HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, November 27, 1973

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

QUESTIONS

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

RHODESIA

In reply to Mr. DUNCAN (October 23).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I took up the matter of the advertisement entitled "Rhodesia Welcomes You", which appeared in the *Advertiser* on October 19, 1973, with the Department of Foreign Affairs in Canberra, which advises as follows:

The advertisement in question could be regarded as a breach of sanctions. United Nations Security Council Resolution No. 253 of May 29, 1968, "calls upon all States members of the United Nations or of the specialized agencies to take all possible measures to prevent activities by their nationals and persons in their territories promoting, assisting or encouraging immigration to Southern Rhodesia with a view to stopping such immigration". (Article 8). The Australian Government recognizes that newspapers are legally free to publish such advertisements. However, the Government believes that it is not in the national interest for newspapers to publish advertisements which could be held to be in breach of Australia's international obligations, and has advised all major newspapers, including the Adelaide *Advertiser,* accordingly. Unfortunately, the *Advertiser* declined to respond to the Government's request for its co-operation.

COPPER COAST PLAN

In reply to Mr. RUSSACK (November 22).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Copper Coast plan was a plan submitted by A. V. Jennings Industries, which was also interested in the casino project. Inquiries are now being made as to the interest of A. V. Jennings Industries in the development excluding the casino project.

TELEVISION STUDIO

In reply to Mr. EVANS (November 22).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Plans are now being examined in the Premier's Department for the construction of an enlarged press conference room on the eleventh floor of the State Administration Centre.

POKER MACHINES

In reply to Dr. EASTICK (October 30).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It is not an offence for a person to be in possession of a poker machine in South Australia, provided it is not exhibited in a public place, or is used for the purpose of gaming with other persons. Members of the Vice Squad advise they have no evidence of any machines being here, but, if there are, the number would be minimal. Four machines have been confiscated by police during the past two years, and a close watch is being continually kept to prevent persons operating them in this State.

SITONA WEEVIL

In reply to Mr. RUSSACK (November 15).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Agriculture states that the Agriculture Department has appointed a full-time entomologist and assistant to study the sitona weevil in South Australia. Because this particular insect is not a pest anywhere else, nothing was known about its life cycle and breeding requirements. Consequently, the department has had to start from the beginning and carry out basic biological studies. These are progressing well after two years work, and the factors controlling the build-up to plague numbers are slowly being understood. During the last 12 months, following my colleague's representations al the Australian Agricultural Council, the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization has come to the department's assistance and has commenced the search for biological control agents in the Mediterranean. A full-time entomologist is now working on the problem at Montpellier in France. His work is closely integrated with the biological studies in South Australia. The search for a biological control agent will be a slow and exacting process, and it is not expected that any practical results will be achieved within five years.

The department has also adjusted its medic-introduction and medic-breeding research programmes to search for varieties that may be able to resist sitona attack. Two research officers are working part-time on this aspect. Several forms of medics have been found that seem more resistant to this insect than those in current use in annual pastures. However, whether these have practical significance is still not known, and this work will have to continue for several years to follow these leads. Research has shown that the sitona weevil is susceptible to several insecticides, but the Director of Agriculture considers that control using these chemicals is not practicable because such huge numbers build up over large areas very quickly.

BALING WIRE

In reply to Mr. ALLEN (November 15).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Baling wire is not subject to control under the South Australian Prices Act, and the current alleged shortage is therefore outside the ambit of the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs. The shortages extend also to fencing materials and other steel products, and the whole question is being discussed with the Commonwealth Government to see whether some scheme of rationalization of distribution can be introduced.

MODBURY HIGH SCHOOL

In reply to Mrs. BYRNE (November 13).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: A contract has been let for the provision of fire escapes at 16 "Marion" type high schools, including Modbury High School. The contractor has programmed the installation of these fire escapes to enable him to complete the work in the shortest possible time. It is expected that all of these installations will be completed by the commencement of the 1974 school year.

LEAVING EXAMINATION

In reply to Mr. DEAN BROWN (November 15).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is not intended to adopt the honourable member's suggestion to make available a public examination of Leaving standard for those students who wish to sit for an external examination. When the Leaving examination is abolished, students will have a school record based on continuing assessment to indicate their progress both for promotion within the school and for presentation to possible employers when seeking a job. This record will be much more informative to employers than the present Leaving Certificate, which merely grades students' achievement in one examination on a percentile pattern.

Employers have difficulty in interpreting these achievement grades for their own purposes and should find the school record a much more comprehensive and useful guide. Employers can be assured that there will be no dilution of quality in the achievement grade awarded on

the school record; this document is the basis for promotion within the school itself. In addition, there will be comments of a student's personal qualities which could be of interest to employers. South Australia will still retain the fifth year Matriculation. However, the general tendency in Australia is for external exams to be reduced to a minimum, and in the long term they may possibly disappear. Already Queensland has no external examinations for Matriculation purposes, and the South Australian move to abolish the Leaving brings it in line with Victorian and New South Wales practice at that level.

The Secondary Division of the Education Department is preparing a programme to seek from employers the educational qualifications they require for entrance to their particular industry, as well as informing them of the quality and content of syllabuses and interpretation of achievement grades. The Parent-Teacher Council has also made a move in this matter. More important than the abolition of the Leaving examination is the building up of sound communication between employers and the educational institutions.

BELLEVUE HEIGHTS SCHOOL

In reply to Mr. EVANS (November 14).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: There is at present no school at Bellevue Heights, though one is in the course of planning. It may be that the honourable member's question arises from consideration by local people as to whether the Eden Hills school will be abandoned when the Bellevue Heights school is built. No thought has been given to such a proposal. It may be pointed out that the Bellevue Heights school is intended to serve a developing area to the south of Shepherds Hill Road, which is a very busy highway.

PETRO-CHEMICAL PLANT

In reply to Mr. KENEALLY (November 22).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Further Education Department has already obtained some preliminary information to assist in planning for courses to meet the needs of the petro-chemical industry to be established at Redclilfs. Sufficient information is not yet available to enable firm planning to be made. However, the Director of Further Education will seek discussion with members of the consortium, and a vigorous path of action will be pursued to ensure that planning both for sufficient accommodation and facilities in the Port Augusta area will take place.

CIGARETTE PRICES

In reply to Mr. OLSON (November 7).

The Hon. L. J. KING: Cigarettes are not subject to price control. Manufacturers' wholesale prices were increased on August 23, following the higher excise levied on tobacco by the Australian Government in the last Budget. Retail prices were raised by an average of 5c a packet when old stock had been sold, and replaced with new supplies subject to the higher excise. A further retail price increase of 1c a packet was recommended by the Retail Tobacco Sellers Association on October 22 to meet increased costs and restore eroded profit margins. The Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs does not know whether some retailers charged the increased retail price for cigarettes, which they had paid for at the old price, as suggested in the question. If this occurred, the conduct of those retailers amounted to exploitation of the public, and is to be condemned.

MURRAY RIVER FLOODING

In reply to Mr. ALLEN (November 8).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Highways Department will give sympathetic consideration to requests for financial assistance from councils for roads affected by the Murray River flood. However, as funds are fully committed, any assistance given would probably need to be in the way of transfers of existing grants rather than additional grants for new work. Councils are well aware of the danger of establishing caravan parks in areas that could be affected by flooding of the Murray River and any loss of revenue as a result of such flooding would need to be borne by the council concerned.

GRAND JUNCTION ROAD

In reply to Mrs. BYRNE (November 15).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Reconstruction of Grand Junction Road between the North-East Road and the Lower North-East Road is scheduled to commence in 1978 and be completed in 1979. However, this is subject to the availability of funds. Work will proceed from the North-East Road eastwards.

UNLEY ROAD CROSSING

In reply to Mr. LANGLEY (November 14).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Plans have been completed and agreement has been reached with the Corporation of the City of Unley on the replacement of the zebra crossing by a pedestrian-actuated traffic signal crossing near the Unley Post Office. Tenders will be called in the near future, but, because of delays in the delivery of signal equipment, it is expected that the new equipment cannot be installed until June or July, 1974.

OPAL

In reply to Mr. GUNN (October 17).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Some years ago the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization invented a process for the manufacture of opaline materials. Australian patent number 50029/64 was accepted on October 11, 1972, and patent rights have also been granted in the United States of America and the United Kingdom. The process was not developed to a stage where commercial production was possible. A Swiss based firm, Pierre Gilson Laboratories, has perfected a process for manufacturing created opal in commercial quantities. The Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization has corresponded with Mr. Pierre Gilson, and has tested a sample of his created opal, which is of excellent quality and virtually indistinguishable from natural opal. The created opal is slightly harder than the natural stone, and there is a slight variance of particle structure detectable with an electron microscope. Visual scrutiny by experienced gemologists evidently cannot distinguish between created and natural opal of comparable quality.

Information now available indicates that Gilson's technique is not based on the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization's process, and there is probably no patent infringement involved. One group in Melbourne is claiming to represent the opal industry, and is attempting to have the created opal banned in Australia. It is not feasible that the created opal should be banned, and the following points must be recognized:

(a) Banning created opal would be tantamount to admitting it is a product of such quality that it constitutes a threat to natural opal.

(b) The majority of natural opal is ultimately exported, and, therefore, banning created opal in Australia would not affect its sales in principal world markets for natural opal.

(c) As with created emeralds, where visual recognition by experts is relatively simple, created opals should be marketed as such, so as to prevent

any damage to the Australian natural opal industry, especially from misrepresentation of the created product abroad.

(d) By-passing of Australia with the marketing of created opal would deprive the Australian gemstone industry of additional business due to cutting, polishing, setting, merchandising, and exporting of the created product.

The South Australian Government is keeping a close watch on all developments relating to created opal, and will do everything possible to protect the opal-mining industry in this State.

QUARRYING

In reply to Mr. DEAN BROWN (November 14).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The Environmental Protection Council has received 18 replies from the general public regarding quarrying in the hills face zone. Detailed submissions from the quarrying interests have yet to be received.

FUEL RESOURCES

In reply to Mr. GUNN (November 8).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I have investigated the possibility of converting coal into liquid and gaseous fuels, and advise that, while synthetic processes are technically feasible, they have so far been uneconomical. The only commercial oil-from-coal process operating in the world today is the Sasol process which has been operating in South Africa since 1955. The plant was designed to produce 200 000 tons (203 200 t) of motor spirit and diesel fuel with other by-products from 1 800 000 tons of coal a year. There is no reason why synthetic crude oil could not be produced in the future from the Lake Phillipson or other brown coals.

ENERGY SOURCES

In reply to Dr. TONKIN (November 7).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: A feasibility study on the subject of an investigation into the State's energy resources has been initiated by the Director of the Industrial Development Division on September 11, 1973. The Policy Secretariat is examining the request, and it is expected that it will be able to make a recommendation regarding the method of approaching the study within the next few weeks.

SAVINGS BANK

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice) Why has Edwin Robert Howells been appointed a trustee of the Savings Bank of South Australia?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government has as a policy the gradual integration of membership of the trustees of the Savings Bank of South Australia and the members of the board of the State Bank of South Australia. Mr. Howells is a member of the board of the State Bank of South Australia. His appointment as a trustee of the Savings Bank of South Australia is in accordance with the policy referred to. Mr. Howells has very wide experience in management of banking, and has expertise in the use of the licence for banking available to the Savings Bank and the State Bank that is not as yet being fully taken advantage of by these banks. The Government has sought for some time to obtain this expertise for the two banks for the benefit of the public of South Australia.

TRIAL COSTS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What have been the costs and expenses so far to the Police Department of *(a)* investigations in the Taperoo Beach murder case; and *(b)* the trial and appeals of Fritz Van Beelen?

2. How are such costs and expenses made up?

3. What are the total estimated costs and expenses?

The Hon. L. J. KING: No allocation of costs to each case is made by the Police Department. Some information could be obtained by research but, as it would be incomplete, it would not be useful.

PASADENA LAND

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Has the Highways Department recently sold land at Pasadena?

2. If so, how many blocks have been sold and what is the total area sold?

3. What has been the sale price for each block?

4. Why was such land sold?

5. At what cost had it been acquired and when?

6. If no sales have been made, is it intended to sell any such land? If so, when and at what price?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

2. Ten (10) allotments were sold and the total area was 78 052 sq. ft. (7 261 m^2).

3. Lot 686, $4 800; lot 687, $7 150; lot 688, $8 750; lot 689, $7 100; lot 690, $5 400; lot 691, $5 900; lot 692, $5 910; lot 693, $5 950; lot 694, $5 980; and lot 695, $5 910.

4. Parts of the original properties had been used for the construction of Five Ash Drive and the balance was surplus to requirements.

5. The land was originally acquired by the department for $57 820 on May 13, 1968.

6. These questions are not applicable, as sales did take place.

SUPREME COURT ACT

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Has consideration been given to introducing legislation to amend section 30c (2) *(a)* and 30c (3) *(a)* of the Supreme Court Act to allow interest at a greater rate than 7 per cent a year and to allow interest to be awarded in respect of damages or compensation in respect of loss or injury incurred or suffered after judgment, respectively?

2. If so, is such legislation to be introduced and when?

3. If not, will consideration be given to introducing such legislation?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

2. No decision has been made.

3. Yes.

CHAIN OF PONDS

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. What stage has the Government reached in the acquisition of properties in the reservoir catchment area at Chain of Ponds?

2. How many properties have been purchased?

3. How many properties are still to be purchased?

4. What stage have negotiations reached on properties still to be purchased?

5. Has there been any demand from property owners for special consideration, and what concessions or special values have been granted?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The replies are as follows:

1. and 2. The number of properties required in the Chain of Ponds area was 35 in the township area, and 15

outside the township, for a total of 50. Of these, 32 properties in the township area and nine outside the township have been acquired.

3. Three properties in the township area and six outside still remain tobe purchased.

4. Of the three properties required in the township, notice of intention to acquire has been served on one, and a notice will be served soon on one other. Agreement has been reached in respect of the third. Action will be taken in respect of the remaining properties outside the township over the next year or two.

5. All property owners, whose properties are required for compulsory acquisition, deserve special consideration and this is given by the department. However, in reaching settlement, proper valuation methods applicable to the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act are applied on a consistent basis to all concerned. No concessions or special values are granted by the department, as this would not be equitable. One of the three remaining acquisitions in the township area is subject to special consideration by the rehousing committee appointed pursuant to the Land Acquisition Act.

COMMUNITY WELFARE

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. Will a community that is unable to find sufficient persons willing to be members of a subcommittee of the consultative council for community welfare be at a disadvantage in the distribution of funds?

2. Are any positions either on subcommittees or the consultative council paid positions?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. No. Community Welfare Consultative Councils, as they are now constituted, are not responsible for the distribution of any funds. They make recommendations to the Minister concerning community welfare matters that may require the expenditure of Government moneys. They are being consulted by the Community Welfare Grants Advisory Committee about grant applications before that committee.

2. No. Members of consultative councils and properly constituted subcommittees are reimbursed for the use of their private motor vehicles and for any necessary travelling and accommodation expenses at normal Public Service rates.

LICENSING ACT

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. Is it intended to introduce legislation concerning the Licensing Act during the present session of Parliament?

2. If not, how long is it expected to be before the promise made to the British Sailors Society Inc. to amend the Act will be fulfilled?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

2. When the legislation is passed and operative.

BOND RATE

Mr. COUMBE (on notice): When can I expect a reply to the questions asked on September 18 and 25 about the bond rate to be charged the South Australian Government and what the effect will be on this State's Loan Account?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I regret that the questions asked by the Deputy Leader were not answered specifically in the House, but I assumed that, with all the publicity that was given to the increase in the bond rate, there would be no need to repeat in the House information which had been announced by the Treasurer of the Australian Government and which had appeared in the press. However, to repeal the information, the terms of issue of Government securities issued in the loan which opened on October 11, 1973, were as follows:

8 per cent maturing February 15, 1975, issued al par.

8.2 per cent maturing May 15, 1977, issued at par.

8.3 per cent maturing October 15, 1983, issued at 99.70 per cent.

8.5 per cent maturing October 15, 1993, issued at par.

The effect will be to increase the Government's interest bill in relation to funds used for capital works and purposes which, in the final analysis, impinges upon the Revenue Account.

ADULT WAGE

Mr. COUMBE (on notice):

1. Is it still the intention of the Government to introduce legislation before Christmas to provide adult rates of pay for those 18-year-olds doing full adult work in this State?

2. If not, is it intended to introduce such legislation, and when?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The replies are as follows:

1. It is not and never has been the intention of the Government to introduce legislation before Christmas to provide adult rates of pay for those 18-year-olds doing full adult work in this State.

2. The Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act is at present under review, and proposals are being considered to enable 18-year-olds, who are doing adult work, to receive adult rates of pay.

PETROL

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. How many summonses have been issued for infringements of the Liquid Fuel (Rationing) Act, 1973?

2. How many other cases are under consideration?

3. What infringements are involved in each of the cases reported?

4. Is it intended to proceed with the prosecution in all cases for which summonses have been issued?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Five.

2. Nil.

3. Section 7—Sell to non-permit holders . .	—	2
Aid and abet sale to non-permit holders.....	—	1.
Section 11—Non-permit holder buying liquid fuel....	—	1
Section 14—Make false statement in application for liquid fuel	—	1

4. Yes, unless precluded by section 26. All prosecutions must be heard and determined by November 30, 1973, otherwise they will lapse.

WELFARE OFFICERS

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. How many officers of the Community Welfare Department employed at Vaughan House, McNally Training Centre and Windana, respectively, have been injured in the course of their duties?

2. What has been the nature of these injuries?

3. How many officers are still suffering from the results of these injuries?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. (a) Minor injuries sustained whilst restraining boys and girls:

	Vaughan House	McNally Training Centre	Windana
1972-1973	11	2	13
1/7/73 to 25/11/73	—	—	—

(b) Minor injuries resulting from direct action by boys and girls:

	Vaughan House	McNally Training Centre	Windana
1972-1973	8	—	1
1/7/73 to 25/11/73	2	2	—

(c) More serious injury resulting from direct action by boys and girls:

	Vaughan House	McNally Training Centre	Windana
1972-1973	5	—	1
1/7/73 to 25/11/73	1	—	

2. The vast majority of injuries in categories (a) and (b) consisted of bruises and lacerations mainly through being pushed or hit. The injuries classed as serious at Vaughan House consisted mainly of facial bruises and shock on having their heads hit against the wall or floor. One officer sustained a back injury when she was pushed over by girls in an absconding attempt.

The serious injury at Windana occurred when the officer suffered lacerations to the hands and bruising to the skull on being hit with a baseball bat.

3. Two officers are still being paid accident compensation because of injuries sustained. Both were from. Vaughan House.

HOSPITALS

Dr. TONKIN (on notice): What total sums have been paid by way of Government subsidy to St. Andrews, Calvary, and Memorial Hospitals, respectively, during the last 15 financial years?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The payments are as follows: St. Andrews Hospital $321 900, Calvary Hospital $753 600, and Memorial Hospital $98 000.

OVERSEA STUDY TOUR

The SPEAKER laid on the table the report on the oversea study tour in 1973 by Mr. E. R. Goldsworthy, the honourable member for Kavel.

Ordered that report be printed.

ROYAL ASSENT

The SPEAKER: I draw the attention of the House to two proclamations in the *Government Gazette* dated November 22, 1973, notifying Her Majesty's assent to the Constitution Act Amendment Bill (Franchise), 1973, and the Constitution and Electoral Acts Amendment Bill (Council Elections), 1973.

VAUGHAN HOUSE

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I give notice that tomorrow I will move:

That in the opinion of this House, particularly because of the happenings of the last fortnight, there should be a full and independent inquiry into the administration of Vaughan House and the methods of rehabilitation being used there.

I express the hope that the Government will give time to a debate on this matter—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot comment on a notice of motion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —because of its importance and significance.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move a motion without notice forthwith.

If this motion is carried, I desire to move:

That in the opinion of this House an inquiry headed by a judge of the Family Court should be held into the recent disturbances at and absconding from Vaughan House.

In moving for the suspension of Standing Orders, I refer to the public disquiet regarding this matter, which is of real interest to the public. The ostrich-like stance of the Minister of Community Welfare—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. EASTICK: —in suggesting that there is—

The SPEAKER: Order! At this stage the honourable Leader can slate only the reason why Standing Orders should be suspended.

Dr. EASTICK: The motion for the suspension of Standing Orders is to indicate clearly that there is public disquiet and concern at the Minister's failure to explain adequately all aspects of the conduct of Vaughan House. The reports emanating from the Minister and members of his staff are at considerable variance. In this morning's press appears a statement that, as I recall it, in the past three years the number of inmates of Vaughan House has declined from 50 to 20, yet last week suggestions were made that as many as 65 people were at Vaughan House. Within the past few days, there have been at least 20 absconding. I stress the term "at least" because the public of South Australia has not been told what is the correct figure. The Minister and members of his staff have acknowledged that there have been several absconding by the same person or persons. There have been instances, Sir—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader has sought the suspension of Standing Orders, and he has the right to speak for 10 minutes only in relation to the reason for suspension: he cannot deal with the subject matter that may be discussed at a later stage.

Dr. EASTICK: Sir, the reason for suspension is to air the grave misgivings that members of the community and we on this side have concerning the Minister's failure clearly to indicate exactly what is taking place at Vaughan House. There have been conflicting reports from both the Minister and his own staff that can only lead to further confusion and concern among the people of this State. The Deputy Premier denied a request that I made last week that a judge of the Family Court be appointed to undertake an independent inquiry into this matter. We have been assured that the position is in hand and that no difficulty is contemplated in future, yet a press report appeared over the weekend of another member of the staff at Vaughan House being injured. Although the degree of injury is not in argument at this stage, it has been acknowledged that injury occurred, and this morning's and this afternoon's newspapers contain a report of further absconding taking place between November 26 and 27.

The SPEAKER: Order! Once again I point out to the Leader that he is moving for the suspension of Standing Orders. He is asking the House for that suspension, and that is the only matter being discussed: he cannot continue to discuss the subject matter.

Dr. EASTICK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In conclusion, I believe that the public of South Australia has every right to expect from the Minister a true and clear statement of precisely what is taking place in connection with the State's rehabilitation scheme for young people. We need to know the contents of the reports that have been made available to the Minister, and we ask that the relevant

information be directed to the attention of a judge of the Family Court. In doing this—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader is now starting to debate the subject matter rather than giving reasons for seeking the leave of the House to suspend Standing Orders. The honourable Leader.

