

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, August 20, 1974

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

PAY-ROLL TAX 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.

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

PETITION: SODOMY

Mr. LANGLEY presented a petition signed by 51 members of the Unley Salvation Army Corps objecting to the introduction of legislation to legalize sodomy between consenting adults until such time as Parliament had a clear mandate from the people by way of a referendum (to be held at the next periodic South Australian election) to pass such legislation.

Petition received.

PETITIONS: SPEED LIMIT

Dr. TONKIN presented a petition signed by 50 residents of South Australia, stating that because of conversion to metrics the speed limit of 30 kilometres an hour past school omnibuses and schools was too high and presented an increased threat to the safety of schoolchildren, and praying that the House of Assembly would support legislation to amend the Road Traffic Act to reduce the speed limit to 25 km/h.

Mr. BLACKER presented a similar petition signed by 50 persons.

Petitions received.

PETITION: WATER RATES

Mr. DEAN BROWN presented a petition signed by 61 residents of the city of Burnside who expressed concern at the present inequitable system of estimating and charging water and sewerage rates, particularly in the present period of high inflation. This practice had resulted in water and sewerage rates being increased, in many instances, by more than 100 per cent, which was an unfair, discriminatory and grossly excessive impost on them, and which would cause hardship to many residents on fixed incomes. The petitioners prayed that the House of Assembly would take action to correct the present inequitable and discriminatory situation.

Petition received.

PETITION: COUNCIL BOUNDARIES

Mr. BLACKER presented a petition from 54 residents of the Flinders District, stating that they were dissatisfied with the first report of the Royal Commission into Local Government Areas, and praying that the House of Assembly would not bring about any change or alteration of boundaries to the District Council of Lincoln and that the city of Port Lincoln be preserved as a city area and not incorporated into a rural area.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

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

WHYALLA WATER SUPPLY

In reply to Mr. MAX BROWN (August 7).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It is intended to transfer a construction gang to commence work on the Eight Mile Creek water supply project in about one month's time.

MEAT

In reply to Mr. CHAPMAN (August 8).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Agriculture states that the honourable member can be assured that legislation covering the meat industry in South Australia is being prepared. The Minister repeats his undertaking that, in accordance with the procedure which has been followed in all cases with legislation affecting rural matters, interested organizations will be consulted before introducing the Meat Industry Bill into Parliament.

PARA HILLS EAST INFANTS SCHOOL

In reply to Mrs. BYRNE (August 6).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Officers of the Public Buildings Department have visited the school several times in connection with requests made by the school, and have taken necessary action to overcome any dangerous situation that may arise because of the dropping of parts of the ceiling caused by wind. The enclosing of the shelter shed has been requested, but, because of the heavy demand on finance for minor works, it has not been possible to carry out this work. The attention of the Public Buildings Department has been drawn to the honourable member's comments, and every effort will be made to prevent a situation, which is hazardous to children, from arising.

TEA TREE GULLY EDUCATION CENTRE

In reply to Mrs. BYRNE (August 14).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: An agreement has been entered into for the leasing of 280 m² of floor space within the proposed Tea Tree Gully city council's new library complex, which will be fitted out for the administration staff of the Further Education Centre and which will provide the necessary information regarding courses and subjects available to the public. Tenders have not yet been called, and information from the council suggests that the earliest completion date will be late in 1975. As an interim measure, a transportable building within the grounds of the old Modbury Primary School will be provided to house Further Education administration staff, and it is hoped that it will be ready by December of this year. The staff will move from the Modbury High School at that time and remain at the old primary school site until the new leased premises are ready for occupation.

STENHOUSE BAY SCHOOL

In reply to Mr. BOUNDY (August 15).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is true that, as the honourable member said in his question, Stenhouse Bay children will have to travel about 58 kilometres to Warooka when the school is closed, and the children will have a very long day. On the other hand, there comes a time when economically and educationally it is no longer practicable to keep a school open, and this stage has been reached at Stenhouse Bay. The district inspector has furnished a detailed report on the situation in which he points out that the enrolment will be five in term 3 of this year, and that it is likely to decline to three in term I next

year. These facts, combined with problems connected with the building and likely future difficulties with water and power supplies consequent upon the closing down of Waratah Gypsum, make it clear that the children will be better off attending at Warooka.

LOXTON HIGH SCHOOL

In reply to Mr. NANKIVELL (August 15).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Because tenders for the building of the Loxton High School community hall were considered by the Public Buildings Department to be too high and not acceptable, it was decided that the hall would be built by the department's day labour. It is hoped that work can commence on site in about 10 weeks time, and that the hall will be completed about 40 weeks after commencement.

GILLES PLAINS INFANTS SCHOOL

In reply to Mr. WELLS (August 15).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Alterations to the library and incinerator surround have already commenced. It is intended to include in the paint and repairs programme for completion during this financial year requirements relating to floor coverings, wall around playground equipment, two sinks and cupboards in a room, and fluorescent lighting in classrooms. The Public Buildings Department has a record of the need to repave the playground but lack of funds has meant that paving projects have had to be given a low priority unless a dangerous situation exists. There are no plans to do the Gilles Plains paving at this stage. It is hoped that concrete blocks to provide dry access to a wooden building in the infants school will be provided within a month or so. An additional six-teacher unit is included in a list of projects referred to the Public Buildings Department for feasibility and cost studies, but present planning does not allow for this to be provided in the next three years. It is hoped that a pre-school conversion of buildings can be made available later this year.

ELIZABETH TRANSPORT

In reply to Mr. DUNCAN (July 30).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The matter of the rationalization of bus and rail services between Elizabeth and Adelaide is one of the many questions now being examined by a bus service planning group set up by the Director-General of Transport since the transfer of private bus routes to the Municipal Tramways Trust. One of the benefits of the transfer is that, as new buses are purchased by the State Transport Authority, it will be possible to integrate and rationalize many public transport services to provide a much improved transport system, something that was very difficult in the past under a multitude of ownerships.

The Elizabeth express bus was introduced by the previous Government as a result of local petitions for such a service, because no attempt had been made to properly co-ordinate feeder bus and rail services in the Elizabeth area, and because no attempt had been made to properly co-ordinate between Elizabeth and Adelaide not served by rail. A recent survey on the bus service showed that about 30 per cent of passengers now using this service are travelling from Elizabeth to areas between Elizabeth and Adelaide; the service is providing a valuable cross-suburban function in addition to its radial-service function. It is not presently intended to abandon the service, as many patrons would be lost from public transport.

On the other hand, the existence of the service, running as it does parallel with the railway, means that many

Adelaide-bound passengers who could be carried on the under-utilized (and faster) rail service, are presently being carried on express buses, partly because they have no integrated feeder bus service by which to travel to the railway line. The bus service planning group is investigating a method whereby residents of all parts of Elizabeth would be given equal opportunity to travel to Adelaide or points in between by rail or bus, rather than some not being able to use the train and others not being able to use the bus. This could be achieved by operating all services in the area to bus-rail interchanges at Salisbury and/or Elizabeth stations, where all services would be co-ordinated. Such a system would give passengers the maximum flexibility and thus cater for the largest number of potential public transport trips.

The new system cannot be introduced until the State Transport Authority has more buses available, as there are similar proposals for improvements to services in several parts of the metropolitan area. Obviously, it is not possible to introduce every improvement immediately. With regard to the specific points raised by the honourable member, I can advise that in peak periods Elizabeth is served by an average of one train every 12 minutes and one bus every eight minutes. The greatest gap between trains is 20 minutes while the greatest gap between buses is 10 minutes. During off-peak periods, the bus runs to a 50-minute weekday frequency, while the train at most times of the day operates about every 45 minutes. The bus service planning group considers that one of the prerequisites of a co-ordinated bus and rail system in the area will be the introduction of a regular-interval rail service on the North Gawler line. Such a proposal, together with others to co-ordinate bus and rail services in the area, should overcome some of the existing dissatisfaction with public transport as highlighted by the honourable member's question.

TOURISM

In reply to Mr. ALLEN (August 6).

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: A committee was formed to recommend a programme for the construction of public toilet blocks in outback areas. The committee comprises one representative each from the Public Health Department, Public Buildings Department, and Tourist Bureau. Unfortunately, the work of the committee has been delayed because necessary inspections and negotiations could not be carried out because of the heavy rains in the North this year. An attempt to secure information by mail has been only partly successful. Four places have not yet replied. The work already done has shown that there will be some difficulties, including availability of suitable land, and satisfactory water supplies and adequate local arrangements for the proper maintenance and cleaning of the toilets at reasonable cost. For example, at Coober Pedy, the estimated cost of cleaning the toilets is \$100 a week for labour alone, plus a further \$70 a week for water and other expenses. This cost is far too high. I have issued instructions that the committee should proceed with its work as quickly as possible. The target is to have three of the public toilet blocks built by this time next year.

In reply to Mr. EVANS (July 31).

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The diverse nature of the tourist industry has so far prohibited the comprehensive collection of statistics to show accurate industry growth patterns. However, several valid indicators are available to support the view that 1973 was a year of growth for the South Australian tourist industry in both money and

number of travellers. Some of these are outlined as follows:

1. Tourist operators and regional tourist associations reported a record year. Bed nights sold in the Flinders Range, for example, increased by 20 per cent to 30 per cent over 1972. Kangaroo Island had a very good year.

2. The Adelaide office of the Tourist Bureau had a record year in number of clients and value of bookings. Commission earnings rose by 38 per cent during 1973-74 over the year before.

3. During 1973, the total number of inquiries handled by the Melbourne office of the Tourist Bureau increased by 47 per cent over the previous year. A five-month comparison only is available from the Sydney office, showing a similar increase.

4. Traffic counts at fruit-fly road blocks of motor cars from other States showed growth in arrivals during 1973; for example, Renmark was up 12 per cent on the preceding year.

5. Caravan parks recorded major advances in patronage during 1973.

6. In 1973, the Adelaide Airport handled 1 271 808 passengers, compared to 1 074 506 in 1972.

MINISTERS' OVERSEA VISITS

Dr. TONKIN (on notice): What are the final totals (previously not available) of the costs of recent visits overseas of—

- (a) the Premier and his party;
- (b) the Minister of Works and his party;
- (c) the Chief Secretary and his party;
- (d) the Attorney-General and his party;
- (e) the Minister of Agriculture and his party?

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

- (a) Cost not yet finalized.
- (b) Cost not yet finalized.
- (c) Chief Secretary still overseas.
- (d) \$22 904.
- (e) Cost not yet finalized.

SPENCER GULF POLLUTION

Mr. GUNN (on notice): What inquiries have taken place to protect the fishing industry in Spencer Gulf against pollution from the proposed Redcliff project, and has any information been made available to the fishing industry?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Fisheries Department research officers completed a two-week survey of Upper Spencer Gulf in the region of Red Cliff Point about 30 kilometres south of Port Augusta on September 30, 1973. The survey was intended to provide basic data upon the ecology of the region so that a detailed programme of investigation of the marine environment in the region may be designed. The study was funded by Petrochemical Consortium of South Australia, and the completed report is the joint property of the consortium and the South Australian Government.

The report is available for study in the office of the Environment and Conservation Department. After the report was studied by the consortium and the Environment and Conservation Department, plans were drawn up between the Fisheries Department, the consortium, and the Environment and Conservation Department for further detailed long-range tests and studies to be undertaken in the Red Cliff Point area. The programmes of studies are being finalized at present. The earlier studies recorded the densities of the stands of seagrasses on the sublittoral platforms and mud flats, and also the relative

abundance of juvenile prawns as well as other species of fish in experimental trawls.

