HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, September 26, 1973

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

PETITIONS: CASINO

Dr. TONKIN presented a petition signed by 508 electors and residents of South Australia who expressed concern at the probable harmful impact of a casino on the community at large and prayed that the House of Assembly would not permit a casino to be established, in South Australia.

Mr. ARNOLD presented a similar petition signed by 65 members of the Zion Lutheran Church (Berri) Incorporated.

Petitions received.

QUESTIONS

CASINO

Dr. EASTICK: Because of the Premier's announced intention to seek a referendum regarding the establishment of a casino in South Australia, can he give an undertaking that if such a referendum is held it will not be conducted on the day on which the double Commonwealth referendum is conducted? It would seem that a double Commonwealth referendum on prices and incomes will probably be held before Christmas. Can we be assured that, if there is a referendum in South Australia in relation to a casino (that is, if the House accepts the measure to be introduced by the Premier), it will not be conducted on the same day as the Commonwealth referendum is conducted?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I can give the Leader that assurance.

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Premier say whether the Government intends to introduce legislation to allow gambling in private clubs if the people of South Australia indicate at a referendum that they are not in favour of a casino in South Australia? This whole matter depends on the definition of "casino", and the licensing of private clubs to allow gambling on much the same terms might overcome the objections that would otherwise be voiced by the people of this State at a referendum. Therefore, if the Premier does not obtain a satisfactory answer by way of referendum, does he intend to get around this answer by introducing legislation in respect of private clubs?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No.

DRUGS

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Attorney-General refer to the Chief Secretary allegations of drug pushing in several city hotels? A recent newspaper report alleged that drugs were freely available at some city hotels, including a hotel in North Adelaide, in my district. As I believe that in certain North Adelaide hotels strict measures are being taken by the management to prevent this practice, and as I believe that any suggestion of malpractice is causing adverse publicity for the reputable publicans concerned, I ask whether this matter can be investigated by the Police Department.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will obtain a reply from my colleague.

WHYALLA TECHNICAL COLLEGE

Mr. MAX BROWN: Can the Minister of Works say when it is likely that the first tenders will be called in respect of the proposed $4,000,000 major addition to Whyalla Technical College? I have been informed that a radio report this morning stated that tenders possibly would not be called for another 12 months. I would be greatly concerned if that report were correct, as I believe that this major project, which is of considerable importance to the city of Whyalla, should not be delayed.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: This morning I heard the broadcast referred to, and I think it emanated from a statement made by Mr. Connor (Principal of the college). As a result of that report, I checked with my department, because it seemed, in those circumstances, rather strange that this project should have been referred to the Public Works Committee. Generally, the policy is that when a project is referred to the Public Works Committee detailed planning has not taken place, because some alterations may be made subsequently. On inquiring this morning, I ascertained that the date for calling tenders in connection with this extension to the college is early next April, and that really involves about six months, not 12 months.

SCUBA DIVING

Mr. BURDON: Can the Minister of Works say whether the committee investigating the safety of scuba diving in South Australia, more especially in the South-East, has yet completed its investigation?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I had discussions with the Chairman of the committee (the Deputy Commissioner of Police, Mr. Draper), and the Secretary of the committee (Mr. Wight) only last week. I understand that they have completed their investigations, but they wish to check a few points prior to presenting their report to me. When I asked for an investigation to be made, I requested the committee to report to me within a month, but that was not possible because the coronial inquiry was proceeding and it would not have been proper to release the Draper committee's report prior to the completion of the coronial inquiry, which, of course, has since been completed. I expect that it will probably be three weeks or four weeks before the Draper committee's printed report is available to me. I intend to make the report public after I have studied it and reported to Cabinet on it.

FROST DAMAGE

Mr. ARNOLD: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture whether a survey has been made to determine the extent of frost damage in the Riverland? Last Thursday morning there was considerable frost damage there, and I believe a survey should be undertaken to determine the extent of the damage, because in some instances the damage has been almost 100 per cent. Will the Minister ask his colleague to have a survey made to ascertain the extent of the damage, and will he see whether assistance is warranted? I believe that many years ago it was necessary for the Government of the day to provide assistance after severe frost damage had occurred.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to ask my colleague to examine the points raised by the honourable member and see what can be done. I hope I can bring down a report, if not tomorrow, early next week.

PARLIAMENT TELEPHONE SERVICE

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Attorney-General a reply, to the question I asked during the debate on the Estimates concerning the sum allocated for the telephone service for the House of Assembly?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Chief Secretary states that no distinction is made by the Postmaster-General's Department regarding telephone charges at Parliament House and, for the purposes of the Estimates, an overall appraisal is made.

COUNTRY WATER RATES

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question about country water rates?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yesterday the honourable member asked me for a reply to his question of August 8. I said then that I was surprised that a reply had not been forthcoming earlier, because my department is very punctual. My officers have drawn my attention to the fact that the reply was available on August 15. I may have forgotten to tell the honourable member that the reply was available, and I apologize for that. As the honourable member stated in his question, the cost of rating country towns on the same scale as the metropolitan area would vary from time to time. The amount involved has not been calculated, as the losses on country water supplies are very considerable; for example, the loss last year was more than $8,500,000, and it is not considered appropriate to increase these losses at this stage.

HILTON PROPERTY

Dr. EASTICK: In the absence of the Minister of Transport, can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say whether the Government has acquired property on the northern side of Rowland Road, Hilton, opposite Theatre 62, and, if it has, to what use the property is currently being put and to what use it is intended to put it in the future?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I will seek that information for the Leader and let him have it.

POSTAL CHARGES

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): I move:

That, because of the sharp increases of postal charges proposed in the Commonwealth Budget, this House request the Government to intervene with the Prime Minister requesting him not to proceed with those increases which will adversely affect newspapers and periodicals, especially as they affect country newspapers serving country people.

Being so far from the city, country people suffer discrimination; they are in the unfortunate situation of having to rely greatly on country newspapers and periodicals. City people, unlike country people, can get the news not only from newspapers but also from radio and television. For information about stock markets, weather forecasts, and so on, country people, especially those on the land, must have regular copies of rural newspapers. By the very nature of their vocation, these people depend on rural publications or, more accurately, non-metropolitan publications. These newspapers are printed in non-metropolitan towns and serve country areas.

At a time when the Government is spending large sums on its own propaganda, we believe there is a need for other voices to be heard. The viciousness of the Government's attacks on country people makes it essential that the voice of country people continue to be expressed through their local newspapers. Other points of view, as expressed through the publications of church and trade union groups, need to continue to be heard.

The savagery of the postal rises on newspapers makes it seem inevitable that many small papers will be forced to close, and that the passing on of the higher costs to the readers of many other papers will make it impossible for subscribers to continue buying them. The increases in some cases will be as high as 700 per cent over the next two or three years. This is completely intolerable, and represents not simply an attack on the country newspapers, and the other publications that will be affected: it is in effect an action that will result in the complete silencing of their voices.

I wish to point out a few anomalies in the effect these rates will have on country people. In presenting the Commonwealth Budget, the Commonwealth Treasurer (Mr. Crean) announced that no change would be made in the basic 7c letter rate. Whilst there is no change in that actual monetary contribution towards posting a letter, the maximum weight of loz. (28.3 g) for that letter has been reduced to 20 g, so now a letter that weighs more than 20 g (about five-sevenths of an ounce) and less than 28 g will attract a postal charge of 15c. I do not know how anyone can say there has not been a change in that case.

Apart from other changes in the registered categories listed, a similar lower top weight will apply from October 1, 1973. Previously 12oz. (340 g) attracted a cost of 7c but this will become 300 g for 7c, a variation of 12 per cent in the top of the scale. I shall now deal with the effect of changes in category rates on an average copy of *Country Life,* the *Chronicle,* or *Land,* weighing l0oz. (283 g). Before the Commonwealth Budget, the charge was 5.9c. After October 1, 1973, it will be 7c for each 300 g, or a cost of 6.7c. After March, 1974, the publication will move from category A to category B, for which the rate is 5c for the first 50 g, plus 2c for the second 50 g, plus 6c, bringing the rate up to 13c. After March 1, 1975, the cost will be 17c and after October 1, 1976, it will be 20c, based on category C rates at March 1, 1974. Publications have been vital to rural people so that they can get weekly stock market reports and prices, weather reports, information about land auctions and sales, notices about administration, and other matters of significant interest to them. The whole action has been completely discriminatory, being aimed at the 2.4 per cent of the community who work in rural areas and depend on these periodicals.

The decision will create many anomalies that I do not think have been researched fully, the objective of the Government being to raise revenue. Many of our non-metropolitan newspapers are on the borderline and are in a quandary about whether to continue to operate by increasing the charges and suffering the consequences through lack of patronage. Any increase in postal charges will affect them adversely. Naturally, even a minor blow to circulation can force a newspaper out of business, and a section of the community could lose its eyes and ears for the news.

What alternative have the non-metropolitan newspapers? Can they find an alternative means of distribution? That may be possible in some circumstances. Perhaps they can send their publication by parcel post to regional areas, expecting former customers to come in and pick up their requirements weekly. Whilst this may be effective in some circumstances, doubtless it will cause many orders for publications to be cancelled, because people will not bother to come in merely to pick up one newspaper. Perhaps people who previously have been receiving three or four newspapers will now take only one and hope that what they want is in that issue.