Dr. EASTICK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The purpose of the motion is to ascertain the facts and to determine what criticism may be levelled against the Minister himself. It does not imply that we have any argument concerning the staff of the institution. I seek the support of the House in suspending Standing Orders.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Deputy Premier): I oppose the motion.

Mr. Millhouse: Come on!

Dr. Eastick: Shame!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I reiterate that I oppose the motion, and I will now try to state my reasons and not debate the subject raised in the Leader's motion. The Leader has had made perfectly clear to him by the Premier previously that the Government will not allow him to have Standing Orders suspended in the way that he has been seeking their suspension this session unless it involves a motion of no confidence in the Government. The Leader knows as well as I and every other member of this House that he has the facility to move an urgency motion simply by giving the Speaker notice in writing. The Government would not oppose such a motion. The Leader has been told that, if there is any matter of urgency and if he goes about it properly, the motion he moves will not be opposed by the Government. That would have given him the opportunity to do what he wanted to do this afternoon. Indeed, from what he has already said in giving his reasons for moving for suspension, I have heard nothing that could not have been done through directly questioning the Minister in Question Time on the matter that he wishes to raise.

Dr. Eastick: We didn't get the answers last week.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: That is ridiculous and the Leader knows it is. Every opportunity has been afforded the Leader in Question Time, and the matter should have been dealt with in that way or by moving an urgency motion, especially in the light of the Government's attitude towards the suspension of Standing Orders. I was listening when the Premier told the Leader that this would be the situation.

Dr. Eastick: You were—

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: He told me what he was going to tell the Leader. That is the situation. Therefore, I oppose the motion of the Leader to suspend Standing Orders for the reasons he has outlined this afternoon.

Mr. COUMBE seconded the motion.

The SPEAKER: The motion is "That Standing Orders be suspended". Those for the motion say "Aye"; those against say "No". There being a dissentient voice, a division is necessary. Ring the bells.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (19)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick (teller), Goldsworthy, Gunn, Hall, Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Noes (22)—Messrs. Broomhill, Max Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran (teller), Crimes, Duncan, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, Langley, McKee, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Weils, and Wright.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Evans and Rodda. Noes—Messrs. Dunstan and Groth.

The SPEAKER: There are 19 Ayes and 22 Noes.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

Later:

The Hon. L. J. KING: I draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the list in respect of the division that occurred earlier today. I was present in. the House, and I can assuredly say that I voted with the "Noes".

The SPEAKER: I direct that the votes and proceedings be corrected accordingly.

QUESTIONS RESUMED

VAUGHAN HOUSE

Dr. EASTICK: This afternoon, in reply to a Question on Notice from the member for Bragg, the Minister of Community Welfare said that, with regard to the number of injuries caused to members of the staff at Vaughan House and at McNally Training Centre, the figure from July 1 to November 25, 1973, was one person injured. I point out that November 25 was last Sunday. Newspaper reports of an injury last week and another over the weekend would suggest to me and to members of the public that the injuries add up to at least two. Therefore, I ask the Minister how many injuries have been caused to members of the staff of Vaughan House and whether a degree of injury must be suffered before that injury is reported on the sheet?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The answer given to the Question on Notice is correct.

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Minister say how many abscondings have occurred from Vaughan House in the past few weeks and how many girls are at present at Vaughan House? As some conflicting statements on this subject have emanated from various sources, I seek this information. Some statements have emanated from the Minister himself (I make no reflection on the staff or officers in this regard). Because of the public disquiet and because the public is entitled to be told the facts that I seek in my question, I ask the Minister to supply this information.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I am rather surprised at the honourable member's comment that he makes no reflection on my staff, because I wonder where he thinks I get the information.

Dr. Eastick: You can't twist out of it that way.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Gunn: You must accept the responsibility.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. L. J. KING: I repeat that I wonder where the honourable member thinks I get the information supplied in the answers, because he can be sure that I do not personally go out and count the number of people at Vaughan House. The population at Vaughan House fluctuates for several reasons. At Vaughan House there is now the remand and assessment centre through which there is a considerable flow of people for assessment before going to the courts and being released, and they are there for only a relatively short period. The stay varies from two months to 10 months in the other section of Vaughan House. If the honourable member would care to indicate the date at which he would like to know the population of Vaughan House I will obtain the information for him.

Mr. Coumbe: As at today.

The Hon. L. J. KING: Very well.

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Minister of Community Welfare say whether any investigation has been made into the relative number of injuries occurring at Vaughan House, McNally Training Centre and Windana Remand Home and, if such an investigation has been made, what were the results of such investigation? It is noticeable in the figures quoted in the reply given to me this afternoon that far more injuries (whether they be minor injuries sustained whilst restraining boys and girls, minor injuries resulting from direct action by boys or girls, or more serious injury resulting from direct action by boys and girls) are sustained at Vaughan House than at either McNally or Windana. The total figures given for 1972-73, and up to November 25, are 27 injuries at Vaughan House, compared to four at McNally and 15 at Windana. Of the 15 at Windana, 13 occurred in 1972-73, with none so far this year. It seems that there is a disproportionate number of injuries caused at Vaughan House. I hope the Minister will be able to explain the reason for this.

The Hon. L. J. KING: Yes, that is true. It is significant that the number of injuries at Windana has declined so markedly since girls are no longer remanded there. Injuries seem to occur to a greater extent at girls' institutions than at boys' institutions. It is difficult to pinpoint the reason for this but there is no doubt that some girls have a much greater tendency to become hysterical and get completely out of control than do boys and, in that condition, they tend to lash out at staff members in a way that boys will not. It is also true that in girls' institutions many of the residential care workers are women and this circumstance may not have the same discouraging effect on the inmates as occurs when the residential care worker is a male. This problem has been tackled to some degree by appointing male residential care workers at Vaughan House. This was not the only reason for taking that course of action and I have explained the other reasons on previous occasions. It is hoped that by appointing male residential care workers to Vaughan House and having at least one male residential care worker on duty all the time, particularly at night, it will be possible to discourage the offering of violence by inmates to the staff. I treat seriously the occasioning of injuries to members of the staff of any institution. It is extremely difficult to protect the members of the staff in all situations from violence offered by inmates, particularly those who are severely disturbed and tend to get completely out of control. In such circumstances staff members are really left in the last resort to try to protect themselves by avoiding, as far as possible, those circumstances where injuries can occur. A typical case was the one that occurred at the weekend when an extremely disturbed girl who had been involved in the earlier incident involving the use of a knife, having been recaptured and returned to Vaughan House, was being searched before admission in the presence of the two police officers who had arrested her, when she lashed out with her fist and struck the residential care worker on the eye. That is a fairly typical situation that can occur in these institutions, and most of the injuries mentioned occur in some such way. I do not mean that they necessarily occur in the course of searches, but often injury occurs when a young inmate is being restrained in some way and struggles, or in cases where the young inmate just gets out of control and becomes hysterical. I think that, basically, the reason for the higher incidence of injuries at Vaughan House compared to that at other institutions is related merely to the sex of the inmates. Some girls tend to get completely out of control and nothing will discourage them from lashing out at whoever is nearby. This tendency seems less marked amongst boys.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Acting Premier agree to allow the motion of which I have given notice for tomorrow to be debated, limiting the time, if he wishes, to that allowed for an urgency motion? The Acting Premier may have noticed that I gave notice of a motion for tomorrow about an inquiry into Vaughan House. I did that at the beginning of Question Time and before the unsuccessful attempt by the Leader of the Opposition—

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am only recounting what has happened this afternoon.

Mr. McAnaney: Question!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Come on, Bill!

Mr. McAnaney: Question!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Acting Premier said—

Mr. McAnaney: Question!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —that, if an urgency motion was moved, he would allow it to be debated.

Mr. McAnaney: Question!

The SPEAKER: "Question" having been called, I call on the honourable Deputy Premier.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member would be fully aware that private members' time in this House has been exhausted—

Mr. Millhouse: You—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member may use the same facility as I said the Opposition could have used this afternoon—

Mr. Millhouse: Oh, come on!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: —by moving an urgency motion if he so desires. If he gains the support of enough members of the House, he can proceed with his motion.

PETRO-CHEMICAL PLANT

Mr. HALL: In view of the apparent danger that legislation before the Australian Senate supporting the new concept of the Australian Industry Development Corporation may not proceed, will the Deputy Premier say what view the Government now takes about the Redcliffs project proceeding, whether the project is in danger, what significance the A.I.D.C. has in respect of the general consortium that will build the Redcliffs project, whether the A.I.D.C. will have a permanent interest or merely a transient interest that will be transferred to private interests later, and what percentage share the A.I.D.C. will, have in the consortium? The Deputy Premier knows well from proceedings in this House that his Government first intended to initiate Redcliffs with a minority Australian interest. When that matter was dealt with in debate in this House, members of the Liberal and Country League Opposition joined the Government in opposing majority ownership by Australians. Subsequently, under pressure from the Commonwealth Minister for Minerals and Energy (Mr. Connor), the Commonwealth Government was able to reach agreement, with the involvement of the A.I.D.C. However, I believe that no-one has been told of the significance and percentage involvement that the A.I.D.C. will have. As there is now some delay to the whole project because of the possible unavailability of A.I.D.C. resources resulting from the failure of the Senate to pass the legislation, will the Deputy Premier reply to the questions I have asked and will he throw light on this matter by giving information which is more detailed and which so far has not been available to the House or to the public?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Let me say at the outset that the South Australian Government is extremely concerned that two Bills now before the Australian Senate shall be passed, because they have a vital bearing on the future of the Redcliffs project in South Australia. At this stage I do not intend to go into any detail on the several specific points the honourable member has raised. I suggest to him that later this afternoon he will have an opportunity not only to hear in full the ramifications of the passage of these two Bills through the Senate but also to say more about the matter himself.

PORT AUGUSTA HEALTH SERVICES

Mr. KENEALLY: Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Health what plans the Health Department has to increase both the scope and capacity of health services available to residents of Port Augusta? Because of the dramatic increase in population that will occur at Port Augusta, the health facilities now available will obviously be inadequate. For instance, additional hospitals beds will be required and domiciliary care and paramedical services will need to be provided or increased.

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

CHAIN OF PONDS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Minister of Works say what arrangements have been made at Chain of Ponds to continue the provision of essential services for those residents who will remain in the town for some time yet? I understand that the acquisition of properties is well advanced and that the store will close at the end of this year. The store not only supplies provisions but also provides a mail service for persons still resident in the district. I understand that the hotel will continue its service for some time, but I do not know for how long.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Initially, I said that we would maintain, for as long as we possibly could, essential services for people who remained in the town. The hotel has been leased to the previous owner, I think for five years, although the period may be three years) and the situation will be reviewed at the end of that time. True, the store *cum* post office will close at Christmas time, mainly because the amount of custom is such that it cannot afford to continue to provide these services. I think that during the honourable member's absence I covered the position when I replied to a question in this House. I understand that the garage has closed and I think that one of the churches will continue to be used. However, I am not certain on these matters. I am interested to know how many people will remain in Chain of Ponds. I think the honourable member would probably be aware that there are few there. There comes a time when we must decide not only whether or not the service should be continued: there has to be some profit in it for those people who provide the service. I am not suggesting, and I have never suggested, that the Government should maintain a service at a loss and provide a facility for the few people who may remain in the area for the whole period. However, I will have the matter looked at and let the honourable member know whether I have missed anything.

FILM CORPORATION

Mr. EVANS: Will the Deputy Premier say why the annual report of the South Australian Film Corporation has not been tabled in both Houses? Section 30 of the South Australian Film Corporation Act provides:

(1) On or before the 31st day of October in each year the corporation shall furnish the Minister with a report signed by the chairman on its administration and the work that had been undertaken by the corporation during the year or part of the year ended on the 30th day of June preceding the report.

(2) The Minister shall cause each report to be laid before both Houses of Parliament within three weeks after receiving the same, if Parliament is then sitting, or, if Parliament is not then sitting, within two weeks after the commencement of the next sitting of Parliament.

That report should be before Parliament now: as it is only two days before the end of this sitting, it should have been in the Minister's hands at the end of October and tabled in this House by November 21. I bring the matter to the Minister's notice now so that we may have the report before we rise on Thursday evening or early Friday morning.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will see what I can do for the honourable member.

SEWERAGE FINANCE

Mr. McANANEY: As I understand that the five other States have rejected the Commonwealth Government's $9 300 000 loan for sewerage because the interest rate is too high, will the Deputy Premier indicate the interest rate charged and the term of the loan? Does he consider that the rate of interest is too high, and what protests about the matter have been made to the Commonwealth Government, especially as the Budget statement called it a grant, most of the money lent being raised through taxation or through credit from the Reserve Bank and not costing the Commonwealth Government anything in interest?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: First, the rate of interest laid down for the loan, which in fact totalled $30 000 000 to all States, was the long-term bond interest rate, which is currently 8½ per cent, to be repaid over 30 years. I objected to that on behalf of this State, saying that in my view the rate was far too high and that the Australian Government should consider reducing the rate of interest to 7 per cent and extending the period of repayment to 50 years, or to 53 years as required by the Commonwealth-States Financial Agreement. Negotiations took place between the State Ministers and the Commonwealth Minister, who said that he would refer the matter back to Cabinet to see whether or not the repayment method could be altered to the credit foncier system and the term of repayment extended to 40 years. So far as I know, that is being done, and the result may be successful. The honourable member said that five other States had rejected this loan, but that is not true: the Minister in question indicated in the press that it was not satisfactory to his State and that he was considering rejecting it. However, if the honourable member reads today's *Australian* he will see that Mr. Hamer has changed his Minister's mind and is about to accept the $9 300 000 loan that that State was offered. I have no doubt that the same will happen in New South Wales, Queensland and Western Australia.

Mr. Coumbe: Wasn't this to be a grant?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes, it was stated by the Prime Minister before the Commonwealth election that it was to be a grant: there is no question about that, and I am not denying it. Along with other Ministers, I drew the Commonwealth Minister's attention to that matter. He pointed out that, when the Labor Government gained office in Canberra and examined the situation, it found that things were not quite as it had thought they were.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: This is a one-year agreement only, and that is important. Not everyone is as clever as the member for Davenport and can work out all these things in six months. The rest of the assistance for the States to improve the quality of living in urban areas will involve not only sewerage reticulation but also upgrading public transport, establishing a land commission and many other things, including in this State, probably for the first lime anywhere, water treatment at the beginning of. next year. That is not to say that extensive grants will not be involved in the total scheme, and members should listen to the full story.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What did the former Government do?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Over 23 years it paid absolutely no attention to this matter, and the people living—

Mr. McAnaney: Why don't you answer the question!

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: People living in the major cities of this nation could have rotted as far as the previous Government was concerned. These people were affected by the immigration programmes of a Government that did nothing to assist the States, and that is the reason for the present mess.

Mr. McAnaney: Why don't you deal—

The SPEAKER: Order! If the member for Heysen is going to disregard totally the authority of the Chair, he will have to stiller the consequences. The honourable Deputy Premier.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I accepted the $1 600 000 offer to this State to speed up the reticulation of sewerage and to catch up the backlog, which fortunately is not great in this State because of the policies not only of this Government but also of previous Governments. We are fortunate in this State in having between 95 per cent and 97 per cent of the total metropolitan area sewered. I was not prepared to come back to this State and say that I had rejected $1 600 000, whether as a loan or a grant, which would help in catching up that backlog. No more do I contend that other Ministers should go back to their States and say that they have rejected $11 000 000 (in the case of New South Wales) or $9 300 000 (in the case of Victoria), when their situation regarding sewerage reticulation is much worse than ours. I am convinced that New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland and Western Australia will accept the terms laid down by the Commonwealth Government in respect of this one-year agreement on the sewerage backlog and will accept a loan to catch up that backlog. I make no apologies at all for the decision I took on behalf of this State relating to this loan, which I hope will serve to speed up the connection to sewerage Of many more houses than would have been connected this year had the $1 600 000 not been received.

HILLS SUBDIVISION

Mr. GUNN: Will the Minister of Environment and Conservation say whether the Government is concerned about the subdivision of 200 acres (81 ha) of natural bush land in the hills face zone close to Windy Point and, if it is, what action the Government intends to take to rectify this unfortunate situation?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The honourable member will probably recall the 1965-68 period during which the Planning and Development Act was introduced in this Parliament, but many regrettable steps were taken as a result of the gerrymander that existed between 1968 and 1970.

Mr. Gunn: You can do better than that!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The hills face zone regulations were not as effective as they are now as a result of the amendments to the Planning and Development Act that have been passed in the last two years. The area to which the honourable member refers was subdivided before those regulations, requiring a minimum allotment size of 10 acres (4 ha) and a 300ft. (91 m) frontage, were passed through this Parliament. Of course, it is regrettable that we had, before the advent of a Labor Government that was willing to introduce proper planning legislation, years of Liberal and Country League Governments that were willing to tolerate the situation which resulted in the conditions to which the honourable member has referred. The present position ensures that that sort of situation cannot occur again in the future, and we are hoping that the problem at Windy Point to which the honourable member has referred—

Mr. Gunn: What—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: —will be the last such situation that we see in this State.

OH! CALCUTTA!

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I ask the Deputy Premier whether it is true that the South Australian Government agreed to pay the cost of a court action to fight the injunction granted in the South Australian Supreme Court banning the screening of the film *Oh! Calcutta!* I refer to the article appearing on page 9 of the *Sydney Daily Mirror* of July 9, 1973. This is the report of an address by the Director of Greater Union Theatres (Mr. Keith Moreman) at the annual Queensland Motion Picture Exhibitors Convention at Surfers Paradise, as follows:

He said an injunction granted in the South Australian Supreme Court banning the screening of the movie *Oh! Calcutta!* had caused quite a few problems. He said the South Australian Premier, Mr. Dunstan, had agreed to pay the cost of a court action to fight the ban there.

He was referring to South Australia. I ask this question because I am most concerned about the accuracy of the statement, as it seems strange that the South Australian Government should fight its own legislation.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I certainly have no knowledge of the matter raised by the honourable member. To the best of my knowledge and recollection I cannot remember its being raised in Cabinet. However, I will check, see what information I can obtain for the honourable member, and let him know.

COMMUNITY VIOLENCE

Mr. ARNOLD: Can the Attorney-General indicate to what extent the Government has considered the growing concern and alarm in the community about the increase in sex crimes and crimes of violence? I refer to a letter of November 24 that I received from a mother of several daughters. She states:

It is with growing alarm and concern that I read of the increase of sex crimes in Australia. As a mother of daughters, I ask you to please see if you can let the Government know of my and many other mothers' concern in this field. I implore you to ask for severer sentences in cases of rape with intimidation or violence and at least the death sentence when rape, torture and murder are committed. Please, also get a copy of the atrocities performed on that poor woman in Queensland and give it to the members of Parliament to read, so that they will see the need for a review in punishment for this type of crime. Our society has become very sick when all women are now told to

lock themselves in their own homes to protect themselves from sexual perverts. Why in this day and age does a Government accept this? Are they complacently accepting as normal—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting.

Mr. ARNOLD: I am quoting a letter.

The SPEAKER: Is the honourable member going to read the full letter?

Mr. ARNOLD: This is the last paragraph—
that wives and daughters in Australia are beginning—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member may be reading from a letter. At the same time, the letter contains much comment which may not be germane to the question.

Mr. ARNOLD: Concluding—
to live in fear and mistrust of their fellow men. It is with concern that I await your reply.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must rule out that expression of comment.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I believe that everyone views with concern the increase in the crime rate, not only in Australia but also throughout all urbanized communities over the past 10 years. It is a worrying and disturbing tendency. It is not easy to assign any one cause to this undoubted increase in the crime rate. I know that the increase is not confined to sexual crime: indeed, I am not aware of any evidence that the rate of increase in sexual crime is greater than the rate of increase in crime generally. Certainly, there is in all urbanized societies an increasing crime rate, and in such societies crimes of violence are increasing. This applies throughout all urbanized communities, and it applies whether or not they have capital punishment. It is a disturbing tendency, which requires the closest investigation by trained criminologists and others with the skills necessary to diagnose the causes and to recommend measures to remove those causes.

In Australia, the National Institute of Criminology has now been formed with the support of the Australian Government and of all State Governments. The institute's first acting director is a judge of our own Local and District Criminal Court (Judge Muirhead). Judge Muirhead has enlisted the skills of many of the leading people in Australia who are trained in criminology and associated disciplines. Not only in Australia are investigations taking place into the increase in crime rates. Of course, it is a misleading simplification to suggest that an increase in the penalties for crime will somehow reduce the incidence of crime. All human experience is to the contrary. Indeed, at various times and at different stages of society and history, when punishment has been heaviest the incidence of crime has been highest. I suppose it is trite now to speak of the picking of pockets within the shadow of the gallows at executions in England. That is merely a graphic way of saying that punishment does not of itself reduce the incidence of crime. This certainly applies in the case of capital punishment, because it is plain from an examination of the figures that the incidence of crime does not vary significantly in a certain place merely because capital punishment is abolished; nor indeed is the position different in one country such as Australia where, at various times, we have had capital punishment operating in one State and not in another, yet we cannot detect any significant variation in the rate of capital crime in those two States.

It is simply not true that capital punishment itself will reduce crime. In fact, all the evidence demonstrates that it is not a unique deterrent to crime, and the same can be said about the severity of punishment generally. Although there must be punishments that have the effect of deterring those capable of being deterred by punishment, it is an over-simplification to say that simply by increasing the severity of penalties for crime the incidence of crime is thereby reduced, as that is not true. One of the most unfortunate aspects of the matter is that the more atrocious the crime the less likely it is that the person committing the crime will be deterred by the thought of punishment, because the atrocious crimes are more often than not committed by people who do not respond in a way that normal and stable people respond to the threat of punishment or, indeed, to any other consideration. Psychopathic personalities are unlikely to respond at all to the threat of punishment, and those people are responsible for a great many of the most atrocious crimes.

Therefore, the topic raised by the honourable member is difficult and complex, causing great concern to all responsible for law and order, the administration of justice, and the safety of our community. The problem is shared by Governments and authorities in all parts of the world, particularly in highly urbanized societies where the high density of population, together with the great mobility provided by the motor car, has produced a situation in which crime can flourish and unfortunately does flourish. This problem must be attacked in an intelligent and scientific way. It is necessary to gather all the information we can not only from this country but from other countries and to try to devise the best programme possible to tackle the causes of crime, rather than the symptoms that emerge when the crime is committed.