A further study of the distribution of the seagrass species in the Red Cliff Point area was carried out in January 1974, in order to record distribution and density of seagrass communities and to establish base line information for future pollution controls. Seagrasses and their associated biota are considered, in the light of our present knowledge, to be the earliest indicators of environmental changes in the existing marine ecosystem. The planned tests and studies are very rigorous, and their requirements will provide the data that is beyond that laid down as necessary for inclusion in environmental impact statements.

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. When the Agriculture Department is moved to Monarto, how many of the staff now employed in the department will be required to go to Monarto?

2. What action will be taken against any members of the staff who refuse to work at Monarto?

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

1. It is not possible to say how many of the people now employed will still be in the department at the time the headquarters is relocated at Monarto. However, subject to decisions as to which, if any, sections are to remain in the metropolitan area of Adelaide, those officers who are then attached to the headquarters of the department will be required to work at Monarto. The implementation of the Callaghan report may have some effect on these numbers, but it is not possible to predict what that effect may be.

2. Decisions on this question will be made if and when such situations occur. At that time any such cases would undoubtedly be considered by the Public Service Board.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. When does the lease expire on the building housing the head office of the Agriculture Department?

2. How many employees are now working in this former warehouse?

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

1. The building is leased on a monthly basis from the Adelaide City Council.

2. About 240.

VICTORIA SQUARE

Mr. COUMBE (on notice):

1. Has the previously announced development plan for a hotel complex on Government-owned land at the corner of Grote Street and Victoria Square, Adelaide, been abandoned and, if so, why?

2. If this development plan has been abandoned, what plans, if any, has the Government for the future use of this site?

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

1. The Government has certainly not abandoned plans for an hotel complex in Victoria Square. It has been negotiating with a particular party for some time, and that party has now been requested to lodge appropriate plans, models, and estimates for examination by the city of Adelaide Development Committee and the committee's technical consultants, Urban Systems Corporation Proprietary Limited.

2. See 1.

GOVERNMENT OFFICES

Mr. CUMBE (on notice): What departments are intended to be housed in the new Government office block being constructed on the corner of Flinders Street and Gawler Place, Adelaide?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Government Office Accommodation Committee is planning the new Government office block, being erected on the corner of Flinders Street and Gawler Place, on the basis that the occupying departments will be: Minister of Education; Minister of Agriculture; Education Department; Department of Further Education; and Public Buildings Department, professional offices. Cabinet has approved a recommendation from the committee that the building be officially named Education Building.

WAR SERVICE SETTLERS

Mr. RODDA (on notice):

1. Have all insurance policies held by war service settlers been transferred to the South Australian Government insurance office and, if so, how many policies have been affected?

2. If policies have been transferred, what is their aggregate annual premium value and what were the names of the companies previously covering the transferred policies?

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

1. Yes. For dry lands the total is 753, and for irrigation the number is 326.

2. Dry lands, \$39 959.26; irrigation, \$5 240.12. All policies were previously with the New Zealand Insurance Company Limited.

COMMUNITY WELFARE DEPARTMENT

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. To what extent will the activities of the Australian Assistance Plan overlap the functions of the Community Welfare Department?

2. Will officers of the Community Welfare Department be seconded to the Commonwealth Government for duties within the Australian Assistance Plan and, if so, how many officers will be so seconded?

3. Have any financial arrangements been made between the Commonwealth and State to cover the services of Community Welfare Department officers in this respect?

4. Will facilities of the Community Welfare Department (for example regional offices) be used by Australian Assistance Plan officers in South Australia, or is it intended that separate premises will be acquired?

5. If facilities are to be provided by the Community Welfare Department, what effect will this have on the normal working of and the services provided by the department?

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

1. Every effort will be made to avoid overlap in the activities of the Australian Assistance Plan and the Community Welfare Department by trying to develop the maximum degree of co-operation between the State and Commonwealth bodies.

2. No proposal has been made for officers of the Community Welfare Department to be seconded to the Commonwealth for duties within the Australian Assistance Plan.

3. No.

4. No such arrangements have been proposed.

5. See answer to 4 above.

FIREARMS

Mr. RODDA (on notice):

1. Does the Government intend to introduce in this session legislation requiring registration of all firearms in this State and, if so, will members of pistol clubs be brought within the ambit of such legislation?

2. Is it intended to enact that a fee be charged for hunting permits, and is it further intended that firearms will not be able to be bequeathed to any person but be forfeited to the Crown on death?

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

1. Firearms legislation has been placed on the legislative programme for this session. As a general rule, all firearms are at present required to be registered, with some exceptions shown in section 15 of the Firearms Act. Pistols do not fall within the definition of firearms, as defined in the Firearms Act, but are dealt with separately under the Pistol Licence Act. All pistols now require licensing, with some exceptions, including pistols properly used by approved members of pistol clubs. The legislation intended contemplates a combination or consolidation of these Acts. It will provide reasonable and effective control of the possession and use of firearms and pistols, and also ensure that sufficient records are kept by dealers to facilitate inquiries to enforce these controls.

2. It is intended to amend the National Parks and Wildlife Act, 1972, in similar terms to those provided in the Bill that was submitted to Parliament in 1973. This will provide, *inter alia*, for hunting permits for which fees will be charged.

DRUGS

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. How many prosecutions for offences involving drug abuse have there been in the year ended June 30, 1974, and by how much does this figure exceed that for the previous 12 months?

2. How many offences involved persons dependent on drugs, and how many were concerned with the acquisition and supply of drugs by non-dependents?

3. What further actions are being considered to contain any increase in offences related to drug abuse in this State?

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

1. Prosecutions year ended June 30, 1973—215

Prosecutions year ended June 30, 1974—269

Increase—54

2. Not available from records kept by the Police Department.

3. Drug health education lectures to selected audiences; liaison with customs and other police authorities; specialized training courses for members of Drug Squad; instruction in in-service training courses; and use of police dogs to locate concealed drugs in premises.

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. How many people are now under treatment for drug-dependence under the auspices of the South Australian Alcohol and Drug Addicts (Treatment) Board?

2. For what drug dependencies are they undergoing treatment?

3. What proportion of drug dependents in the community is it estimated is not now receiving treatment?

4. What actions are being taken to ensure that these people come for treatment?

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

1. At present there are 15 drug-dependent persons undergoing treatment at Elura Clinic and St. Anthony's Hospital, which are the two units of the Alcohol and Drug Addicts (Treatment) Board.

2. Opiates, hallucinogenic, and sleeping preparations.
3. This information is not known, but it is estimated that only a small proportion of drug-dependent persons seek treatment.
4. Those who come before the courts for offences relating to drug dependence are often bonded to take treatment or are brought for treatment by their probation officers. A small number present for treatment voluntarily. It is difficult to take effective steps to bring the unidentified drug-dependent persons to treatment.

TUMBY BAY ROADS

Mr. BLACKER (on notice):

1. What is the estimated completion date for the sealing of Bratten Way between Tumby Bay and Cummins?
2. Is it contemplated that the road between Tumby Bay and Ungarra will be sealed and, if so, when?

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

1. Until the terms of legislation covering Australian aid for roads from July 1, 1974, onwards are known, the expected completion date cannot be predicted with any accuracy. Indications are that completion will not be possible for at least five years.
2. The sealing is not included in present advance programmes, and the work is unlikely to be carried out for at least five years.

PORT LINCOLN HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. BLACKER (on notice):

1. When is it expected that stage I of the Port Lincoln High School will be completed?
2. When this school is completed, will the need for the wooden classrooms now in use still remain?
3. When will work on stage II commence?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The replies are as follows:

1. It is expected that the buildings will be ready for occupation by October. The long delay in the completion of this work has been caused largely by labour and material shortages.
2. The accommodation provided in the new building will be sufficient to house about 650 students, apart from many specialist rooms. As the present enrolment is 1 008, the balance of the school population will occupy relocatable rooms. However, many will be removed from the site. This information has recently been conveyed to the high school council; moreover, the headmaster has undertaken a survey of rooms to be retained and those which will be surplus to requirements. These comprise both timber buildings and metal-clad transportables.
3. No precise information can be given now as to when the second and final stage of the building programme will be carried out. This is a consequence largely of problems in planning that are now being created by inflation of building costs, together with the large number of schools where the accommodation is equally as outmoded as that of Port Lincoln High School, and where the first stage of rebuilding is only now commencing.

TORRENSVILLE COMMUNITY CENTRE

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. What progress has been made with the community centre project at Torrensville?
2. What will be the extent of the buildings?
3. What number of properties are to be acquired for completion of the project?
4. How were persons advised of intention to acquire property in connection with this project, and what reaction has there been from property holders?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The replies are as follows:

1. After the provision of funds by the Australian Government in the 1973-74 financial year and a community survey conducted during November and December, 1973, by the Community Welfare Department, a brief for a community centre high school at Thebarton was prepared by a special project team. This brief and the associated sketch plans have been submitted to the Australian Department of Tourism and Recreation with a view to securing the necessary funds that will allow the project to go ahead.

2. Apart from the provision of the necessary school facilities which will be the responsibility of the Education Department, the provision of other buildings will depend on the availability of funds from other sources. The initial brief assumes the provision of additional sports and recreation facilities, performing arts facilities, a health centre, child-care facilities, and buildings concerned with the establishment of a social centre.

3. The properties to be acquired fall into two categories: (a) Properties to be acquired as soon as possible; and (b) properties to be acquired as they become available. There are eight properties in category (a) and a further 24 in category (b).

4. Before any final decisions were made on property acquisition, a public meeting was held on Thursday, February 28, 1974. As a consequence of that meeting, the architects for the project reconsidered the distribution of buildings so that the least possible disturbance to residents might occur. Five properties have already been acquired by the Education Department, including three with a priority (a) rating. Negotiations are proceeding in relation to the other acquisitions, and where necessary appropriate arrangements will be made through the re-housing committee.

RAILWAY BRIDGES

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. For each concrete core sample submitted by Mr. T. Egan and/or his representatives for testing in relation to his contract with the South Australian Railways between November 3, 1964, and May 9, 1966, what were:

- (a) the core strengths (expressed in p.s.i.);
- (b) the corresponding minimum concrete strengths required under the terms of the contract and/or the specifications of the bridge designs and drawings (expressed in p.s.i.);
- (c) the corresponding railway bridges between Mannahill and Methuen in which the concrete batches were used;
- (d) the corresponding dates or approximate dates for the pouring and testing of this concrete; and
- (e) any other information relating to such tests on individual concrete samples or collective concrete samples?

2. Were all these tests carried out at the Islington laboratories of the S.A.R. and, if not, where were the tests conducted?