I refer to the dependence of non-metropolitan publications on postal circulation. The *West Coast Sentinel* has over 90 per cent of its circulation posted, and one need be no great mathematician to know what the proposed increases will do to a country paper in this situation: it will be forced to close down. That community will be just another to lose its local paper and that paper's coverage of local markets, gossip and sporting results. I refer

to *Stock Journal,* which is currently posted at 4½c a copy. By the end of 1975 that publication will cost between 15c and 16¢ to be posted. This journal is published primarily by stock agents for circulating market trends, current prices, and new trends in local markets and in markets in other States and, to any stockowner or any person who depends for a livelihood on this industry and who deals in stock, sells off shears, and buys rams, it is imperative that this publication be allowed to continue to circulate at a reasonable postage rate.

I believe this exercise has been designed in strict opposition to decentralization: it is working away from the decentralist policy to which every Party has paid lip service. Unless an equitable system providing equality to non-metropolitan areas concerning the circulation of the country newspaper is developed, we will be going in the wrong direction. Many people do not realize the importance of the reduction in cost obtained through bulk postage rates. This is not as simple a matter as many people believe when so many hundred or so many thousand articles are posted. Articles must be vamped and revamped and the post codes must be in order. Considerable work must be done by those taking advantage of concession rates and, if the Commonwealth Government increases postage to the full rate and eliminates the concession rate, postal employees will not have this service completed for them, and this changed situation will create additional work for them; whereas, previously, articles for posting in this way were at least arranged in their correct post code sequence.

Let us consider another publication, *South Australian Motor,* which probably has a wide distribution with almost every motorist receiving it. An article in the *Sunday Mail* of September 23 states:

South Australia's *South Australian Motor,* for example, has a circulation of 200,000. Its cost is included in the Royal Automobile Association membership fee. The journal costs less than 3c to post. According to the Post Office's formula of phasing out publications registered as category A and B, its mailing cost will rise progressively to 15c by October, 1976.

R.A.A. public relations officer, Mr. Graham Edis, says this represents a 600 per cent increase. "Whereas now we pay $5,000 annual postal fees, by 1976 we will be paying up to $37,000," he says.

He maintains if the plan goes through, the R.A.A. will have to consider having its magazine delivered by a private contractor or else stop publishing.

It is an unfortunate set of circumstances in which an ultimatum has to be presented suggesting that the magazine may be delivered by a private contractor (thus taking work away from the Post Office) or be discontinued. Trade unions will also feel the hardship. One of the biggest trade union publications, *Australian Worker,* costs $260,000 to post each fortnight, but by 1976 it will cost 15c to post compared to 2c today. The Secretary of the Australian Workers Union (South Australian Branch), Mr. Dunford, has stated that the paper may be forced to publish only monthly and that unions are concerned. I think that everyone is concerned with this issue. Lately, there have been developments in the Commonwealth sphere in which certain amendments have been agreed to by the Commonwealth Government, but no really satisfactory result has been achieved. Compromises have been reached, but unless we give this matter urgent attention and express opposition to anything that will affect adversely the suggestion of decentralization, we are headed in the wrong direction.

Mr. Hall: It may be an attempt at control and censorship.

Mr. BLACKER: Perhaps, but I am not qualified to comment on that aspect. As a matter of necessity, I express my opposition to this action. I urge members of the Government to refer this matter to their Commonwealth colleagues in the hope that something may be done.

Mr. EVANS seconded the motion.

Mr. OLSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

CONSUMER CREDIT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (INTEREST)

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Consumer Credit Act, 1972-1973. Read a first time.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It deals with an amendment to the Consumer Credit Act, 1972-73, to update this Act following the recent general rise in interest rates for the lending of money. On Sunday, September 9, 1973, the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth of Australia announced that there would be a general rise in interest rates throughout Australia in an attempt to curb the inflationary spiral of the economy. Since that announcement the rate for long-term Commonwealth bonds has increased from 7 per cent to 8.5 per cent through open-market operations of the Reserve Bank of Australia. This is a rise of 1.5 per cent in the long-term rate. The Commonwealth bond rate is the prime rate of interest in Australia, and is the significant determinant of other interest rates. Therefore, other interest rates have also risen by a similar figure, or a greater proportion, to the rise in the Commonwealth bond rate. On Monday, September 17, the interest rate on trading bank overdrafts increased from 7.75 per cent to 9.5 per cent, a rise of 1.75 per cent.

Concurrently, finance companies and consumer credit organizations are raising their interest rates by about 2 per cent. The only exemption from this general rise in interest rates is money lent for the purpose of building a house. The Consumer Credit Act, 1972-73, specifies the conditions and standards for the lending of credit, but section 6(1) exempts certain credit providers and credit contracts from the provisions of the Act, except for parts 5 and 6. One cause for exemption is stated in section 6(1)(i), which provides:

Where the credit provider is a person whose business does not involve the provision of credit at a rate of interest exceeding 10 per cent per annum, or such other rates as may be prescribed.

Trustee companies, solicitors and accountants now place money out on short-term and long-term mortgages for commercial projects at interest rates below this 10 per cent a year limit. In fact, for trustee companies this is a significant source of investment, as a mortgage is a trustee investment under the Trustee Act. Because of the across-the-board rises of about 2 per cent in interest rates, it now seems reasonable, feasible, and logical to raise this 10 per cent a year limit to 12 per cent a year. Unless this action is taken quickly, we will see the freezing of funds from these appropriate sources because there is no point in companies, solicitors, and accountants lending money while they can obtain higher interest rates elsewhere.

It is unreasonable to force credit providers now operating below this minimum interest rate to alter their status as a credit provider because the Commonwealth Government has decided to use interest rates as a monetary means of controlling inflation within our economy. This amendment in no way alters the impact of the Government's action: in fact, it has the opposite effect. By raising this minimum by 2 per cent it will encourage credit providers to raise their interest rates by this amount, and therefore will

encourage them to co-operate in achieving the Commonwealth Government's objective.

One other aspect should also be examined. In the Stamp Duties Act Amendment Act, 1968, a section provides that stamp duty is payable only on loans for which the interest rates exceed 10 per cent per annum. For similar reasons to those outlined above, it seems reasonable and proper for the Government of this State to alter this provision so that the limit at which stamp duty is payable is 12 per cent. However, as a member of the Opposition, I cannot move to alter this provision, because it affects the revenue collection of the Government. 1 urge the Premier and his Cabinet to examine this provision and to make the appropriate amendment. By doing so, the South Australian Government will be helping the Commonwealth Government attain its monetary objectives. Clause 1 of my Bill is formal, while clause 2 amends the minimum interest rate applicable to this legislation from 10 per cent to 12 per cent a year. I urge all members to support the Bill.

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

OFFSHORE RIGHTS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Millhouse:

That this House call on all South Australian members of the Commonwealth Parliament, and particularly the Senators irrespective of their Party allegiance, to oppose by every means in their power the Seas and Submerged Lands Bill and the Seas and Submerged Lands (Royalty on Minerals) Bill now before that Parliament,

which Dr. Eastick had moved to amend by striking out "the Seas and Submerged Lands Bill and".

(Continued from September 12. Page 723.)

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I suspect that when the member for Mitcham moved this motion his purpose was to embarrass certain members of the Commonwealth Parliament, irrespective of Party. It is rather interesting to find that since moving the motion the honourable member has seen fit to change his attitude, namely, at the Constitution Convention, and I suspect that he will now wish to support my amendment, which recognizes that the South Australian members of the Senate and House of Representatives have sufficient integrity and responsibility to the State to examine seriously the legislation relating to navigation and shipping matters. I believe that those members who recognize their responsibility to South Australia will vigorously oppose the Seas and Submerged Lands (Royalty on Minerals) Bill currently before the Senate. At page 268 (No. 4 proof) of the Commonwealth Constitution proceedings, dealing with agenda item 9 ("matters that might be referred to the Parliament of the Commonwealth with broad reference to (*a*) family law; (*b*) defamation; and (*c*) shipping and navigation"), Senator Murphy is reported as saying:

As to shipping and navigation, yesterday I referred to the trade and commerce power. I said that the power falls far short of what is needed. This is especially so in relation to shipping and navigation despite the fact that this was due to an oversight. Sir Robert Garran, one of the most eminent constitutional lawyers, the co-author of the comprehensive exposition on the Constitution, secretary of the drafting committee and later Solicitor-General, had this to say:

> It is due to an oversight in the hurried last stages of the drafting of the Constitution that the Federal Parliament has not express and plenary power to make laws with respect to navigation and shipping. Canada has that power. In the Australian draft Constitution of 1891 "navigation and shipping" were included among the specific subject matters of Federal legislative powers. At the Federal Convention of 1897-8 the same provision was inserted. At a late stage of the sittings of the Convention it was pointed out that in the United States Constitution navigation and shipping were deemed to be implied from the trade and commerce power and the Admiralty jurisdiction and it was suggested that the express mention of navigation and shipping in the Australian Constitution might be construed to limit the trade and commerce power. Accordingly, the subject matter, navigation and shipping, was omitted and by the declaratory words of section 98 the trade and commerce power was expressed to extend to navigation and shipping.

There are innumerable practical difficulties resulting from the irrational division of legislative authority. On occasions this has led the States themselves to request the Australian Government to use its resources, for example, to remove wrecks. There can be no doubt that control of shipping and navigation should be conducted on a national basis.

