? Where will they be sited?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will get a report.

Dr. TONKIN: I think the Minister's conduct is most reprehensible; it does no credit to the Government.

Mr. Payne: I know whose conduct is reprehensible.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Personalities will not enter into this debate. I ask the

member for Bragg to confine himself to the matter under consideration.

Dr. TONKIN: Perhaps the Minister will tell me to what use the new residents block at Modbury Hospital will be put? I understand it will be difficult to get residents there since it is not to be a teaching hospital; yet I notice that the residents block is to be completed, and we are currently voting money for that purpose. Perhaps the Minister, if he knows (and I do not believe he does know all these things) will get a report on it. Would he deign to give some sort of an answer to my question? It is important to know what is happening at the McNally Training Centre and also what is proposed at Campbelltown for the community welfare centre, which is a most important matter. I understand that the Campbelltown Community Welfare Centre, which will cause much interest in the community, is the first of its kind. Perhaps, if the Minister does not have full information on that, he could get a report for me.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will get a report for the honourable member from the Chief Secretary and the Minister of Community Welfare.

Mr. GUNN: Could the Minister obtain information for me on the construction of the new school at Streaky Bay, which was promised but does not appear in these Loan Estimates? As a result of information I was given by the Minister, people in this area were led to believe that tenders would be called last June. Can the Minister say why there has been a delay and what the current position is?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will inquire and furnish the honourable member with a report.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister obtain a report on what is intended regarding the major additions to the Loxton Primary School?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes.

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Minister consider reporting progress? I find the situation has developed in the last 20 minutes where, through no fault of his, he is unable to answer questions or to give the detailed information we require.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: If you had sat here under Sir Thomas Playford you would not have been given any consideration at all.

Dr. EASTICK: I am talking about the present, not the past. It is not the Minister's fault, but so many Ministers are not available to talk to the lines.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: The Treasurer usually handles the Loan Estimates, not Ministers.

Dr. EASTICK: That is the point I am making. It is not the Minister's fault that he has been placed in this position of being unable to give adequate information.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Are you moving that progress be reported?

Dr. EASTICK: Yes. I move:

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

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (17)—Messrs. Becker, Brookman, Carnie, Coumbe, Eastick (teller), Evans, Ferguson, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Hall, Mathwin, McAnaney, Nankivell, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, and Messrs. Tonkin and Venning.

Noes (22)—Messrs. Broomhill, Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark, Corcoran (teller), Crimes, Curren, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Jennings, Keneally, Langley, McKee, McRae, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Allen, Millhouse, and Wardle. Noes—Messrs. Dunstan, Hudson, and King.

Majority of 5 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

Line passed.

Advances for Housing, \$29,500,000—passed.

Other Capital Advances and Provisions, \$19,330,000.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport say what operations are being carried out in relation to the Kangaroo Island ferry service and whence the money is being obtained for that service?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Roads and Transport): No allocation is being made for the service.

The CHAIRMAN: On what line is the honourable member seeking this information?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: On the line relating to the Kangaroo Island ferry service.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: No allocation is being made.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Does that mean that nothing is being done about it?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: No, it means that no Loan money is being advanced this year.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Research must be proceeding on this, and I should like to know where the money is coming from.

The question is simple and the Minister should have no problem in answering it.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: This line refers to the m.v. *Troubridge*. Obviously the honourable member is talking about the Backstairs Passage service, and that does not come under this line. I am unaware of the position, but I will find out.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: It is unfortunate titling when it is stated as "Kangaroo Island Ferry Service".

The CHAIRMAN: Order! It has been the practice and procedure of this Committee that, where an item of expenditure is shown in the Loan Estimates, even though no specific amount is stated, honourable members may seek information in a limited way only.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I am certainly getting information to a limited extent only. I understood that the Kangaroo Island ferry service—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: There is nothing on the line for it.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Will the Minister listen, instead of interjecting? He is keeping this Committee in a state of dissatisfaction. There is a ferry project which has not been put into operation and of which we know the history. For various good reasons, the Government has not been able to put it into operation straight away. The Government has purchased the m.v. *Troubridge* and is operating that. I was inquiring about the ferry service to operate in Backstairs Passage which is estimated to cost about \$9,000,000. I do not know how the estimate was arrived at, because the Minister has not been able to tell me.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member is out of order in extending the debate as he has done. I have pointed out previously that, in Committee, we are dealing with Loan Estimates that are specified, and any remarks must be confined to the specific line in the Loan Estimates.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I want to observe that that line is titled wrongly.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I cannot sustain that point.