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

The answers to (a), (b), (c) and (d) are set out in the following table:

Core Strength	Minimum Strength Specified	Location of Bridge	Date Poured	Date Tested
1 850	3 000	233 m 28 c	Dec. 1964	27/1/65
1 450	3 000	233 m 28 c	Dec. 1964	27/1/65
550	3 000	233 m 28 c	Dec. 1964	18/1/65
1 230	2 000	233 m 28 c	Dec. 1964	18/1/65
1 350	2 000	233 m 28 c	Dec. 1964	25/11/65
1 260	3 000	233 m 28 c	Dec. 1964	25/11/65

Core Strength	Minimum Strength Specified	Location of Bridge	Date Poured	Date Tested
1 670	3 000	233 m 28 c	Dec. 1964	25/11/65
2 360	3 000	233 m 28 c	Dec. 1964	25/11/65
1 870	3 000	233 m 28 c	Dec. 1964	25/11/65
2 200	3 000	233 m 28 c	Dec. 1964	25/11/65
5 300	3 000	232 m 54 c	Feb. 1965	24/11/65
1 810	3 000	232 m 54 c	Feb. 1965	24/11/65
2 060	3 000	232 m 54 c	Feb. 1965	24/11/65
2 560	3 000	232 m 54 c	Feb. 1965	24/11/65
3 010	3 000	232 m 54 c	Feb. 1965	24/11/65
4 930	3 000	232 m 54 c	Feb. 1965	24/1.1/65
2 770	3 000	232 m 54 c	Feb. 1965	24/11/65
2 590	3 000	232 m 54 c	Feb. 1965	24/11/65
2 680	3 000	232 m 54 c	Feb. 1965	24/11/65
3 380	3 000	232 m 54 c	Feb. 1965	24/11/65
2 570	3 000	232 m 54 c	Feb. 1965	24/11/65
2 140	3 000	232 m 54 c	Feb. 1965	24/11/65
3 110	3 000	232 m 54 c	Feb. 1965	24/11/65
1 170	2 000	232 m 54 c	Feb. 1965	24/11/65

With regard to (e), I point out that the decision to be made by railway officers at the time when core strength analysis became known was one of whether or not to persevere with Mr. Egan as the contractor. In view of the urgency of the whole project, the undesirable delays that would result in the termination of the contract, and in an effort to give Mr. Egan every opportunity to lift the quality of his work, it was decided to persevere with the contract. As a result, work was accepted in the full knowledge (and I repeat in the full knowledge) that whilst the strength tests were below specification, such would not be critical in relation to the stresses to which the concrete would be subjected. In other words, the end result of the poor quality work performed by the contractor was that, whilst the work was more than satisfactory to withstand expected stresses, it would not be as durable as specified. The expected deterioration has and still is taking place. Remedial action has been and will be taken as required from time to time. For this reason, valuations at less than the contract rates were made when assessing payments due to Mr. Egan.

With hindsight, the Railways Commissioner and I are satisfied that the right decision was made when it was decided to persevere. Later of course, it became necessary to terminate the contract because of the inability of Mr. Egan to improve the quality of his work, notwithstanding generous extensions of time. It seems to me that, having failed through litigation to obtain greater payment from the S.A.R., a belated attack is now being made on the quality of construction because of cracks in the concrete, a factor long since known by the S.A.R., and one which was recognized would occur because of the poor quality work and therefore earlier deterioration.

I again emphasize that, apart from regular inspections of bridges made by permanent way employees and a bridge inspector, divisional engineers and other senior engineers at head of branch and assistant head of branch level make random inspections. In fact, such an inspection was made by the Assistant Chief Engineer during the second week in June, and three weeks before that a divisional engineer made an inspection as a result of which some remedial work was undertaken on one pier. A week ago today, several bridges between Methuen and Mannahill were inspected by the head of the Civil Engineering Branch. Nothing was observed to indicate any unsafe condition or any need for immediate attention. The Railways Commissioner and his officers are fully aware of the paramount importance of safety first. In fact, it is a golden rule in all railway operations, and the S.A.R. is justifiably proud of its record in this regard.

2. Yes.

PORTRUSH ROAD

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. When did work first commence on the road-widening programme for Portrush Road?
2. When is it expected that this programme of work will be completed?
3. What has been the total expenditure on that programme up to June 30, 1974?
4. What is the expected finance required to complete this programme?

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

- | | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|
| Cross Road to
Greenhill Road | Payneham Road to
Magill Road | Magill Road to
Greenhill Road |
| 1. December, 1969 | January, 1973 | The proposed widening of this section has been suspended for an indefinite period. On the basis of costs of the other sections, it is likely to cost about \$1 350 000. |
| 2. September 1974 | December, 1974 | |
| 3. \$547 344 to date | \$756 348 to date | |
| 4. \$640 000 | \$900 000 | |

MONARTO

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice): What has been the expenditure by the Monarto Development Commission or related departments on promotional materials, publicity, publications, and public relations concerning the proposed new town of Monarto for 1973-74?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The total expenditure by the Monarto Development Commission or related departments on promotional materials, publicity, publications and public relations concerning the new town of Monarto for the year 1973-74 is \$23 000.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice): What has been the total expenditure up to June 30, 1974, on Monarto, the Monarto Development Commission, and the associate consultants, respectively?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The total expenditure to June 30, 1974, on

- (a) Monarto is \$5 742 600; on
- (b) Monarto Development Commission, \$511 400; and on
- (c) Associate consultants, \$315 200.

POLLUTION COMMITTEE

Dr. TONKIN (on notice): Will the findings and recommendations of the Spencer Gulf Water Pollution Co-ordinating Committee, which have been available for some months, be communicated to the Commonwealth Government's present inquiry into the Redcliff project?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The recommendations which have been given to the Government by the committee and which are for further action by the South Australian Government would naturally be available to the Australian Government at its request.

STEEL DISPUTE

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Premier say how much of the massive increase in unemployment in the Adelaide area is directly attributable to obstruction of the delivery of steel supplies? This afternoon's newspaper states that Adelaide has been harder hit by unemployment than have country areas. During July, the number of unemployed in Adelaide increased from 4 900 to 6 300, an increase of 28.6 per cent, whereas in country areas the number increased from 2 800 to 3 200, a 14.3 per cent increase. This is a reversal of the normal pattern in this State (and, indeed, in other States), the increase usually being greatest

in country areas. As there has been no respite in the position regarding steel supplies as a result of the continuing industrial anarchy that members opposite have failed to correct—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader may not comment.

Dr. EASTICK: —I ask the Premier to answer the question I have asked about the massive unemployment.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is most difficult to ascertain the degree of stand-down as a result of the steel dispute at Port Adelaide. There have been some reports from companies about prospective stand-downs, some of which reports have proved to be accurate and some of which have not, so at this stage I cannot reply accurately to the Leader's question about what proportion of the increase in unemployment has been due to this dispute. Some industries (for instance, A. B. Denning and Company Proprietary Limited) closed down for reasons other than anything related to the steel dispute. The Denning company had come here during the term of office of the Hall Government, in response to a contract given to it by the Municipal Tramways Trust for the construction of buses. Subsequently, the company tried to maintain its facility here, although it did not have contracts to fulfil. It maintained its facility uneconomically for some time, and now it has decided that it cannot maintain what is an uneconomic venture for it when it has not sufficient orders locally. That had nothing to do with the steel dispute. On the other hand, if sufficient steel had been available to the remainder of industry, people put off by the Denning company could easily have got employment elsewhere, and they have not done so, so it is extremely difficult to give an accurate reply. However, the plain fact is that South Australian industry, which is heavily concentrated in the metals area, has lost basic supplies of steel amounting to about 60 000 tonnes.

Dr. Eastick: I told you that three weeks ago.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I did not need to hear it from the Leader to know about it, because I had been in close contact with this matter throughout.

Mr. Mathwin: You are a lawyer. Why didn't you offer proper legal advice?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Perhaps the honourable member can give legal advice from his deep knowledge.

Mr. Mathwin: I said you were a lawyer.

The SPEAKER: Order! In accordance with Standing Order 169, I warn the honourable member for Glenelg.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If anyone can produce legal advice that can show that this Government or this Parliament can take control in this dispute in some area of jurisdiction, I shall be pleased to hear about it.

Dr. Eastick: You said you would.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You said you were going to do something about it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is all very well for members opposite to tell us to do something about it. If only they would say what—

Mr. Goldsworthy: You said you were going to do something about it.

Dr. Eastick: Put some teeth into the emergency powers legislation.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the Leader wants a reply to this question, I will give it to him. If members opposite merely are carrying on with the business of trying

to make political points out of the matter, doubtless they will.

Dr. Eastick: Rubbish!

Mr. Gunn: Reply to the question.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I thank the honourable member very much: that is what I am trying to do, and I suggest that honourable members listen. As a result of this dispute, there has been a grave under-supply of steel to industry within the State, the stockpiles of steel have been used, and Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited will not move more steel into South Australia by road. Consequently, if from now on nothing more was involved in the hold-up of steel, South Australian industry would take six months to recover from this senseless dispute. It is a senseless dispute in that the union that is causing it (and only one union is, namely, the Transport Workers Union) has not had one member affected adversely by it. The employment of not one member of the union is in jeopardy as a result of the matters in respect of which there is a dispute; not even a penny piece has been lost by any member of that union, even though other unionists in South Australia have been put out of work and, in prospect, many more will be put out of work because the Transport Workers Union refuses to go to arbitration.

Mr. McAnaney: We don't want a confession: we want action.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will come to that matter, but I am replying to the honourable Leader's question. The Waterside Workers Federation has been doing this kind of work in 29 other ports in Australia. The matter having been raised, it was the subject of a determination by the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission in Melbourne, and the federation was awarded the work. As a result, B.H.P. Company Limited provided a new facility at Port Adelaide to ensure the minimum handling of steel in order to see to it that customers got steel of the best quality. In accordance with practice elsewhere, under the determination of the commission, waterside workers were to be trained to do the work. The T.W.U. in this State alone refused to allow the steel to be moved out of the container berth at Port Adelaide and it has picketed the site. The federation has offered to move the steel from the wharf at Port Adelaide and to allow the T.W.U. to load it, provided that the demarcation dispute is taken to arbitration. That is the only sensible course to follow. The T.W.U., however, refused to comply with that offer. Further, it has refused my appeals, so a conference was called in my office by the Deputy President of the Industrial Commission (Mr. Deputy President Williams) with the conciliation commissioner and unions concerned. As a result of that meeting, letters were sent to the Commonwealth office of the T.W.U. by the Deputy President, by the President of the Australian Council of Trade Unions (Mr. Hawke), and by me. No reply has been received from the T.W.U. to any of those letters. A further meeting of the people concerned was called at the weekend in Melbourne by the Deputy President and by the President of the A.C.T.U., but the union refused to communicate. Previously, I asked South Australian employers not to take action that could provoke other sections of the trade union movement while endeavours were being made to obtain some kind of reason from the union, but that has failed. I cannot suggest further to employers that any result can be achieved by the efforts of the Industrial Commission, by the A.C.T.U., or by me in this matter. Therefore, the employers have decided that they will take action in

two forms (about which I have warned the trade union movement). First, they will take action in tort against the union concerned.

Dr. Eastick: But you wanted to take that provision out of the Act.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the Leader will listen I will come to that in a moment. First, the employers will take action in tort; and secondly, they will instruct the transport companies (which are responsible to provide them with transport to collect the steel) to break the picket line. I have told the unions that, if that action is taken and there is any breach of the peace, the police will enforce the peace and will not allow any interference with peaceful movement. What is more (even contrary to what has previously happened as this Government has been opposed in principle to taking civil action in areas where it believes that a civil dispute should be settled by an industrial tribunal), unfortunately there is no industrial tribunal in the Australian jurisdiction in regard to this matter.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You'd better leave the law alone.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I suggest that the honourable member listen to what I have to say if he is interested.

Mr. Goldsworthy: I'm very much interested.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Kavel knows what is required of him in Question Time and, if he disregards the authority of the Chair, I will not hesitate to bring Standing Orders to his notice.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have told the unions concerned and the Trades and Labor Council that, although the Government has been opposed to the bringing of civil actions in tort in industrial disputes, the action of employers in bringing tort actions in this situation is something that the T.W.U. and the trade union movement generally, by failing to settle this matter in its own house, would bring on itself in consequence. The Government will not support any trade union that may be the subject of tort action in this dispute, and the police will enforce the peace. That is the present situation. I have appealed to the trade union movement to put its own house in order but it has not done so, and this is of grave concern to me.