The report of the Joint Committee on Constitutional Review, 1959, at pages 57-65, provides a wealth of information on various aspects of navigation and shipping and, although it involves several aspects of the centralizing of authority, by the referring of measures to the Commonwealth Government, it has been recognized by many people throughout the Commonwealth over a long period that it will be necessary at some time to determine the matter relating to navigation and shipping. Indeed, it is recognized as being vital in regard to international law that the Commonwealth Government accept various directions from the international maritime organization. Successive Commonwealth Governments have denied the States an opportunity to determine, in agreement with the Commonwealth Government, those areas coming under either Commonwealth or State jurisdiction and, as no worthwhile effort has been made to finalize this matter, it needs to be finalized now. However, the present Commonwealth Government has seen fit to take the matter much further and, having assumed sovereignty over the submerged lands and seas involved in this matter, it has tried to place a mineral code on the Statute Book. It is the move into the area of determining a mineral code that is against the best interests of the community, and it is for this purpose that I have moved an amendment to the motion. My purpose is to indicate to our Commonwealth colleagues that we acknowledge their integrity in relation to submerged lands but that we believe that, in the best interests of the State they represent, this additional matter should be laid aside until other aspects of navigation and shipping have been finally determined, in the High Court if necessary. The Premier has said that he is seeking to obtain maximum benefit for this State, but it is significant that, in the absence of an initiative by the Commonwealth or another State, he has not convened a meeting of State and Commonwealth representatives to resolve the issues that will eventually have to be resolved between the States and Commonwealth or in the High Court. At the recent Constitution Convention, Senator Murphy's views, which were not unanimously accepted by all delegates, evidently convinced the member for Mitcham that the attitude he expressed in the original motion was incorrect; when he followed Senator Murphy in the debate, he said (at page 270 of No. 4 proof of the official record of debates at the convention):

Finally, I say with respect to Senator Murphy there is no doubt at all that he is right on the question of shipping and navigation. If one looks at chapter 10 of the 1959 report, from which he quoted, one sees that it is clearly set out. It was a mistake at one of the later constitutional conventions which caused intrastate shipping to be omitted from the powers of the Commonwealth. I can see no reason for perpetuating that mistake. To that extent I agree with Senator Murphy but on the other two I have most definite reservations about handing over all our powers to the Commonwealth.

The other two areas referred to were those of family law and defamation. It is on the basis of that announcement that I believe I will now have the honourable member's support in opposing his original motion and supporting my amendment. I cannot accept that it is in the best interests of this State or any other State that many of these matters should be argued at length in the High Court, with resultant heavy costs. The Seas and Submerged Lands Bill and the Seas and Submerged Lands (Royalty on Minerals) Bill came before the Commonwealth Parliament in April and May of this year. The House of Representatives passed the Bills, but they were set aside for three months by the Senate.

The media in this State alleged that Liberal and Country League Senators had renegued on their Commonwealth Leader and embarrassed him, and that his leadership had been jeopardized as a result of their setting aside the Bills. Actually, the action taken in the Senate in setting aside the Bills was taken with the full knowledge of members of the House of Representatives and of the Senate and with the full knowledge of the leaders of the Liberal organization across Australia. The action was supported by Liberal leaders across Australia because they could see that delaying the measures would allow the States to have consultations with the Commonwealth before the measures had to go for lengthy litigation in the courts. Unfortunately for South Australia and other States, the discussions that should have taken place have not taken place and, in the interests of the nation, it is only right that the opportunity should now be taken to determine this matter. I look forward to a continuing co-operative attitude by all States, particularly those dominated by the Australian Labor Party. I hope that they will come to grips with the shipping and navigation requirements so that those decisions that can be made without great expense will be made, and so that a determination will be made between the States and the Commonwealth that will prevent the squandering of taxpayers' funds to no real purpose. I therefore ask members to support the amendment.

Mr. COUMBE secured the adjournment of the debate.

The SPEAKER: The question is "That the adjourned debate be made an Order of the Day for —". The honourable member for Mitcham. The honourable member for Fisher.

Mr. EVANS: For and on behalf of the member for Mitcham, I ask that the debate be adjourned, and that this motion be made an Order of the Day for Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER: Has the honourable member the authority of the honourable member for Mitcham to seek the adjournment?

Mr. EVANS: The member for Mitcham has asked me, as Opposition Whip, to look after his matters. I take it that this includes the present motion.

Debate adjourned.

CRIMINAL LAW (SEXUAL OFFENCES) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 19. Page 826.)

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I support the Bill. In introducing it, the member for Elizabeth has tried to provide for a code of sexual behaviour regardless of the sex or sexual orientation of the people involved, and I think that this represents a remarkable breakthrough. In his second reading explanation, the honourable member said:

In drawing this Bill I have sought to abolish the specific prescriptions against homosexual behaviour and to apply the sections relating to heterosexual behaviour and offences against women to homosexuals and males.

He also said:

I recognize that it is part of the function of the criminal law to safeguard those who need protection by reason of youth, age, or inability to withstand the force of others. I certainly strongly support such protection. Indeed, the Bill seeks to strengthen such safeguards by expanding certain offences involving persons of special responsibility in society to apply regardless of the sex of the offenders or victims.

I believe that the Bill does exactly what the honourable member says he is aiming to do. It tightens and strengthens safeguards by expanding certain offences, particularly those against male and female children by adult males and females. Indeed, life imprisonment is provided as the penalty for offences against children under 12 years of age. Male prostitution and soliciting by males is recognized in the Bill, as are male brothels, and this situation did not obtain before. I think that all members must support this most reasonable and, I believe, desirable reform. Possibly an area of dissent and of some emotionalism has been summed up by the member for Elizabeth, as follows:

I now turn to the central question raised by this Bill—I disagree with him slightly there, because I think all matters raised by the Bill are pertinent to the one overall need to remove sexual discrimination between offenders and victims—

which, put simply, is as follows: whether a person, by virtue of his committing homosexual acts, must be prosecuted by society or, where positive harm is caused to third parties or society, whether such a person should simply be ignored by society's laws.

There is no doubt that this subject will cause debate and disagreement among members. One must respect the views held on this matter. However, I believe that there is much misunderstanding in the community about homosexual behaviour and the nature of homosexuality generally. Ventilation of these matters can lead only to further understanding, which will perhaps settle the fears some people hold, I believe unreasonably, at present.

Although I think these fears are unreasonable, I respect the fact that some people hold them genuinely. Nevertheless, I do not believe these fears are justified. If these people took the trouble to research the situation thoroughly, as I am sure members have done and are doing, their fears would be settled. I do not intend to deal at length with matters covered in the debate in October, 1972, when another Bill on the subject was introduced; the member for Elizabeth has already referred to this. I suggest that those new members who have not perhaps had the opportunity of investigating this matter as thoroughly as they might like should read the speeches made on that occasion, as I believe the situation was then covered fairly thoroughly from both points of view. Obviously, on that occasion some members were reassured by the facts brought out, as was apparent from the voting on that Bill. I make clear that I believe the provisions of this Bill will in no way alter the present concept of offensive behaviour in public. Behaviour of any type that is offensive will remain offensive and will be treated as such. This Bill does not give anyone the right to behave offensively in public, whether the acts performed are heterosexual or homosexual.

I now refer to a few points made in 1972 that I believe must be raised again now. As we well know, the whole matter of homosexual behaviour was brought to the fore again in this State with the tragic death of Dr. Duncan. At that time, the Hon. Murray Hill introduced

his Bill, and I believe his motives in doing so were extremely high-minded. At that time, he said he believed that people were important and that a minority group in the community was being persecuted. He believed that the death of Dr. Duncan was the result of such persecution. There was considerable public disquiet after Dr. Duncan's death.

Mr. McAnaney: Will this kind of Bill stop that sort of thing happening?

Dr. TONKIN: It will indeed, because the situation at present is that, as homosexuals are liable for prosecution for the mere homosexual act, whether in private, away from the view of others, or in public, when anyone would be subject to prosecution, they have no defence at all against blackmail, persecution, victimization or bashing simply because, if they threaten to bring action against anyone who is blackmailing, persecuting or assaulting them, they are immediately faced with the charge of committing an offence under the terms of the present Act. The legislation passed during the last Parliament reversed the onus of proof.

The position then was that it would be a defence for anyone charged with such an act to prove that it was committed in private between consenting adults. Really this did not solve many problems, because it still meant that the person charged with an offence would have to appear in court and state publicly the facts of the case. Even that is enough to make such a person open to the prospect of blackmail or victimization. By removing that aspect in this legislation, there will be no prospect of blackmail. If anyone in this House or outside behaves offensively, he will be dealt with. That is as it should be. In the terms of the Bill, if homosexuals (or heterosexuals, for that matter) do not behave offensively in public, they cannot be charged with an offence relating to something that happens between two consenting people in private.

There is much misunderstanding about the nature of homosexuality. I consider that most homosexuals do not fully understand the nature of their behaviour, but nevertheless understand their instincts and motivation. There is now much reason to believe that the psychological nature of the condition of homosexuality is such that the threat of criminal sanctions is not an appropriate means of controlling the behaviour in question, and there is every reason to believe that the bad effects on the community stemming from the existence of the sanctions are considerable. Some people fear that removal of these sanctions might lead to even worse effects. It has been suggested that homosexual practices among existing homosexuals may become more common, that attacks on, or seduction of, minors may increase and, in general, that influences tending to turn people into homosexuals may become stronger.

This is an argument heard frequently. These fears are held sincerely by many people and are based primarily on their failure to understand the true nature of homosexuality. There is a misconception in the minds of these members of the community, who understand by the term "homosexuality" an actual sexual act. In its medically and psychologically accepted sense, of course, the definition is much wider, and relates to emotional involvement between persons of the same sex, either male or female. This abnormal emotional attachment, which often has its beginnings in a person's early life, unfortunately, and without any element of real conscious choice, becomes the normal thing for that person.