MILK VATS

Mr. CHAPMAN: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture to investigate the need for bi-ennial capacity inspections of dairy milk vats by the weights and measures section, and more particularly the $13 charge that is paid by dairymen for these inspections? As a result of representations from the dairy industry, I am informed that stainless steel vats are a health requirement placed on all dairymen supplying milk for human consumption. It is claimed that these vats are checked for capacity and stamped before delivery. It is further claimed that they are checked on installation for a fee of $13, and are checked bi-ennially thereafter. I am also informed that there is little or no chance of the vat capacity altering during the life of the appliance. The capacity inspection and charge are seen by representatives of those concerned as superfluous and unnecessary. I seek the Minister's co-operation in this matter and any further information that may be available. Although it is understood that the interests of the consumer public must be observed, it has been pointed out to me that this action by the department with regard to these appliances is questionable.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I think that this question would more properly be directed to the Minister of Lands, who is responsible for the administration of weights and measures in this State. I will refer the matter to him and let the honourable member have a report as soon as possible.

VISTA SEWERAGE

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Works ascertain whether the Engineering and Water Supply Department intends to sewer a part of Vista bounded by David Street, Janlyn Road, and Endurance Street? This area, which has

neither sewerage nor a common effluent drain, is experiencing the problems involved in such a situation. A recently installed sewerage drain finishes at Sandalwood Drive, St. Agnes, which is not far from this area.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will obtain this information for the honourable member and let her have it.

WATER SUPPLY

Mr. RUSSACK: Can the Minister of Works say whether the Government will consider informing, by radio, particularly on days of high fire danger, people in affected areas where water supplies have to be turned off when major emergency repair work has to be undertaken? On Monday, November 19, a day of very high fire risk, there was no water in the Blyth-Brinkworth area. The turning off of water was necessitated by the need to repair a burst main. The President of the Brinkworth Emergency Fire Service has informed me that he was not told and did not know that the water had been turned off. To his knowledge, the only person who was told was the local hotel licensee. In Blyth, the District Clerk was told on the Sunday afternoon and asked to pass on the message to the local hospital and hotel. I understand that hotels are informed because their cooling systems are affected. I appreciate the fact that some effort was made to tell these people that the water would be turned off. However, the general public was placed in great difficulty with regard to the need for waler for domestic use, stock, schools, hygiene, toilets, etc. I understand that, when power is cut off, the Electricity Trust informs people about it. As prior knowledge that water was to be turned off would help people to cope with the difficulties involved, I ask the Minister to consider my request.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As the honourable member's request appeals to me as being reasonable, I will certainly have my. department examine the possibility of doing as he suggests. If it is practicable to do this, where we can we will certainly implement the honourable member's suggestion.

COMMERCIAL MOTOR VEHICLES (HOURS OF DRIVING) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

AUSTRALIAN INDUSTRY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Deputy Premier) moved:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable a motion to be moved without notice.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): Opposition members are willing to support the motion for suspension, as we recognize the need for matters of general concern to be aired publicly. Although the suspension of Standing Orders was denied the Opposition earlier, we will not let this influence our attitude in the present case. I hope that in future Opposition members are also given the chance—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot bring that subject matter into his speech.

Dr. EASTICK: Thank you, Sir, for your advice. We do not look to have anything swept under the carpet, therefore we support the motion.

Motion carried.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Deputy Premier): I move:

That this House is of the opinion that, in seeking to amend the Australian Industry Development Corporation Act, 1970, and to pass the National Investment Fund Bill, 1973, the Australian Government is acting to ensure a proper level of Australian equity and the maintenance of a high proportion of Australian participation in major Australian industrial development without resort by the Australian Industry Development Corporation to oversea borrowing; that the successful passing of these Bills is essential for the proper development of the Redcliffs project in this State; and that this House desires that this State's representatives in the Australian Senate should be speedily informed of this opinion.

First, I appreciate the Leader's co-operation in this matter, but I hasten to assure him that I believe this matter is of a slightly different nature from the matter raised by him.

Dr. Eastick: This is a political spoof, and you know it.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: If that is the case, the Leader will have the chance to deal with it in the debate.

Dr. Eastick: He will.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: At this stage I seek the unanimous support of the House for the motion. The two Bills are now to go before the Australian Senate. They are designed to allow a major Australian Government corporation to seek Australian funds for investment in major Australian industrial developments: in other words, to assist in the national process of buying back the local shop and of making sure we do not lose it in future. They are also designed to allow a very wide range of public participation in Australia's industrial progress.

The reason why these Bills (one an amendment to the Act which set up the Australian Industry Development Corporation to allow it to expand its vital operations; and the other to provide a fund to channel financial resources to the corporation) are of immense importance to South Australia is that if they are not passed by both Houses of the Australian Parliament, the project at Redcliffs is in jeopardy. This House has already passed (almost unanimously) a motion calling on the Australian Government to take all possible action to resolve a deadlock between it and the South Australian Government in respect of the establishment of the Redcliffs complex.

The only dissenting voices to that motion (affecting as it did the proper economic and industrial planning of one of the State's most important industrial regions) came from the members for Goyder and Mitcham. They were concerned with the achievement by the Government of a proper level of Australian equity in the Redcliffs project. That has now been achieved as a result of the motion of this House and of the prolonged negotiations of the Premier. In other words, one of the results of the motion they did not vote for in this House was that it reinforced before the Australian Government the South Australian Government's resolve that Redcliffs must go ahead. A clearer example of State resolve could hardly be found.

Both of the major Parlies in this House agreed that the Australian Government be informed of the necessity of proper industrial development in the mid-north, with all that that means for the stability of the State as a whole. However, having achieved with the Australian Government its commitment to the furtherance of the Redcliffs project (having, in fact, achieved after considerable negotiations between the two Governments, agreements which provide for both the viability of the project and for what amounts to a 51 per cent Australian ownership of the project) the State is now faced with a new attack on the development of this industry from the Opposition in the Senate. We in South Australia are well and truly experienced in the frustrations that a Government can be subjected to by a hostile Upper House. What is happening in Canberra is the same as has happened here many times.

Dr. Eastick: Rubbish!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: What is happening in Canberra in respect of these two Bills is of about the same order: the Opposition has decided that the old catch-cry of "creeping Socialism" is the reason why the Australian Government should not be able to promote a corporation able to raise in Australia and invest in Australia the large sums needed to develop Australia. By doing so, it immediately places in a critical position the funds needed to support the Australian component in the Redcliffs project.

For the benefit of the House then, I will deal with the Australian Government Bills in detail. There are two Bills currently to go before the Senate in Canberra. One Bill proposes to change the charter of the Australian Industry Development Corporation, and the other Bill proposes, through the institution of a National Investment Fund, to channel financial resources to the corporation so that it can fulfil its proposed enlarged objectives. The Bill, which has passed the House of Representatives, has gone to the Senate. It basically contains provisions to alter the shape and the charter of the A.I.D.C.

Dr. Eastick: Nationalize it!

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Rubbish!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Bill removes any restrictions under the old Act (that is the 1970 Act) and it authorizes the corporation to raise money through borrowings inside Australia, in contrast to the previously expressed provision of the Act in which it was required to seek to borrow moneys principally outside Australia. That is the difference and, if the Leader believes we should be borrowing from outside instead of from inside, he must oppose the motion. The Bill also substantially changes the charter of the corporation to enable it to invest in, or to form, or participate in, the formation of a company, or to carry on any business or activity concerned with the manufacture, processing, treatment, transportation, or distribution of goods, or the development of natural resources including the recovery of minerals. Members may be aware that the Australian Industry Development Corporation was formed principally to borrow money from overseas; to acquit any equity so gained in the shortest space of time practicable; and to be a lender of last resort. To do this it has generally pursued a policy directed to securing, to the greatest extent that is practicable, participation by Australian residents in the ownership of capital and in the control of that company or of companies engaged or proposing to engage in the industry. The corporation is also required to have regard to the present monetary policies of the Commonwealth in the execution of its functions. The Australian Government is concerned to ensure that these objectives are followed. Accordingly, it has enlarged their scope to allow for trusts to be set up under the A.I.D.C. board to encourage people and institutions to invest in its activities.

It intends to make the investment in the National Investment Fund attractive enough to obtain adequate financial backing through voluntary subscriptions. Within the fund it is intended that there be different divisions to cater for the requirements of investors; for example, requiring capital growth, dividend payments, and risk capital. Foreign investors would be provided for through the sanitizing of the borrowings. (This terminology is given where the borrowing of debt capital from overseas is transformed directly or indirectly to Australian-owned equity capital.) In South Australia the main project now requiring financial assistance from A.I.D.C. is the Redcliffs petro-chemical project. If these funds are not readily available through capital borrowings to obtain the required degree of Australian ownership, then the project could be seriously disadvantaged.

Members would realize from recent newspaper reports that the Chairman of A.I.D.C. (Sir Allan Westerman), has advised the Australian Government that A.I.D.C. is now so starved of funds that it is unable to carry on any further business. At present the Reserve Bank requires a 33⅓ per cent deposit on all oversea borrowings, and this has effectively precluded oversea borrowing by Australian companies. It could be that this requirement might be waived for the A.I.D.C. but. even so, oversea borrowing could be contrary to present economic policy which is seeking, on anti-inflationary grounds, to slow the expansion in the money supply. The fact is that in South Australia we have the chance of indicating once again to the Australian Government and Parliament that the proper planning development of this State is above Party politics.

Under the Constitution the Senate is a House charged with the task of representing the States in the Australian Parliament. This motion proposes that this House advise it to do so. These Bills coming before the Senate now are designed for the benefit of this nation, and one of the first States in this nation to receive such benefits will be South Australia. The ability of the A.I.D.C. to invest in Australian industries of the magnitude of Redcliffs is essential in a world facing an energy crisis. The ability of the people of Australia and their institutions to invest in their own country's investment corporation in a time of world-wide economic uncertainty is a proper aim of national government. I commend the motion to the House. We have moved for the suspension of Standing Orders this afternoon in order to place this motion before the House so that the South Australian representatives of the Australian Senate can be informed. I hope, of a unanimous decision of this House in the terms laid down in the motion. I do not want to provoke members opposite but the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Kavel by his snigger have indicated how cynical they are. They can be as cynical as they like: we are not interested in the politics of the matter.

Dr. Eastick: Ha, ha!

Mr. Coumbe: Ha, ha!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It would not matter how sincere or genuine we were, these people would still laugh at shadows, at nothing. We are concerned as a State Government to see that Australians have a fair and reasonable opportunity to invest in Australia so that Australia will develop and we as citizens of South Australia will gain the real benefit not only in our industry but also in our mineral resources. If these Bills are frustrated or if they are amended or not passed by the Senate, according to Sir Allan Westerman the death knell of the corporation, which was created by a Liberal Government (Sir John McEwen introduced it), will have been sounded. Surely this is not what members opposite want in this case. I seek their support.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): It will take me only a few words to say, "It will not be supported." The motion is a political spoof, and all Government members know it. This is a blatant attempt to try to take the heat off the "Australian" Government (I place that word in inverted commas because I do not accept it as the Australian Government: it is the Commonwealth Government of Australia), which has made yet another blue in relation to the financial arrangements associated with the brandy industry. We also have a number of other issues, one of which was explained by

the Deputy Premier this afternoon, whereby the Commonwealth Government suddenly found it was not able to implement a promise it made in relation to sewers, and, instead of a grant being made, it was suddenly announced that a loan would be made at 8½ per cent interest.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable the Leader must link up his remarks with the motion.

Dr. EASTICK: I link them up, because this is only one of several failures by the Commonwealth Government to honour its election promises. As it is being criticized because of the announcements it has made in relation to brandy, and as the Premier of this State has condemned the Prime Minister (I accept his responsibility for the community of South Australia), the Prime Minister is now trying, by the back-door method of getting the Government to move this motion, to play down the overall problems associated with Commonwealth Government mismanagement. We have been asked to accept a motion that suggests that South Australia's representatives in the Senate should abdicate their responsibilities to the people of Australia and be pushed into taking an action that is against the best interests of Australia. By this motion they are being asked to get on with the job and pass the measure so that it can be implemented to the advantage of the community without first ensuring that all aspects of the Bills are in the best interests of the Australian people. Members of the Senate with whom I have discussed this measure have indicated clearly that it is nationalization by a back-door method.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Come on! You've got it on the brain.

Dr. EASTICK: Let the Minister get it on his brain. The Minister got his copy of the Bills from the library, but members of the Opposition have not had access to them. There are many issues in the Bills currently before the Commonwealth House that seek to tie down the future development of Australia along lines that the majority of people in Australia do not desire. There is within the scope of the Bills a series of acts which, if put into effect, would completely destroy the future development of Australia along sensible and practical lines.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What are they?

Dr. EASTICK: The Deputy Premier said that the project at Redcliffs was in jeopardy unless the measure was put through the House quickly. I wish now to quote from the proceedings of Senate Estimates Committee F of October 18, 1973, at page 289, under the heading "Australian Industrial Research and Development Grants Board." The persons present were as follows:

> Senator Wriedt, Minister for Primary Industry and Minister representing the Minister for Secondary Industry: and from the Department of Secondary Industry, Mr. R. C. Moore, Assistant Secretary, Management Services Branch, Mr. W. J. Done, Assistant Director, Finance Management Services Branch, Mr. G. E. Bowen, Principal Project Officer, Policy Secretariat, Mr. F. N. Bennett, First Assistant Secretary, Secondary Industry Research Division, Mr. K. G. Purcell, Assistant Secretary, Industry Efficiency Branch, Secondary Industry Policy Division, Mr. E. W. Ryan, Executive Officer, Australian Industrial Research and Development Grants Board and Mr. J. N. Lane, Assistant Director, Industry Efficiency Section, Secondary Industry Policy Division.

The discussion, reported on page 290, is recorded as follows:

Senator DURACK: I do not know. Here we have the Australian Industry Development Corporation.

CHAIRMAN: My advice from the clerk is that it is for another committee to question.

Senator DURACK: No. This is a special appropriation.

CHAIRMAN: I have had a look at it, I have asked the advice of the clerk, and the clerk advises me that it comes within another committee's consideration.

Senator DURACK: I cannot follow this at all. I can follow it where you have expenditure under the control of the Department of Works or under the Department of Services and Property, but this is a special appropriation and is certainly under the Department of Secondary Industry. It could not be under any other department. Everybody knows where the A.I.D.C. resides, and here is the appropriation that has been made. There is no appropriation this year, but it is here firmly under the Australian Industry Development Corporation. I want to ask a question on it.

Senator WILKINSON: I think Senator Durack is right. There is no appropriation and he wants to ask why.

Senator DURACK: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: I will permit it if the Minister is prepared to deal with it.

Senator WRIEDT: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Senator DURACK: I just want to know why no advance is being made this year to the A.I.D.C.

Mr. BENNETT: The purpose of the special appropriation is to provide capital instalments to the corporation. It does not require a capital instalment this year. The instalments it has drawn in the past provide it with adequate capital reserves to meet its present level of activity.

However, a few minutes ago we were told that it was starved for money.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: What is that report?

Dr. EASTICK: The organization does not require a capital instalment this year.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Well, get on with it.

Dr. EASTICK: The Minister must be on shaky ground if he wants to go quickly over all this. The report continues:

Senator DURACK: That is the reason that is given, is it?

Mr. BENNETT: That is the reason why there is no appropriation for this financial year.

Senator WILKINSON: I take it that the second paragraph of the explanation is the answer—that there is $100 000 000 payable and so far $50 000 000 of that $100 000 000 has been drawn and that is all that is required.

Mr. BENNETT: That is correct.

Senator DURACK: That is so, $50 000 000 is its present capital. It was envisaged, at least that it would have a capital of $100 000 000 under the Act and so on, and we are all familiar with the proposed increased activity of A.I.D.C., which is subject to a good deal of discussion at the moment. Apart from the political discussion though, the Government's policy is to expand the activities of the Australian Industry Development Corporation in any event, whether Bills are passed or not. I just wondered why the A.I.D.C. was apparently satisfied with its present capitalization.

Senator WRIEDT: I will ask Mr. Bennett to elaborate on that question.

Senator Wriedt, not a back-bencher or someone who did not know what the Cabinet decisions were, said that. The report continues:

Mr. BENNETT: The purpose of the capital of the corporation is to provide a base for borrowing. It provides a security against corporation borrowings. The corporation may borrow up to four times its drawn-on capital. So it may borrow up to $200 000 000 on the basis of the $50 000 000 capital. Its present borrowings are substantially below that figure.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Where can it borrow the money?

Dr. EASTICK: I am pointing out that the Deputy Premier has told us a short time ago that the organization is starved for funds.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Where can it borrow from?

Dr. EASTICK: I will come to that in due course. As distinct from its being starved of funds, which I suggest is incorrect information given and which destroys the Deputy Premier's argument, the officers of the Department of Secondary Industry who deal with financial matters have

given the information about the present financial position of A.I.D.C. The report continues:

Senator DURACK: It does not anticipate needing to borrow beyond that in this financial year?

Mr. BENNETT: That is correct.

CHAIRMAN: There being no further questions, I thank the Minister and the officers from the Department of Secondary Industry for their attendance.

Clearly, those who are in charge of A.I.D.C. and who are responsible for raising and distributing the funds, when questioned as recently as October 18, 1973 (only five weeks ago), have given that information. On October 16, when the Australian Industry Development Corporation Bill was being debated at the second reading stage in the House of Representatives (reported at page 2161 *et seq.* of *Hansard*), at page 2163 Mr. Lynch, the member for Flinders, stated:

Under the new provisions the Government proposes to exploit the greater fund raising powers of the A.I.D.C. The A.I.D.C. could raise increased funds within Australia on its own account, through the National Investment Fund, and from the Australian Government. There would be a shift in emphasis from external to internal fund raising. These additional sources of investable funds will eventuate in a minimal net addition to the community's savings since Australia has already achieved a very high savings rate by international standards. The main effect will be a diversion of savings away from other financial institutions and towards the A.I.D.C. Under these circumstances the overall proportion of assets owned by Australians will only increase if the buy-back operation causes displaced overseas capital to move out of Australia. Any increase in Australian ownership in the buy-back areas will be directly offset by reduced Australian investment in other areas. Moreover, any increased Australian control that does occur will be in the hands of the A.I.D.C.

Many other parts of this debate that I could quote would be equally as revealing as the extracts that I have read. I point out to members opposite that my clear understanding from my discussions with people associated with the debate, which will proceed later today or tomorrow in the Senate, is that those persons are mindful of their responsibility to the Australian community and of the dangers that exist in the Bills before the Senate at present, and I believe that they will not abdicate their responsibility to the people of Australia by accepting the Bills without a clear and concise revelation by members of the Commonwealth Government of the true interpretation of the legislation. I believe that the measures in the Senate will not be passed within the next few days (time alone will tell), because Senators recognize the importance of investigating throughly by a committee of inquiry all aspects of the Bill and the effect it will have on the corporation in the future. In the past, the Opposition has said that it recognizes the value of the corporation, provided that it works in the interests of the whole of Australia. However, as the measures which are currently being discussed and which this motion seeks to influence are not in the best interests of the Australian community, I oppose the motion. I oppose it also because I recognize that the funds currently available to the corporation are adequate to implement the work to be undertaken at Redcliffs.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That's not so.

Dr. EASTICK: The Minister and his colleagues have undoubtedly received assurances from the Commonwealth Government about the position.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Not at all.

Dr. EASTICK: The same Minister not long ago told us that no school in Australia would be disadvantaged as a result of the implementation of the school aid scheme, whereas some have been disadvantaged. Ministers and their Commonwealth colleagues told us that we would have grants for sewerage, whereas we are not receiving any. The Premier wrote around seeking funds from the wine industry for the Commonwealth Labor Party's campaign prior to December 2, 1972, on the basis that the industry would not be disadvantaged in the future, whereas it is being disadvantaged. The Commonwealth Government sought to upset the arrangement that existed for the completion on time of the Dartmouth dam, and it failed, and the Opposition supported the move that it should fail. The same thing happened in regard to the help that was to be given young people regarding the interest they would pay on loans for their houses, but what has happened? Not only have they not received any benefit: they have witnessed a rapid escalation of the interest rate. On the basis that we have been misled so often by Canberra since the present Government took office, together with the revelations contained in the documents I have read to the House, I believe that the Ministers are jumping in on a political spoof, which has been recognized by the Opposition and which will prevent it from accepting any part of a ridiculous motion such as this.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Development and Mines): I will try to keep to the terms of the motion, although I noticed that the Leader of the Opposition was able to ramble from Dan to Beersheba. I would like to start by pointing out that I believe that I have a higher estimate of the Leader's colleagues in the Senate than he has. The Leader said, in effect, that they are a group of hidebound ideologues who are not willing to listen to a reasonable appeal from the elected representatives of the people of South Australia. He said also that, as they will refuse to pass the Bill, what we are doing now is a pointless exercise. I have a slightly higher regard for these honourable gentlemen than has the Leader. I believe that this is a useful exercise and that the Liberal Senators would want to know what this Parliament considers to be in the best interests of the people of this State.

Consistent with my desire to speak to the motion, I will briefly set out six premises on which I base my conclusion that a vote in favour of the motion is irresistible. I will allow succeeding speakers to study those premises and to answer the points I raise and any other points that may have anything to do with the substance of the motion. The first premise is that all members are committed to the Redcliffs project. I believe that is true and, if it is not true, any honourable member can say so in the House. The second premise is that all members support the Australian Government's 51 per cent Australian equity requirement in the project. Again, I believe that is true and, if it is not true, any honourable member can get up and say otherwise.

The third premise is that the 51 per cent Australian equity cannot be obtained within the necessary time table without the corporation's participation. Certain Opposition members might like to come to grips with that point. We are aware that two Australian companies will be participating in the project, namely. Colonial Sugar Refinery Company Limited and Ampol Petroleum Limited, but neither one is in the position, so far as I am aware, to be able to bring the Australian equity to the 51 per cent level, which, on the first two premises I put forward, is necessary to the success of the project. So, we need the corporation's participation in the project if we are to get to the necessary level of Australian equity so that the project, which we all support, can reach fruition. Then I would add that the corporation will be unable to participate at the necessary level within the necessary time table without the oversea borrowings that would have to take place, unless it can obtain its equity by other means.

Mr. Millhouse: Are you in favour of the 51 per cent equity?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: My Government has always been in favour of the maximum possible Australian equity in the project. I am in favour of it, and the honourable member knows it. What we were concerned about previously was to get a decision in the matter. We were able to get a decision, and we fully support that decision. But, given the decision we were able to obtain, the corporation's involvement is absolutely necessary to the project.

Mr. Millhouse: You didn't want 51 per cent.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The honourable member will have his chance to oppose the motion, if he wishes to do so. However, I am not even sure that he will want to gel to his feet.