I only wish there were some area of jurisdiction open to the Government: if there were, I would take it. I have exhausted every means available at the Government's disposal to settle this matter. What is happening at present is that a few workers at Port Adelaide are holding the whole State and its whole basic industry to ransom on a basis that can in no way be justified. I regret this, and I have no sympathy for them whatever: I believe they are totally wrong, and the Government is totally opposed to what they are doing.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Will the Premier, with the co-operation of the Australian Government, ensure that machinery is established to provide for arbitration on future disputes similar to the present steel dispute? Furthermore, will the South Australian Government now proceed with its proposed legislation regarding torts and industrial disputes? I understand that the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission is unable to handle the present steel dispute or arbitrate on it for two reasons advanced by the Transport Workers Union: first, that it is not yet an interstate dispute; and, secondly, that it is a dispute between a land-based union and a waterfront union. I am sure the Premier fully understands those reasons, having already stated today that no arbitration can take place. Also, His Excellency the

Governor stated in his Speech when opening the present session of Parliament that legislation regarding industrial disputes and torts would be introduced. Earlier this afternoon the Premier gave his unofficial blessing to the use of torts against certain unions. I wonder, therefore, whether he no longer intends to proceed with that legislation.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I suggest that the honourable member examine the Australian Constitution to see why there is no jurisdiction. It is not a matter of this State's and the Australian Government's introducing legislation: the Australian Constitution prevents jurisdiction in this matter. The Australian Government cannot legislate for control of non-interstate disputes. Regarding the member's second question, I have not in any way given my unofficial or other blessing to the institution of tort actions. Indeed, I do not approve of them. I have said simply that this Government will not support any union in the dispute, the subject of a tort action.

Dr. Eastick: You won't be changing your mind on that?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, I will not, and the trade union movement has been clearly informed of that fact.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Millhouse: You're in a bit of difficulty over the whole thing.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Of course I am, and I do not disguise it, either.

Mr. Millhouse: I think you had better leave the law alone, in that case.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the member for Mitcham would like to listen, I will tell him. The Government does not intend to introduce the legislation this session.

STATE'S FINANCES

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Premier give the House information regarding the Premiers' Conference held last week? In particular, can he say whether a so-called package deal was offered by the Premiers to the Prime Minister and, if it was, what was the outcome of such an offer? More importantly, can the Premier say whether, as a result of the conference and the Prime Minister's decision not to agree to representations made by the States as a whole, he will be forced to introduce in South Australia additional distasteful items of taxation?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No package deal was offered by the States, and that was made clear to the Prime Minister. The States offered co-operation in the control of cost inflationary influences in the economy. The States' case to the Commonwealth was that demand inflation management had gone to the limit to which it ought to go; in fact, possibly beyond that limit. I was able to cite to the Prime Minister, with the agreement of the other Premiers, the figures for increased production in certain areas of goods supplied to the Australian market and for vastly increased imports in those areas in the past three months, with more on the water. In some areas of consumer durables, particularly affecting this State, there have been increases of from 100 per cent to 240 per cent in imports in the past three months; therefore,

the Australian economy is moving rapidly from an under-supply situation to an over-supply situation, and this cannot but affect employment if present measures for demand limitation are continued.

In addition, we pointed out that the major influences of inflation at present in Australia were not demand-pull but cost-push, and that the major element of cost-push was a series of leap-frogging wage demands, acceded to by multinational corporations not relying on Australian finance and therefore not subject to Australian credit control influence, vastly in excess of cost of living increases or productivity increases, and that the Australian economy could not contain them. The Premiers were agreed on a series of measures which I spelt out at the Premiers' meeting prior to the Premiers' Conference, which I took to the Prime Minister, and which he accepted. They were these: first, that we would co-operate with the Commonwealth Government in a joint approach by the States and the Commonwealth to the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission for an introduction of wage indexation to the level of average wages in Australia, with a small amount extra to allow a margin for appreciation and for provision for anomalies arising out of recent major upsets in the general relativity section, so that thereafter wage increases would be limited on the indexation principle; secondly, that we would legislate in the States to provide that all our salary and wage-fixing tribunals would observe the wage indexation principle and, except in cases of marked anomalies, would not depart from it in any wage increases; thirdly, that the States would legislate to provide the Prices Justification Tribunal with State jurisdiction (not a transfer of powers to the Commonwealth, but action whereby the States would make the Prices Justification Tribunal their instrument and whereby we would, where we had prices offices in the States, provide assistance for the Commonwealth from State prices offices); and that the Prices Justification Tribunal would be instructed to reject price increases where the cost increases involved were concerned with wage increases above the indexation principle.

The fourth point was that the States and the Commonwealth would impose penal provisions in respect of company tax and pay-roll tax for companies exceeding the wage indexation principle in any wage agreements outside awards. In addition, it was expected that the Commonwealth Government would take measures, using both the Prices Justification Tribunal and the Commonwealth taxing powers, to ensure economic restraint and prices restraint throughout Australia, and that this would not be limited to workers but would be an overall restraint imposed in their jurisdiction. That was accepted by the Prime Minister and, in consequence, working parties have been set up in relation to each of these measures.

It was not a condition of these proposals, but the States also put forward something further: that, since all the States have in fact already acceded to the Commonwealth proposals about demand management by increasing their indirect taxes and charges to the community to reduce the level of liquidity in the economy in demand pull, we should not then be pushed into a further situation of major increases beyond those generally undertaken by the States. That did not mean that South Australia did not have some more announcements to make about increases in taxes and charges, because in the overall view it still had, and they were in accordance with those that I had forecast previously; but we asked that we should not be put in the position of going beyond that situation into areas where Victoria and New South Wales were faced with the kinds

of tax and charge which in themselves would be grossly cost-inflationary.

To require the States to do this would be utterly inconsistent with cost inflation control of the kind we had proposed to the Commonwealth and it had accepted. The Prime Minister would not accede to those requests but he has acceded to a request from South Australia and Tasmania to examine certain areas, which have been submitted for this year only, for Commonwealth support of certain projects within the State which otherwise would bear heavily on our State Budgets and which are in accord with the priorities of Commonwealth expenditure.

Similar submissions have not been made by the other States, but the Commonwealth has agreed to look at these submissions from South Australia and Tasmania during the Budget discussions this week. The Prime Minister agreed that the overall position of the States' finances would be looked at in the Budget discussions this week. The Treasury advice to the Prime Minister was that it was too early to move into reverse regarding the demand control proposals that were evident in the Premiers' Conference in June. In this, I believe that Treasury officials are wrong and that the present indicators existing in the economy should have been taken into greater account by them. What is more, it is obvious that the majority of the Commonwealth Labor Party, as a result of the announcements of the Caucus economics committee, does not agree with the Treasury officials on this matter.

Therefore, I hope there will be a review of the matter in the current financial discussions in Canberra and during the pre-Budget meeting of Cabinet and its committees. So that is the immediate position. As the honourable member will see when the Budget is introduced on August 29, this State is in a happier position, because of the extreme budgetary conservatism I have exercised as Treasurer of this State. I have exercised much more conservatism than have the Treasurers of Victoria, New South Wales and Western Australia.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Would you call yourself a Conservative?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Not generally; I would never suggest that. I am suggesting, however, that in accounting matters in the State I have been much more cautious than my counterparts have been.

Dr. Eastick: Are you referring to the Tonkin Administration in Western Australia?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am talking of the present Administration in Western Australia.

Dr. Eastick: How long has it been—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Coumbe: Will you have to increase taxes?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will have to increase taxes beyond what I have already done. I shall be making an announcement within a day or so about increases in stamp duties in South Australia, which I forecast previously; those increases will have to occur. But, after all the increases have been made in New South Wales (and many of them will be far in excess of what is to happen here), that State will face a Budget deficit of between \$130 000 000 and \$150 000 000. Victoria and Western Australia have proportionate amounts of deficit. This State, happily, is not facing such a situation: we shall be able to be within manageable limits in the Budget as a result of long-term planning, over the past four years, of the way in which our Budgets and expenditures should

go, and indeed the new longer-term planning introduced in the early part of this year. Since we are a claimant State on the Grants Commission (the only claimant State left on the Grants Commission, in effect) we are affected by the situation in New South Wales and Victoria. Therefore, there will be some impact on our finances as a result of the disastrous situation existing there. I hope that the Commonwealth Government will see the force of the matters that the Premiers put to the Prime Minister in the meetings last week. I emphasize to the honourable member that all the Premiers said that their co-operation with the Commonwealth Government—well, it was a little difficult to determine exactly what it was that Queensland said because—

Mr. Coumbe: They all finished up agreeing.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No. I do not know what it was that Queensland agreed to or did not agree to, because it was most difficult to make that out clearly. The position stated by the Premier of Victoria and by me to the Prime Minister was exactly the same, and Sir Charles Court, Sir Robert Askin and Mr. Reece went along with the proposals we put forward. We made perfectly clear that our co-operation with the Commonwealth in control of cost inflation was not dependent on the Commonwealth's agreeing to different proposals about State finances.

Mr. McANANEY: The statements of Revenue Account show that under the item "Legislature and Administration not included elsewhere" the payments have increased from \$1 997 000 in July, 1973, to \$3 377 000 in July, 1974, an increase of 69 per cent. As that increase needs some explanation, will the Treasurer supply it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will obtain a full report for the honourable member.

FULLARTON ROAD CROSSING

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Minister of Transport consider providing a pedestrian crossing at the junction of Grant Avenue and Fullarton Road, Rose Park, as a matter of urgency? Last week I asked a question in this House relating to the provision of pedestrian crossing facilities at that site, and the Minister said that plans for the installation of a pedestrian crossing on Fullarton Road had been completed and were being submitted to the Burnside council, and that the crossing could be installed early in the 1975-76 financial year. I have received many requests from residents of Rose Park and Dulwich, from the board of management of Queen Victoria Maternity Hospital, from patients at that hospital who, for one reason or another, find it difficult to cross roads speedily at times and from the staff and parents of children attending Rose Park Primary School. Those children use the Victoria Park facilities for sporting activities but because of the danger of crossing Fullarton Road some of these sporting activities have had to be curtailed and the students have been disadvantaged by this. They do not have as large a schoolground as other schools have. It has been put to me that it is not fair to expect the teachers at the school to bear the responsibility of shepherding the students across the road, and I have been told that traffic signals at the junction of Grant Avenue and Fullarton Road would give a two-way control for pedestrian traffic and make the whole situation very much safer. I think that 12 months is too long a time to wait.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I thank the honourable member for reminding me of exactly where this information is, but if he reads it he will, find that this matter

is not in my hands: it is in the hands of the Burnside council. As the council is the body responsible, the honourable member should direct his question to it. I assume that the honourable member will do that, as his district is involved. However, alternatively, if he wishes me to raise the matter, I shall be happy to do so.

Dr. Tonkin: I've spoken to the council.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I cannot (nor should I be able to) direct councils in this matter, which is certainly one between the honourable member and the council.

WOMEN'S SHELTER

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Community Welfare consider having a women's shelter established in Adelaide? The Minister will be aware that, on July 31, in my speech in the Address in Reply debate, I dealt with the need for such accommodation. It may not be necessary for the Government to spend much money in providing this accommodation: perhaps a building that is not being used fully or a building that could be converted could be used for this purpose.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I agree with the honourable member about the need for a shelter of this kind. The matter, which has received some consideration, will be further considered as to its practicability and the financial aspects concerned. I hope to be able to give further information to the honourable member soon.