Mr. COUMBE: For the Electricity Trust, provision is made for progress payments on gas turbines and boilers at Dry Creek. Am I to understand that there has been a delay in the delivery of these turbines? If there has been, can the Minister assure the Committee that the first unit will be installed in time to cope with the expected additional load before the new unit goes in at Torrens Island?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I will obtain the information for the honourable member. So far as I know, there has been no delay. The honourable member asks for an assurance that the first turbine will be available and operating before the new unit at Torrens Island comes into operation, but I cannot give him that assurance without checking the matter. I will check on it and let him know.

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Minister say what progress has been made concerning the festival theatre and whether there is any change in the estimated date of completion?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: So far as I am aware, it will be completed on schedule.

Mr. VENNING: Can the Minister explain the details of the allocation of \$50,000 in connection with the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board, and explain also the situation concerning estimated repayments of \$6,000 and proposed net payments of \$44,000?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will get a report for the honourable member.

Dr. EASTICK: I seek information concerning the allocation of \$50,000 in connection with the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board. There has been much recent discussion, in which the Minister of Agriculture has been involved, about the inadequacy of the killing works, especially in relation to cattle, although the capacity to handle sheep is being increased. I point out that \$50,000 is not nearly sufficient to provide the necessary improvements. Although I appreciate that the Minister of Agriculture is awaiting from Mr. Gray a written report on the whole set-up of the abattoir, I should like to know whether we can expect that this allocation may be increased if necessary.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I can assure the Leader that that is the case. However, I do not think the Minister of Agriculture expects a written report: I understand that Mr. Gray is making submissions from time to time, although I am not suggesting that he is not putting pen to paper. There is no question that, if the report indicates that far more than \$50,000 is required, the Government is capable of legally entering into the extra cost.

Mr. EVANS: As the Treasurer has said, it was earlier intended to advance \$3,000,000 over three years to the Municipal Tramways Trust, and \$2,000,000 has been advanced over the last two years, \$400,000 being allocated this year to replace the old diesel bus fleet. Can the Minister say whether any of these buses have been modified to conform to the

legislative requirements regarding width and whether any of them will continue to be used by the trust or sold to the Education Department for school transport purposes? If they are being sold to the Education Department, how many are being sold and what is the price to be paid for them?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will answer the questions which I think are relevant to this debate. The \$400,000 is the amount necessary to complete the bus changeover programme in accordance with previous decisions. Alterations to buses and whether they are in conformity with the Road Traffic Act or whether we are selling them to the Education Department are matters which, I respectfully suggest, I would not be in order discussing, and unless you authorize me to do so, Mr. Chairman, I would not like to transgress your position.

Mr. CUMBE: The Minister has just said that the \$400,000 completes the programme of replacing the buses. Does this mean that no more buses are to be provided? I should have imagined that it would be Government policy, because of the need for greater support of public transport, to provide more Municipal Tramways Trust buses.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: This is basically for the completion of the replacement programme commenced some years ago. The old buses are being phased out and the new buses phased in. Whether we will have more buses in the future is being considered, but this is not provided for in these Estimates.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Last year \$500,000 was allocated for transport research, but only about \$32,000 was spent, yet the balance at June 30 was nil. However, probably there is a simple explanation for this. Last year, after about half an hour of questioning, the Minister said that the research related to a linear induction motor, which would revolutionize transport. Can the Minister say on what the \$500,000 will be spent this year for transport research, and what has happened to the linear induction motor?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The linear induction motor is one of several projects with which the Planning and Development Branch is involved. Although \$500,000 was allocated last year, the Director-General of Transport only began his duties early in February and had to build up a support staff. If provision is made for a year's operation and only a few months is involved, there must be an alteration in the amount: it is as simple as that.

Mr. Goldsworthy: If \$32,000 is subtracted from \$500,000 and the balance is shown as nothing, what has happened?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The document shows that \$500,000 was provided but only \$32,570 spent.