Mr. Millhouse: I'll get you on your change of mind.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mitcham will have his opportunity to speak. The honourable Minister of Development and Mines.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I wonder whether the member for Mitcham, like the Leader of the Opposition, will speak to the motion if he gets to his feet. The corporation will not be able to participate at the necessary level within the necessary time table, which is vital, without being able to raise the capital it can raise in the way envisaged by legislation currently before the Australian Parliament. My next premise is that oversea borrowings by the corporation, into which it would have to move under its present charter, would run counter to the Australian Government's current anti-inflationary policy of restricting capital inflow.

Mr. McAnaney: What do you mean by "anti-inflationary"?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: We have been told by many experts in the field that the member for Heysen is well versed in economics. Let him rise when the time comes and deny, if he likes, that one way of combating inflation is restricting capital inflow. Let the honourable member deny, if he can, that the Australian Government has tried, and tried successfully, to restrict capital inflow. There is no doubt that one of the major sources of present inflation in Australia was the virtually unrestricted inflow of capital from abroad during the time of the previous Government in which Mr. Snedden was Treasurer, and the present Government has been able to restrict this.

The point the Leader has overlooked is that, while it may be possible for the corporation under its present charter to participate in the Redcliffs project within the necessary time table and at the necessary level of Australian equity by borrowing overseas, to do so would be to run counter to the express policy of the Australian Government which I would have thought members opposite would be willing to support in Older to restrict capital inflow, in the interests of an anti-inflationary policy. My final premise I have already made in speaking to this one, namely, that this policy is necessary, desirable, and will remain so for some considerable time. We as a Government are heavily committed to this project along the lines which have already been worked out and which have been known to the people of this State.

Mr. Hall: They are not known.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The people of South Australia also are heavily committed to the 51 per cent equity arrangements as well as to the involvement of the corporation. I have set out the reasons why I believe it necessarily follows that the passage of these Bills through the Senate is necessary for the time table and the level of equity to be maintained. The Opposition has the matter in its hands and, if it wishes to vote against the motion, it can do so, and it will be for the people to determine why this opposition was expressed. I want to see the project proceed along the lines explained. I do not want to see it proceed in such a way as to jeopardize the Commonwealth's anti-inflationary policy.

Do members opposite believe that this is the only project in which the corporation is interested and in which it will want to participate? There are many other major developmental projects in which it is proper and desirable that it should be involved. We cannot expect that this Stale will be able to secure the overwhelming commitment of those funds: we must expect that other States will also have a call on the economic muscle which will be available to the corporation. All States have their developmental projects. Although we as South Australians would like to see a high priority given to our projects, we must be willing to agree that other States have the right to call on the corporation at the same time. Further (and I believe that ideological arguments should not enter into this), we are committed to the mixed economy. No-one would seriously deny that Government should not be involved in modern industrial development. Under the Industries Development Act, this State Government is involved in industrial development; we are able to take up equity capital in industrial concerns, and have done so.

What more is there than Government being involved in the economic sphere to the point of equity or ownership? If members opposite do not like those arrangements, they have had their opportunities here from time to time to suggest that those sections of the Industries Development Act that allow us to use this weapon should be repealed. I hear no criticism of those sections, and we can certainly use them to a much greater extent than we have done hitherto.

Mr. Coumbe: Are you speaking as a past Chairman of the Industries Development Committee?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Just in the short time I was Chairman, the committee was willing to give its approval to the Industries Assistance Corporation's taking up equity capital in two industrial concerns. The concept of the mixed economy, which is enshrined and which is to be developed in the amendments before the Senate, applies also in our State legislation.

Mr. Gunn: Another example of blatant Socialism!

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The honourable member, by his disorderly interjection, merely underlines the point I am trying to make: that the opposition to this motion is based not on pragmatic grounds but on the grounds that certain people are completely opposed to the Government's being involved in the economic sphere whatever. The involvement of the South Australian Government in the economic sphere and the limited involvement of the Australian Government in the economic sphere through the existing Act under which the A.I.D.C. operates are moves that have been sanctioned by previous Liberal Governments.

Mr. Keneally: What would members opposite say if the Australian Government were not interested in primary production?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: This is why I regard members opposite as fig-leaf Socialists rather than true free-enterprise advocates. I have tried to be as concise as possible in condensing into six brief statements the reasons why the arguments in favour of the passage of the motion are irresistible. Let members opposite answer them if they can.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I oppose the motion, because it is a blatant piece of political humbug, the type we are getting tired of in this House. When the Opposition has tried to raise on several occasions matters which it has considered to have been of considerable importance to the people of this State, it has been denied that right by the Government.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: When?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I remember trying to raise the matter of the broken promise of the Commonwealth Government in respect of aid to independent schools.

Dr. Eastick: On July 24!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: We were told that this was not a matter concerning the State Government: it was within the province of the Commonwealth Government. I remember a motion moved in this House, soon after I was elected to Parliament, seeking to censure the then Commonwealth Government (then a Liberal and Country Party coalition) in respect of the Commonwealth Budget. It seems to be all right for the Government to bring such matters up at a minute's notice, but when the Opposition has proper grounds for complaint it is always a matter for the Commonwealth Government.

This motion asks us to pass in this House a vote of censure or no confidence in the Commonwealth Senate. However, if ever the people of Australia have a Chamber to be thankful for during the life of this Commonwealth Government, it is the Senate. I refer to some of the radical legislation which the Commonwealth Government has sought to pass and which has been modified by the Senate with the overwhelming approval of the majority of the people in Australia. Indeed, this bears eloquent testimony to the value of that House. Further, we know that it is Labor Party policy to abolish State second Chambers and to abolish the Senate. Yet this motion asks us to influence the Senate in their work. This is political humbug.

How many Government members know the details of Bills currently before the Senate? We are here being asked to make a snap judgment on the say-so of the Deputy Premier, yet I understand he has had access to the only copy in the Parliamentary Library of the two Bills concerned. What sort of responsible attitude is that, when the Government is asking us to give a decision on this matter? L am confident that the Senate will consider the matter in detail; indeed, it will give the matter far more consideration than the cursory consideration being given in this debate. I received a copy of the motion about 10 minutes before it was moved.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: The Leader had it before 2 p.m., and that is something he has never done for us.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The fact is that we have had short notice of this motion. We are expected to get hold of these Bills, study them, and give a considered judgment about whether what is, in effect, a censure motion in the Senate should be carried. What sort of political humbug is this? The Deputy Premier has said that certain projects could be disadvantaged; he is not even sure that they will be disadvantaged. I doubt whether he is fully familiar with the details of this legislation. He asks us to be above Party politics. Where does he stand with regard to the broken promises of his Commonwealth colleagues, who are making liars of themselves? How far above Party politics are they? Irresponsible promises were made at the election that cannot be fulfilled, yet the Commonwealth Government now expects the public to accept its back-flip. The Prime Minister is a lawyer, and we know that lawyers are handy at bandying words about. A firm undertaking was given that there would be no increase in taxes (and we have the wine tax situation involved here). Now we are told that there will not be an increase in taxes but that the Commonwealth intends to raise more revenue by altering tax arrangements.

Even if this did not represent a piece of political humbug, I would be inclined to oppose the motion. We have not had time to look at this matter properly. The Government has been irresponsible in introducing the motion at such short notice. No doubt when the member for Mitcham speaks he will point out how the Government was annoyed with the Commonwealth Minister for Minerals and Energy (Mr. Connor) when there looked like being a delay with regard to the Redcliffs project. Surely the Government does not seriously expect us to support a motion such as this.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): I support the motion, which is not only in the interests of the Australian community generally but also very much in the interests of this State. The member for Kavel has treated us to much abuse and misrepresentation, but I do not intend togo into that kind of argument. The issue that arises is whether or not the Australian Industry Development Corporation will be permitted to borrow internally rather than overseas. This position is different from that referred to by the Leader, who said that the corporation has a capital entitlement of $100 000 000 of which at present only $50 000 000 has been paid over. That capital cannot be put at risk by the corporation, which must hold it against any borrowing undertaken by it, the corporation being allowed to borrow up to four times its capital. The matter at issue basically comes down to whether or not the corporation is to be permitted to borrow in Australia as well as overseas. At present, all oversea borrowing carried out privately involves depositing with the Reserve Bank 33⅓ per cent of the sum borrowed. Certainly, the Government would be entitled to exempt the corporation from that provision, although undoubtedly there would be a tremendous scream from all private interests if the Australian Government did that. However, in circumstances where the 33⅓ per cent deposit with the Reserve Bank is adhered to, clearly the cost of oversea borrowing increases enormously.

The second point to make is that any capital inflow, just as with any increase in exports, in present circumstances involves a direct increase in the money supply. Therefore, in circumstances where the Government policy is to mop up excess liquidity, capital inflow or an increase in exports will run counter to that policy, or it will have the same effect, as will have any other means of increasing the money supply, of increasing the overall liquidity of the economy. That means that in current circumstances if the corporation were to expand its borrowing significantly it would be running counter to the anti-inflationary policy presently being adopted by the Australian Government, unless it were permitted to borrow internally when there would be no monetary consequences of that borrowing. I find myself puzzled by the view of the Leader that this is somehow back-door nationalization, and I hope other members opposite will not take that view. As the Minister of Development and Mines pointed out, every member in this House voted for legislation to permit the South Australian Government to take up equity capital in private companies through the Industries Assistance Corporation.

Mr. Millhouse: There wasn't even a division.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: True. There was no suggestion that that was nationalization. I admit that the ability of the Industries Assistance Corporation to undertake

this type of activity is very limited, because that corporation either has to be provided with funds through the Budget or it has to borrow, its borrowing as a semi-government organization being subject to the financial agreement so that it could borrow only up to $400 000 in any one year without affecting equally the borrowing of other semi-government instrumentalities or of the State Government itself.

It is certainly true that we have a limited ability within the State, because of the financial agreement and the Australian Government's overall control on the amount of finance that can be generally made available, to raise funds and involve ourselves in a huge project such as the Redcliffs project. All that is involved in the amendment to the Australian Industry Development Corporation Act now before the Australian Parliament is to permit it to borrow internally, and to provide for a general expansion of its charter to enable it to take out shares and to be involved or be a partner in a project such as the Redcliffs project. Outside the ideological battle that tends to go on in a phoney way in Canberra, no member of this House really objects to that kind of thing. We have been involved in that sort of approach on pragmatic grounds time and lime again When the pipeline authority was established in South Australia, and the South Australian Government was to provide the full cost partly through borrowing and was to set up a statutory authority to build and run the pipeline, there was no opposition in either House of the Parliament.

However, people who were ideologically prejudiced with regard to private enterprise might well have thrown up their hands in horror at the idea of the Government running a pipeline. Subsequently, when I visited the United States of America and spoke to several gas producers and representatives of gas pipeline companies that were privately owned, and said that the pipeline authority in South Australia was a Government corporation and that the Government operated the pipeline, they all threw their hands up in horror. Honourable members will be aware that many business people in the United States regard any Government action as a complete prostitution of economic activity and have an almost paranoiac attitude to Government operations. However, that has not been so in this State.

I know that some Opposition members were not in the House when the pipeline authority legislation was passed, but it was passed unanimously, with the full support of Sir Thomas Playford and the members for Mitcham and Goyder. It is the kind of project which we have accepted in this State and which has been accepted over the years throughout Australia. Government in Australia has always been involved in economic activities and the running of enterprises. I must refer to the energy crisis that is now apparent in the world. In future it will become much worse than it is now, and it may be that the present Middle East situation will calm down and—

Mr. Millhouse: Come on: get back to the motion!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will make clear what the tie-up is.

Mr. Hall: You're on a time limit; you're under control now!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is a pity that the members for Mitcham and Goyder were not under some control at times. When they were members of the Liberal and Country League, they were more under control than they are today. They now have complete irresponsibility, and do not have to worry about getting back into power or of being responsible for any decisions they may make. The position I alluded to is that, whilst the present Middle East crisis may ease and we may have a temporary reprieve in the energy crisis, the long-term prospects are dim and there is no doubt that, for the future of this nation and of the world in general, the problem of providing adequate energy will be critical. It seems to me (and I put this on pragmatic grounds free of ideological hangovers with which others may be concerned) that, in a community like ours, the responsibly elected representatives of that community have a basic responsibility to ensure that the energy resources of the community are properly conserved and developed in the overall interests of that community.

The Redcliffs project is important from that point of view, and I believe that a majority Australian participation in that project is extremely important. I am delighted that 51 per cent is to be achieved, but this 51 per cent apparently requires the participation of the corporation. No matter what one's views ideologically are about the role of private enterprise, the need to support the proposition that the development and conservation of our energy resources should be under the overall control of the elected national Government is beyond dispute. To oppose an approach such as the involvement of the corporation in Redcliffs (or in general projects throughout Australia, particularly concerning energy) because it involves Government in economic enterprise activity, seems to me to be so archaic and nineteenth century, and so much a representation of an extreme right-wing point of view, that it is almost beyond belief. Yet, the Leader of the Opposition said this afternoon that amendments now before the national Parliament represented some kind of nationalization.

Mr. Gunn: Of course they do, and you know it.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I would have expected a real right-wing reactionary like the member for Eyre to say that, and he said it. We know that the honourable member does not believe in the national interest. He believes in the national interest being controlled by private individuals who are outside the control of the Australian people.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: And not many of them, either.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If the honourable member says what he has just said, that is the kind of proposition he is supporting. The honourable member is supporting the control of resources essential for our future development by private individuals completely outside the care and control of the elected representatives of the people. That is the kind of right-wing reactionary attitude that is almost Fascist in character.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: It is Fascist.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is a pity that the member for Eyre makes that sort of statement because he feels involved in the Party-political battle in this House, but he should not make that kind of statement. I am sure that, if the honourable member accepted some guidance from the member for Goyder (and he desperately needs guidance from someone), the member for Goyder would give it to him, and that his attitude on these matters would be greatly improved. The motion is straightforward: it recognizes the involvement of the corporation in the Redcliffs project; it recognizes by implication that the amendments are necessary to allow the corporation to gain further funds internally within Australia; and it recognizes that this is in the overall Australian interest and in the interest of development in this State.

By implication it also recognizes that further oversea borrowing at this stage, by directly adding to the money supply, would be inflationary. The member for Kavel said

that the Government was introducing a motion with little notice. On October 18 the Leader of the Opposition, without giving notice to any Government member, moved to suspend Standing Orders in order to move a motion in relation to the Australian Minister for Minerals and Energy (Mr. Connor). The Leader received suspension of Standing Orders without having indicated to the Government what the subject matter was and without giving any previous notification. I suggest to the Leader and to the member for Kavel that I am sick of hearing that the Australian Government's policy is designed to provide—

Dr. Eastick: Commonwealth Government!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is the Australian Government: we are one country and this State is part of that country. I am not going to be governed by some hidebound conservative attitude that, because the Constitution states "the Commonwealth", we have to say "the Commonwealth". We are all Australians, and the Government that represents Australians is the one in Canberra, and that is the Australian Government. The Australian Government's policy on education—

Mr. Gunn: What about you?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am an Australian: I am not a Southern Rhodesian, some other kind of reactionary, or someone who is living in the past or who wants to take piddling points—

Mr. Coumbe: Aren't you a migrant to South Australia?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am still an Australian, proud of being a migrant to South Australia, and I am proud of my background. I have nothing to hide so far as that is concerned. I am sick of members like the Leader and the member for Kavel when dealing with a policy which benefits 99 per cent, or more, of Australian schools—

Mr. Dean Brown: What has this got to do with it?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am referring to a point made by the Leader and the member for Kavel, who suggested that we could not trust the Australian Government. That was the point, and they used schools as an illustration.

Dr. Eastick: That was only one of many.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It was one they used in a completely false way.

Dr. Eastick: No, it wasn't.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It was. After all the fears expressed in this House, South Australia has only one category A school and—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The example the Leader and the member for Kavel used was completely false, and I am replying to it.

Dr. Eastick: The promise was that no-one would be disadvantaged.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The fact of the matter is that 99 per cent—

Dr. Eastick: That's not 100 per cent.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I know it is not 100 per cent.

Dr. Eastick: The promise was 100 per cent.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: In fact, 99 per cent of Australian schools and schoolchildren will benefit. The attitude of the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Kavel to this motion is similar to their attitude to education policy, because they will allow the 1 per cent who may not be as well off as previously to govern their whole attitude, and they will ignore the 99 per cent who will benefit. That is what the Leader of the Opposition has done on this occasion, and his attitude to this motion is essentially one of, "Look, we have got a possible political advantage in the Senate. To hell with the Australian interest; we must look after our own Party's point of view," (his Parly's narrow, small-minded, little-L.C.L.-Party point of view). I think it is a great pity that the Leader of the Opposition was not capable of adopting a broader attitude than the one he adopted this afternoon. We supported his criticism of the Commonwealth Government in this House on two matters—

Mr. Coumbe: When it suited you.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Oh well, it never suits a Party in power in one State to criticize colleagues in power in Canberra.

Dr. Tonkin: I think it would suit you very well just at the present.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The member for Bragg is being deliberately uncharitable. He and the Leader of the Opposition are not prepared to criticize at all their colleagues in Canberra. They are not saying a word about that. They are not willing to say that action contemplated by their colleagues in the Senate could be wrong.

Mr. Dean Brown: They didn't break their promises.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The member for Davenport is a relatively new member—

Mr. Gunn: And a pretty good one he is, too.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I do not know; he has been identified with the ordinary ratbag views the member for Eyre expresses. That may make the member for Davenport, in the eyes of the member for Eyre, a good member but it does not make him one in the eyes of everyone else. I will not say what it makes him, because I might transcend the Parliamentary rules of debate if I did. On many occasions the Government has risked the ire of our Canberra colleagues and—

Mr. Coumbe: You have done as you were told.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Nobody tells us what to do. We adopt an independent attitude. We do not have a Party Caucus like the members of the L.C.L. have.

Dr. Eastick: That was the Premier's pay-out; instead of being able to announce the consortium, Mr. Connor announced it for him.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: In the long run that is irrelevant—

Dr. Eastick: The Premier did not think it was irrelevant.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: He may have been upset al the time but in the long run what is important is not who announces a project but how effective the development of the project is in the interests of the State and what is going to happen for the ultimate benefit of the people in this State and in Australia generally, and that is the corporation's policy. These arid Party-political arguments of the sort that some members opposite want to indulge in are really most unfortunate and not something that should intrude into this debate. This debate points out a need that vitally affects this State and we are asked to work together in order to fulfil that need.

Mr. Coumbe: I wonder why the Minister got up to speak at all.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Because of the garbage that colleagues of the member for Torrens were indulging in, and because of some of the misinformation they were putting out! This does not involve nationalization by the back door: it involves Australian participation in a national project, and Redcliffs is a national project in the interests of not only South Australia but Australia overall, and it is necessary to have the corporation's participation in order to ensure that it goes ahead. I support the motion.

Mr. HALL (Goyder): The Government has moved a motion that members of the L.C.L. cannot understand, and they will not be able to grasp its importance to South Australia and Australia generally. The Government has the problem of its own insincerity in the way it has handled the Redcliffs project since it was announced. It will not help the debate on this motion to recapitulate the way the project was announced and the way the Premier claimed to have had a report on the possible pollution effects on Spencer Gulf when he did not have that report. He deliberately misled the people of South Australia on that matter. The Government then combined with the L.C.L. Opposition in a motion to deny the principle, first, that there should be 51 per cent Australian ownership of the Redcliffs project and, secondly, that no liquid petroleum should be exported from Australia under this programme. All members of this House, except three (members of the Liberal Movement and the Country Party), voted against that motion.

That is not a very happy background for this motion. 1 rather enjoyed the speech of the member for Kavel, because he is the only one of all the Liberal and Country League members who knows how to attack the Government, and it is a pleasure to know that he is back in the House and can, for a change, direct a few words to the Government that look like an attack. One of the Government's problems is that the Liberal Opposition looks at every project as though it will always be in Opposition, both here and in Canberra. It never sees itself as being a Government in charge of the legislation it is considering.

Mr. Keneally. It'll always be an Opposition.

Mr. HALL: As long as it has this attitude, I must agree with the member for Stuart that it will always be an Opposition. We of the L.M. have other plans, however.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member must link up his remarks with the motion.

Mr. HALL: I will link them up. The L.C.L., in considering this proposition, is adopting a pre-1938 ideology. It has not yet caught up with the politics of Sir Richard Butler or Sir Thomas Playford. I remember making a speech in Queensland on Tuesday, February 8, 1972, when I occupied a position different from my present one, and I gave two examples of Government involvement in industry. I stated:

> In 1950, Tom Playford in South Australia guaranteed the Adelaide Cement Company $2 000 000 to build more production units and expand its operation. That loan kept its ownership in Australian hands. The company prospered and became the most efficient cement producer in Australia. A short while ago it took over the Brighton Cement Company in Adelaide, outbidding British interests to do so. Government action in 1950 enabled this favourable chain of events to occur. We also had Cellulose Limited, a pine log to cardboard manufacturer, which began operations in 1938 and was partly Government-owned.

The Leader of the Opposition ought to listen to this, because he does not seem to have listened to anything else in recent months. I also stated:

> The then L.C.L. Butler Government initially took up a large parcel of shares (in fact, the enterprise would not have begun without that support) and the Playford Administration bought into further share rights a number of years later.

Has the Leader of the Opposition been listening to that statement that the Cellulose company would not have existed if the Butler Government had not purchased shares?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Was that back-door nationalization?

Mr. HALL: I do not care what it was, and I will say something to the Minister soon. In that speech I also slated:

> Our L.C.L. Government sold that shareholding in 1969. I do not know of any opposition from the Labor Party in South Australia when the shares were sold to the other major producer, a company located in the District of Millicent. Both Apcel and Cellulose are owned by one company now. Looking back, I can say that that was a successful enterprise, and it was better that it was established. It lies in with modern thinking to which other members have referred in this debate. Section 16g (1) *(b)* of the Industries Development Act, 1971, as printed at page 143 of the Statutes, deals with the powers of our corporation. It gives the Government power—
>
> to subscribe to the capital of any corporation that engages or proposes to engage in an industry by the purchase of shares.

Sir Richard Butler did that formalizing in 1938, and does anyone on this side of the House deny the validity of his action? Sir Thomas Playford, all through his long period of success, referred to Sir Richard as the father of industrialization in South Australia. However, the attitude of the present L.C.L. denies that and the member for Eyre cries "nationalization!" when there is a prospect of action being taken on a national scale. The Government, in its many failures regarding Redcliffs, continues to keep us in the dark about what is happening. We do not know what negotiations have taken place and we do not know what share percentage and equity the A.I.D.C. will have. We have not been reassured that the corporation will be involved in the project, and we ought to have the information to which I have referred. The lack of it does not help us to discuss the motion rationally and logically.