PARLIAMENT HOUSE STEPS

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I would have asked a question of the Premier, but no doubt you, Mr. Speaker, have observed that—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE—he has gone out of the Chamber, and therefore I am not able to ask him a question.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will put a Question on Notice about that matter, and instead I will ask you, Mr. Speaker, a question on a totally different subject. Can you, Mr. Speaker, say what action, if any, you intend to take concerning Miss Coral Gunning, who has her motor vehicle and caravan parked partly on the steps of Parliament House? You will have noticed, Sir, that a lady is occupying a little caravan which has written on it "Music on Wheels" and which is pulled by a motor car. The caravan and motor car are partly occupying the steps of Parliament House.

Mr. Mathwin: There are flags flying, too.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, there is a good deal of decoration on the vehicle. On Friday evening, when I went up to the caravan to speak to the lady, she was not there. When I spoke to her at lunch time yesterday, I found to my surprise that I was the first member of Parliament to have spoken to her since she took up the position, last Friday I think.

Mr. Mathwin: That's not true.

Members interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister of Works says, "One nut to another," but I hope he will take the situation rather more seriously than that, because I think it should be taken more seriously. When I spoke to her last evening this lady told me (as I think she has made clear in her public interviews) that she intends to stay there until she is able to speak to those who she thinks can help her in what I understand is a most worthwhile project. You, Sir, will know that the steps of Parliament House are under the jurisdiction of the Speaker and the President. When I was Attorney-General, I had some reason to

consider the legal situation and, after discussing the matter with the Crown Solicitor, I came to the opinion that I have just stated. Therefore, it is a matter for you, Sir, to take action either alone or in concert with the President of the Legislative Council. Of course, the caravan and car are also partly (in fact, mainly) on the footpath in front of the House. Therefore, if they wish, it is for other authorities to take action, too. Although her action may be eccentric, having spoken to the lady I have found that she seems perfectly rational; she has requests she wants to make of the Premier and others. It is absurd that the situation should be allowed to run on as it is running on, without anyone in this place taking any action at all. As this responsibility is yours, Mr. Speaker, as much as anyone else's (and more than it is most people's), in the absence of the Premier, to whom I could have directed my other question, I direct this question to you, asking you what action you intend to take.

The SPEAKER: Until now, I have taken no action whatever. The honourable member will fully realize that I have no jurisdiction over the area in which the vehicles are parked.

Mr. Millhouse: That's not right.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. RODDA: Will the Premier say how long this delightful lady of music will be allowed to keep these vehicles partly on Parliament House ground, with a large projection taking up the footpath that is provided for the use and enjoyment of the people of Adelaide? I do not want to canvass the reasons why the lady is where she is: I have read with interest the comments on her reasons and on the Premier's attitude to them. However, I am concerned about the many thousands of people of Adelaide who use these streets, particularly in peak hours. If we observe the congestion caused by people using this area before 9 a.m. and after 5 p.m., we see that what she is doing does inconvenience these people. There is an obstruction there, and it does make for weak Government—

The SPEAKER: Order! The latter part of the honourable member's comment is out of order.

Mr. RODDA: —to allow these people to do these things. I ask the Premier whether, in the interests of South Australia, he will invoke his commission to clear the streets of Adelaide.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The matter of seeing that there is no obstruction of roads and footpaths in the city of Adelaide—

Mr. Rodda: Did you say there was no obstruction?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No. I was saying that the matter of keeping the roads and footpaths clear of obstructions in the city of Adelaide was a matter for the Commissioner of Police. Under the terms of the Police Regulation Act, the Government may give certain directions to the Commissioner. That is consequent on the legislation passed as a result of a Royal Commission report.

Mr. Chapman: You do make use of that legislation?

The SPEAKER: Order! In accordance with Standing Order 169, I warn the honourable member for Alexandra.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: When Executive Council gives a direction to the Commissioner of Police, the direction is tabled in this House, and no direction has been given to the Commissioner of Police on this matter. How the Commissioner considers the matter should be dealt with appropriately is in his hands: I have not given any direction in the matter. The lady concerned is carrying on some demonstration for some reason that seems to have been stated rather differently to different people. She

has not sought an interview with me. She has not tried to make an appointment with me or, so far as I am aware, with the Minister of Community Welfare.

The Hon. L. J. King: No, certainly not.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Neither of us has been approached for an interview about the matter.

Dr. Eastick: I haven't, either.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No. In fact, on Friday I received from the lady a telegram stating that she was not really trying to pressure the Government, me, or the Minister of Community Welfare. She said that she had the greatest admiration for both of us.

Mr. Gunn: Did she mention the member for Mitcham?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: She did not, but I thought that the sentiments that she expressed on that matter were appropriate. However, she said she was trying to draw the attention of the community to the matter, and doubtless she has gained some publicity from it. Regarding the appropriate way to deal with her, I have no doubt that the Commissioner of Police has decided that he does not intend to proceed with any sort of confrontation.

Mr. Venning: Do you—

The SPEAKER: Order! In accordance with Standing Order 169, I warn the honourable member for Rocky River for the first time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Police Department can exercise discretion about how it deals with certain situations.

Mr. Millhouse: Of course, she's partly on the steps of the House, you know.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That was not my observation.

Mr. Millhouse: Maybe you'd better have another look.

The SPEAKER: Order! In accordance with Standing Order 169, I warn the honourable member for Mitcham for the first time.

Mr. Gunn: There won't be too many left soon.

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Eyre.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know whether her washing, which is flapping in the breeze, happens to be flapping over the Parliament House steps.

Mr. Mathwin: She's very good on her ukulele.

The SPEAKER: Order! In accordance with Standing Order 169, I warn the honourable member for Glenelg for the second time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I hope we are getting to the end of the silly season when people think that the way in which to get publicity and public attention is by sitting out in front of this House. If people only go about matters in the proper way by approaching the Government or the community if they want support, I am sure that they will do much better than is being done outside the House at present.

COBDOGLA SCHOOL CROSSING

Mr. ARNOLD: In view of the recent inspection by the Minister of Transport of the Sturt Highway near the Cobdogla school, and in view of the letter that I forwarded to him from the Headmaster of the school and the Chairman of the school committee seeking answers to several questions about the safety of students crossing the Sturt Highway, can the Minister say whether further studies have been carried out in relation to the problem in the area? If they have, what has the Minister to report, and when will the necessary safety facilities be provided?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: At present, the position is as the honourable member has stated. An investigation has

taken place, with decisions being conveyed to me. Following that, an on-site inspection was made. To the best of my knowledge, not many factors were revealed that had not been known when the decisions were made. I have asked that the situation be reviewed again. Although the matter is currently being examined, at this stage I have no further information.

PETRO-CHEMICAL PLANT

Mr. BLACKER: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say whether it is correct that the Environmental Protection Council, which was created by the present Government on the recommendation of the Jordan committee, has seen neither the environmental protection clause nor the Redcliff technical data on which the adequacy of the protection clause could be judged? If that is the case, what action does the Government intend to take to allow the Environmental Protection Council the opportunity to review the situation and, if necessary, act in the interests of the public? This morning I received a circular from the Conservation Council of South Australia Incorporated detailing a press release made on the Redcliff chemical complex. In that release several statements are made outlining the Conservation Council's views on the intended project, including the allegation that the Environmental Protection Council has not had the opportunity to review the situation.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The honourable member would probably be aware, if he looked at the legislation establishing the Environmental Protection Council, that, if the council felt it was not being supplied with the information it required, it would be able to obtain it. If the council were in the situation as outlined, it would certainly have approached me seeking such information. As it has not done so, I can only assume that it has all the information it requires.

TOURIST ROADS

Mr. BOUNDY: Will the Minister of Tourism consider making unmatched grants for tourist roads as a means of assisting rural councils to provide access to beauty spots and shack areas? Members will realize that grants to councils for tourist roads are made on a \$1 for \$1 basis. The District Council of Warooka, in my district, poses some problems in this respect. The council has about 12 140 ha of national parks in its area from which no rate revenue is received. A road count has shown that during the tourist season traffic in the area increases nine-fold. Over half the ratepayers are non-residents, which indicates a high level of beach houses, and so on. All the foregoing is evidence that tourism is big business in this part of the State. It also illustrates that the district council has insufficient funds and, therefore, that a case exists for it to receive unmatched grants for tourist roads.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The problem of providing access roads for tourists is not isolated to the area to which the honourable member has referred. He would realize, however, that the many people who visit the area either have shacks in the district or are visitors to it. As a result, the additional flow of people into the district must benefit the local community. As funds for general tourist development are at present severely over-taxed, it is difficult for the Government to provide additional funds for this sort of work. However, it is not impossible for us to consider any special case. Although I should not have thought, on the information the honourable member has provided, that it involves a special case. I shall be happy to examine the matter.

ELIZABETH COURT

Mr. DUNCAN: Will the Attorney-General say what action the Government intends to take to improve the time lag at present existing for the hearing of cases at the Elizabeth Local Court? I recently approached the Attorney-General regarding this matter, as contested cases at the Elizabeth court are now being listed for early next year.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The member for Elizabeth has shown consistent concern about the problems of disposing of cases at the Elizabeth court. There has been a substantial increase in the court's work, mainly because of the increased number of contested summary jurisdiction cases, which increase may well be related to the greater availability of legal aid services in the Elizabeth area since the establishment of the Australian Legal Aid Office there. As a consequence, it has been necessary to give close attention to the problem involved in the efficient and expeditious disposal of work in that court. The Chief Stipendiary Magistrate (Mr. Matison) has conducted an investigation into this matter, and it has now been decided to attach a third magistrate to the Elizabeth court. At the same time, the court's responsibilities will be increased to some extent by the attachment to it of a country circuit, just as a country circuit is attached to other suburban courts. Until it can be arranged to provide the third magistrate at Elizabeth, temporary arrangements have been made, through the good offices of the Senior Magistrate at the Port Adelaide court (Mr. Crowe), for the surplus work from Elizabeth and, indeed, from Holden Hill, to be disposed of by Mr. Crowe, who has agreed to set aside every Friday for that purpose. I hope that this will immediately alleviate the problem at Elizabeth, and that the long-term problem will be solved when the third magistrate is attached to the court there.

GREYHOUND RACING

Mr. BECKER: Will the Attorney-General, representing the Chief Secretary, call for the appointment of a committee of inquiry into the conduct of greyhound racing in this State? I understand that a greyhound named *Ibis Lady* has, after racing, been subjected to three swabs in the last 12 months, and on each occasion the swab has proved positive. I understand that the secretary of the syndicate that owns the greyhound has made submissions to the Chief Secretary and to Mr. W. F. Isbell (Chairman of the Government's Sport and Recreation Committee), regarding the conduct of the swabs and the administration of greyhound racing in this State. Because of the allegations that have been made in the letter of July 28 this year to Mr. Isbell, I ask what action the Government intends to take.

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

TRADE UNIONS

Mr. VENNING: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry say whether he agrees with the statement by his Commonwealth colleague Mr. Clyde Cameron that the trade union movement is at its lowest level? If the Minister agrees, I should like to know when he will take action to start to govern in this region of chaos. The Minister's Commonwealth colleague, who made strong statements about this, is reported in the press last Saturday morning as having said:

Rank-and-file unionists should throw over-militant officials out of office.