I consider that these people should be helped. Personally, I think they are to be pitied, because they miss out on much that heterosexual people enjoy and take as their normal way of life. However, homosexuals regard their conduct as a totally normal way of life. There have been suggestions that homosexuality is genetic, that it depends on heredity, but I consider that the major cause of homosexuality is environmental. Environmental factors have a strong bearing on the matter, and many theories have been advanced. Such factors as the absence or ineffectiveness of the father, lack of communication or identification with the father, and a marked domination by the mother, are among those factors tending towards homosexuality in males.

Several reasons and psychological explanations have been given, but these factors operate at a very early age on the developing personality of children. It seems that, if the child is orientated in the direction of homosexuality by these factors, adult homosexuality is likely to follow, although not necessarily so. If it follows, it will do so long before any understanding of or contact with adult homosexuals takes place. There is much evidence to suggest that homosexuals are made, not born. Certainly, they are not made by other homosexuals.

It is thus most unlikely that any change in the law against homosexual practices between consenting adults would increase the likelihood of people growing up as heterosexual persons becoming homosexual through contact with homosexuals. I think that what I have said has been proved conclusively. There are varying estimates of the number of homosexuals in our society, ranging from 4 per cent to 7 per cent. In one case, a figure of one in 20 has been quoted. Judging from the assessments that have been made in various communities, it is reasonable to suppose that the existence of the law as it now is has little effect on the incidence of homosexuality. In countries where the legal situation resembles, or is more open than, the one proposed here, there is no evidence to show that the incidence of homosexual practices has increased. I refer, as I did in 1972, to the position in Belgium and in France.

People require reassurance about paedophilia. There is a mistaken idea currently held that homosexuals are much more likely to attack young children. Paedophiliac people, who attack young children, are in a totally different category, regardless of whether they are homosexual or heterosexual. They are unfortunate people, and recently we had the example of a tragic abduction. The change in the law provided in this Bill will strengthen the sanctions against child molestation and abduction, and the Bill should be supported for that reason also.

One may say that the honourable member wants to tighten up the legislation to overcome the fears that some people have. If that is so, I trust that he will be successful. I said in 1972 that it was clear that the imprisonment of homosexuals was unlikely to cause them to change their ways, when one considered that their behaviour was psychologically induced, and it would seem that imprisonment was not intended as the sole punishment in itself. It is the punishment exacted by society, consequent on prosecution, and possible conviction and imprisonment that are the real things. This is capitalized on by those people who are unscrupulous enough to take advantage of it for victimization and blackmail, and I have covered that matter in reply to the interjection by the member for Heysen.

I consider that homosexuals are very much open to blackmail by both other homosexuals and other people and, because at present they are in defiance of the law, they can do little about their unfortunate position. It is possible for some homosexuals who sincerely wish to do so to change their behaviour to conform to the norms of society, but the efforts of that minority are not likely to

be helped by the present situation. They still must face the present law that is likely to make them liable to prosecution. Homosexuals will not come forward to seek help when there is any risk of prosecution, exposure or punishment.

I consider that the Wolfenden report is extremely valuable to people who want to study the matter in depth, and I again commend that report to members who have not made such an examination of the matter. It was submitted in the United Kingdom in 1967 and the law there was changed extensively as a result. That report states, in part, that the function of the law in matters of moral conduct is "to preserve public order and decency, to protect the citizen from what is offensive or injurious, and to provide sufficient safeguards against exploitation and corruption of others, particularly those who are especially vulnerable because they are young, weak in body or mind, inexperienced, or in a state of special physical, official, or economic dependence". The report continues:

It is not, in our view, the function of the law to intervene in the private lives of citizens, or to seek to impose any particular pattern of behaviour further than is necessary to carry out the purposes we have outlined. It follows that we do not believe it to be a function of the law to attempt to cover all the fields of sexual behaviour. Certain forms of sexual behaviour are regarded by many as sinful, morally wrong, or objectionable for reasons of conscience, or of religious or cultural tradition; and such actions may be reprobated on these grounds. But the criminal law does not cover all such actions at the present time; for instance, adultery and fornication are not offences for which a person can be punished by the criminal law.

I could continue at great length, but I would not be furthering the cause of this Bill in so doing. Nevertheless, I must refer to the conclusions of the Wolfenden report. The committee dismissed the concept of homosexuality as a disease, with the implication that the sufferer could not help it and therefore carried a diminished responsibility for his actions. However, it accepted that it was often the only symptom of psychological disorder being associated with full mental health in other respects, while alleged psychopathological causes had been found to occur in others besides the homosexual. It had been suggested to the committee that associated psychiatric abnormalities were less prominent, or even absent, in countries where the homosexual was regarded with more tolerance. In other words, the incidence of psychiatric abnormalities was probably due to the circumstances pertaining to the community because of its attitude towards the homosexual. I suppose that this is another chicken and egg situation.

The Wolfenden report (and I believe this is an important feature) examined and dismissed a number of arguments against legalizing adult acts in private, its conclusions being as follows: (1) There was no evidence for the view that such conduct was the cause of the "demoralization and decay of civilizations", although like other forms of debauch it might unfit men for certain forms of employment. (2) There was no reason to believe that such behaviour inflicted any greater damage on family life than adultery, fornication, or lesbianism. (3) The evidence indicated that the fear that legalization of homosexual acts between adults would lead to similar acts with boys had not sufficient substance to justify the treatment of adult homosexual behaviour in private as a criminal offence; on the contrary, the evidence suggested that such a change in the law would be more likely to protect boys than to endanger them.

In the speech I made on this matter in the last Parliament there are several quotations from religious leaders, all supporting the proposition that the present proscribing of homosexual acts between consenting adults in private should be withdrawn. I referred to the Archbishop of Canterbury (Lord Fisher), the present Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. Ramsay), members of the Congregational Church, and the Bishop of Adelaide, who, while strongly condemning the sin and requiring the enforcement of the law to prevent corruption of other people, said he would not object to the law being amended to allow acts of homosexuality in private between consenting adults, and this is basically what this Bill seeks to do.

Some people refer to the Bible and quote passages from the Old Testament to back up their arguments that such legislation should not be passed, and I will deal briefly with this matter. I respect their views, but I point out that laws made in Biblical times were made according to behaviour in those times, and of course the great advances in medicine and knowledge should now be used to help to understand these people rather than treat them as social outcasts, with moral persecution and social stigma heaped not only on them but in many cases also on their family. One cites, as I did in my speech last year, as a parallel example our tremendous advances in the understanding and treatment of mental diseases, and one wonders just what would be the position regarding mental hospitals nowadays and those people who are unfortunate enough to be patients had we still continued to regard them as possessed of the devil, as they were in Biblical times. I believe that the whole basis of the Christian faith is surely that God forgives, and God is love. The great Christian virtues of compassion, forgiveness and understanding must be pillars of strength in this enlightened age, not simply props to uphold every word written some 2 000 years ago.

It seems incumbent when referring to this subject for the speaker to say, and I do so now, that I must emphasize my personal view that I do not condone homosexuality. It is interesting to ponder why it should be necessary for everyone speaking in favour of a move such as this to say that he does not personally condone homosexual behaviour. Why should this be necessary? I believe it is because there is still a certain amount of emotional involvement in this matter—there is still enough social stigma attached to it in our community for us to want to dissociate ourselves from any possible rub-off that may come from speaking in favour of this legislation. This in itself is a good indication of the state of mind of society generally. I do not condone homosexuality, but I do not pretend to understand it, and I am not in a position to understand it fully, although I have done my best to understand it and, because I have done this, I support the Bill. I hope other members will do all they can to understand the situation as far as they can, too, so that they can understand the point of view of other people.

I first came to grips with this problem some years ago in San Francisco when, while walking through Union Square, I was accosted by a male homosexual. I found to my honor that my immediate reaction was one of extreme anger: I found that I was nearly inclined to take physical action. As I am normally easy-going, my rather violent reaction to this incident made me stop and think, and afterwards I tried to analyse why I felt as I did: I do not think that it did me any credit, especially in retrospect, because I believe it was an instinctive reaction based on fear and a total lack of understanding. It was then that I started to ponder the situation of the homosexual in our society.

I refer now to the tragedy of Dr. Duncan and the persecution leading up to that tragedy. I do not intend to attack the Attorney on this occasion, as he will be pleased to hear, but I wish we knew more about the circumstances surrounding this death. I believe this knowledge can only help the passage of legislation such as this. It was this tragedy which caused many more people in our community to look at the whole problem of homosexuality and the whole problem of victimization, blackmail, bashings and assaults that have been associated with it.

Mr. McAnaney: What about compulsory unionism?

Dr. TONKIN: The honourable member's interjection is not as silly as it sounds on first hearing: compulsory unionism has some bearing on this matter. Perhaps it is not unionism, but a well developed spirit (perhaps a bond of strength) exists among groups that are being persecuted or victimized. However, I do not think it is compulsory unionism, but it may be a gathering together for mutual protection. I believe these people in the community need a fair go: they are a minority, and are not getting it. They need help and understanding, not persecution. I believe that we have to accept that most of them have deep emotional attachments. For the benefit of members I quote what was said by Dr. Richard Ball at the Day Seminar of the Diocese of Melbourne Social Questions Committee, as follows:

> There are many misconceptions about homosexuals and homosexuality. In particular, it is easy to denigrate the intensity and the quality of the feelings which one homosexual has for another. It is easy to say that, by definition, it must be of a lesser degree, a lesser quality, less meaningful, etc., than heterosexuality. I would challenge this. A lot of homosexuality may be cheap and nasty, but so is much heterosexuality. It is grossly unfair to compare the average homosexual with the rare heterosexual, which is what our society tends to do. This is less than honest, and is a perversion of the truth, which is used to belabour homosexuals.