Mr. Goldsworthy: But the net balance is shown as nothing on page 12.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the honourable member is concerned and thinks the Under Treasurer has made a mistake, I will ask the Under Treasurer on behalf of the honourable member to obtain the information. I will enumerate some of the projects (and I emphasize "some") with which the branch is now involved. They begin with dial-a-bus, then downtown distributor bus systems, corridor projects, reserved bus lanes, express bus services, mode change study, downtown bus operation, North Adelaide road access, bus service planning, common ticketing, interchange facilities, Flinders University, goods movement in South Australia, West Lakes, Murray city, King William Street subway, South Australian Institute of Technology, Victoria Square, BTE-CBR joint projects, public transport map, metropolitan time table, transport pricing policy, implementation problems, and a status report on transport planning in South Australia. These are some of the jobs with which the Transport Planning and Development Branch (which Opposition members love to rubbish) is involved.

Dr. EASTICK: I refer to the item "Adelaide Children's Hospital—\$125,000". Although much detail is given about other hospitals in this group, there is no detail about how the money is to be spent on this hospital. About two years ago, we were given to understand that the \$10,000,000 building programme for the Adelaide Children's Hospital had to be deferred because it had been decided, as Government policy, that the Home for Incurables would take priority. In view of the increased allocation from \$60,000 in 1971-72 to \$125,000 this year, can the Minister say whether this means that the preliminary planning and/or development stage of the Adelaide Children's Hospital building project is being authorized and that there will be increasing allocations for the next few years?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I think the Leader's construction is probably correct, but I will check it for him.

Mr. EVANS: I refer to information that I sought earlier, and to the Treasurer's statement on the \$400,000 loan to the Municipal Tramways Trust. We are discussing the Loan

Estimates and will be asked to vote on them. As representatives of the people, we are supposed to know what is happening to the financial allocations, what effect they will have when they are spent, and why there has been any variation. There has been an increase in the cash inflow. The Treasurer's explanation states:

It was earlier intended to advance \$3,000,000 over three years to the trust to finance the replacement of its older diesel bus fleet with modern diesel vehicles designed for one-man operation.

We are replacing the older and obsolete buses, of which there are over 100 in the yards; they are redundant. We are to spend this money in this department. Can the Minister say what will happen to these older buses? Will they be scrap or completely valueless, or will they have some value? If they are not to be used by the Education Department, where will they be used? What will happen to them? They do not conform to the law in two respects. First, when fully loaded they are overweight; secondly, they are 3½ in. wider than the legal maximum width.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That is untrue.

Mr. EVANS: It is not. Permits are issued for these buses—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I cannot allow the honourable member to continue along the lines he is now trying to follow. We are dealing with the Loan Estimates. The honourable member is now seeking information about the law controlling the operation of some vehicles. I will not allow that.

Mr. EVANS: I accept your ruling, Mr. Chairman. My point related to money being spent on buses that could not be used by private enterprise without permits. Therefore, I see a limited market in which the trust could recoup money in respect of them. If the Minister can say what the trust intends doing with the buses, it will give me, as a person who represents people in this Parliament, an idea of where the money will go.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The buses are up for sale.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I wish to criticize what I believe is to be the Hackney redevelopment plan. I do not have sufficient information to know just how far the increase in population density is to be carried, but I strongly believe that if we have a choice between low-density population combined with sprawl, and high-density population combined with compact planning, we should choose low-density population combined with sprawl.

Mr. Hopgood: Can't we have both?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: It is possible to compromise between the two and, no doubt, there will be a compromise over the Hackney project. I do not have the complete statistics, but I have some figures on population density, and it appears to me that the present density will be greatly increased. No-one can deny that present standards in this area are low and that there is room for great improvement, but I warn the Committee against high-density living. I do not necessarily condemn high-rise apartments as such so long as they are not associated with high-density living in a given area. If we have high-rise apartments that will greatly increase the density of population to the acre, we will be asking for social evils which we do not need here and which we can easily avoid by using more of our available land.

I saw some of the more modern high-rise developments a few years ago in the United Kingdom and, although they looked reasonably attractive compared to the type of slum being cleared, they were not an attractive prospect to one who could cast his mind forward a generation or so. Even expensive apartments one thinks will never deteriorate can become the slums of the future, and the social evils would be tremendous. America is having great trouble now with its high-density living, and there is no need for us to have that mode of living here.