However, I will vote for the motion on the basis that what may be involved will be a choice between oversea ownership of a large section of Redcliffs and ownership of shares by the corporation. If I, as an Australian citizen, had to choose between whether I wanted the Government to be involved through an organization sponsored by the corporation and whether I wanted direct ownership by a large oversea concern, I would choose Australian ownership through the corporation. Would any member here not do that? We should have had detail in speeches on this motion, but Government members and two of the Opposition members have not provided any detail. I understand that the member for Davenport is the next speaker, and he should say whether he wants an oversea corporation to own the project or whether he wants A.I.D.C. involvement.

Of course, doubtless his opinion (and the opinion of other members of his Party) is conditioned by the thought that they will always be in Opposition. However, I do not expect to sit on the Opposition side always, even though my task may be tortuous because of smaller representation. I will use any influence I have to assure that Australian Government ownership is disposed of to the public at the first possible and proper opportunity, and obviously the people who originated the proposal did so in order to help develop private industry.

In the absence of the member for Kavel, who has now returned to the Chamber, I paid him some sort of compliment. He is the only L.C.L. member who knows how to speak up and attack the Government, and I give him credit for that. However, our views diverge on this issue, because I consider he does not appreciate the ramifications of the motion and needs more time to study them.

Mr. Dean Brown: Will you—

Mr. HALL: The member for Davenport has come up again with that attitude of Opposition impotence. He cannot understand the use of Parliamentary power. The very way this motion has been moved and debated by the Opposition, loose though the argument has been, shows that the Opposition in the Senate has the power to deal with the legislation. Everyone in the House has been saying that, so let us tell that Opposition how to deal with the matter. Do members believe that the Opposition in the Senate cannot amend the legislation to its liking? In general terms, the motion asks that the Bills be passed essentially in a form that will allow the corporation to operate, and surely members here have enough confidence in their own colleagues to believe that they will delete the objectionable clauses and make the legislation work on behalf of private industry. To take any other view would be to adopt a completely negative attitude.

Mr. Dean Brown: But when—

Mr. HALL: The member for Davenport adopts the perpetual negative attitude about which I am speaking. Why can he not adopt a positive attitude?

Mr. Goldsworthy: What's your argument?

Mr. HALL: I am arguing that this motion must be supported and that members of the Opposition in the Commonwealth Parliament will deal with the Bill according to their own reasoning to ensure that the essential provisions are passed. One fallacy in the original Bill involving the A.I.D.C. was that the corporation organization must not take a risk. That was really a failure in the original Bill and it was a different attitude from that adopted by the Butler and Playford Administrations, which took risks in support of industries. In some cases, such support cost the taxpayers money, but generally the risks have paid off.

One failure of the corporation has been the denial of its right to take risks, and I hope that this will be corrected in the amending Bills. I do not give unqualified support to the Bills now before the Senate. However, it is ridiculous to take the basic view that Opposition members have taken by way of speech and interjection, namely, that there should not be an A.I.D.C. The member for Eyre and other members have a basic fear of the corporation. That is the only thing that we can gather from the Leader's speech. It is time that the L.C.L. and several of its supporters grew up in respect of this measure and understood that no-one is poking his thumb in the face of foreign investors in Australia: we are merely saying that in future we should see that as much of Australian industry as possible is owned by Australians. Nearly all representatives in Australia of foreign companies agree with that.

Mr. Mathwin: They object to—

Mr. HALL: If the member for Glenelg is trying to say it does not occur in other countries, he does not know anything about it. In nearly every other under-developed country in the world there is an insistence on local participation in ownership. The representatives in Australia of foreign companies agree that as much future investment as possible should be owned by Australians. Indeed, I believe this is proper maturity and we cannot achieve this with too much foreign capital. Everyone knows that Australia's economic strength as it is today has been based largely on foreign involvement; indeed, no political Party could deny it nor should deny it.

As a corollary of that, no political Party should deny our aspirations for the future in respect of Australian ownership. Therefore, the views of the Opposition are puerile: it does not take a broad stance, from a political viewpoint in Canberra, about the details of these two Bills, but it will try to shy off all the political implications of this motion. I do not care what the Minister of Education sees in this, or what devious plans he may have for nationalization, because my political ambition is to displace him, as well as his colleagues in Canberra, and amend any legislation I do not like. Indeed, that should be the objective of everyone who sits here in Opposition, but it should not prevent the support of a general trend in legislation.

However, the attitude of the L.C.L. Opposition members here means that unless they get it according to their own design, with every "t" crossed, we should not have it at all. That is a stupid political view. The motion has been put before us and there is only one way on which we can vote on it: we have the choice of accepting further oversea ownership of Redcliffs, or the alternative of Australian ownership through A.I.D.C. participation.

I hope that if the corporation does take up or buy a shareholding in this project it will dispose of its shares to the public sector or to other industrial operators, as in the case of Cellulose Australia Limited, at the earliest opportunity. Further, I refer to the history of the sale of the Commonwealth Oil Refineries interests, sold out by a Liberal Government, as well as the disposal of Amalgamated Wireless (Australasia) Limited shares. Any future shares held by the corporation should be disposed of by a non-Labor Government.

If, in the meantime, an enterprise is helped off the ground to become Australian owned, I do not object. Having said that, I believe I have been consistent in supporting this motion in respect of the policies I have supported in the past two years. I know that the L.C.L. Opposition here does not understand what we are talking about, and that does not surprise me. We know that this motion will be carried, and I suppose that L.C.L. members will vote against it, believing that there is some support for what they call their Senators in Canberra. However, their Senators in Canberra are evident only just before election time.

I remember the recent observation when someone asked when anyone last heard anything from a South Australian Senator, Liberal or Labor. About a day later a Senator moved a motion in respect of wine tax, and we realized, of course, that the Senate election is next year. That is the only time we hear anything from a South Australian Senator, and that is why I do not feel sorry for our Senators getting a kick in the pants from South Australia; indeed, they need more such kicks.

Generally, I deplore the way this debate has been handled. From the Government's side there has been an almost complete lack of information. As I have already said, we have been given no indication of how important is A.I.D.C. involvement in the project. Instead, we have simply heard statements concerning its importance, and we must accept that, in the absence of any other evidence, we would adopt a negative attitude. However, the one thing we must have is a progressive attitude, and the attitude expressed has been a negative attitude: that we cannot afford it. This House should support the motion. However, I wanted it to be on the record that that does not mean I support the objectionable proposals in the Bills in the Senate. I support only the motion asking that A.I.D.C. be given flexibility in its financial resources to support the Redcliffs project.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): I must immediately clarify certain false impressions given by previous speakers of L.C.L. policy. First, the L.C.L. supports 51 per cent ownership in Redcliffs. Secondly, we support an effective A.I.D.C. operating within Australia. This afternoon we

have heard members opposite and members on the cross bench trying to hit at the L.C.L. in support of this motion. However, the whole purpose of members supporting the motion is one of political gain. True, members opposite have different reasons for supporting it from those of members who sit on the cross bench. Indeed, the last speech was an attempt to woo the Australian Labor Party voters at the next Senate election.

Much play has been made that the L.C.L. members are not interested in a 51 per cent interest in Redcliffs. In fact we are, but we are concerned about how that 51 per cent equity is to be obtained. We will not sell Redcliffs down the drain, unlike members opposite or those sitting on the cross bench. The member for Goyder referred to a speech he made in February, 1972, and he gave an example of Australian ownership. However, it is interesting that there he was referring to loan capital, yet here we are referring to equity capital. If the honourable member does not appreciate the difference between loan capital and equity capital, he certainly should not be speaking on this motion.

Mr. Millhouse: Would you have agreed to the passing of the Acts concerning Cellulose?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: We are referring to the National Investment Fund Bill, which is before the Senate at present. Speakers supporting the motion this afternoon have condemned the action of the Senate. Do Liberal Movement members fully appreciate the reasons for the Senate's objecting to that legislation? Indeed, I gained the impression from his speech that the member for Goyder had not even read the Bill.

The legislation provides for the establishment of a national investment fund in Australia, for the fund to supply finance to the corporation. We should examine immediately the consequences of this fund raising if such legislation proceeds. First, such a fund will completely destroy the Australian capital market, because the proposed national investment fund has the ability to raise capital under most privileged terms that no private enterprise in Australia could possibly offer. Therefore, this will effectively destroy the whole Australian capital market. It will mean that private enterprise will be unable to obtain the capital for investment projects such as Redcliffs.

Secondly, the proposed fund will bring about inefficient allocation of capital funds within Australia, because the funds will be allocated under artificial conditions rather than the natural conditions of the present capital market. Such artificial conditions will lead to great inefficiencies, as any Liberal worth his salt will appreciate. Any Liberal worth his salt will certainly oppose legislation such as that now before the Senate, because that legislation is contrary to the fundamental principle behind Liberal philosophy.

Mr. Millhouse: Which is what?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Therefore, I am rather surprised that the member for Goyder said that he would support the national investment fund legislation currently before the Senate. Obviously, if he is a Liberal he has not read that legislation or, if he has read it, he is not a Liberal. Certainly, if that fund is established it will be used as a means of nationalizing Australian industry. Great play was made about this by the Minister of Education and other members opposite. In effect, what is proposed will lead to the nationalization of industries. The Australian Government will supply the equity capital and, if its demands are met, will have full power over that capital. At Redcliffs. it is proposed that 51 per cent will be Australian-owned through the corporation, and this will effectively nationalize Redcliffs.

Mr. Millhouse: Would you rather not see Redcliffs at all or see a nationalized concern?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: If the honourable member will wait a moment, I will deal with that matter.

Mr. Millhouse: Deal with it now.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: As presently constituted, the corporation can effectively provide loan funds for industrial development in Australia and can do so on the basis that Australians control the use of that capital.

Mr. Payne: Using oversea loan funds.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Yes. I was rather surprised that the Minister of Education, who is a former economist (no wonder he got out of that field), did not point out the consequence of this. There is a certain amount of Australian capital that can be used for investment in gaining Australian equity. Certain oversea capital comes to Australia and we have two choices as to how to use it: either we allow oversea companies to buy equity in Australian companies or we allow the corporation to control that capital, making sure that it is used for the benefit of Australia. That is the point that the Minister of Education failed to raise and it is exactly the basis on which the Australian Liberal Government last year and in previous years supported the present concept of the corporation. Destruction of that concept would open up Australian companies to oversea financial interests. It is simply a matter of where priorities are placed, and we base our priorities on safeguarding Australian equity in Australian companies. We would use finance to Australia's advantage.

Mr. Millhouse: When will you answer that question?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I am still coming to it. As presently constituted, the corporation has good guidelines. First, it can use oversea capital to invest in Australian industry. However, it cannot remain indefinitely in control of that equity capital. It is provided that it must sell out as quickly as possible to private enterprise in Australia I should have thought that was a most desirable characteristic for any Government financial body to have. To destroy that aspect is to destroy so much of the effectiveness of the corporation. Moreover, the corporation must borrow from overseas. I have already pointed out the advantages to Australian industry, as well as in protecting Australian interests, that follow from the corporation's having to borrow from overseas rather than from inside Australia. If Australian finance were raised in Australia that money would be taken from Australian equity, which would mean that we would be selling Australian equity to oversea interests.

Mr. Millhouse: You haven't come to that point yet.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I now come to the point raised by the member for Mitcham. I reiterate that the L.C.L. supports the construction and development of Redcliffs. We also support the idea that 51 per cent of the equity capital should be Australian-owned. As presently constituted, the corporation can supply much of the funds fdr this project. The Minister of Education said it could not do this, because it would not import oversea capital, and he referred to that glorious bogy of inflation. However, I suggest that the Australian Government is not really worried about inflation: nothing could be further from its mind. If that Government wanted to import oversea capital it would do so, regardless of the effect on inflation. Instead, it is trying to pass legislation that will slip in nationalization under the carpet. We could raise 51 per

cent Australian equity for Redcliffs, first, through the A.I.D.C., secondly, through the Australian Resources Development Bank, and thirdly (if we really needed this, and I do not think we would, because the corporation could supply sufficient capital), through the open capital market. Government members become irate when they ser.se a possible threat to Redcliffs, but they are trying to conceal the true facts about Redcliffs. I have been told several relevant facts by people in the petro-chemical industry. First, it is well known throughout the industry that Dow Chemical Company is 18 months ahead of I.C.I. in technology so that, in choosing the I.C.I. consortium, we have ended up with a consortium that does not have the technical advantage possessed by the other consortium. Secondly, I believe (although I do not have any evidence, except the authoritative source to which I referred) that Dow Chemical—

Mr. Millhouse: Will you give us your authoritative source?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The gentleman does not wish to be named. I believe that Dow Chemical would finish the project and be producing well before I.C.I. can finish building the plant. I understand that, after losing the contract here, Dow Chemical has looked elsewhere and found a site on which to develop a plant that will be producing the same chemical products before I.C.I. will be producing them here. It seems that there is evidence to suggest that the South Australian Government wanted Dow Chemical to win the contract, but it was our dear friend the Commonwealth Minister for Minerals and Energy who insisted that the contract must be awarded to I.C.I.

At present the Senate is carefully examining the Bill to establish a national investment fund. For three good reasons it will reject or severely amend that legislation, and I sincerely hope that it does. If the Bill is not amended, the Australian capital market will be distorted and that will lead to the inefficient allocation of capital funds within Australia and will particularly encourage the nationalization of Australian industry. I have suggested why the corporation, as presently constituted, could raise oversea finance and invest that finance through the Commonwealth Government control in Redcliffs. I have indicated that members of the L.C.L. support a 51 per cent Australian equity in Redcliffs and support the building of that project as quickly as possible. Also, I have outlined ways in which we can achieve the 51 per cent Australian equity. For these reasons I applaud the actions of our Senate members at this stage. Because I believe they are taking a responsible attitude towards the National Investment Fund Bill, I strongly oppose the motion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I did not get my question or any other question answered, but I will deal with that in a minute. It is really delightful to observe the obsessive way both the bigger Parties in this Parliament regard the Liberal Movement. The member for Davenport spent most of his speech attacking the attitude of the member for Goyder who had spoken in this debate.

Mr. Nankivell: Rubbish!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The honourable member said that the sole reason for our supporting the motion was political gain and an attempt to woo A.L.P. voters. The Acting Premier, when moving the motion, was just the same in what he said. He was kind enough to let me have his notes, and they show that right at the beginning of his speech he could not keep the L.M. out of it. Harking back to the motion debated a few weeks ago, he said:

The only dissenting voices to that motion (affecting as it did the proper economic and industrial planning of one of the State's most important industrial regions) came from the members for Goyder and Mitcham. They were concerned with the achievement by the Government of a proper level of Australian equity in the Redcliffs project. That has now been achieved as a result of the motion of this House and of the prolonged negotiations of the Premier.

Perhaps it was a back-handed compliment, but the Acting Premier could not leave us out of his speech: he brought us in quite early. The member for Davenport was precisely the same. I paid him the compliment of listening to his speech and, interjecting by way of intelligent questions, I asked him what he would have done about Cellulose, but he turned his back on me and would not reply. We had much that was airy-fairy from him, but when one tried to pin him down to a precise example he would not reply.

Mr. Payne: He couldn't find it in his notes.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know what he was doing, but he would not come out either for or against the actions taken by Liberal Governments on that matter. I persistently asked him (and you were indulgent with me, Mr. Speaker, and I appreciated that) whether he would rather not see Redcliffs built or have a nationalized industry, but he would not answer that, because he could not. The honourable member knows that the future of this State will be significantly affected by the Redcliffs project, and he does not (if he can avoid it) want to be seen to be against it. However, on the other hand, because of his theoretical objection to nationalization, he does not want to admit that it would be better to have Redcliffs even if it were a nationalized industry. These things show the dilemma in which the L.C.L. finds itself today, and the member for Davenport was the third speaker on the L.C.L. side, so he had a prominent place in what could be called the batting order.

The fallacies in the attitude of both major Parties were underlined by the member for Goyder. The Liberal Party and the Country Party, together with the Democratic Labor Party, have a majority in the Senate, and they can amend these Bills if they want to. The Government has the choice of either accepting or rejecting the amendments (that is, of taking what it can get) or of being accused of being a dog in a manger. At this stage the choice is the Government's and, if the Commonwealth Government wants to be a dog in a manger (and the result would be that we would lose Redcliffs because the corporation could not get the capital to pul into it and would not have it on any other terms), that is the decision of the Commonwealth Government and of no-one else. Both the major Parlies at some stage of the legislative process in Canberra have it in their hands to decide whether Redcliffs goes on or does not go on. I suggest that that point has been overlooked, I believe deliberately, by the A.L.P. in this debate. It will be up to the Commonwealth Government whether Redcliffs goes on: if it rejects the Bill because it will not accept the amendments inserted by the Senate, the direct result will be that Redcliffs will not be proceeded with.

It will be the Government's choice, as it will be the choice of the colleagues in Canberra of the L.C.L. in this Parliament, whether the Bill is defeated or amended. Let us be clear on that point. If we are clear on it, we must realize that this debate is a hollow sham and a waste of Parliament's time. During the weekend, when I saw the Notice Paper, I wondered how we would occupy ourselves today and for the next couple of days before getting up for Christmas. The Notice Paper is pretty thin and, if it were not, I do not think we would have debated this motion this afternoon. We are debating it

simply because the Government can afford the time to play a bit of politics, and it is playing politics on this matter. One must admire the Government's tactics this afternoon. It has been clever and has left the L.C.L. absolutely flat-footed on this matter. We have found out during the course of the debate that the L.C.L. knew about this motion before the House met this afternoon. That courtesy was not shown to members of the Liberal Movement, nor to the sole Country Parly member in this House. L.C.L. members were given advance warning of this, yet they were still left absolutely flat-footed and they have fallen completely into the trap laid for them by the Government. Unless the point I have made is taken up, they will be seen as jeopardizing the Redcliffs project by voting against this motion. The Government has played politics very well indeed on this and I admire their tactics. It is the sort of thing I would like to think I would do myself if I were in Government. In fact, we did it a couple of times when we were in Government between 1968 and 1970. But the L.C.L. is still a sitting target for this sort of thing. Its members cannot possibly ever react quickly enough to avoid the traps set for them. I support the motion and I respectfully adopt the arguments put by the member for Goyder. I want to see the Redcliffs project go ahead and I doubt if it can go ahead in the present political and financial climate of Australia without the assistance of the corporation. The matter is as simple as that.

That does not mean to say I accept without reservation the terms of the two Bills which are befote the Senate, but which the South Australian House of Assembly seems to be spending. its time debating. Having paid the Government a compliment on its clever tactics this afternoon, I question the fairness of those tactics. This motion was moved without notice, certainly without notice to us, although we now know that the L.C.L. did have some hours notice of it. The motion relates to a complex matter, which is the subject of bitter debate in another Parliament, and it was introduced by a speech read at such breakneck speed by the Acting Premier that I found it impossible to comprehend it while it was being read.

Mr. Venning: But you were given a copy of it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Oh yes, and I want to be fair about that. When I asked him for his notes, he gave them to me immediately and they were a great help to me. However, other members want them as well and I am the only one of 46 other members in this place. There may be some significance in that. All these things are a little unfair, but on the other hand the L.C.L. could have, but did not, ask for an adjournment. The Leader of the Opposition, poor chap, fell into another trap because he made a little speech in the debate on the motion for suspension.

Mr. Payne: He supported that motion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, the Leader of the Opposition fell into a trap, this time of his own making, because he made a little speech on the motion for the suspension of Standing Orders in which he said that, unlike the Government which had just denied him the right to have Standing Orders suspended, he would not hold up the Government by doing the same thing. Having said that, he could not then ask for the adjournment of the debate. It was a pity he tried to be clever in that way because, if he had held his fire, it would have been much better for him, because the L.C.L. could at least have taken a little time to consider its attitude on this matter.

Mr. Nankivell: What's in the motion?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not think the L.C.L. likes what I am saying. They are trying to get me off the point.

Mr. Becker: You think you're on the stage.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: A couple of weeks ago the member for Hanson was calling me one of the black crows and, before that, I was Heckle or Jeckle. The honourable member went quiet after the abduction affair, but now he wants to get back into full flight because he hopes that little episode is forgotten. I will now get back to my notes.

Mr. Venning: You have got notes, have you?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not need them. In moving this motion, the Government is running true to form as the junior partner of the Commonwealth Labor Government in Canberra. There is no doubt whatever that the scheme of the Labor Party is to use South Australia as best it can as a pilot for its policies and ideas, and we find time and time again that members of this Government will defer to what is proposed by their Commonwealth colleagues. When we heard this afternoon from the Minister of Development and Mines in this debate, I tried to nail him on the question of Australian participation in the ownership of the Redcliffs project. I do not know whether the member for Hanson will take this as a compliment or not, but the Minister reminded me of the honourable member. I have noticed often during this session, when I have asked the honourable member an innocent question by way of interjection when he was speaking and it was a bit hard for him, that he turns his back on me and will not look at me. The question may not be too difficult, but it may be a bit hot, so he turns right away.

Mr. McANANEY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. What has this drivel got to do with the motion?

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. The honourable member must continue his remarks on the basis of speaking to the motion before the House.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: May I refer to the speech made in this debate by the Minister of Development and Mines, because he did precisely the same thing. I tried to nail him on the question of equity, which had been raised by. the Acting Premier in his speech, and I deliberately quoted from the speech, but the Minister turned his back on me and pretended not to hear what I had to say. He never did give me an answer to the question I asked, because he knows that he was one of the bunch of hypocrites on his side who two or three weeks ago voted against an amendment moved by the member for Goyder in favour of 51 per cent Australian ownership in this project and within a week they were told by their Commonwealth colleagues, their senior partners, that 51 per cent it was going to be. The Minister for Development and Mines would not admit today that there had been any change of heart, but during that debate every member on the Government side avoided stipulating any proportion at all. It was always "a very high level of equity" or something like that. They did not mention 51 per cent, nor did the members of the L.C.L. They all voted against Australian ownership, yet a week later Mr. Connor came out and said it was going to be 51 per cent and they gave in to it lamely. Now every member of this House is apparently of the same opinion. If that does not show the hypocrisy of this Government in its dealings in this matter, I do not know what does. The Minister of Development and Mines would not face up to that point this afternoon, and no-one in the L.C.L. Opposition has dared to face up to it either, because L.C.L. members know that on this matter they were obviously wrong and that the best way they can hope to get over the position is by ignoring it and, like the member for

Hanson on another matter, hoping that people will forget about it. This is all hypocrisy and it shows that this motion is all politics and does not mean a damned thing except that it tries to embarrass the L.C.L. members and, through them, members of the Country Party and the Liberal Party in the Senate. However, I do not believe that this motion will have much effect in Canberra: apparently, nothing that we do here has effect there. All that the Government members want to do is score a point if they can. In my view, that is as much as the motion is worth.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You will support it, will you?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Kavel knows that I will vote for the motion. He may pretend that he has not been listening, but he has been, as have all his colleagues. They cannot trick me in this way. We only have to count how many L.C.L. members are present now to see that. I see now that the member for Mallee is leaving the Chamber but I do not think we will miss him much; he is so seldom here, anyway.