This is an extremely good paper, and I recommend it to others wanting to learn more of the homosexual problem. I know that there are many homosexuals in our community: they are law-abiding citizens, and do not offend against decency in any way. I congratulate the member for Elizabeth for introducing the Bill, and I congratulate those people who I know have helped him to prepare it. I believe it can only benefit society. After all, it is a Liberal principle that the rights of minorities must be protected as far as possible, just as the rights of the majority must be protected. As a matter of principle, I support the Bill.

Mr. JENNINGS (Ross Smith): I, too, support the Bill, introduced with great courage by the member for Elizabeth. In introducing the Bill the honourable member drew attention to the fact that it was much easier to introduce such a Bill these days than it was formerly. I think that he is being modest in saying that, because many of us were aware of this problem for many years but chose to do nothing about it. I think that when a member is confronted with a situation of this nature he has to make his position clear. We have known for many years people in this House saying, "Well, we have to declare ourselves on this matter." I am declaring myself now: I favour this Bill, but how any member chooses to vote is his business.

I reached the age of puberty a long time ago, but the way I feel today after being up so late last evening, I do not know whether I will get back to it again. I realize, first, that some people do not conform to what we consider to be normal sex patterns. It has sometimes been suggested that these people are immoral and perverted, and would take advantage of children and of anyone with whom they have some chance to take advantage of sexually. I have never found this situation in the many parts of the world to which I have travelled. I have met many such people and I am absolutely certain that, for a long time, we have been trying to put our heads in the sand about this matter. I congratulate the member for Bragg: he spoke from his professional experience in the matter, but I could not understand all of what he said, because we do not see it from the same point of view.

Mr. McAnaney: Is this a socialistic practice?

Mr. JENNINGS: Whether it is a good socialistic practice or not is scarcely the point: this is not a matter that has to be based on whether it is a socialistic practice or any other kind of practice. I hope members will deport themselves with some dignity, rather than refer to the fact that it was a Socialist who introduced the measure, a Conservative who seconded it, and a Socialist who is thirding it. This does not help the case at all. I think whoever made that interjection did himself no good at all. In my opinion, the people about whom we are speaking are more to be pitied than anything else, although they may consider that they are not to be pitied and that we are the ones who should be pitied. There is no reason at all why these people should not have the same support of the law, provided that they adhere to the law in the same way as do other people in the community. I commend the member for Elizabeth for his initiative in introducing this Bill, and I give him my full support. As it will obviously be a Committee Bill, we shall have an opportunity to say much more at a later stage.

Mr. CHAPMAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

PETROCHEMICAL PLANT

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Hall:

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

(*a*) whether it has a legally binding letter of intent from every company required to participate in the construction;

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

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

(Continued from September 19. Page 830.)

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): I oppose the motion. One wonders about the motives of the member for Goyder, who moved this motion, and of the member for Mitcham, who seconded it. I note that neither of these gentlemen is in the House at present to lend further support to a motion that I am sure no other members of this House support. I am greatly interested in the reason why the member for Goyder found it necessary to move this motion when he could well have obtained the relevant information from the Premier by way of question. The honourable member suggested that the Premier's original announcement on this project was made for the purpose of obtaining an electoral advantage over the Liberal and Country League at the last State election.

The member for Whyalla has already said how ridiculous that proposition is. The districts that are more closely concerned with any development that takes place at Redcliffs are those of Port Pirie (represented by the Minister

of Labour and Industry), Whyalla and Stuart, and I suggest that each of those districts is fairly well represented. The people in those districts seem to be completely happy with their representation, so much so that I suppose that the three members receive on average about an 80 per cent vote which, members should agree, is a fairly comfortable vote and one that is not likely to be changed to any degree by an announcement made by the Government on this matter.

If the decision made in this matter was not made with a view to obtaining an electoral advantage, the other arguments advanced by the member for Goyder have no basis whatsoever, and it seems that the honourable member is again trying his hand at something at which he has proved himself to be quite an expert. Although we have become used to the shallowness of the member for Goyder, to the sort of matter he debates, and to the level on which he debates various issues in this House, we have come to expect somewhat more from his Deputy, the member for Mitcham, whom we on this side have always accepted to be a member who at least tries to debate issues on their merit and to research his subject closely beforehand. On this occasion, though, even the member for Mitcham has reduced his contribution to the same level as that of his Leader. When commencing his speech in this debate on September 19, the honourable member said:

It is because of some of the remarks he—

the Premier—

made in this debate last week that I have been moved to support this motion.

He has supported the motion merely for that reason: that is why the honourable member has bought into this debate, not because of any support for the purpose of the motion, and I think that explains why neither he nor the member for Goyder is in the House at this stage. We on this side, as well as, I think, those members of the Opposition who do not have the same political viewpoint as that of the two gentlemen to whom I have referred, suspect that this is purely a political exercise.

Mr. Becker: Headline hunting!

Mr. KENEALLY: It may well be that, although, if there is one member in this House expert at that, it is the member for Hanson, who will well recognize this practice engaged in by people who at one time were his colleagues. As members should be aware, the project at Redcliffs is in my district, and the people of Port Augusta, the city most closely involved in this matter, are entirely satisfied with the work done by the Premier in connection with establishing this petro-chemical complex. We are entirely satisfied with the attitude adopted by the Government which, as the people of Port Augusta realize, will protect the area from the adverse effects of pollution, etc. The member for Goyder has suggested that the Government does not have a legally-binding letter of intent from the companies involved, but the Premier has adequately answered this charge. In fact, the Government has two letters, which have been submitted on the basis that they may be regarded as legally binding letters, subject to the Government's wishing to accept them. So, the first charge of the honourable member has been well and truly answered.

The second charge, as to whether the State Government has the unqualified approval of the Commonwealth Government for the export of liquid petroleum from South Australia, has also been answered by the Premier. It seems to me that the member for Mitcham (who is normally intelligent, although one does not always agree with his viewpoint) has not been able to read as efficiently as one usually expects him to read. On September 12, in answering the charge of the member for Goyder, the Premier said:

The member for Goyder then asked me to notify the House that I had the unqualified approval of the Commonwealth Government for the export of liquid petroleum from South Australia. Of course, I have not got it: that is not part of the contract, and about that the honourable member is wrong. It is not intended to export liquid petroleum to Japan. In fact, a condition of the whole project is that a petroleum refinery be established at Redcliffs and that liquid petroleum gas be converted to gasoline. Both of the consortia have undertaken that that will be the case in either of their developments, and it is provided for already by legislation of the Commonwealth Parliament, of which legislation the honourable member is apparently unaware. His suggestion that we should pass a motion in this House on this basis only reveals his complete ignorance of the project. It has nothing to do with it. It is not intended to export liquid petroleum gas.

Members may remember that, when speaking to this motion, the member for Mitcham suggested that the Premier had not covered that point. I interjected and said that the point had been well and truly covered, to which interjection the member for Mitcham retorted by suggesting that I could not read. Obviously it is the member for Mitcham who is not competent to understand what has been said in this House. I think we would all agree that the activities of the Commonwealth Minister for Minerals and Energy (Mr. Connor) should be applauded in South Australia. Mr. Connor insists that basic fuels produced in this country should be utilized in the first instance by this country; even Opposition members would agree with that, although perhaps the more radical rump, the Liberal Movement members, might not always agree.

The third query that the honourable member wants answered is whether the Government is fully protecting the environment and ecology of Spencer Gulf. In this day and age no Government will allow an industry to be established unless full consideration has been given to the environment and the ecology. Any Government that ignored those factors would not retain power for very long. We are fully aware of the importance of protecting the environment and the ecology, and we will discharge our responsibilities in that respect. The honourable member well knows that, before an indenture is signed, the matter will be referred to a Select Committee, which will be charged with the responsibility of ensuring that the environment and the ecology are protected. Actually, the matter will be well catered for before it reaches the Select Committee. The Port Augusta council and residents and private businesses in that city are completely happy with what the Government is doing in this respect. We at Port Augusta know that the development will pose problems for the city, but we know that we will have the sympathetic support of the State Government and the Commonwealth Government in providing at Port Augusta the housing and other facilities required to cater for the population explosion.

The difficulties we may face at Port Augusta are not solved one whit by the sort of exercise which the member for Goyder has participated in and which the member for Mitcham has supported. Of course, one must sympathize with the member for Mitcham; he was probably so embarrassed by his Leader's effort that he felt that he should support him. However, his support was incompetent because he was completely unaware of the information the Premier had since supplied to the House. I believe that every member is completely aware of the motives behind the motion. It was essential that I, as member for

the Stuart District, should state clearly the viewpoints held within my district. I strongly oppose the motion and I am disappointed that it was seconded. I suggest to members who wish to support the motion that they should carefully read the Premier's contribution to this debate. If, after doing that, they still feel compelled to support the motion, all I can suggest is that they are unaware of the factors involved and that their intelligence is questionable. I oppose the motion.