People talk of the need for open spaces and, no doubt, there is a continuing need to provide them. Although we have a general set-up of blocks of land, open spaces are often the backyards of the people. Such places are far better than having families living a long way above ground level. The practice of rearing families way above ground level is pernicious and could lead to crime and almost every other social evil, so that it might not even be possible to send children out to play unless accompanied by guards. The elevated system is a vital link in these buildings and, when the elevators break down or for any reason they are not operating, evil accumulates. One could easily get the situation obtaining in the United States, where the police must enter some buildings despite the hatred shown towards them by every person in the building.

That sort of thing need not happen in Adelaide because we have the necessary land. We should be willing to pay the added cost of the sprawl that we so often condemn in order to ensure that we do not erect too many high-density buildings. Perhaps the Hackney pro-

ject will not be dangerously high in this respect. However, I warn the Committee about raising the density to a dangerous limit, because what may seem to be a well ordered and highly civilized area this year could in 15 or 20 years be a crime-ridden slum, full of delinquents, lawbreakers, and people who are generally unhappy.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister of Environment and Conservation): The undesirable aspects referred to by the honourable member have been taken into account in relation to the Hackney redevelopment proposal, which is designed to overcome all the difficulties of which the honourable member has spoken. I assure him that this is intended to be a well balanced development. Although I cannot give details of the number of people involved in the area, this aspect has been considered, with a view to ensuring that there is adequate space in the project for everyone. I will obtain additional information for the honourable member which, I hope, will put his mind at rest.

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Minister of Works say whether alterations to the Glenelg Community Hospital are included in the \$6,000,000 allocation for non-Government hospitals? It has been agreed, with the Government's blessing, that part of this hospital is to be redeveloped and further labour wards are to be built. However, the position regarding hospitals, particularly in the southwestern districts, is indeed serious.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

Line passed.

Miscellaneous, \$2,700,000.

Mr. EVANS: The Treasurer said in his second reading explanation that \$392,000 was spent from one account in 1971-72 on the purchase of additional and replacement buses for the transport of schoolchildren in country areas and that it was intended to make \$450,000 available for this purpose in 1972-73. Can the Deputy Premier say whether redundant Municipal Tramways Trust buses are to be used by the Education Department, and is this sum being made available for the purchase of some or all of those buses?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

Line passed.

First schedule passed.

Second schedule passed.

Clauses 1 to 12 and title passed.

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

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I understand that this is the first time the Loan Estimates have been presented to the House in this way. The Bill has been reported without amendment and, whilst it may seem tremendously surprising that there should be no amendment, it is not surprising, because we have had little information available. I am not criticizing the staff, the Treasury officers, and particularly the Under Treasurer (Mr. Seaman), whom we are fortunate to have. Obviously, these gentlemen have the full details at their fingertips, and the Minister has not.

I must apologize to the Minister for saying the things I said earlier. I think it is unfair to expect him to have all this information at his fingertips. He did not have much support from the other Ministers, and the Treasurer is absent. However, it is a most unsatisfactory state of affairs, not only for Ministers but also for private members of this House. We have just passed a vote of \$159,560,000 and the Committee stage of the Bill has been a formality. We have had from the Minister answers, which it is inevitable that he should have given, that he would have to get reports. I think it will be a long time before he lives down the statement "I will get a report."

Mr. Venning: He has had to hold the fort, though.

Dr. TONKIN: I think he has done a wonderful job, with the limitations on him, but the reports that he will get for us will be given us after the Bill has passed and after the money has been appropriated. How can we as members of Parliament do our duty to the community in these circumstances? We might well ask why we bother to ask questions. As the Minister pointed out, perhaps we could ask questions without notice or put questions on the Notice Paper and get more detailed replies than he has been able to give us this evening. But the fact remains that the activity tonight has been a complete formality and nothing else.

A few comments have been possible, but few details have been given. I think Parliament deserves more consideration and, if the present system makes it impossible for the Government to provide details, to answer questions, to remove doubts and to satisfy members that these expenditures are warranted and deserve favourable consideration, perhaps this system should be changed in some way. I am not blaming the Government or the Minister, but I think it is most unsatisfactory that all this money should be approved without details

being given to members. I support the third reading, but only under protest.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): As the Opposition Whip, I acknowledge that I was informed that the Treasurer and Attorney-General were away on business, and I realize that the Minister of Education is away ill. However, I believe that the right thing to have done in the early stages was to delay this Bill and to go on with something else, because in the past we have been able to obtain more detailed information from Ministers than the information that one or two Ministers have been capable of giving in these circumstances.