Mr. Gunn: You ought to talk!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I really do enjoy the antics of L.C.L. members. If I am not here they notice it, and if I am here they wish I were not. I do not know how to take them, but I must say I never did know how to take them. I feel much more comfortable now that I am a member of a decent Party. I will support the motion for what it is worth because, on balance, we want Redcliffs, whatever the price may be so far as its ownership is concerned. However, I do not consider that this is a genuine attempt to help Redcliffs: it is merely an attempt, for want of any better business to put before the House, to embarrass the L.C.L.

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

That the question be now put.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (23)—Messrs. Broomhill, Max Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Crimes, Duncan, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King (teller), Langley, McKee, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.

Noes (19)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe (teller), Eastick, Goldsworthy. Gunn, Hall, Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Dunstan and Groth. Noes—Messrs. Evans and Rodda.

Majority of 4 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

The House divided on the Hon. J. D. Corcoran's motion:

Ayes (25)—Messrs. Broomhill, Max Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran (teller), Crimes, Duncan, Hall, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, McKee, McRae, Millhouse, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.

Noes (16)—Messrs. Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick (teller), Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Nankivell, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Dunstan and Groth. Noes—Messrs. Allen and Rodda.

Majority of 9 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

NATIONAL PARKS AND WILDLIFE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister of Environment and Conservation) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the National Parks and Wildlife Act, 1972. Read a first time.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

The SPEAKER: The question is that the Minister have leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without his reading it.

Dr. Tonkin: No!

The SPEAKER: Order! Leave is refused.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: At the time of the passage of the National Parks and Wildlife Act in March, 1972, several of the provisions of the former Fauna Conservation Act relating to the use of guns for the hunting of animals were not included in the lew legislation. At that time it was intended to include those provisions in an amendment to the Firearms Act but, as it subsequently became apparent that the whole of that Act needed revision, it was decided to leave consideration of the problem until such a revision could be carried out. It is still the Government's intention that legislation relating to the control and use of firearms will be tightened.

However, in the period since the passage of the National Parks and Wildlife Act, it has become further apparent that controls over the hunting of animals are needed, and numerous representations have been received from property owners and sportsmen seeking controls over irresponsible hunting, both by guns and other means. The present Bill provides a new requirement that persons wishing to hunt must take out a hunting permit, and provides the machinery for the issue of such permits. Exemptions from this requirement are included principally to enable landowners to destroy pest fauna on their properties or to carry out their responsibilities under the Vermin Act.

I am pleased to announce that the revenue received from this source, less administrative costs, will be paid into the Wildlife Conservation Fund established under section 11 of the Act for the future conservation of wild life. So that there will be no difficulty for a person in obtaining such a permit nor excuse for not complying with the requirement, it is intended to make an approach to the Commonwealth Government for the issue of such permits from post offices (as well, of course, as being available from the National Parks and Wildlife Office in the city). One of the intended features of such a permit is that there will be a basic fee for the right to hunt, whilst an additional fee will be required in the case of hunting animals for which an open season has been proclaimed.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the Bill. Clause 3 is formal. Clause 4 enacts a new Part dealing with hunting permits. New section 68a creates an offence of hunting, or possessing a firearm for the purpose of hunting, without a permit. The Minister may grant permits for periods not exceeding 12 months. A person shall be presumed to have a firearm for the purpose of hunting, if the firearm could be used for that purpose and there is some other evidence of intention to use it for that purpose. Certain exemptions are given so that vermin, animals that endanger life, and animals (other than protected animals) that are causing damage to crops, etc., may be destroyed. An exemption is also given so as to avoid the obligation to take out more than one permit under this Act. A definition of "hunt" is given.

Mr. ARNOLD secured the adjournment of the debate.

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (T.A.B.)

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

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 22. Page 1932.)

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): This legislation indicates a most disturbing state of affairs. The Totalizator Agency Board has got into serious difficulties, and this will have an impact on the finances of this State. I read with interest the second reading explanation of the Minister of Education.

Mr. Evans: Was it really given by the Minister of Education?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It seems strange for the Minister of Education to be handling this Bill. Normally it would fall within the province of the Chief Secretary, whom the Attorney-General represents here, but the Attorney-General is in enough trouble, anyway. I suppose they are sharing the burden. Indeed, the Minister of Education recently took some interest in forestry. However, I can understand his sharing the problems confronting the Government. This Bill reflects a most unhealthy state of affairs. I do not profess to have known a great deal about the situation in T.A.B. before I read the second reading explanation, in which the Minister stated:

> To illustrate this position I will set out in some detail the board's involvement in Dataline Holdings Proprietary Limited, an involvement which is now fairly well known and which has resulted in the board's present unhealthy financial position.

I doubt very much whether this has been well known to the public at large or to most members of the House, although I dare say it was well known to the Chief Secretary. Later in his explanation, the Minister stated:

> It is known that expenditure on Databet is to date about $1 500 000, and it is not yet clear just how much of this should be taken into account in fixing the total amount of the rebate.

That rebate refers to a rebate of stamp duty that has been allowed to T.A.B. for capital investment and establishment costs. There is clearly disturbing information in this explanation that I did not know before I read the explanation.

Mr. Coumbe: Don't you think the public should have been told about this?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: The statement was made by the board.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The sum of $1 500 000 is not chicken feed. Obviously, T.A.B. is not out of the woods yet, so this legislation is really the basis of a recovery operation. It is difficult to apportion blame for this rather sorry state of affairs. What we have to do is make up our minds whether to support the legislation, and it seems to me that we do not have much option but to support it. The position is undecided. The legislation seeks to put the operations of T.A.B. under closer scrutiny of the Treasurer, since in future the Treasurer will have to approve borrowings by T.A.B. and, upon that approval, repayment will be guaranteed by the State. That is highly desirable. It is a pity that the operations of T.A.B. have not been under the scrutiny of the Auditor-General.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: The Act does not require the Auditor-General to audit in this case.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It is a pity that he was not involved. If this had been a Government instrumentality, the Auditor-General would have had a good deal to say. about what has happened. Being as charitable as we can, we must agree that it is highly desirable that the operations of the board be scrutinized by someone. Under the legislation, the Treasurer or his officers will now be involved with some of the board's operations, and I agree with that. The Opposition is not so happy about the second provision in the legislation dealing with a further rebate of stamp duty for T.A.B. until it gets out of this mess. Even this provision is not clear. In the explanation, the Minister sketchily traced the history of the relevant operation of the board, as follows:

> In July, 1971, the board became involved in a contract with Dataline Systems Proprietary Limited for the manufacture of computer equipment for on-course totalizator operations . . .

The board bought one computer, which did not work, and apparently got another for spare parts. The member for Hanson may have more details about this than I have. The board was involved in something outside the original concept of its operations. It is disturbing that a board set up by an Act of Parliament should have engaged in operations outside its original concept and that it should have got into serious difficulties. I am disturbed by the information contained in the second reading explanation and by the fact that there has not yet been any real assessment of what the Government is up for.

Mr. Coumbe: Do you think it's a scandalous position?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not think that description is too strong. Obviously the company with which T.A.B. became involved is grossly over-capitalized. No real assessment has yet been made as to how much money will have to be allowed as rebate. It is unrealistic to expect that the racing industry could help in this situation from its diminished returns. We all know the difficulties under which racing clubs are operating in the State at present. I will support the second reading because in the Bill the Government is undertaking a recovery operation to try to correct a most unsatisfactory situation which has developed and which will cost the taxpayers of the Slate much money.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I support the remarks and attitude of the member for Kavel. It is a pity that we are faced with legislation with which we will have to agree but which deals with a situation that should never have occurred. This board should never have been placed in this situation by its administrators.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It's no good just to blame the administrators.

Mr. Gunn: Blame the Chief Secretary; he should resign.

Mr. BECKER: The Minister has had no experience in management or in private enterprise. However, he should know as well as. I do that a board supervises the operations of its executive staff. If the executive staff makes a recommendation, the board examines it, but the board is there to be advised by the executive staff, otherwise there would not be an executive staff. In the case of T.A.B., the executive staff is of high quality and standard. Most members of the management of T.A.B. are highly successful businessmen in their own field. It is not putting it too strongly to say (as has already been said) that there is a scandal involved with regard to this Databet system. T.A.B. has been taken for $1 500 000 and we must approve legislation to rescue it because, if we do not do so, the racing industry will lose $1 500 000. No political Party or Government would say that the racing industry should sustain this loss. Members know the situation in which the racing industry finds itself at present.

Mr. McAnaney: The bookies are keeping it broke.

Mr. BECKER: I do not agree with that. As there is an inquiry into racing in South Australia at present, one wonders why this legislation has been brought in now, particularly at this stage of the session, because the report of that inquiry will be brought down within the first two months of the new year. I assume that the report of the inquiry will relate to aspects of the Totalizator Agency Board and of Dataline Systems and the Databet project. I understand that in evidence (and I have not seen all the transcript of the inquiry) a statement was made that T.A.B. should continue to manage off-course totalizators only and not be involved in on-course totalizators. Apparently, this has caused the problem. I suppose the management thought it would become involved in on-course totalizator operations. Last year it lost $70 000 to operate the on-course system at Globe Derby, and it is expected it could lose between $110 000 and $120 000 next financial year on on-course operations. Any T.A.B. loss, particularly for on-course totalizators, is money that is being denied to racing. Therefore, racing clubs (horse-racing, trotting, and greyhound-racing) must share in this loss. In the report for the 1972 financial year the Chairman of T.A.B. said:

On-course totalizator operations are conducted by the board on 18 courses. In an endeavour to provide a much more effective system than the current manual operations, the board is developing, and having manufactured, computerized totalizator equipment. This equipment will, after the usual testing periods, be ready for introduction during 1973.

Later in the report it is indicated that T.A.B. took out a contract with Dataline Systems for a computer card equipment system, and written into the report is an amount of $276 000 under the heading "Investments, shares, and advances". We assume that that was the amount involved to June 30, 1972, in Dataline Systems. A note in the balance-sheet for that year provides a commitment for capital expenditure, namely, (a) balance payable under terms of contract to Dataline Systems Proprietary Limited for computerization, $391 140; (b) balance payable under terms of contract to Dataline Systems Proprietary Limited for remaining installation of security equipment, $13 800. That meant a total payout of $404 940. In the report dated August 27, 1973, the Acting Chairman said:

The board has continued to support the development of a fully computerized on-course totalizator system by Dataline Systems Proprietary Limited for use on South Australian courses with compatibility for off-course use. To safeguard its interests in regard to its contract the board became a majority shareholder in this organization. Unforeseen delays have occurred in meeting contract target dates, and a working system is now scheduled to be available in March 1974.

In his second reading explanation the Minister said that T.A.B. purchased 46 per cent of shares in Dataline Systems Proprietary Limited for $150 000; it purchased the remaining share capital, or 54 per cent, for $27 000. When it purchased the initial shares, it must have valued the company at more than $300 000, but when it paid $27 000 for the remaining 54 per cent of the shares, it must have valued the company at about $50 000. Later, it sold 18 per cent of the shares for $7 200 in order to retain two key personnel. The question is: what is the value of Dataline Holdings and what is the value of the shares that T.A.B. has in the company?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: We know the question, what is the answer?

Mr. BECKER: We find the executive staff of T.A.B., considered as top management experts, making such investments.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: The board didn't do that.

Mr. BECKER: It was done with the approval of the board.

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

Mr. BECKER: The seventh annual report of the Totalizator Agency Board, which is for the year ended June 30, 1973, states:

		$
NOTE 1	Investment in Dataline Holdings Proprietary Limited at cost	169 800
	Advances to Dataline Systems Proprietary Limited at cost	122 632
		292 432

There is a contingent liability for guarantee of a bank overdraft of Dataline Systems Proprietary Limited up to $200 000, and at the time of the report the amount overdrawn on that guarantee was $198 998. The report continues:

The South Australian Totalizator Agency Board owns 82 per cent of the share capital of Dataline Holdings Proprietary Limited (incorporated in Victoria) which company owns all the issued share capital of Dataline Systems Pty. Ltd. As at June 30, 1973, the liabilities of Dataline Holdings Proprietary Limited and its subsidiary exceeded tangible assets by $344 208. The investments in Dataline Holdings Proprietary Limited and advances to Dataline Systems Pty. Ltd. are therefore not supported by net tangible assets. The board is of the opinion that the development work undertaken by Dataline Systems Pty. Ltd. will provide profitable trading opportunities for the company in the future and that therefore there is no necessity to provide against diminution in the value of the investment and advances at June 30, 1973, as the diminution in value is not considered to be of a permanent nature.

That is a surprising statement when we consider that an organization known as B.C.A. Management Services Proprietary Limited was commissioned to make a survey of the activities and operations of Dataline Systems Proprietary Limited between July 24 and August 2, 1973. This survey really provides the crux of the whole issue and gives the reason for these two amendments. One amendment authorizes the board to borrow money guaranteed by and with the consent of the Treasurer at a reasonable rate of interest, and so the board will be able to waive the stamp duty payments to the Government covering purposes specified by notice in the *Government Gazette,* whether those moneys were so expended before, on, or after the commencement of the Act.

We take it that we will be authorizing the expenditure of public money to cover the proposed losses of this organization. We will leave to the board whether it goes ahead with the dataline system, but the Treasurer will have an oversight in respect of what is done. The report on the survey to which I have referred makes some startling observations. It states:

The following aspects of S.A.T.A.B. and D.L.S. interrelationships were examined by the consultants:

The S.A.T.A.B. statements of operational objectives for the Databet system;

The operations of Dataline Systems in relation to—

S.A.T.A.B. requirements;

Product quality specifications, product performance standards and product quality control.

The survey examined the feasibility of statements that Dataline Systems Proprietary Limited had hoped to be able to operate a fully operational system less doubles, trebles and forward betting, by February 28, 1974. Before it could even do that on a computer, there was a cost of at least $50 000 to provide the wiring, and so on. The survey revealed that doubles, trebles and forward betting facilities could be offered manually from February 28, 1974, at

Globe Derby Park, with a fully automated service being dependent only on the completion of some hardware (the computer) and some software (knowing how to sell) expected not later than June 1, 1974. It seems, from the operations and involvement of the project, doubtful whether the board would be able to introduce this service.

It is also interesting to note that the board, to obtain the right to conduct the on-course totalizator at Globe Derby, arranged a guaranteed loan of $450 000 to the trotting club to help the club with improvements. I do not think anyone would deny that that action was unusual and that similar action had not been taken previously. However, there is intense competition between the totalizator companies in this State. We have Automatic Totalizators Limited and Bertram and Thomas Totalizators. Normally the racing club approaches one of these organizations to have it operate the totalizator for it on the course.

The club could arrange the totalizator, but in this case one company offered to operate the totalizator on-course at Globe Derby and offered to pay the club, I understand, 3¾ per cent of the turnover. This company was outbid by the board, which offered 4¼ per cent of the turnover. The T.A.B. was successful and received 8½ per cent of the turnover on-course. It pays an amount to the club and from the balance it must meet administrative expenses. The present turnover on-course at Globe Derby is about $20 000 a night. The board, from its 8½ per cent share, pays an amount to the club and retains $900 to pay wages and all operating costs each evening. That is why the board, in the first year, has lost about $70 000 in operating that totalizator. That was a fairly expensive folly if the board was gambling on the fact that an endeavour would be made to have a computer operating on the course. The report of the survey also states:

Achievement of the February 28, 1974, target, originally conditional upon acceptance tests successfully completed on July 27 and 28, 1973, is now conditional upon:

- the reinforcement of the board of Dataline Systems Proprietary Limited as set out later in this report;
- the reinforcement of the management of Dataline Systems Proprietary Limited as recommended later in this report;
- the immediate investment of $7 500, if necessary by leasing, in equipment vital to the progress of the Globe Derby Park databet system;
- the investment of $450 000 by S.A.T.A.B. in registered secured notes in Dataline Systems Proprietary Limited as set out later in the report between now and June 30, 1974.

The reason for the additional $450 000 going from the T.A.B. to Dataline Systems is that from now until June 1, 1974, Dataline Systems will lose another $321 000. To back up that evidence I refer to the cash-flow budget. It is expected that Dataline Systems will lose from July 25, 1973, $44 000 in that month, the losses continuing until June up to $24 000, aggregating $321 000. No matter how much money is to be poured into the company there is still no guarantee that it will be eventually successful. Other regrettable facts are highlighted in the report. Item 10 states:

The measures recommended are considered by the consultants to be the only means of assuring that the S.A.T.A.B. can recover the full value of its investment in Dataline Systems Proprietary Limited. The possibility of taking a decision now to terminate Dataline Systems Proprietary Limited's operations immediately on the close of its S.A.T.A.B. and Zieron contracts has been considered but this choice is not recommended. Details are set out in later sections of the report, which indicate that there are profitable short to medium term income earning opportunities for Dataline Systems Proprietary Limited provided that effective financial, board and management structures are adopted.

The crux of the issue is that effective financial, board and management structures be adopted. How was the T.A.B. able to get itself into this situation? Under the heading "Background data relevant to acquisition and subsequent operation of Dataline Systems Proprietary Limited", the report continues:

The initial goal of S.A.T.A.B. which resulted in involvement with Dataline Systems encompassed a world-wide marketing effort to support a new, untested concept in automated on-course bet processing.

Mr. Keneally: That is great stuff.

Mr. BECKER: It is, and members should know about it. Despite Automatic Totalizators having been in business for many years, that company was never consulted, even from an advisory point of view, as to whether the concept outlined by Dataline Systems would ever be workable. What happened? The report continues:

Dataline Systems was, at the time, a very small and dependent company which required both financial and management support for its development.

Item 17 states:

Dataline Systems was (and still is) a completely hardware manufacture oriented company with no resources available to provide the necessary software design, development and support for this project.

Item 18 slates:

Dataline Systems projected its funding requirements to December, 1973, at $500 000 for operation of the company and $80 000 expenditure in plant and equipment on the assumption of sales in the areas of computerguard, remote control equipment and two totalizator systems.

Item 19 states:

S.A.T.A B. choice of D.L.S. as the supplier of the Databet system concept was made without tender request from other reputable manufacturers and suppliers of equipment and systems.

How can any business go into something like this without calling tenders and without making inquiries? The report continues:

20. Because of conditions prevalent at the time, the agreed management support of D.L.S. by S.A.T.A.B. was not forthcoming to the anticipated level.

21. The projected overhead coverage to be derived from computerguard security systems was nullified to some extent by apprehension on the part of qualified customers to the continued stability of D.L.S. due to S.A.T.A.B. involvement in the company.

22. D.L.S. was aware of market opportunities but lacked the marketing expertise toprogress the opportunities.

These facts should be disclosed. Members should be aware of what happened and what did not happen. The report continues:

The S.A.T.A.B. did not adequately research the operational viability of D.L.S. before acquiring its 46 per cent interest, D.L.S. having at that time neither the technical nor the economic resources or reserves to undertake as large a task.

Let us be fair. Dataline Systems did not inform the T.A.B., and this is where the problem lay. True, we can be critical of the T.A.B., but at the same time we should also be critical of Dataline Systems, an organization which hoodwinked certain business men, and I am interested to see that the report states:

Dataline Systems did not—

- adequately convey to S.A.T.A.B. the full nature and extent of the complexities involved in the Databet system development;
- properly support the S.A.T.A.B. with technical knowledge to facilitate project planning;
- convey to the S.A.T.A.B. the full ramifications of its plans to fund overhead coverage from computerguard business, particularly when conflict arose later between its interests and those of S.A.T.A.B.;

justify project and other funding requirements to enable the S.A.T.A.B. to provide balanced adequate and comprehensive allocations of funds;
provide comprehensive progress reports for monitoring of system progress or of expenditures;
properly manage the Databet project as a total effort but rather as a group of unrelated, independent tasks;
properly manage its overall business as a total effort but rather in a crisis atmosphere, one aspect receiving attention after another as the need became critical.

This is where they conned the poor old T.A.B. into the operation. In respect of item 28, the report continues:

Despite the comments made, it should not be concluded that all aspects of the Dataline Systems venture have been failures. In fact, the reverse is true. An effort of this type, starting with a concept and proceeding to full production while developing a complete complement of hardware and software expertise, could easily have been expected to involve a period of 2½ to three years. Culminating with the efforts of the past three weeks, the project has produced in much less time than this integrated teams of hardware and software experts, quantities of programmes and equipment at prototype stages and experimental proof of the validity of the original concept.

We are setting a dangerous precedent in taking from the public purse money to cover the establishment of this organization and its losses. Does this now mean that, in future, the Government will, in the case of any other totalizator organization losing money in the establishment of its on-course totalizators, provide compensation? Of course not. Yet this is where the T.A.B. has been established to operate on course in competition with private enterprise on far more favourable terms than private enterprise could ever receive.

Mr. Keneally: A Socialist plot?

Mr. BECKER: I am not saying that. Let us be realistic. The T.A.B. was established to provide off-course totalizators. It was not established to provide on-course totalizators. In respect—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is getting away from the subject matter of the Bill.

Mr. BECKER: The point I am trying to make is that we are creating legislation to cover a comedy of errors. As has been said, the situation borders on a scandal; these events should never have been allowed to occur. However, now we have to take money out of the public purse to cover the loss. T.A.B. on-course will operate on terms that are more favourable than those which apply to the other on-course totalizators. It would have been better if T.A.B. had stuck to off-course operations, without becoming involved in investing money in businesses. It should have operated solely in racing, ploughing back any money available into racing. The inquiry into racing in South Australia should not have been necessary, and racing clubs should not have been required to ask the Government for help. Now we have this legislation requiring Government expenditure, so that little money will be left for racing generally.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—"Powers, etc., of board."

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: No-one seems sure of the outcome of these provisions. What will be the Government's financial commitment in this operation?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Deputy Premier): I do not think we can say exactly what our total commitment is likely to be. Although the Government is far from satisfied with the handling of the matter by the board, it feels it has a moral obligation to do something about it. We have gone from a sum of $1 500 000 to a likely sum of $2 100 000, and we still do not know what will be the exact position.