Mr. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

The SPEAKER: The question is "That the adjourned debate be made an Order of the Day for—

Mr. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, for and on behalf of the member for Goyder, I move:

That the adjourned debate be made an Order of the Day for Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have the authority of the mover of the original motion?

Mr. EVANS: I do not specifically have that authority; to say that I have the authority would be a lie, but I believe it is one of my duties to save business that belongs to members on the Opposition side, regardless of the Party they belong to. However, I cannot say that I have the mover's permission, because I do not have it.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Fisher has moved "That the adjourned debate be made an Order of the Day for Wednesday next". Is that motion seconded? For the question say "Aye"; against "No". I declare the motion carried.

DARTMOUTH DAM

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Hall:

That the Prime Minister be informed that it is the opinion of this House that Dartmouth dam should proceed as planned because:

(*a*) the urgency of its construction has not diminished since the signing of the agreement;

(*b*) its priority of claim on Commonwealth funds is at least equal to many other items included in the Commonwealth Budget; and

(*c*) South Australia's extra water entitlement which is part of the Dartmouth agreement will not be available to this State until Dartmouth dam is declared operational,

which the Hon. D. A. Dunstan had moved to amend by leaving out all words after "that" second occurring and inserting:

this House supports the views expressed in the letter of the Premier to the Prime Minister refusing discussions for postponement of the construction of Dartmouth dam.

(Continued from September 12. Page 717.)

Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I commend the member for Goyder on moving this motion. The issue of water storage in South Australia has probably done more than anything else to bring the Australian Labor Party into disrepute. I believe that this matter goes back to 1967, when the then Premier (Hon. D. A. Dunstan) moved the following motion:

That, in the opinion of this House, assurances should be given by the Governments, the parties to the River Murray Waters Agreement, that whatever action is taken by the River Murray Commission concerning the Chowilla dam or any other alternative proposal, South Australia will be provided with water in dry years to the extent intended to have been assured by the Chowilla dam project.

That was the beginning of the water problem that then arose in South Australia. The present motion highlights the position facing the State. No member would disagree with the terms of the Premier's amendment, but its purpose is to get away from the subject matter raised by the member for Goyder in his motion. Speaking in this debate, the Premier stressed the vital importance of Dartmouth dam to South Australia. I recall when, as Leader of the Opposition, the Premier clearly stated in this House that the Dartmouth project would be of no use whatever to the State, as water held in that storage would be used by New South Wales and Victoria and we would get none of it.

Mr. Coumbe: He was very dogmatic, too.

Mr. ARNOLD: Yes. Obviously he has now changed his mind and agrees with the action we tried to take in 1970 to safeguard the interests of South Australia when it became apparent that there was no chance of building Chowilla dam. The 250 000 acre ft. (307 500 m/) of additional water provided will give South Australia about 37 per cent more usable water, and this is essential to the State. The Minister of Works has said that, even with this additional water, which he now agrees will be available from Dartmouth dam, South Australia will still be over-committed with the water commitments it now has.

What worries me most about the matter is that three valuable years have been lost. Had the drought of 1967-68 continued for another 12 months, large areas of irrigated projects in this State, especially at Waikerie, Sunlands, and Golden Heights, would have had to be written off because of the saline nature of the irrigation water. At that time, the flow rate in the river had dropped to such an extent that there was no flow at all between lock 3 and lock 2. Consequently, the only water in Waikerie for irrigation was the water held between the locks, and the salinity level in that water was between 700 and 800 parts per million. The damage caused by that saline water was extensive. In 1970, by defeating the Dartmouth proposal the A.L.P. put South Australia at serious risk. For political purposes, the present Premier put South Australia in a dangerous position, and there was no need at all for him to do that. Those three vital years have now been lost.

Had the project proceeded in 1970, Dartmouth dam would now have reached the stage where water could start to be stored. With the very wet year we are having at present and the large flow rate in South Australia, much water would have been stored in Dartmouth to safeguard the interests of the State. The action of the Labor Opposition in 1970 was probably one of the worst political acts I have ever seen. That action has had a far-reaching effect on the State, and I believe it has taken its toll on the Labor Party with regard to integrity and respect. I believe integrity is something a person is born with, while respect must be earned. Because of its actions affecting water storage in this State, it will be a long time before the present Government is respected or thought to have integrity.

Mr. MILLHOUSE secured the adjournment of the debate.

COMMONWEALTH POWERS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Millhouse:

That this House, while acknowledging that the Commonwealth Constitution should be reviewed and amended to suit contemporary conditions, support the federal system of Government and oppose any action to clothe the Commonwealth Parliament with unlimited powers, to invest the High Court of Australia with final jurisdiction by abolition of appeals to the Privy Council and in particular action by the Commonwealth Government or Parliament to weaken the sovereignty of the States,

which the Attorney-General had moved to amend by leaving out all words after "That" first occurring and inserting:

this House acknowledges that the Commonwealth Constitution should be reviewed and amended to suit contemporary conditions, affirms that the distribution of legislative powers between the Commonwealth and the State should be that which is most conducive to the government and welfare of the Australian people and supports the abolition

of appeals to the Privy Council and the clothing of the High Court of Australia with final appellate jurisdiction and with jurisdiction to give advisory opinions.

(Continued from September 12. Page 719.)

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I support the original motion. That motion is changed by the Attorney-General's amendment, which introduces some new matters, and I draw attention to the phrase in the amendment "which is most conducive to the government and welfare of the Australian people". This term would create a lawyers' paradise when courts were determining what was most conducive to the government and welfare of the Australian people. This is one of those indeterminate matters to which we on this side have referred many times, and in that respect it is similar to the word "substantial", which means different things to different people.

The motion shows clearly that we acknowledge that the Commonwealth Constitution should be amended to meet present conditions. The need for such amendment has been stated many limes. My colleagues and I recognized that before and at the Constitution Convention. Earlier this afternoon I said that we considered that a decision should be made on submerged lands, navigation, and shipping, and that there was a need for clear understanding between the Commonwealth Government on the one hand and the State Governments on the other.

As I have said previously, at the Constitution Convention members of the Commonwealth Government tried to introduce into the debate measures which were totally political in concept and promotion and which did not do anything to help the convention to come face to face with the difficulties existing between the Commonwealth and the States. Delegates went to the convention with the clear understanding that its major purpose was to explore the matters highlighted on the agenda and then refer those matters to committees charged with the responsibility of obtaining information and reporting back to subsequent meetings of the convention. Because of this realization, I suggest, the convention was a success.

If it was viewed, as was the case in some places, as a convention that would be successful only if it came to grips with the inflation problem or if it finalized differences between the States and the Commonwealth Government, then it would be a failure. It has been accepted in both the Commonwealth and State spheres that the discussions, as reported in the official record, did the groundwork from which the committees can now work, and I look forward to action being taken by the committees without undue delay, so that the next meeting of the convention, to be held before June 30, will be able to move towards a satisfactory and successful conclusion in many areas of difficulty.

I do not suggest that we will resolve all the problems before the next meeting concludes, but I consider that there will be sufficient accord amongst Commonwealth Government, State Government, and local government delegates to be able to record effective progress. Many people who have examined the convention and its function seem to have missed completely the point that, whatever decisions the convention agrees to, the final decisions must be made not in the various Parliaments in Australia but by the men and women of Australia. The fact that a referendum will be required to give effect to the alteration agreed to by the Commonwealth Government and the State Governments has yet to be debated and promoted to the community.

The initial decisions being made by members of the Commonwealth Parliament and the State Parliaments automatically will create in the minds of the people of Australia a degree of suspicion adverse to the passage of the necessary referendum. It is essential that we in this Parliament recognize the need for decisions made by the Commonwealth Government, State Governments, or the convention to be sold to the community if eventual success is to follow. I make no bones of the fact that this will probably be the most difficult contract of the lot. The agreement reached around the conference table between the various political Parties and between the State Parliaments and the Commonwealth Parliament will be a simple matter compared to successfully selling the idea to the community at large.

In supporting the motion rather than the amendment moved by the Attorney, I believe that both the motion and the amendment have the same purpose as a general concept, but I believe the attitude expressed by the Attorney in his amendment is not likely to provide a climate for rapid or successful decision without tremendous legal argument.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I oppose the amendment moved by the Attorney-General. The Australian Labor Party is running true to form: it wants to get away from any emphasis on its own platform and policies, and this amendment by and large is in vague terms so that it can mean anything or nothing at all. The motion sets out specifically the policies of the A.L.P. on matters pertaining to the Constitution and, of course, indicates opposition to them because the A.L.P. is centralist (out and out centralist) and I do not believe in centralism.

The amendment seeks to tone the motion down so that we get words such as "the distribution of legislative powers between the Commonwealth and the State should be that which, is most conducive to the Government and the welfare of the Australian people". My idea of what is most conducive to the Government and the Australian people is certainly not the same as the idea of this Government. I could not accept such a vague statement as this. Regarding the Privy Council, the amendment is a direct negative of what the motion proposes, so I am against the amendment because it completely alters the sense and meaning of the motion. If it is carried I will vote against the motion in its amended form.

There is no doubt whatever that the Labor Party is a centralist Party. It does not matter whether the members of the Party are in State politics or in Commonwealth politics, as I saw a fortnight ago at the Constitution Convention. Everything said in this place and anywhere else about constitutional relationships between the States and the Commonwealth shows that the States are, in the eyes of the Labor Party, to defer to the Commonwealth. I again say that one cannot be both a good South Australian and a good Labor man.