The Commonwealth Minister also said that the rank and file were sick and tired of having to go on strike at the drop of a hat, and the report of his comments also states:

In effect, a day off work meant the worker was being fined at least \$20 ... He supported criticism of many trade unions by the Queensland Trades and Labor Council President (Mr. J. Egerton), who said in a letter to Queensland union leaders that the trade union movement was at its lowest ebb. When he returned to Canberra, Mr. Cameron issued a statement attacking near-anarchy and bloody-mindedness among trade unions.

Therefore, I ask the Minister of Labour and Industry whether he agrees with the sentiments expressed by his Commonwealth colleague, and I ask what he intends to do about it.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I am delighted to have the opportunity to reply to the honourable member. I can only say that, if he had read the press report a little further, he would have seen my comment.

At 3.10 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from August 15. Page 510.)

First schedule.

Engineering and Water Supply, \$38 110 000.

Mr. EVANS: I move:

That the vote of \$38 110 000 for Engineering and Water Supply be reduced by \$100.

This is the only way I can protest about the programme of this department. Last year \$8 697 000 was allocated to metropolitan sewerage works and we expected to receive a Commonwealth Government grant of \$2 000 000. Subsequently, we received a loan of \$1 600 000, which was substantially less than we expected, was completely different from what had been promised by the Prime Minister in that it was a loan and not a grant, and carried an interest rate that meant that we would repay \$5 000 000. This year \$8 536 000 has been allocated for metropolitan sewerage works, a sum that is effectively less than that allocated last year. The member for Tea Tree Gully and the member for Mawson have said that they are satisfied with the work that has been done on their districts. However, the District of Fisher, which has more unsewered properties than has any other district, has been denied services that have been supplied in other parts of the metropolitan area. If we have reached the stage in which a Government member receives better services in his district than those given to Opposition members, we are at a low ebb in politics.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It may have something to do with the contours of the area.

Mr. EVANS: The contours in my district are bad, but the Minister of Education knows that the Government and councils have approved of allotments being made available, and people have bought them in order to build houses. The Minister also knows that the rainfall in this area is greater than in any other part of this State and that the soils cannot absorb effluent, thus creating a problem that is not evident elsewhere. Each year for the past four years I have asked for a reasonable sum to be spent on sewerage facilities in this area. I do not wish the grant to Tea Tree Gully or any other district to be reduced, but sewerage services are important for the community. It seems that

the Government is making money available for many other projects: for example, a \$10 000 000 community project at Para Hills, another project at Port Noarlunga, and a Commonwealth assisted community complex at Marion.

I do not wish to deny people living in these areas the benefits of these projects, but last year in the District of Fisher only \$490 000 was spent, and that did not keep up with the inflationary trend of 1972-73. Although I asked the Minister what amount had been spent on a Blackwood project, I received no reply, and this year no disclosures are being made of the amounts relating to each area. The Treasurer stated that about \$2 000 000 would be provided to construct sewers in Athelstone, Blackwood, Braeview, Christies Beach, and Morphett Vale, but last year \$2 178 000 was made available in these areas. We are making money available for projects that could be postponed: swimming pool projects and Monarto could wait. Last evening I was handed a petition signed by 350 residents of Hawthorndene who asked me to present it to the Treasurer after I had signed it (which I did), but it will have to be re-worded to be presented to Parliament. These people are emphatic that they are living in a health-hazard area.

The Mitcham council has told one house owner that he must not allow effluent from his property to flow into the street, otherwise his house may be condemned. This is a new house but the council is correct in its prohibition, because the effluent could prove a health hazard. What the hell can this chap do with the effluent? The council has a problem and people living in the district have problems, but we are asked to accept a reduction in expenditure on sewers in one of the most important areas of the State. Many families in my district fear an outbreak of gastroenteritis, particularly during the coming summer. At the same time, the department is acquiring land; in fact, it has already purchased land for the Stirling sewerage development project. Small areas in the Stirling District Council may have a problem, but it is much more serious in the Mitcham Hills area, and the position should be rectified immediately. The sum of \$2 000 000 has been allocated, and we are expecting to receive \$3 500 000 from the Commonwealth Government. Although we expected to receive \$2 000 000 last year, we received only \$1 600 000. If we do not receive the \$3 500 000 from the Commonwealth, where will we be?

If, as the Minister has said, there is enough in kitty to offset any Commonwealth reduction, let us allocate that sum, too. We are keeping about \$4 000 000 in Loan money, possibly for a rainy day, but when are we likely to face a worse rainy day from the point of view of the health of the community? Some of these allotments were created over 15 years ago, when I admit that a Liberal Government was in power. People have gone there, knowing full well the effects of too much effluent in the area.

Mr. Langley: Whose fault was that?

Mr. EVANS: There is no way of turning back from the path that has been followed. The member for Unley will recall that similar conditions exist in the Mawson and Tea Tree Gully Districts.

Mr. Langley: Surely the people can speak for themselves.

Mr. EVANS: They do not need to now, because the problem has been solved in the main. I ask the Committee to support my motion, because this is one area where the Government has fallen down. The Government has not even kept up with inflation. This matter is a disgrace to the State and Commonwealth Governments. The Commonwealth Government gave a firm commitment

in 1972 that it would make up the backlog in sewerage facilities, and it made a similar commitment before the last State election. It is as important to people in every part of our metropolitan area that they have sewerage as it is to people in other parts of Australia. The Commonwealth Government, including the member for Hawker (Mr. Jacobi), in part of whose area this problem exists, should be notified of the seriousness of the situation.

Mr. Langley: What about your own Commonwealth members?

Mr. EVANS: They are well aware of this problem. Blocks are lying idle, and people have committed their life savings to building on them. What can they do with the blocks? They have gone there in ail sincerity and, with faith in the Government and Government departments, and they have waited patiently. As in the coming year more houses will be built in the area, the problem will escalate. There is no way in which the Minister, the Commonwealth Minister, or I can say, "Sorry, you can't build on those allotments." These people have spent large sums on their blocks and face a building cost inflation rate of about 40 per cent.

If they are forced to wait for sewerage, imagine how high the cost of building their house will eventually be. A 14-square house costing about \$21 000 today might well cost them between \$35 000 and \$40 000. These people cannot afford to wait any longer. Even if they sell their blocks the problem will remain for someone else. If the problem is serious enough, when the blocks are sold they will no doubt sell for less than the sum for which they were bought. Tied up with this matter is the problem of the Government's heeding the Ombudsman's recommendations. I am not being political in this matter. I have corresponded with the Minister and have organized public meetings, which was the only way in which I could have contact with the people concerned. As their situation is far from hopeful, I hope the Committee will support my motion.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Crimes): The member for Fisher has moved to reduce the vote for this line by \$100. I point out that members must confine their remarks to the motion until it has been disposed of.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I support the motion. I raised this issue last Thursday (when the Minister of Education was in charge of the debate), and clearly he was unaware of the promises that had been made by Commonwealth members of his own Party. The explanation of last year's Loan Estimates states:

The Government is proceeding on the assumption that a grant of at least \$2 000 000 will be received from the Australian Government in 1973-74 towards the speeding up of the sewerage programme. If that amount is not forthcoming it will be necessary to reduce the departmental programme.

Undoubtedly, the Treasurer said that, having regard to statements made by the Hon. E. G. Whitlam when Leader of the Opposition and to communications he had had with the Government after Mr. Whitlam became Prime Minister. At page 23, the Australian Labor Party's 1972 policy speech, under the heading "Sewerage", states:

A Labor Government will immediately ask the principal water and sewerage authorities what Commonwealth grants in the present financial year would enable them to embark promptly and economically on an uninterrupted programme to provide services to all the premises in their areas by 1978. For subsequent financial years, the Commonwealth Grants Commission will investigate and recommend the size of Commonwealth grants—

and I stress the word "grants"—
required to see the programme through.

It then proceeded, under the heading "Loan Council", to say what the council would do. Clearly there was a firm commitment by the Australian Labor Party at the 1972 Commonwealth elections to make funds available for this purpose by way of grant, which was beneficial to the State. It was not to be a grant that would be eroded by the provision of interest and terms over a period. Indeed, when further announcements were made by the Minister of Works during November, 1973, he suddenly said it was to be a loan, and we were told how the loan would be repaid. The Minister in this place has attacked the decision that was taken by the Australian Government making this a loan with repayable conditions as opposed to a firm commitment that he and his colleagues had accepted in faith from the Commonwealth Labor Government in 1972.

To bring the matter into perspective, because the doubting Minister of Education intruded into the debate, I refer to Parliamentary Paper No. 11 of 1973-74 relating to works in this category. Under the heading "Sewerage of New Areas" on page 9 (and I will refer to the metropolitan area only) is the sum of \$2 178 000; for house connections \$1 200 000; for extensions, services, and minor works \$1 938 000; a total of \$5 316 000. Those sums were allocated in anticipation of a \$2 000 000 grant. It was clearly recognized that if there were a reduction in the grant the programme would be curtailed. In the Loan Estimates for 1974-75, again at page 9 and under the same heading in respect of the metropolitan area, we read that the sewerage of new areas is to cost \$1 980 000 (a figure markedly less than for 1973-74). The sum of \$1 300 000 is allocated for house connections. This is an increase of \$100 000, and one might accept that additional \$100 000 as being due to the escalation of costs associated with inflation. For extensions, services and minor works \$2 012 000 is allocated, making the total expenditure in these fields \$5 292 000.

The proposed expenditure is less than for 1973-74. Against the background demonstrated in this place over a long time there has been a marked reduction of effectiveness in respect of money spent, because of inflation associated not only with wage and salary increases but also with material costs. This proves that the Government has failed miserably to honour its commitments and promises to the South Australian public. In introducing the Loan Estimates, the Treasurer said he believed that the Australian Government would make available \$3 500 000 for the improving of metropolitan sewerage. The Government, through the Treasurer, has not dealt with members as we should expect: with frankness and with a clear indication of exactly what is taking place in Government management. There is a clear indication of Government mismanagement in this whole area. The people of the community are having the wool pulled over their eyes by a Treasurer who stands up and says one thing, although he realizes that an entirely different set of circumstances prevails. I believe the member for Fisher is correct in exposing the duplicity of the Treasurer in this matter and the failure of the Government to honour its obligations to the community in South Australia.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I support the member for Fisher in what he said about progress in the sewerage of the Mitcham Hills area. I support him, because it was an area I represented for about 15 years and, during the whole of that time, I fought successive Governments in the hope of being able to get a sewerage scheme for the area. It was not until I was a member of the Hall Government, from 1968 to 1970, that it was decided to sewer the area. I assure the member for Fisher that in the area there are

houses built 50 years ago that have still not been sewered. In case there is any reflection on me because I was a member of the Government that finally decided to sewer the area, I assure members that the area in which I happened to live at Eden Hills was cut out of the scheme: I received no benefit.

There is no doubt whatever of the necessity for a sewerage scheme for the Hills: it is long overdue. The decision to sewer the area was taken in the late 1960's; this is now 1974 and slow progress indeed is being made. I do not blame this Government only, although it is this Government which has the responsibility now and which has proceeded slowly with the scheme. I suspect the Government realizes the area involved has no political interest in contrast to the Districts of Mawson and Tea Tree Gully, seats held by the Government. I can say that, whereas perhaps the member for Fisher could not or did not wish to say it, because the area is in his district. However, there is no doubt much force in that observation. It is utterly unfair that such should be so. I believe that far more than has been done should have been done far more quickly to sewer the area. Many people live there; it has a growing population; and observations by local medical practitioners, councillors and others have shown over the years that there is a higher incidence of some sicknesses caused there, it is believed, by trouble with septic tanks and overflow effluent than in other areas. There is no doubt about its being a health hazard. I hope that this motion, although doomed to failure will have some effect on the Government and that much will be done to speed up the sewerage of Blackwood, Belair, and surrounding districts as we decided to do nearly five years ago.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I support the motion. Government members, by interjection, have indicated that the member for Fisher is embarking on a political exercise. In fact, the Minister of Education tried to impute the basest of political motives to the honourable member for moving this motion. However, the facts speak for themselves.