Mr. Goldsworthy: That's not very satisfactory.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It is not satisfactory to the Government either, but I should like the honourable member to tell us how more specific information can be made available. I believe the Government has no option but to accept its moral obligation in this matter.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): Although the Chief Secretary has been responsible for T.A.B., there has been no report back to the Minister or the Government by the Auditor-General on the activities of the board. As State moneys will be infused into this operation, what action does the Government intend to take to keep apprised of events?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Recently, a new Chairman (Mr. Max Dennis, the recently retired Chairman of the Public Service Board) has been appointed to the board, and we hope the board may now rescue itself from its present position. Under the Bill, the Government may make further guarantees available if that is necessary. We will not do anything in the way of helping the board unless we are perfectly satisfied that a case exists for our helping. Through the Treasury and the Chief Secretary we can keep ourselves informed of the position.

Dr. Eastick: You can't see any virtue in requiring the Auditor-General to report periodically?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Leader can rest assured the Government will watch the position closely.

Dr. Eastick: I think it would be a good idea.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not think so; the Government is competent to obtain the necessary information, without having the Auditor-General report to it.

Mr. Coumbe: Will the Government consider that action?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not think it is necessary. We can get the Auditor-General and a dozen other people to help us if we need that help. We have our own methods of obtaining information, and the honourable member knows what they are.

Mr. COUMBE: The Deputy Premier uses the word "we", but he is speaking about the Government, whereas members of Parliament generally should have this information. I ask that the Government consider referring this matter to the Auditor-General, because members should be able to obtain details so that they can be considered.

Mr. BECKER: Members, on behalf of the public, should be fully informed about financial matters of the T.A.B., but its annual report does not explain all the expenditure items. The management consultants have considered three possibilities for the Databet business, but we should be able to obtain more details from the T.A.B. annual reports. The Auditor-General would ensure that the reports would contain sufficient detail. I should like a guarantee that such a situation will never arise again, but the Minister cannot give that assurance. What chance have Opposition members of ascertaining what is happening unless a detailed report is available?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: If it is considered that the T.A.B. report does not contain sufficient detail, the Government could consider whether more information should be made available. Any decisions made by the Government will not be made until after much detailed consideration. As the Treasurer will be involved in a guarantee, members can be assured that all details will be examined before any decision is made.

Clause passed.

Clause 6—"Temporary rebate of stamp duty."

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: This clause highlights a most unsatisfactory feature of the operations of the board. No doubt the special expenses to be included, leading to a rebate of stamp duty, will be those concerned with the Databet system. Although it is known that the expenditure on Databet is about $1 500 000, it is not clear how much should be considered when fixing the total amount of rebate, because this amount will be determined when the capital value is assessed. Who is to determine the capital value of the equipment? That would not need to be a prolonged process. When will it begin, and at what stage will the Government decide to cut its losses? Members of the public, and we as their representatives, must be concerned about these matters. Will the first decision be whether the board should withdraw from data betting so as to rescue this operation?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: If I had all this information I could tell the honourable member what the Government is up to, but I cannot. I cannot say who is doing it, but the Commissioner of State Taxes will have a great interest in it and he will look at it. The Commissioner will want to satisfy himself that a reasonable valuation has been made of the assets before assessing stamp duty. If the honourable member needs the information, I will get it for him. The honourable member should bear with the Government in the situation in which it finds itself. We will look at the matter as closely as possible.

Mr. BECKER: I take it that this will help the T.A.B. improve its cash-flow basis. Can the Deputy Premier say whether the T.A.B. will be permitted to continue on-course totalizator operations or whether it will be recommended that it stick closely to off-course T.A.B. operations?

Mr. McANANEY: What investigation has been, or will be, made into the practicability of the computer method?

Mr. BECKER: It has been said in this debate that Opposition members can ask questions on T.A.B. operations. On September 11, when I tried to ask a question regarding such matters, I was ruled out of order. The Speaker ruled that it was not a matter of Government concern, nor was it a matter under the direct jurisdiction of a Minister or of a Government department. Subsequently, I asked a further question.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. BECKER: This is important.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! We are discussing the stamp duty provisions. Question Time is the time during which questions should be asked and replies given.

Mr. BECKER: I will seek information from time to time concerning the operations of this provision and its effect on T.A.B. Can I ask such questions of the Minister responsible? Hitherto, I have not been permitted to ask them. Can the Deputy Premier assure me that, if I raise such matters again, such information can be obtained?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: If the honourable member was ruled out of order because the subject matter of his question did not come under the direct control of a Minister, and if that ruling was upheld, I suggest that he write to the Chief Secretary (the Minister dealing with the board) to obtain information. So, another course is open to the honourable member, because he could raise the matter in that way. No barrier has been created by the Government to the seeking of information on T.A.B. I do not think that we could have been any more frank than we have been in respect of this Bill.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

MARINE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 22. Page 1933.)

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): The Marine Act, which is a very old Act and in which you, Mr. Speaker, would have a vital interest, plays an important part in the mercantile affairs of this Stale. The Act has often been amended. The Minister, in his second reading explanation, invited us to go back to 1881 (92 years ago) and study the provisions made then and consider them in this modern year of 1973. We know that this is one of the few Bills that must go home to England for Her Majesty's assent in accordance with the old British shipping legislation that was designed originally so that the British Empire (now the British Commonwealth of Nations) would enjoy uniformity in respect of legislation governing ships at sea.

Unlike the Harbors Act, which deals with ships in harbors, the Bill now before us deals with ships at sea and creates uniformity in this regard. The Bill contains some commendable provisions, apart from the pecuniary matters. First, I will comment on the penalties that run throughout the Bill and try to relate the Minister's thinking in this regard to the 1881 provisions. It is fair to say that, after 90 years, there should be a reasonable increase in penalties. However, in checking the various increases and the types of offence for which they are provided, I realize that some of them are minimal whereas others are very steep. I think the ideas of the advisers to the Minister were that the more serious the nature of. the offence the greater should be the increase in the penalty.

I intend to run through some of these penalties by way of illustration. Before doing that, however, I think it is desirable to point out that the Minister intends to move to alter one of the sections of the Act regarding a master, mate or engineer (whether first, second or third ticket officer) to provide that, in sitting for examinations of competency, the officer no longer has to be a British subject. Those of us who have been connected in some way with river trade or vessels at sea know that many members of our community who have come from overseas are splendid and experienced seamen or engineers who should be. eligible to sit for examinations and receive the appropriate ticket. They are denied that right under the old Marine Act, and I think the amendment being made is good and one that should be approved.

The penalty provisions are really based on the safety of vessels and passengers at sea. This is a major part of the whole Marine Act and I suggest it would have the support of all members. Of course, the Harbors Act is in a different category. Clause 4 deals with obstructing inspectors, and clause 5 deals with bribes. Clause 6 deals with safety equipment, overloading of vessels, compass adjustments (a necessary adjunct to the Bill), examination of certificates of competency, assessment of Admiralty charts, and many other matters. The penalties are increased from $100 to $500 in some cases and in other cases from $20 to $100.

Clause 7 deals with examinations for masters, mates and engineers, and I support the deletion of the provision restricting these persons to British subjects only. Clause 8 deals with penalties for fraudulent use of certificates, and clause 9 deals with determinations regarding competency. Of course, competency is a big point, especially in regard to fishing vessels. By clause 10 the penalty is increased from not less than $100 to not exceeding $1 000. This is one of the bigger increases and it is perfectly correct to make the increase, because the provision relates to ships

that put to sea in an unseaworthy condition. The increase is completely justified.

Clause 11 deals with the penalty for departing from or arriving at any port without having the hatches battened down. This is an incidental provision. In the case of vessels leaving Port Pirie to top up at Wallaroo a special arrangement is made whereby bags are put on top of the bulk wheat and I hope that this practice will be allowed to continue. I suppose we may get a similar position at Port Giles.

Clause 12 deals with detention of unsafe ships, and clause 13 deals with the draft in the case of larger vessels, and freeboard, as it is known in regard to lighter vessels. Clause 14 deals with the marking of the load line, as does clause 16. That line is commonly called the Plimsoll line, as laid down by Lloyds of London, and most vessels have the correct line on them. These clauses deal with those cases where the line is not marked or is marked incorrectly.

Clause 17 deals with the penalties for masters who take ships to sea without certain safety equipment, and the penalty is increased from $200 to $1 000. I completely agree with that increase. Clauses 18 and 19 deal with lights and signals. Clause 19 is interesting because it deals with lights only on vessels on the Murray River. When the Marine Act was first written, vessels were plying on the Murray River for the cartage of wool and other products. That is not done now, but we have passenger vessels plying up and down the river and pleasure craft also use the river.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: And also houseboats.

Mr. COUMBE: Yes, and the Minister has been concerned about effluent discharged from them. We must be careful about competency here, but the vessels must have the correct lighting on them. Clause 20 deals with giving the wrong instruction for steering and amends section 65 of the principal Act. That section contains the quaint phrasing typical of the old Act and it must be read to be believed. The section provides:

No person on any ship shall when the ship is going ahead, give a helm or steering order containing the word "starboard" or "right" or any equivalent of "starboard" or "right", unless he intends that the head of the ship shall move to the right, or give a helm or steering order containing the word "port" or "left", or any equivalent of "port" or "left", unless he intends that the head of the ship shall move to the left.

That is not a bad sort of provision! Anyone who has been on the bridge of a vessel knows that the order is given as "Starboard", "Port", "Right", or "Left". Of course, I am not speaking about naval vessels. Clause 21 amends the old section 67 and relates to equipment. Clauses 22 and 23 have similar application, while clause 24 deals with surveys, which are very important. I know that the Minister has had problems about surveys, particularly in the case of vessels on the far West Coast and in the South-East.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: The South-East is all right now.

Mr. COUMBE: I would expect the Minister to say that. This clause makes provision for vessels which have been surveyed but for which the time that the certificate is in operation has expired and where the owners do not bother to have the vessel resurveyed. A penalty not exceeding $2 000 is provided for these cases. A small fishing vessel plying for hire or small reward may be affected and, whilst I make no excuse for anyone who refuses or forgets to have his vessel surveyed, I hope that the Minister will treat this matter sympathetically. I know of cases where a vessel has not been able to be put on a slip, because of a build-up of vessels waiting to be put on that slip. However, the penalty should be heavy in the case of wilful disobedience.

Clause 25 deals with hindering surveyors, and clause 26 deals with the penalty for surveyors who receive fees unlawfully. Clause 27 deals with fraudulent statements, and clause 28 deals with certificates running out of date. All sorts of other trivia are dealt with, but these provisions are necessary. Clause 30 amends the old section 82 and increases the penalty from $40 to $300 for the offence of carrying too many passengers on a vessel. I should have thought that this was a serious matter. The penalty in respect of each person carried in excess of the specified number is increased from 50c to $2. This is important, because the overcrowding of vessels could cause fatalities. Subsequent clauses deal with information to be provided by owners and masters, surveys, the carriage of dangerous goods and explosives and also of grain, the last commodity involving bulk handling and the special method of battening down hatches. Reference is made also to drunks trying to board and possibly causing damage to a vessel.

The penalty for failing to report a collision at sea is increased from $100 to $500. However, I should have thought it would be higher. The Bill meets with my approbation. The shipwreck and salvage provisions cover fishing vessels not previously included. Previously, although the coast trade and the river trade were provided for, fishing vessels even of a substantial size were not covered, but I agree that they should be covered. I support the Bill.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I support the Bill. It has three main objects, one being to change the penalties originally provided by the Marine Board and Navigation Act of 1881. Another object is to remove the present requirement that a person who sits for an examination to qualify as a master, mate or engineer should be a British subject. Section 17 (1) of the original Act provides:

Examinations shall be instituted for persons who wish to obtain certificates hereinafter termed certificates of competency to the effect that they are competent to become—

(a) masters or mates of coast-trade ships; or
(b) masters or mates of river ships; or
(c) first-class engineers of coast-trade ships or river ships; or
(d) second-class engineers of coast-trade ships or river ships; or
(e) third-class engineers of coast-trade ships or river ships:

and such examinations shall be held at such places as the board directs.

Subsection (4) provides:

No person shall be examined as aforesaid unless he is a British subject.

This has caused much hardship in the past, yet such a requirement is not even included in the Commonwealth Navigation Act. Many migrants, including medical practitioners and dentists, have suffered much hardship through not having their qualifications recognized. The respective professions here do not allow these people—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must come back to the Bill.

Mr. MATHWIN: I was just floating along! Nevertheless, migrants have often suffered great hardship. Clause 2 (1) of the Bill provides:

This Act shall not come into operation until Her Majesty's pleasure therein has been publicly signified in this State.

This is unusual. Most Bills are proclaimed by the Governor but, this legislation emanating from the United Kingdom, proclamation in this instance is at Her Majesty's

pleasure. Clause 3 defines "fishing vessel" to mean "any vessel not propelled solely by oars and used in the taking of fish or oysters for sale (including trawlers, luggers and whale chasers)". No reference is made to abalone fishing. Is. this intentional? Under what category is it included? Subsequent clauses increase penalties, in some cases up to $1 000 and $2 000. However, especially in relation to the provision dealing with ships in an unseaworthy condition, the increase is fair. Generally, I support the increases provided in the Bill.

I refer to the penalties to be imposed on a person who is drunk seeking to board a ship. Where inebriation is concerned, part-time fishermen or those who catch only a few fish sometimes take a few cans or bottles of beer with them and are more likely to be inebriated when coming off a vessel than when going on to it. Negotiating the Patawalonga boat haven entrance, a seaman would need to be sober whether he was going out or coming in. Generally, I support the Bill, looking forward to some interesting discussion in Committee on some of the clauses.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Interpretation."

Mr. BLACKER : The definition of "fishing vessel" refers to fish or oysters. Does this include abalone and scallops?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: (Minister of Marine): Any vessel not propelled solely by oars is a fishing vessel for the purposes of this Act, which should not be confused with the Fisheries Act.

Mr. MATHWIN: Is abalone meant to be covered in the definition of "fishing vessel"?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: In this legislation, we are dealing with fishing vessels in the sense of shipwreck and not in the sense that I think the honourable member is concerned about. Previously, in this Act we referred to coastal trade and river trade, fishing vessels not being included. I do not think we need to go to the lengths of including references to abalone, and so on.

Clause passed.

Clauses 4 to 40 passed.

Clause 41—"Penalties on drunken or disorderly persons persisting in going on board ship.

Mr. MATHWIN: Although the penalty has been increased to $100, does the Minister intend to put people who have become inebriated off at a convenient place?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The word "convenient" is the operative one in the existing section of the principal Act, and we would be considerate and understanding in such cases.

Mr. MATHWIN: Do the words of that popular song "What shall we do with a drunken sailor?" relate to this clause?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: They may have some connection with it.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (42 to 48) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADELAIDE FESTIVAL CENTRE TRUST ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 22. Page 1933.)

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): I support the Bill, but I am rather surprised that, with the many Select Committees that were set up to discuss the festival theatre, we can now change the relationship between the Adelaide City Council, the Government, and the trust without having another Select Committee to investigate this matter. However, once the trust was set up it was a matter of time before it was given complete control. The Adelaide City Council has had much to do with establishing the festival theatre, and has done a splendid job. Now, the theatre will be removed from part-ownership by the council and vested in the trust, and the council will have its liability to the complex set at $1 800 000. The city of Adelaide now has a wonderful festival centre, which is a great asset arid which will provide a just reward for the efforts of those concerned with its establishment. The Commonwealth Government has stated that funds will be made available for the arts, and the Bill recognizes the fact that moneys from that Government will be available to the trust.

It is just as well that the trust does not have to carry the interest burden on the total cost of the complex. Because of the generosity of the Commonwealth Liberal Government from 1971 to 1973, interest-free grants were made available to States without conditions, and the State Government decided that $2 680 000 should be used towards the cost of the festival theatre and also that loans should be written off in 1975; involving an amount of $1 600 000. Therefore, the total contribution from the Commonwealth Liberal Government of about $4 300 000 has been used for the theatre complex. Although the Deputy Premier stated earlier today that the Commonwealth Liberal Government had never made any contribution to this State, that Government made a large amount of money available without tags regarding expenditure and without interest.

Mr. Nankivell: You mean grants?

Mr. McANANEY: It made a genuine grant, not one that attracted high interest rates. It is wonderful that the festival centre will not be overloaded unduly with capital liability and high interest payments. As long as this is done and entertainment of all kinds can be put on there at a minimum of cost, the ordinary man in the street will be able to attend performances. The full houses that have attended to date show that the festival centre appeals to the general population. I support the idea of vesting the property in the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust. It is wise for one body to control all aspects. The relieving of the Adelaide City Council of the liability set out in the original Act is fair and reasonable and, overall, I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Interpretation."

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Attorney-General say why the taking of control of the land in question from the Adelaide City Council and the vesting of it in the Government through the trust is not being referred to a Select Committee? I am not suggesting that it should be so referred, but I ask whether the Government has made an arrangement that has obviated the reference to a Select Committee.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): What has been done has been done with the full agreement of the. Adelaide City Council.

Remaining clauses (5 to 12) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADELAIDE FESTIVAL THEATRE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such

amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 22. Page 1934.)

Mr. RUSSACK (Gouger): I support this Bill. I am sure all agree that South Australia should be very satisfied with the festival theatre, and I am sure they will be equally as pleased when the festival centre has been completed. The brief history of the festival theatre is interesting. The first action was taken in 1964, when the Festival Hall Act enabled the Adelaide City Council to build a festival hall in Adelaide with Government assistance. That Act provided that the council could build, spend money, and borrow money. Section 4 provided that the hall should remain vested in the council, which was to have the care, control and management thereof.

This Bill reverses that procedure, and the vesting of the festival theatre will pass from the council to the Festival Centre Trust. The Government of the day made money available for the project and the Treasurer was to approve plans. A Select Committee considered the site known as Carclew, and the story of Carclew is now history. I refer to the second reading explanation of the 1970 Bill, which amended the Festival Hall Act. In the second reading explanation on October 21, 1970, at page 2211 of *Hansard,* we read the following:

The council and the Government have agreed that the Carclew building be made available for the rest of its life to the Bunyip Children's Theatre as a children's theatre centre in South Australia, and the Bunyip Children's Theatre has been invited to undertake negotiations with the Government and the council for a licence of the building to proceed to make this a children's theatre centre.

I understand this has been most successful. However, I further understand that the agreement could soon be terminated between the Government and the Bunyip Children's Theatre. Will the Minister clarify the situation applying here? In 1970, because the hall would be more appropriately named a theatre, the name was changed to Adelaide Festival Theatre. Further, the word "Treasurer" was substituted for the word "Minister", possibly to imply acceptance by the Government, rather than by one Minister.

Further borrowing powers to the Adelaide City Council were granted. This covered the sum of $600 000, provided that appropriate security was obtained for the borrowing. This was a charge against the general rate of the council. It was also provided for by the winding up of the financial situation of Carclew, to which I have referred. The estimated cost of the Adelaide Festival Theatre was $5 760 000, the Government to contribute $3 950 000, and the Corporation of the City of Adelaide to borrow $1 800 000 on a credit foncier arrangement, the repayment being $153 000 annually. This money has been borrowed fully, and there has been an overpayment, during construction, of $417 000 above the estimate. Earlier this evening a Bill was passed amending the 1971 Adelaide Festival Centre Trust Act, which provided for the assessed value of the centre to be $50 000 for council rating and Engineering and Water Supply Department rating purposes. This year the Corporation of the City of Adelaide will obtain $8 500 in rates, this being obtained at a rate of 17c in the dollar.

A public subscription was launched to obtain $100 000 and, additionally, the Commonwealth Government was to provide $100 000. Members of the public over-subscribed $60 000, and with this excess subscription works of art were purchased. This Bill refers specifically to the works of art and what is to happen to them. The people of South Australia responded most generously to the appeal for subscriptions.

Clause 3 defines "the vesting day" when the ownership of the complex is to pass from the Corporation of the City of Adelaide to the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust. Section 654, on which the centre is situated, will pass from the control of the council to the trust. Clause 4 provides:

Section 3 of the principal Act is amended by inserting in subsection (4) after the passage "the Festival Theatre" the passage "where that cost was incurred before the vesting day".

The Government will therefore now take full responsibility for all expenditure after the vesting day. Clause 6*(e)* strikes out original subsection (4) and inserts the following new subsection:

If the Treasurer is satisfied that the amount expended by the council in the exercise of the powers conferred on it by section 3 of this Act exceeds $7 000 000 as a consequence of an alteration of or addition to the Festival Theatre approved by the Treasurer the Treasurer may in addition to the amounts authorized by this section to be paid to the council pay to the council an amount equal to the cost to the council of those alterations or additions.

That is, provided that the cost was incurred before the vesting day. New section 7a (1) provides:

On and after the vesting day no further moneys shall be payable by the Treasurer to the council pursuant to section 7 of this Act except any such moneys as are required to be so paid by the Treasurer to satisfy any liability incurred by the Treasurer pursuant to that section before the vesting day.

Therefore, the Government has taken the responsibility to meet any liability in respect of the theatre which, before the vesting day, will be determined by proclamation. New section 7b provides:

The Treasurer may pay to A. V. Jennings Industries (Australia) Limited, in this section referred to as "the company, an amount not exceeding $42 840 in accordance with an arrangement entered into by the Treasurer and the company with respect to certain expenditure incurred by the company in relation to overtime payments in connection with the construction of the festival theatre.

I understand this overtime was necessary for two reasons. First, certain industrial problems were faced by the builder; and secondly, it was desired (and this was the main reason) to have the building completed by the expected date of opening. Therefore, the Bill provides that the Government is to meet the additional cost of $42 840 for overtime payments. Section 8 of the principal Act is repealed. Under the Act the Government could assist the Corporation of the City of Adelaide where there was a liability or loss in operating costs. If there are any funds in the Adelaide Festival Theatre Appeal Fund, such funds will be made over to the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust, but the Bill also specifies that these funds are for a specific purpose. This is set out in new subsections (4b) and (4c), as follows:

(4b) On and from the vesting day all works of art, purchased or acquired by the council out of moneys provided from the fund, shall vest in and belong to the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust.

(4c) All moneys received by the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust from the trustees of the fund pursuant to subsection (4a) of this section, shall, by force of this subsection, pass to the Trust freed from any trust and shall be used and applied by the Trust for the purchase or acquisition of works of art for or in connection with the Festival Theatre or for any purpose ancillary to that purchase or acquisition.