Mr. Jennings: You cannot be a good South Australian and a good Australian, in other words?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Ross Smith, who is making one of his nowadays infrequent incursions into a debate, says one cannot be a good South Australian and a good Australian. I did not say that. All I said was that one cannot at one and the same time be a good South Australian and a good Labor man, because a good Labor man is a centralist and centralism will ruin South Australia and the other smaller States. In spelling it out in detail, I point out that it has never been denied by any member of the Labor Party (I am waiting for the day when it is) in a debate in this place. Indeed, the most significant implications are often to be derived from what is left unsaid and from the points which are ignored. The Minister of Transport, who is at the moment sitting on the front bench, indulged in that little exercise only

last Wednesday. If he cannot answer a point, especially if it is unanswerable, he just forgets it and does not answer at all. Then the silence is just as eloquent as any attempt at denial, or as an admission for that matter.

No Labor man has ever denied this. What would the situation be if there were a national Parliament and no State Parliaments? The preponderance of membership of that Parliament would be from the Melbourne-Sydney axis, quite obviously and properly: that is where the political influence would be, and decisions made there would be paramount. South Australia, Queensland, Western Australia and Tasmania would just count for nothing, because they would not have the political influence. If people want that, well and good, but I do not want it and I do not believe we should allow this situation to develop, because not only will it be to our own detriment: it will be to the detriment of Australia as a whole if a concentration of political power is allowed to develop in the south-eastern corner of this continent.

I am absolutely opposed to the centralism of the A.L.P., and I do not believe that one can be a good South Australian and a good Labor man. I hope, although I do not expect it, that the motion in its present form will prevail. Whether it does or not, this has been a useful exercise to emphasize once again the centralist tendencies of the A.L.P., and the people of this State will not be allowed to forget that this is so.

The House divided on the amendment:

Ayes (20)—Messrs. Broomhill, Max Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Duncan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Jennings, Keneally, King (teller), Langley, McKee, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, and Wells.

Noes (17)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Hall, Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse (teller), Russack, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Majority of 3 for the Ayes.

Amendment thus carried.

The House divided on the motion as amended:

Ayes (20)—Messrs. Broomhill, Max Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Duncan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Jennings, Keneally, King (teller), Langley, McKee, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, and Wells.

Noes (17)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Hall, Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse (teller), Russack, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Majority of 3 for the Ayes.

Motion as amended thus carried.

PRICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it insisted on its amendments to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

DRINKING DRIVERS

Adjourned debate on motion of Dr. Tonkin:

That, in the opinion of this House, an intensive campaign focused on accident prevention should be conducted throughout the community, with particular emphasis on education, and with facilities made available to enable people who have been drinking to relate personal alcohol intake to individual blood-alcohol level, and to be advised and warned against driving if a level above the legal limit is indicated.

(Continued from August 15. Page 351.)

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport): I move:

To strike out all words after "House" and insert: the South Australian Government's Road Safety Council is to be highly commended for its excellent work in focusing attention on all aspects of road safety through education and publicity campaigns. In particular, the council is to be commended for its initiative in taking steps to publicize the relationship between alcohol intake and blood-alcohol levels.

I believe it is necessary to amend the motion in this way, because at present the motion implies that little or nothing is being done to prevent accidents, whereas that is not so.

Mr. Coumbe: You agree with the motion in principle, though?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I would always agree with any principle that involved the promotion of road safety. However, I cannot support a motion that suggests that the Road Safety Council is not doing the job that it is designed to do. I think we should acknowledge the work that the council is doing because, in my opinion, it is doing a creditable job, and I never lose an opportunity to pay due regard to its work. The member for Bragg said that the relationship between blood alcohol and road accidents was now well known: I do not know whether the honourable member has access to some facts and figures which I do not have or which the Road Safety Council, the police and members of the medical profession also do not have. I remind the House that last year, when I introduced an amendment to the Road Traffic Act to provide for the taking of blood samples from all accident victims, I said that the principal purpose of the Bill was to obtain statistical facts in relation to this problem.

Mr. Mathwin: You refused to do it many times before that, though.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Many people have laid claim to various points of view on this matter. I have often heard it said that alcohol is involved in at least half of the accidents that occur. I am not aware that that statement would stand up to tests; it may be correct, and I am not saying it is incorrect: I am merely saying that it is not a proven statistical fact. I think South Australia will soon lead the way in yet another field, because we will have important statistical information. Only a day or so ago I was given the first monthly report on the blood-alcohol determinations as a result of the legislation I introduced last year.

Dr. Tonkin: Strongly supported by us!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am grateful that it was supported, I think unanimously. It is interesting to note the statistical facts revealed by this report: there were 761 specimens and 148 of these, or 19 per cent, were positive; 26 of the positive specimens had a blood-alcohol level of between .01 per cent and .04 per cent; 16 had between .05 per cent and .07 per cent; 52 had between .08 per cent and .14 per cent; and 44 had between .15 per cent and .24 per cent.

Dr. Tonkin: That's in line with oversea figures.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Further, 10 of the positive specimens had a blood-alcohol level greater than .25 per cent (the people concerned had obviously made a fair job of themselves!). However, although these figures are interesting and informative and form the basis of one part of the statistics that we desire, they are a long way from giving the complete picture that I want to see. At this stage, I do not know how many accidents were involved in this number of 761 persons who were blood-tested.

Dr. Tonkin: It's being tied in with the degree of severity of the accident in each case, though, isn't it?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I think the first thing is to try to get the additional statistical information that we

desire. Bearing in mind that 761 people were blood-tested, I should like to know how many accidents that represented; what was the category of the people concerned (whether they were drivers or passengers and, if the latter, whether they were sitting in the front seat or the back seat of the vehicle); how many were motor cyclists, pedestrians, cyclists, and so forth. I am hoping that these additional figures can be collated, so that we shall then be in a sound position.

Dr. Tonkin: You need to know the type of accident and the severity of it as well.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Yes; I think we are reaching the point where we shall be able to be a little more positive and know much more than just the calculated guessing that has occurred in the past. I do not think anyone will deny that drinking is certainly a problem when driving is involved. However, as T have said, we will have to determine the problem positively. I do not quarrel violently with the motion, except that I do not think it places the correct emphasis on the situation; hence the amendment. However, at least the member for Bragg has not followed his Party's policy, for he has not introduced the random breathalyser or sought to reduce the blood-alcohol level from .08 per cent to .05 per cent, which I understand is now the policy—

Dr. Tonkin: I don't think so.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I have here a copy of the *Advertiser* of July 16, which states:

The Liberal and Country League has formed an official policy on road accidents involving alcohol and will advocate removing the drinking driver from the road. The new policy for the State Opposition calls for voluntary breath testing, possible random breath testing, and lowering of the blood alcohol level to 05 if necessary . . . The policy was announced yesterday by Dr. Tonkin, M.P., for Bragg.

I do not know whether that is L.C.L. policy but, if it is a misprint, I should have expected the member for Bragg to ask the *Advertiser* to withdraw it.

Dr. Tonkin: I think it may be distorted.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the *Advertiser* has distorted the honourable member's statement, I suppose the matter should be sorted out between him and the *Advertiser.* I have usually found that, when the *Advertiser* has distorted what I have said, I have never had any trouble in getting the distortion rectified.

I turn now to the activities currently being conducted by the Road Safety Council. If any criticism can be levelled justifiably at the council, it is that the council does not blow its own trumpet often enough to let everyone know what it is doing. The motion refers to an education programme; of course, the Road Safety Council embarked on an education programme in connection with alcohol a long time before the member for Bragg gave any thought to the matter. In fact, I have shown the honourable member a series of pamphlets on this question.

I refer particularly to a pamphlet printed in Victoria; it refers to a blood alcohol content of .05 per cent. Of course, one would not need to do many sums to relate the information to a blood alcohol content of .08 per cent. The pamphlet shows that, if a person drinks two 7oz. (198.9 *ml)* glasses of beer in an hour, he will have a blood alcohol content of .02 per cent; if he drinks three glasses in that time, he will have a blood alcohol content of .03 per cent; if he drinks four glasses, he will have a blood alcohol content of .04 per cent; and if he drinks five glasses, he will have a blood alcohol content of .05 per cent. Obviously, if the person drinks eight glasses in an hour, he will have a blood alcohol content of .08 per cent.

The pamphlets have been produced by the Commonwealth Department of Shipping and Transport in Melbourne and have been circulated widely in connection with the activities of the Road Safety Council. Other pamphlets are entitled "Drinking, Driving, Drugs"; "Alcohol and Driving"; and "Holiday Driving". Posters available clearly show the work in which the Road Safety Council is engaged. Although the council has been doing this work for some time, that must not be taken as an indication that the council is complacent. On November 15, 1972, the member for Mitchell asked whether I would initiate through the Road Safety Council discussions with the Australian Hotels Association with a view to gaining that association's support for a display of suitable material to educate the drinking public about the relationship between alcohol intake and driving ability. The Road Safety Council has discussed the matter with the Australian Hotels Association, and it would appear that much progress has been made, to the extent that I hope we will see, in the not too distance future in South Australian hotels, coasters produced for the purpose of drawing attention to the blood alcohol content associated with the consumption of various quantities of liquor. The suggestion has much merit, because coasters are a very effective form of publicity. If I asked a member to name those gentlemen whose portraits are in this Chamber, I doubt whether the member could name five gentlemen. However, I hope that that kind of criticism will not be valid in connection with the coasters I have referred to. Every time that a person picks up a glass, he will get the message. I will do all in my power to help the Road Safety Council in its efforts.