Mr. Coumbe: The honourable member can speak up for his own constituents.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, and he has placed factual material before the House, facts which are undeniable. The Government can say what it likes; it can accuse the honourable member of what it likes but it will need stronger rebuttal than the invective of the Minister of Education before the honourable member will take any notice. Whether the Government thinks it is political or not, the member for Tea Tree Gully has been singularly successful, in conjunction with the Government, in getting the larger part of her electoral district sewered. That is an undeniable fact. Since the member for Tea Tree Gully has been in this House she has spent much of her time promoting the need for sewerage in her district and she has done this with much success. It was a hot political topic: effluent was running down streets in the Tea Tree Gully area. She displayed much assiduity and she was successful, as has been the member for Mawson, in making representations to the Government for the provision of sewerage in his district. That is an accomplished fact.

The Blackwood-Belair area was established many years before the Districts of Tea Tree Gully and Mawson were established and they have not been sewered, even though programmes were arranged for sewerage of some of those areas. The only thing we have heard in rebuttal of the remarks of the member for Fisher is that the area is difficult to sewer. Hawthorndene is not sewered, although this area is not difficult, Blackwood and Belair may be

more difficult areas, but surely that is not the criterion the Government uses. The Government will have to do better than the snide reply of the Minister of Education. Hawthorndene would not be difficult to sewer and it was established long before the Tea Tree Gully area was established. I think the remarks of the Minister highlight the fact that Government members have become unduly dependent on Commonwealth Government intervention; unfortunately, they have been misled by their Commonwealth colleagues. It is not an over-statement to say that the Commonwealth Government has been completely untruthful in the statements and undertakings it has given this State.

The Minister of Works has said that there would be an immediate grant of \$2 000 000 to this State but that grant seems to have disappeared. Nevertheless, there is an overall reduction this year in State funds on the lines concerned with the sewerage of new areas, house connections, and extensions, services and minor works. This is not good enough. The member for Fisher has a valid complaint in this regard. It is an argument that can be sustained in its entirety and I support the motion wholeheartedly.

Dr. TONKIN: The residents of the Fisher District have been given a lousy deal: large areas of that district are unsewered. The Minister of Education said that this was largely because of the contours of the district of Fisher but, if it is due to the contours, that is all the more reason why more should be spent in that area until it is made safe, either by sewerage or by some other means. Personally, I think the provision of sewerage is the only possible way in which the area can be made safe. Diseases have a habit of changing their nature: one organism may, by changing in a small way, provide a totally different disease. As the member for Mitcham has already said, some diseases occur more frequently in unsewered areas. This concerns me because I have recently heard of two cases of hepatitis that have ended in death. Hepatitis is a disease from which one normally recovers even when contracted acutely. It seems there are indications that the disease is changing in its nature. It is one of the diseases that can occur in unsewered areas; gastro-enteritis is another. I believe this matter should be of extreme and grave public concern because it is the health of the people we are playing with. It is not good enough in the context of our present standards of public health and standards of living that large areas of this city should still be unsewered, particularly when those areas have been established for such a long time. I support the motion.

The Hon. I. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I oppose the motion. The member for Fisher would be aware that this is a vote of no confidence in the Government.

Mr. Gunn: That would be justified.

The Hon. I. D. CORCORAN: Any move to reduce a line in the Loan Estimates is taken by the Government to be a vote of no confidence and I am certain the honourable member knows that that is so and that it must be treated as such because, irrespective of what he has said and how sincere he is (and I do not doubt his sincerity), the Government is not going to fall over this issue. It is desirable to sewer every area throughout the State than can be sewered. No-one refutes that, but the member for Fisher knows that there is a certain sum to go around and a certain number of things have to be done and only so much can be done at any one time. .

It gets back to a decision on priorities. Whilst it has not been said directly today (I think probably it was said

more strongly by the member for Mitcham than by anyone else), the Government has been accused of giving preference to Government members in this regard. That is not the case. The need for sewerage in Tea Tree Gully or in Mawson or wherever it has been provided has been just as great as, if not greater than, in the areas referred to by members opposite today. The priorities have been organized and decided on by the Government in relation to the location of its work force, equipment, ease of working, the speed with which they could get it done, and the cost at which they could get it done.

I think the member for Kavel said that the Minister of Education had referred to contours. The honourable member would appreciate that that does have a bearing on decisions because much more can be done in a relatively flat area for less money than can be done in a difficult area. That stands to reason, and the department is anxious to service as many areas as possible and clear as much of the backlog as possible. I think that is the main reason behind the decisions relating to priorities. It is no good my saying that Adelaide and many of our country towns are much better off as to sewerage than are the capital cities and country towns of other States, because probably such comparisons are odious. I realize the problems ahead of us. There has been criticism of the Commonwealth Government as to how money is to be made available to the States in this connection. However, this is the first time in the history of this country that a Commonwealth Government has recognized the need to help the States in this regard. As the Leader said, originally it was announced that the money would be advanced by way of grant. It has not been provided in that way.

Dr. Eastick: You didn't hear the Minister of Education.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: He was not intimately involved in this matter. With the other State Ministers, I argued with the Commonwealth Minister for Urban and Regional Development (Mr. Uren) about the change in relation to this grant. However, the Commonwealth had suddenly realized that this money would be given to the States to provide a service for which a charge was made. For that reason, a grant was not applicable. I argued that South Australia would accept anything extra that we could get. Initially, the other State Ministers would not take this money, and they were due for much more than we were to get. I said that we would take it because we wanted to tackle the backlog of work. However, I said that the interest rate payable on the money should be reduced. After further negotiations, the interest rate was reduced slightly below the rate announced initially. Nevertheless, the Commonwealth went back on its word, as this grant was not a grant.

I give that Government credit for recognizing for the first time the need to help the States in this area. The problem in Sydney, Melbourne, Brisbane and Perth is far greater than it is in this State. The efforts of this Government and previous Governments, particularly the Playford Administration, have meant that there is no great backlog of sewerage work in this State. The areas that are now problem areas were not tackled previously. The member for Fisher rightly says that the situation in his area is largely a hangover from the past. Only in 1965 was legislation passed compelling subdividers to provide water, sewerage, kerbing, footpaths, and so on, including the cost in the price of the block. I will not say that people living in these areas went there with their eyes open. As the member for Fisher has said, in many cases they have been assisted to build in these areas by State

Government instrumentalities. If the member for Fisher were in my position, as Minister, he would know that he had only so much of the cake and that he would have to spread what he had as adequately as possible over the crucial areas.

Mr. Coumbe: What about water quality?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: In the allocation in the Loan Estimates this year for the Engineering and Water Supply Department, \$3 000 000 is provided for water treatment, and this is the first time that such an allocation has been made.

Mr. Dean Brown: Not before time.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Very well; the honourable member wants that work done, but that takes \$3 000 000 that could otherwise be used for sewerage work. In considering the backlog of sewerage work, we must also remember the equipment and work force that is necessary to do the work involved. With so much subdivision taking place, even if the money were available (and it is not), we could not get the contractors to do this backlog of work. Throughout the Loan Estimates, there is pressure for money to be supplied so that work can be done. No doubt in this debate we will hear complaints from members about insufficient money being available for certain work.

Mr. Coumbe: I remember you saying the same thing.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Apparently the honourable member agrees with what I am saying: that there is pressure in every area for money. The \$3 000 000 provided for water treatment is for part of a project that will be spread over 10 years. In this work, we can hope for assistance from the Commonwealth Government, as we have received assistance in relation to sewerage work. Until the Commonwealth Budget is brought down, we cannot know what funds will be made available. However, when we have this information, I will demonstrate to honourable members exactly what improvement will take place in catching up the backlog of sewerage work. I recognize the problem that exists and how serious it is. However, no-one could do more than the present Government is doing to solve the problem and catch up on the backlog of work.

Dr. EASTICK: Unfortunately, what the Minister has said does not go far enough. Under the heading "Sewerage Works" in the document "Payments to or for the States 1973-74", the Hon. Mr. Frank Crean states, at page 65:

The Australian Government is offering the States assistance totalling \$30 000 000 in 1973-74 as the first contribution towards a programme to eliminate the backlog of unsewered premises in principal urban areas. The funds will be provided for specific projects approved by the Australian Government. The distribution between the States takes into account a number of factors including the relative numbers of unsewered premises in the various States.

In this regard, the Minister of Works correctly said that the sum to be provided to South Australia would be less than that received by the other States, but that we would benefit by having additional funds of \$3 000 000 for water treatment.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: That's out of our own State funds; the Commonwealth allocation will be in addition to that.

Dr. EASTICK: If we get it. Do we have a firm commitment?

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Yes.

Dr. EASTICK: Have we got any money?

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: No, but the Commonwealth Budget hasn't been introduced.

Dr. EASTICK: The sums provided for this work in the various States were as follows: New South Wales, \$11 200 000; Victoria, \$9 300 000; Queensland, \$3 100 000; Western Australia, \$3 800 000; Tasmania, \$1 000 000; and South Australia, \$1 600 000. The correct figure for South Australia was about \$1 578 000. When we are committed to prepare many serviced blocks to make up the leeway caused by the Government's failure to allow developers to continue operations as they had been allowed previously, we see that much money must be spent to service the many blocks in what will be the metropolitan area. I ask how much of the work will be done on behalf of the Land Commission, with the department's funds. Will the commission fund after the work has been done or will it pay for the work as it is proceeded with?

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: It will be the same as with the developer.

Dr. EASTICK: The delay often is so great that there is an upset in the department that is required to do the initial funding, and I hope the Minister will obtain, from the lesser amount to be spent in 1974-75, a potential improvement in the metropolitan sewerage system. If we tie up funds awaiting Commonwealth Government funds, we must not only reduce our work but also service funds awaiting infusion from another department. We all hope for a clear flow of funds so that we will get value for every \$1.

However, it would not surprise me if we had to service our funds for a longer period, and this would result in a reduced programme. The Minister has said that the water treatment programme will take \$3 000 000 of Loan funds in 1974-75, but he did not say that when the member for Torrens as Minister of Works first put forward the proposal, the Party of which the Minister is a member laughed it out of court.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: It didn't.

Dr. EASTICK: The proposal was said to be impracticable, but suddenly it was resurrected late one November or December evening as a mammoth new project. We must also accept that, if the project had been commenced when it was first committed, it would have been concluded at a lower cost to South Australia than otherwise. The priorities were determined in 1969-70, when the scheme was first proposed. This project is only another area in which there has been total mismanagement by the present Government, resulting in a costly exercise to the people of this State.

Mr. EVANS: I realize that this is a no-confidence debate, and I said there was no other way to deal with the problem. I have gone as far as I can go with letters and petitions. The Minister has said that, until now, the department has tried to sewer the areas that are easier to sewer, and where the terrain is better and the digging of trenches can be done more easily than it can be done in rock formations in some parts of the Adelaide Hills. However, I assure the Minister that that is not the case at Hawthorndene.