Therefore, the $60 000 that was surplus in the public appeal, plus any funds in the trust of the festival theatre, will be used for the purchase of works of art and will also come under the control of the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust. In recognition of the $1 800 000 that the Adelaide City Council provided for this venture, it is to nominate

two of the six trustees of the trust. The Bill represents a further step towards completing the whole centre. On completion, there will be a festival theatre, a drama section, and an amphitheatre facing the Torrens River, so that it will be a centre of which South Australia can be justly proud.

We can accept with great satisfaction this theatre and the proposed centre. Although it is perhaps unwise to make comparisons with other States. I think I would be justified in saying that in this case South Australia stole a march on New South Wales. From the beginning of this venture in 1964, the Governments and personnel concerned are to be complimented on the work done. I am certain that in the hands of the trust all will be well for the future. As the member for Heysen said in relation to a complementary Bill, this complex will be such that Mr. and Mrs. Average will find it possible to attend the various types of function and presentation held there. By the Bill, the administration and control of the theatre will be stabilized in one trust. As I think this is commendable, I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Interpretation."

Mr. RUSSACK: What is the future of the Bunyip Children's Theatre in Carclew?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Deputy Premier): At present the Government is looking at the estimate of the cost to redecorate (paint, and so on) this building. We have no intention of disposing of it; it will continue to be used by the children's theatre group.

Mr. COUMBE: I am glad to have that assurance. I have been connected with this matter since 1964, having been an original member of the Lord Mayor's committee. In the Bunyip theatre, Marie Tomasetti and Anthony Roberts provide a feature of cultural life for young people. What will happen to the vacant block of land between Strangways Terrace and Jeffcott Street that was purchased at the same time as Carclew?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As far as I know, the Government has no specific plans for that land. As I do not have the relevant information, I will inquire and let the honourable member know.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (4 to 9) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

HARBORS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 22. Page 1934.)

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I support this second major nautical Bill. Once again, the Minister takes us back to 1881 and, in another case, to 1913. Apart from a few provisions relating to penalties, the Bill seeks to get over a couple of administrative difficulties that confront the Marine and Harbors Department from time to time. The first substantive amendment refers to pilots in circumstances in which the master of an outward-bound ship orders a pilot and then finds that the ship is not ready to leave on the day and notifies the pilot accordingly. There may be reasons for this action, but the repeal of this section means that regulations may now be made so that Parliament will be able to scrutinize them and consider the fee that is to be paid to the pilot in these circumstances. The Minister suggested that the fee will deter the unnecessary ordering of a pilot (we do not know what the sum is to be), but it will not cause hardship in genuine cases.

Sections 103 and 104 of the original Act make interesting reading, particularly as they relate to the penalties of £2 2s. and £10. The second major amendment widens the powers given to the Minister in relation to issuing pilotage permits in certain circumstances. From experience I know that this is a vexed question, because masters of vessels that trade between ports of South Australia (or, in some cases, ports of Australia) can obtain a certificate that allows them to travel up or down the Port River without a pilot in some circumstances. Apparently, the department has encountered administrative difficulties, and this provision allows the Minister to issue a permit as he thinks fit. If a master believes that he has been aggrieved, he has the right of appeal. Apart- from these two major amendments, the Statute law revision amendments, and the alteration of penalties, it is a simple Bill and solves some problems.

However, I wonder why such Bills are being introduced at this time. The two Bills to which I have spoken could have waited for another six months before being introduced, but they have been introduced in the last week of sitting. The original Acts have been on the Statute Book since 1881 in one case and since 1913 in the other case. Apparently, the Minister wants to clear the deck and get rid of the rats and mice so that he can point to the size of the Statute Book of the State. We are dealing with trivia, however necessary they may be, and it is regretted that in the last week of sitting we are being snowed under by many small Bills. Having helped pilot this measure through, I hope it comes to a safe mooring.

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

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (WEIGHTS)

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

BUILDERS LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HOUSING TRUST AND HOUSING IMPROVEMENT) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

EGG INDUSTRY STABILIZATION BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendment:

Page 28, line 9 (clause 50)—Leave out "one hundred licensees" and insert "one-quarter of the number of persons who are, pursuant to the Marketing of Eggs Act, 1941-1972, entitled to have their name included on the roll of electors for a district".

Consideration in Committee.

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment be agreed to.

The Government does not object to the amendment, which provides for the same ratio as does the preceding clause. As many as 361 people, each of whom owns over 500 hens, are entitled to a vote. However, within two or three years the number of such voters might be only about 250.

Mr. HALL: This is an ineffectual amendment and the. Deputy Premier, in agreeing to it, said so in effect. The figure of 91 producers who, under the Legislative Council's amendment, will be entitled to petition for a poll compares with the 100 producers provided for by the Bill as introduced. I suppose that another place dealt with a certain principle, and wants one-quarter of the number of eligible producers rather than a certain number.

However, I am extremely sorry that the Upper House did not make the number 50, which would have been a definite move in the direction of democracy in this matter. I had an amendment along these lines that I would have moved, but I could not attend the Chamber on the evening when this Bill was last debated. No other member adopted my amendment, notice of which appeared on the Notice Paper and to which attention had been drawn. They seem happy to have this great hurdle placed in the path of progress of the industry, so that 91 producers must petition before a poll can be held, although they know that the democratic procedure would have been to make the number 50, which would have meant a reasonable procedure similar to the provision in other sections of our primary industry. I am concerned that the Upper House, where the power of the vote lies, did not make a sensible amendment instead of a stupid play on words. However, I suppose one should not be surprised at the actions of the other place.

Mr. WARDLE: I do not think the amendment is a play on words, because a fundamental principle has been changed. The Bill, as it left this place, referred to licensees and to egg producers who were producers under the Commonwealth Marketing of Eggs Authority. The number of such producers in South Australia is now 1 909 and this will probably diminish each year as it has fallen at an average rate of 288 over the past five years. I suggested in the second reading debate that the provision of one-quarter of producers being entitled to call for a poll was a more generous provision than that contained in clause 49, which provides that at least 100 growers must petition. I believe that the amendment brings this provision more into line with clause 49 and that it is the majority wish of the industry that this be done. At present, 361 producers are eligible to vote, although only 274 producers at the last election chose to complete their application and apply to have their names placed on the roll for a poll.

Mr. McANANEY: I support the principle of specifying a percentage as the number required to call for a poll, but 25 per cent is too low and at least about 33 per cent should be specified. In the case of a poll in the potato industry, more than the required percentage called for the poll but many fewer voted at the poll. The new quota system will bring more stability to the egg industry and I do not think that the number of licensees will fall as has been suggested.

Motion carried.

SUPERANNUATION AMENDMENT BILL (GENERAL)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

FIRE BRIGADES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1. Page 2 (clause 3)—After line 2 insert new paragraph *(aa)* as follows:

(aa) the Chief Officer of Fire Brigades, who shall be a member *ex officio*;"

No. 2. Page 3—After clause 5 insert new paragraph 5a as follows:

"5*a. Amendment of principal Act, s.* 12—*Tenure of office*—Section 12 of the principal Act is amended by inserting after the passage 'the chairman' the passage 'or the Chief Officer of Fire Brigades'."

Consideration in Committee.

Amendment No. 1:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 1 be agreed to.

It makes the Chief Officer of Fire Brigades an *ex officio* member of the Fire Brigades Board and, as it was accepted by the Government in the Legislative Council, I commend it to the Committee.

Mr. COUMBE: I am pleased that the Government has agreed to the amendment and, because of the Attorney's commendable and prompt acceptance of it, I will say little more. The Chief Officer of Fire Brigades should be an *ex officio* member of the board. I understand that the next amendment is consequential, although I should not mention that amendment now.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 2:

The Hon. L. J. KING: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 2 be agreed to.

As the member for Torrens has suggested, it is consequential on the first amendment.

Motion carried.

LAND SETTLEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 22. Page 1934).

Mr. ALLEN (Frome): I support the Bill, which amends section 2a of the Land Settlement Act of 1944 and in effect extends the life of the Land Settlement Committee from December 31, 1973, to December 31, 1977. The committee was first established in 1944 to help allocate blocks of land to soldier settlers when many members of the armed forces were returning from the Second World War. Initially the committee was appointed for four years and its life has been extended since then.

The committee has been involved in much work. As I have said it was involved first in soldier settlement and, as soldier settlement was phased out, the committee investigated and approved advances from the State Bank to rural settlers. Further, during the recent rural recession the committee investigated the deferral of payments due to the State Bank in respect of guarantees on rural advances. It is contemplated that, with the upsurge in rural activity, parts of the Western Division of the South-East may soon come up for settlement, and this committee may well be asked to investigate acquisitions in that area.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): In supporting the member for Frome regarding the continuation of this Act, I should like to express an opinion on the unsatisfactory way committee members are paid for their services. The only satisfactory way to pay members of Parliamentary committees is to have a sitting day fee. Then, according to the amount of work the committee does and according to which members of the committee attend meetings, there will be a much fairer way to make payment. I suggest that an amount be paid for sitting a specified number of hours.

A member of a committee should receive more for attending a meeting on a day when Parliament is not sitting than on a day when Parliament is sitting, because on the latter day the member is already in Adelaide and has not the expense of attending a meeting. A similar principle applies to electoral allowances. Some committees meet for many hours. Indeed, as much time is put in by members on some committees as is put in

by some members of larger districts who may only be driving around electioneering. These committees work on specific Parliamentary work, and this should be taken into account. Members should not be paid if the committee does not sit.

Mr. HALL (Goyder): Despite the enormously wide gulf separating the member for Heysen and me, he being a member of an inert organization—

Mr. McANANEY: On a point or order, what has an inert organization to do with the Land Settlement Committee?

The SPEAKER: [am just waiting to see what connection it has.

Mr. HALL: I was only illustrating that, even though most of our views are extremely separated, I agree with the member for Heysen in this instance. I agree entirely that members of Parliamentary committees should receive remuneration on a sitting-fee basis. Members would not then be subjected to the type of publicity surrounding recent moves by the Government to increase committee fees substantially. I hope that in Committee the Minister will say how often the Land Settlement Committee has met, say, in the last 12 months, so that we can judge its value to the Parliamentary system.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): In view of the excellent work carried out by the Land Settlement Committee, I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill. The member for Frome has told me that that committee has met five times in the last six weeks. The comments of the member for Heysen about members from large districts driving around electioneering are totally incorrect.

The SPEAKER: Order! The remarks referred to were out of order.

Bill read a second time.

in Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Expiry of Act."

Mr. HALL: How often has the committee met over a longer period than that referred to by the member for Eyre?

The Hon J. D. CORCORAN (Deputy Premier): I am not sure how often the committee has met, but the member for Eyre referred to the committee meeting five times in the last six weeks. The Land Settlement Committee is required under the Rural Advances Guarantee Act to consider every application that is submitted to it by the Treasurer. I understand that, under that Act alone, about 400 applications have been received by the Treasurer. True, it is some time since the committee met and considered matters concerning drainage in the South-East. However, that does not mean that no such matters will be placed before it shortly. The committee considers matters in several areas, functioning under certain Acts, and, despite the number of times it meets, it must exist. The remuneration paid to committee members has not been altered since 1961 and, if it was fair in 1961, it is fair now. Indeed, as far as I know, the document circulated to members did not include a change in remuneration for members of the Land Settlement Committee.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

PORT FLINDERS VESTING BILL

Adjourned .debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 22. Page 1935.)

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): I support the Bill. I was interested to find out where. Port Flinders was located, namely, in an area commonly known as Weeroona Island, or otherwise known as Mount Ferguson. It is located in the District of Pirie and the Port Germein District Council area whose headquarters are in Melrose. The township of Port Flinders was originally surveyed on what is commonly known as Weeroona Island, being an outcrop of land between Port Pirie and Port Germein which at high tide is severed from the mainland. The township as surveyed covered the whole of the island but, apart from a few buildings and some recreational facilities, it never developed and there was very little interest in the land until the 1960's.

With the passing of the Real Property (Registration of Titles) Act, 194'5, the Surveyor-General when applying the Act to Port Flinders in 1950 discovered that practically all titles to the land on the island were held under the old conveyance system and most difficult to trace. Additionally, there were two different plans of the township showing the location of one or two allotments in entirely different locations, some below high-water mark. In 1965, in order to preserve the *status quo* of landowners, the Surveyor-General agreed to have the township resurveyed, and it was requested that any building activities be held up pending clarification of titles, the issue of titles being also suspended.

By 1972, the survey had been completed and all titles recalled, and the plan had been publicized and accepted by all interested landowners and by the District Council of Port Germein, and it is understood it must now be approved by an Act of Parliament. The township itself, non-existent except on the plan, could have future development, as power and water facilities have been extended there, and it is the desire of all interested parties and the council that the matter be resolved and legal titles under the Real Property Act be issued to permit pending and future land transactions to be negotiated in the normal manner.

Although the Bill is small, it covers the history of the area as far back as 1849, referring to people who have been interested in the land up to the present. Over several years the island has not been developed greatly. The Bill refers to an agreement involving the Minister of Lands, the Highways Commissioner, the Port Germein council, Mr. and Mrs. Ward, Mr. Curtis, and Mr. Morgan. At present, they are the only ones with an interest in the area.

It has been an interesting exercise to look into the history of this matter. Over 40 years ago, as a small boy, I camped with my parents on this island. Since then, this area has not been developed. With the affluence of our society and with the island being so close to Port Pirie, one would have thought that holiday shacks would be built there as they have been built in other areas. With this legislation and the development at Redcliffs, there is a good chance that this area will be developed. Under the Bill, the Crown will take over the land and reissue it to the present owners, giving them fresh titles. Roads will be established and the area will have an opportunity to be developed greatly. I support the Bill.

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

RED CLIFF LAND VESTING BILL

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

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 22. Page 1935.)

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I support the Bill, which is the first of two Bills that will allow the

Redcliffs industrial complex to be commenced. The second reading explanation indicates that the normal procedure for acquiring land under the Land Acquisition Act will not be followed in this case, with the land being acquired almost immediately. Other provisions in the Bill provide for compensation to and protection of persons whose land will be used. Only this morning I saw this land, which is mainly waste swamp land. The delineation of the land is most interesting (as members can see for themselves from the plan in the House), with a tongue of land which extends right to the main road and which is near the Nectar Brook railway station. One can foresee the possibility of a railway spur line being established from the main Commonwealth line at the Nectar Brook station to the centre of the complex.

Immediately to the south of the area to be vested in the authority is the laid-out town of Miranda. I am informed that, with the exception of one or two shacks, there is no development of the area. Even if this area had been included in the vested area there would have been no great disadvantage to people. However, under the Bill, if people want to do so they can take up blocks available to them as a result of purchases made many years ago. I note that clause 5 provides for the immediate vesting of this land in the authority and is contrary to the usual procedure followed under the Land Acquisition Act. To avoid any inconsistency, clause 6 overrides any conflicting problem associated with the law, and the rights of persons whose land is acquired are protected by clause 10. Clause 10 provides that certain sections of the Land Acquisition Act (and they are enumerated) are to apply to the operations of this Bill: that is, the relevant provisions of the Land Acquisition Act in regard to acquiring land and to persons whose property is to be taken over are covered by this measure.

We find no objection provision, this having been deleted. In other circumstances one would query this deletion, because it would seem that persons whose properties are being claimed are being treated roughly. However, the area is not of high value, and I understand from persons in that area, particularly those associated with the council, that discussions have taken place with persons whose properties are to be acquired and they are not greatly disadvantaged by the loss of this area and have indicated their willingness to release the area to the authorities. There is no provision for a notice of intent and, in addition, as no specific time is provided there is no period in which an objection can be lodged, but I have already referred to that matter.

The other important aspect is that no housing committee is to apply, because there is no house on any part of this area and, as there is no chance to make a claim on that basis, that provision has been deleted. In supporting this measure, I hope that Opposition members will have the chance of a longer period in which to review the indenture Bill to be introduced later this session. This Bill will be of tremendous importance to the future of the State and its ramifications will require close scrutiny. Whilst supporting this measure, at short notice, without argument, I indicate that it will be necessary for the greatest co-operation to be given to the Opposition when considering the indenture Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 11 passed.

Clause 12—"Duty of Registrar-General."

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Development and Mines): I move:

After "Authority" to insert "or at the direction of the Minister of Lands".

This minor and technical amendment arises from the fact that a perpetual lease is involved and, technically, the Minister of Lands wields the authority.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 13—"Disposition of the land and the roads."

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): Can the Minister indicate the type of arrangement to be undertaken later between the authority (being the vested organization at present) and the various members of the consortium? Further, will additional petro-chemical industries approach the State Planning Authority or the consortium for the purpose of obtaining land?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: These arrangements are being worked out in the general discusion with the consortium in drafting the indenture. I assure the Leader that members will have plenty of time to consider the indenture Bill. This aspect has not yet been finalized. The land will remain in the possession of the State Planning Authority and only the area that will be required by the consortium for the plant contemplated will be made over on the basis eventually determined. That is by no means the total area delineated on the map. Adjacent to the area of the plant is much land for what are known as downstream activities so that works can be established to treat the finished products of the consortium. Those establishing these plants will be treated on the same basis as in the case of the consortium. A small part of the remaining area is to be regarded as a buffer strip and will serve as a link to Highway No. 1 and the railway line.

Dr. EASTICK: I presume that there will be a direct link from the Commonwealth railway to the complex. Also, is it intended that the area delineated will provide an area for houses other than the few houses associated with security or caretaker responsibility? Will the area that is not delineated be the housing estate that will go with the complex, or is it intended that the houses will be on other land? I also would appreciate an indication of the responsibility that the authority will accept initially in respect of fire protection and the treatment of vermin and noxious weeds. In the case of other Government land, adjoining landowners have complained that the Government has forsaken its responsibility.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: In relation to a rail spur, the answer is "Yes", and in relation to long-term housing the answer is "No". What may happen in the construction phase is a difficult thing. That is basically the responsibility of the consortium but, regarding housing workers employed at the plant, it is not contemplated that there should be any houses in the area acquired. It is considered undesirable that such an estate should be established.

Mr. Coumbe: Where will it be?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: It will be in other areas to be delineated. I do not think it would be desirable in anyone's interest for the Deputy Leader to draw me on that matter. Regarding on-going responsibility, the Government accepts that it has a responsibility in areas that have been mentioned by the Leader, but I would not want to nail responsibility down to the State Planning Authority. The Leader knows that there is a fairly attractive area under a sort of tree cover between the plant site and Highway No. 1. This area could well be established as a fauna and flora conservation area that would improve the amenity of the surrounding buffer strip. We also have ideas regarding the samphire swamp at the northern end of the area to be

acquired. These matters can be taken up by Government departments other than the State Planning Authority.

Clause passed.

Clause 14 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MUSEUM BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 5 (clause 13)—After line 6 insert new paragraph *(ba)* as follows:

(ba) to manage all funds vested in, or under the control of, the board and to apply those funds in accordance with the terms and conditions of any instrument of trust or other instrument affecting the disposition of those moneys;

No. 2. Page 5, line 9 (clause 13)—After "in" insert "relation to".

No. 3. Page 5 (clause 13)—After line 13 insert "and".

No. 4. Page 5, lines 17 to 20 (clause 13)—Leave out all words in these lines.

No. 5. Page 7, line 5 (clause 20)—After "may" insert ", upon the recommendation of the board,".

Amendment No. 1:

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister of Environment and Conservation): I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 1 be agreed to.

The Government always intended to ensure that one function of the board was to do what is mentioned in the new paragraph, and no harm can be done by including the clear understanding.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 2:

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 2 be agreed to.

The Legislative Council suggests that the matters dealt with in the provision may well extend into other States but nevertheless apply in this State, and the point is well taken.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 3:

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 3 be disagreed to.

This amendment is consequential on amendment No. 4, which seeks to delete subclause (1) *(g)* and to which I shall move to disagree.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I believe the amendment is perfectly reasonable, having regard to the matters covered by the Bill. Not only would the Minister himself be making the decisions: he would be acting on advice received from within his department. It is not in the best interests of the community that relics and materials held in trust for the people of the State should be disposed of without Parliament's considering the matter.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 4:

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 4 be disagreed to.

It seeks to delete paragraph *(g)* of subclause (1), a provision to which the board agreed in discussions before the Bill was introduced. One of the reasons for updating the Act is that we will be calling on the museum to undertake surveys and certain studies in respect of the establishment of future national parks and conservation parks and to perform certain scientific functions. It is only proper that the board should perform the various functions set out, including those that may be assigned to the board by the Minister. The existing provision will allow the museum to undertake the sort of functions that we believe it should undertake on behalf of the State.

Dr. EASTICK: I have already indicated that it was in the best interests of the museum, having regard to the other functions provided for in the Bill, that this paragraph be deleted, and I am still of that opinion. I support the amendment.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (22)—Messrs. Broomhill (teller) and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Crimes, Duncan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, McKee, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo; Wells, and Wright.

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

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Dunstan and Hudson. Noes—Messrs. Nankivell and Rodda.

Majority of 5 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

Amendment No. 5:

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 5 be agreed to.

This amendment clarifies the wording of the clause.

Motion carried.

The following reason for disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments Nos. 3 and 4 was adopted:

Because the amendments restrict the effective operation of the South Australian Museum Board.

MINING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Development and Mines) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Mining Act, 1971-1972. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Members will recall that last year the Mining Act was amended so as to give the Minister power to exclude a person from a precious stones field where that person had been convicted of certain offences relating to mining. During the passage of that amending Act through this House, the effect of the provision was limited to one year from the commencement of that. Act. This means that as from January 25, 1974, the Minister, will no longer have the power to exclude persons from precious stones fields.

The Government believes that the mere existence, of the power has had a beneficial effect and that in order to preserve and foster peace on precious stones claims the Minister must continue to have power to exclude offenders from those fields; it is virtually a power to prevent further offences and as such serves the purpose of cooling down the explosive situations that so easily arise in the mining of precious stones. This Bill seeks to extend the life of the

provision for a further, three years from next January. The situation may be reviewed again at the end of that period. I commend this Bill to members so that it may be considered and passed without undue delay.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 74 of the principal Act so that the power of the Minister to exclude persons from precious stone fields and orders made by him for that purpose may continue in force for four years from the commencement of the Mining Act. Amendment Act, 1972 (that is, January 25, 1973).

Mr. GUNN secured the adjournment of the debate.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I move:

That Orders of the Day (Other Business) be made Orders of the Day for tomorrow.

I have to admit that I do not necessarily have the permission of members of the Liberal Movement to move for the adjournment of their business, but I do so in the hope that they will concur.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.56 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, November 28, at 2 p.m.