I turn now to another form of publicity that is being issued by the council, a driver's information sheet, in which the various road traffic laws are highlighted. On the reverse side of the sheet, details of the points demerit scheme are displayed. From time to time different road traffic information will be publicized in this way. The sheet is distributed to people when they renew their drivers' licences.

I realize that I have not fully covered all the activities of the Road Safety Council. It has full-time instructors, and its activities, which are continually being expanded, are in the best interests of road users. I never miss an opportunity of commending the council for the very fine work it is doing. Accordingly, I have moved the amendment, which is in keeping with the high regard in which all members of this Parliament hold the safety council. We should not carry a motion that could be regarded as a slur on the activities of the council or which could direct attention to its alleged inactivity. I believe we should pass a resolution paying full regard to what the council is doing.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I support the motion and I am at variance with the Minister when he suggests the honourable member is criticizing the job done by people associated with road safety. For the Minister to suggest for one moment that the member for Bragg is criticizing the safety council or the people in charge of road safety in this State is an absolute mis-statement of fact and the Minister should be ashamed of himself for even suggesting it. The motion contains no indication that the member for Bragg thinks along those lines.

The Minister's amendment is not positive. The motion indicates that the member for Bragg agrees with the work and the activities of the Road Safety Council and indeed he is moving to extend those activities. All he asks is voluntary use of breathalyser tests. I know this would be foreign to the Minister and that the use of the

word "voluntary" is rather hateful to some members on the other side. The use of the word would lead the Minister to regard the matter with a certain contempt. However, the member for Bragg has merely suggested the voluntary use of the breathalyser to indicate clearly the alcohol level in the blood of the person taking the test. It is open for people to use it if they wish; it is to be made available to them.

The Minister spoke of education, of pamphlets, and of coasters, but surely the voluntary breathalyser test in itself would be an education. People who would not be interested would be those probably with too much alcohol in their blood, but people who took the test voluntarily would know the exact figure. I cannot see the reasoning behind the Minister's remarks. There is no doubt the Road Safety Council is doing good work in this State. The Minister said that the pamphlets are freely available, but they have now been put in his case, and I wonder how freely they are available to the general public. I have not seen them about. Certainly, some of the clubs in my district have not displayed them. If the Minister has some to spare I could distribute them to my clubs, and I could put them in my football club this weekend.

Mr. Dean Brown: Which club is that?

Mr. MATHWIN: This year's premiers, the Bays. I am sure people would be interested in reading the pamphlets if they were available.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Are you expecting some heavy celebrations this weekend?

Mr. MATHWIN: That could be so. I believe, as I am sure does the member for Bragg, that the work of the council is appreciated by all the people of South Australia. I do not know how anyone could read into the motion a criticism of the council, because it is not there. As usual, the Minister is drawing red herrings. He is quite good at it. He is trying to pull the wool over the eyes of the Opposition, but although he does his best he fails every time.

The Minister commented on the L.C.L. policy, as set out in the *Advertiser,* which he read with great enthusiasm. When members on this side quote from newspapers, the Minister says, "Why are you so foolish as to believe everything you read in the newspaper?" However, he is willing to grab at any straw to try to criticize any motion or suggestion emanating from this side. He did this today to the member for Bragg, but in reading from the newspaper I think he distorted the report just a little, to his own advantage as he thought. However, what the Minister said is not L.C.L. policy. He did a bad thing in bringing it before the House in that way.

Lowering of the blood alcohol level from .08 per cent to .05 per cent is suggested as a possible move to emphasize the dangers of drinking and driving. It is not major policy, so I do not see what the Minister is getting at. If one reads the full report in the *Advertiser,* one can see clearly what is intended by the L.C.L. policy. Unfortunately, the Minister is not here now to hear what I have to say. I believe he deliberately distorted these matters and tried to bring the member for Bragg into disrepute. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

NURSES' MEMORIAL CENTRE OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA, INCORPORATED (GUARANTEE) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 13. Page 760.)

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I am pleased indeed to see that the Government is finally making amends for all the upset and concern it caused some time ago to the committee for the Nurses Memorial Centre. I congratulate the Government on finally being sensible and taking the action it is taking. I am rather disappointed that the Premier cannot be here, because he had a large interest in the matter, of which I will remind members later. I am surprised that we seem to have so little business to go on with today, in view of the fact that we sat until the early hours of this morning. However, that is not my business; presumably the Government knows what it is doing. I am sorry that the Premier has had to go home. Some time ago, the nurses association acquired a property in Dequetteville Terrace, between Rundle Road and North Terrace, but it sold that property when the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study indicated that the site would be required. It turned out that this advice was an error, but the nurses did not learn it was an error until they had sold the property.

Having sold that site, they acquired a site on the corner of Capper Street and Dequetteville Terrace, immediately adjacent to Prince Alfred College. They were pleased to have such a site in a prime position and ideally situated, although I suppose one drawback was that it was not in the best electoral district, although the previous site had been in that district, loo. The new site was immediately in front of the land acquired by the previous Government as the site for the new Government Printing Office. The nurses were pleased to have acquired this new site, much of the concern they felt in leaving the original site being dissipated. However, they were promptly put in jeopardy again when they were notified that, since the Government Printing Office was no longer to be built on the site behind theirs, that land could now be used for a high-density housing scheme, the third to be proposed in the Premier's district. Therefore, there was a real possibility that the nurses' site would be required for that development. As this was the second site with which the nurses had had trouble, one can imagine their concern, which was conveyed to the Premier and to other members, including me. Plans for this high-rise development incorporated three 11-storey blocks of flats among other high-rise buildings.

Mr. Coumbe: Was that a coincidence?

Dr. TONKIN: It may or may not have been. I believe that another high-rise development is proposed for the Premier's district, but perhaps that is not germane to the matter under discussion. In March, 1972, the nurses were informed that their site was to be acquired by the State Planning Authority. Following representations, the Premier offered the association 12 alternative sites around the city of Adelaide. This sounded good until it was found that the sites were not very suitable, none being as good as the site on Dequetteville Terrace. In any case, only two of the sites were owned by the Government, so the other 10 sites would have been subject to compulsory acquisition.

The nurses were concerned about the matter, because they had sufficient funds in hand to commence building. I must pay a tribute to members of the nursing profession who have conducted fund-raising campaigns to pay for their memorial centre. Because of all the delays and with the inflation of building prices, the real value of their money has been whittled away. Finally, the nurses were informed recently (not long after I had made a speech in this House on the subject) that the high-rise development had been modified. Indeed, there has been no sign at all that it will go ahead. It is a great pleasure now, when driving along Dequetteville Terrace, to see the Nurses Memorial Centre beginning to take shape on that site. It does the Government some credit to have accepted that this is the best site and, as I have said, to make

amends by taking this action and guaranteeing the loan of the money required. I wholeheartedly support the Bill.

Bill read a second time and referred to a Select Committee consisting of Messrs. Becker and Dean Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Dunstan and Langley; the committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to adjourn from place to place; the committee to report on October 16.

PHYSIOTHERAPISTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 20. Page 871.)

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I support the Bill, which is self-explanatory and soundly based. It provides for the licensing of specific people to practise physiotherapy under supervision. The Bill also relates to special circumstances that arise from time to time. Some graduates who come from other countries to South Australia are not eligible, under the standards that apply here, for full registration, because their qualifications are not always accepted. We are indeed fortunate (and I have said this regarding many professions, branches of graduate training, and other spheres) to have a high standard of academic achievement in this State. Because of this, it is not always possible for people who come to this State to register. To enable them to undertake training as physiotherapists, so that later they may practise without supervision, the Bill provides that they may be licensed to practise under supervision.

This licensing may be renewed annually for up to three years and, during that time, it. is expected that these licensed people will undertake courses of instruction and practice to qualify them for full registration. The steps to be taken depend entirely on the board, which has full direction. Provision is made for the keeping of a register of licensed physiotherapists to ensure that these people will be kept under the notice and supervision of the board. When they have satisfied the board that they are qualified and competent to practise physiotherapy in their own right, they will no longer be under supervision but will join the normal register of physiotherapists and practise as such. I understand that the Bill has the full support of members of the Australian Physiotherapy Association.

Although this matter is not directly related to the Bill, there is in Adelaide a physiotherapist, Mr. Maitland, who has become so skilled in manipulation that he is attracting the attention of members of the physiotherapy profession as well as members of other disciplines from overseas. These people come to learn the skills that Mr. Maitland can impart. He has developed a world-wide reputation in this regard, and it is interesting to know that some chiropractors who now wish to take up the practice of physiotherapy, are taking action towards this end.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 7 passed.

Clause 8—"Exemption of osteopaths."

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Attorney-General say whether it is competent for a chiropractor to become a licensed physiotherapist while undergoing further studies to qualify him to become a registered physiotherapist in terms of this new legislation?

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): I have not considered this aspect, but I should not have thought that the fact that a person was a chiropractor would make any difference. Provided that he came within the qualifications for obtaining a licence, I should think that would be sufficient. I do not see any problem.

Dr. TONKIN: I understand it is allowable for graduates of some chiropractic schools to be given status for the study undertaken in obtaining their chiropractic qualification. Perhaps the Attorney will find out what is the position and let me know.

The Hon. L. J. KING: Nothing in the Bill disqualifies a person who has a chiropractic qualification from getting the benefit of the Bill, but I do not know whether there is any question of credit being given for chiropractic studies. I will find out for the honourable member.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (9 to 30) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.32 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, September 27, at 2 p.m.