I know that the Minister of Education is one man who is capable of answering in detail practically every question asked in relation to the Loan Estimates dealing with his own department. Indeed, he was a member who, when in Opposition, sought much information and criticized the Government of the day if it could not give him that information. It is regrettable that the Loan Estimates have been disposed of this evening, when, unfortunately, three Ministers were forced to be away. As much as I support the Loan Estimates and acknowledge that they cannot be changed, I think each Parliamentary here is entitled to obtain as much information as possible and, if he wishes, to voice a vote of protest even if he knows that he will be unsuccessful. On the basis of the information available, I do not think that that opportunity to protest was readily available this evening, whereas much more information has been available in the past, and I think that is regrettable.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): Like the other two members who have spoken on the third reading, I believe that the whole debate on the Loan Estimates is a farce, because in reality the Government could, if it wished, spend all of this money on, say, school buildings, and Parliament would have no redress. Looking through the details of expenditure on the various items last year, for instance, one might see that millions extra was spent on one line, while millions less was spent on another line. No supplementary Estimates are brought down by the Government for Parliament to check on how it has spent the money, and the Government does not come back to receive approval for the money spent. Parliament has no control at all over the expenditure provided in the Loan Estimates.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I think that the member for Bragg

came into the House at the last election (in 1970), the member for Fisher having entered this place two or three years earlier, and the member for Heysen has been here a little longer. I want members to cast their minds back to the Loan Estimates under the conduct of the then Treasurer (Sir Thomas Playford), a Treasurer who had held a record term in the days when I came into this Parliament in 1962, and I want members who were here then to be honest with themselves and to ask how the Loan Estimates debates were conducted.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: He knew the answers.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: He did not. Often, he did not even bother to rise from his seat to reply, and not even one Minister helped him in respect of the Loan Estimates. It was the tradition that the Treasurer handled the Loan Estimates on his own, and the member for Alexandra knows that to be fact.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: And he knew the answers.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: On the Budget Estimates it was a different matter (the various Ministers handled their own departments), but they did not on Loan Estimates. I can say for a fact that on a number of times, and honourable members can refer to *Hansard* to substantiate this, I got up and asked questions—

Dr. TONKIN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I am not sure that the question of the previous Treasurer's handling of the Loan Estimates—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You questioned the conduct of this debate.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Bragg in speaking to third reading did question the methods of the Ministers, and the Minister of Works has a right to reply.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I venture to say that no-one tonight tried to stop any honourable member in this Chamber from having his say and seeking the information he wanted. I say to any honourable member opposite or even on this side that they should

not expect the Treasurer or any Minister to know every intimate detail of something that is contained in an estimate (and I emphasize the word "estimate").

Dr. Tonkin: That is exactly the point I make.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I think I was proper and correct in saying that, if I did not know an answer to a question, I would get a report. I can assure honourable members that they will get the information they have sought. However, the point I really want to make in reply to the remarks made by the member for Bragg and the member for Fisher is that, had they been in this House when the record-holding Treasurer of this State, Sir Thomas Playford, was Treasurer, they might not even have received the courtesy they received this evening. Even though I have great respect for Sir Thomas Playford, I did not expect him to have an answer to every question I asked of him. I was reasonable enough to know that he would not know whether there was \$20,000 to be spent on a port here or somewhere else.

I do not agree with the statements that have been made by the member for Bragg or the member for Fisher this evening, and I can only assure them that, as I have stated that they will get a report, that will be honoured whether it is in my department or in the department of any other Minister. I emphasize that these are only estimates. This is the first time in the history of this Parliament that the Loan Estimates have been conducted in this way, by means of a Bill. I did not mean to be rude to honourable members, but I do get a little annoyed when I receive unreasonable requests for information and snide inferences that we are not capable of handling the situation. I do not get easily annoyed. I can assure honourable members that no-one tried to stop them from speaking and that no-one will deny them the information they sought.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11.35 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, August 10, at 2 p.m.