In 1974-75 we are reducing effectively the amount to be spent. We will complete the easier areas and still have the difficult areas that will be more expensive, but we still are reducing the commitment. We will slow down the progress on effective connections. At the same time, the Minister has said \$3 000 000 will be made available for filtration, and the Treasurer has referred to \$3 000 000 being spent on the Hope Valley water treatment plant. If the \$3 000 000 comes from the Commonwealth Government, what direct bearing will that have on the sewerage commitment, The sewerage commitment

from the Commonwealth Government was \$1 600 000 last year, and the Minister has said that he confidently expects to receive \$3 500 000 this year, so the filtration commitment has no bearing on the sewerage commitment.

Further, the Commonwealth Government has no reason to be proud of what it has done, and our State Minister has admitted that the Commonwealth Government has broken a promise. The Commonwealth Government will receive \$2 500 000 000 a year more in taxation, and we are dealing with a commitment of \$3 500 000 to try to solve a sewerage problem. The Minister has said that we have a shortage of manpower.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: No.

Mr. EVANS: He has said that we can use only so much manpower and equipment, according to our works programme.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: On an annual basis.

Mr. EVANS: However, last year we spent \$2 178 000 on metropolitan sewerage works, whereas this year we have allowed only \$2 000 000. At the same time, we have an inflationary trend in that field of at least 16 per cent. We have reduced the amount of work to be carried out on sewerage by 16 per cent, plus \$178 000. Is the Minister suggesting that the same number of gangs will be working but that the men will not do as much work or will have more leave, or that there will be more strikes? Why are we reducing the commitment?

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Have you thought about what land developers and the Land Commission will require from us?

Mr. EVANS: Does that mean that we will develop 1 000 houses at Monarto with sewerage facilities but leave them empty while, at the same time, other areas will be going without? Last year \$2 178 000 was provided, and that would not affect the Land Commission. It seems that we are reducing the amount of work to be done, because this year the State Government will commit only about \$5 000 000 on metropolitan sewerage works whereas last year it spent about \$6 700 000. This is a situation that is totally unacceptable. Perhaps it may be an oversight by the Government but, with an inflationary trend, the reduction of work during 1974-75 will be about 40 per cent, and that is frightening. The Minister should consider this matter seriously, because more enthusiasm should be shown by the department in reducing the backlog of sewerage facilities in long established areas of this State.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (18)—Messrs. Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans (teller), Goldsworthy, Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, and Venning.

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

Majority of 4 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

Dr. TONKIN: Regarding the Bolivar, Glenelg and other metropolitan sewage treatment works, can the Minister of Works say what provision has been made in long-term planning for the use of methane gas, generated from the treatment of sewage, for the generation of electricity and other energy requirements? The use of methane gas in this regard is becoming more and more publicized, and I believe that the turbines at Torrens Island are capable of using natural gas and, therefore, methane. Can the Minister say whether it would be

possible to use methane gas from Bolivar for the generation of electricity at Torrens Island?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I recently saw information on this matter which indicated that, even on the site of the treatment works, it was not a proposition to use methane gas for the production of electricity. Although I doubt whether it would be a proposition to do as the honourable member has suggested, I will inquire into this matter.

Mr. Coumbe: Are they producing it now?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes, at Glenelg, which has the necessary plant, but the question of economics is involved in this matter.

Dr. Tonkin: The Royal Society's Esso Award this year has been to a firm, Ruston Turbines, in the United Kingdom, for a most efficient methane gas turbine.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No doubt, and it can certainly be used. South Australia is generously endowed with fuels that can be used to produce electricity for many years to come; so, the pressure is not on us to investigate these new sources of power, such as solar energy, although they are constantly being examined. However, I will inquire about this matter for the honourable member.

Mr. ALLEN: Regarding the \$1 000 000 allocation for replacement of the Morgan-Whyalla main, can the Minister say whether the replacement will take the form of concrete pipe laid underground (which has been unsuccessful) or steel pipe constructed above the ground? The concrete main, laid in the early 1960's, was placed underground between Bundaleer reservoir and Spencer Gulf, because it was stated that this would save several millions of dollars. Is the \$1 000 000 allocation to repair only a section of the main, or will the whole of the main be replaced over a period?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The \$1 000 000 allocation this year is for repairs to only a section of the main. It will be a steel main. As the concrete main installed initially was unsuccessful, it will have to be entirely replaced over a period of years.

Mr. VENNING: Can the Minister say whether the replacement main will be above or below ground?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It will be a steel main, but I am unable to say whether it will be above or below ground. However, I will inquire and let the honourable member know.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Can the Minister say what is proposed with regard to the \$188 000 allocation for the Woolpunda water supply scheme, bearing in mind that I submitted to him a petition from people south of the New Well area for an extension of the scheme into their area? Has he considered including these people in the scheme?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am unable to give the details of the proposal, but I will inquire from the department and let the honourable member know as soon as possible, bearing in mind the point he has raised.

Mr. COUMBE: Regarding the allocation for River Murray weirs, dams, locks, etc., can the Minister tell me the circumstances surrounding the \$928 000 that has been received unexpectedly from the River Murray Commission in connection with the arrangements involving the Hume dam?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to ask the commission the reason for this windfall. Undoubtedly it was the result of an arrangement made some time ago.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Can the Minister say whether any of the allocation for River Murray weirs, dams, locks etc. is to be used for work in connection with salinity control? If not, will the Minister ascertain what work is currently being carried out in this regard?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No part of the allocation is for work in connection with salinity control, although this can sometimes involve repairs to locks. I shall be happy to ascertain the current position and the sum likely to be spent on work in connection with salinity control this year.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I seek further information from the Minister of Works on the \$660 000 for central workshops and foundry (which I presume is at Ottoway) and on the \$6 177 000 for plant and machinery. I refer also to the allocation for preliminary investigations and miscellaneous items. The Minister is no doubt aware that the Public Accounts Committee investigated some aspects of Engineering and Water Supply Department's activities at Ottoway.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Government has decided to centralize the departmental workshops at Ottoway. This will involve moving the Kent Town operation, and the \$6 177 000 relates to new plant and extended workshops to be provided at Ottoway. The whole set-up at Kent Town will be moved to Ottoway over five years, and the Kent Town site will be handed back to the Adelaide City Council and will revert to park lands, the purpose for which the site was originally intended.

Mr. BECKER: When will the Darlington to Port Adelaide trunk main be completed? In addition, when will the laying of the main along Military Road, West Beach, be completed? It seems that at present the department is working in the treatment works at Glenelg.

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

Mr. VENNING: I understand that the Environment and Conservation Department has stipulated that the Morgan-Whyalla main should be laid underground. Over many years it has been found preferable, in order to preserve services and mains to place the pipes above ground. Does the E. & W.S. Department accept such directions from the Environment and Conservation Department?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As I said before, I am not certain whether the main will be laid underground. I understand it will be laid over a shorter route, and no doubt certain sections of it will be underground, but I am not aware of the point raised by the honourable member. However, I will find out and let him know.

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Minister give an assurance that he will obtain a clear understanding of the effect of the Australian Government funds, which are injected into various projects, on funds currently being allocated for these programmes? In presenting the 1973-74 Loan Estimates the Treasurer stated.

The Government is proceeding on the assumption that a grant of at least \$2 000 000 will be received from the Australian Government in 1973-74 towards the speeding up of the sewerage programme. If that amount is not forthcoming, it will be necessary to revise the departmental programme.

That suggests that the sum to be spent on the whole programme is consistent with funds being injected. If we consider the expenditure of about \$5 300 000 referred to earlier, including the \$1 600 000 from the Commonwealth Government, the State's actual commitment in this area would be about \$3 700 000. With the \$5 200 000 determined in respect of 1974-75 (\$3 500 000 from the

Commonwealth), the actual State expenditure for this year in the specific categories would be only \$1 700 000. That is a \$2 000 000 reduction in State Government spending, if what I am saying is correct. I am not trying to upstage the Minister, because I am sure he appreciates that we need a clear understanding of how the accounts are formulated.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I believe the Leader's assumption is correct. I, too, am not certain, but it appears to me that the total programme would include a \$3 500 000 grant from the Commonwealth. The point made by the member for Fisher is taken. One condition laid down by the Australian Government when making the \$1 600 000 available to the State was that the programme be maintained at the same level of spending by the States as had been maintained in previous years. In other words, because the Commonwealth made the additional funds available, the States could not cut programmes. In relation to the 1971-72 and 1972-73 Loan Estimate expenditures, last year's level of expenditure on sewerage was maintained. I believe we cannot reduce substantially, or even to a minor degree, the level of expenditure on a programme in which we have been involved over the years, because the grant is conditional in this respect.

Dr. Eastick: Perhaps the Australian Government got wind of the way we managed our hospital grants.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not know about that. However, the Australian Government said it would provide additional funds if the States did not reduce programmes below their previous level. I will get a clear explanation from the Treasury on the aspects raised by the Leader.

Mr. McANANEY: I understand that work was to commence on Hahndorf sewerage this year. As it does not appear under a separate item, is it included in other new works?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have the same impression, the work could have been on design only. However, I will find out when it is expected that work will commence.

Mr. CHAPMAN: My question relates to expenditure on water supply projects in connection with country water-works. As I cannot see a provision regarding American River, will the Minister ascertain how the \$2 238 000 for extensions, services and minor works is to be spent? Perhaps the much sought after project for American River is included in that large sum. I appreciate that the E. & W.S. Department has done much work in relation to this project and that it has completed a survey of the Middle River area in relation to a water supply. Landowners adjacent to what is known as the long route have agreed to pay the current fees and there appears to be little local objection to the project. Can the Minister say whether any objections still exist in this regard?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will inquire of the department and ascertain the latest position regarding the American River project. I was under the impression that the matter had not been resolved, but I will check and let the honourable member know.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Two routes were originally proposed. Landowners adjacent to the short route said that they had no use for the water and objected to paying any rates. I was asked by the Minister to call a meeting of landowners adjacent to the long route; 24 of the 26 attended, and they supported unanimously having a main laid past their properties. They said they would use the water, and they agreed to pay the State charges applicable.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am aware of the background to the problem, but I do not know whether or not it has been solved.

Mr. McANANEY: I seek information on the latest development regarding the Callington-Hartley-Strathalbyn water supply.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will seek the information required by the honourable member. I have just received information about the point raised by the member for Rocky River, involving the Morgan-Whyalla main. I believe that it is to be a mild steel concrete-lined main 42 kilometres long. It will be buried for a distance of 42 km, as opposed to the 46 km over which it was buried previously.

Mr. RODDA: I have received a complaint about the outflow from the treatment works at Naracoorte. Whilst the pumping system works well, the clearing of the outflow has caused trouble to owners of nearby farms. I am getting specific details but I want to highlight the inconvenience caused to the people in question.

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

Mr. EVANS: The Minister of Works has said that the Commonwealth Government asked that this Government keep up its commitment to about the same level as that of 1972-73. If this involves only the monetary commitment, the actual productive work will be much less than it was in 1972-73 when the commitment involved \$6 697 000 without any Commonwealth help. I wonder how the Commonwealth Government will look at the situation this year, bearing inflation in mind. Might it say to this Government, "Look, you have reduced your State commitment by nearly 30 per cent yet you want us to increase our commitment by over 100 per cent"? When the Minister of Education was attempting to look after this discussion last week, I asked how much would be spent on the Blackwood sewerage extension. In 1972-73 it was slightly more than \$400 000, and in 1973-74 it was \$490 000. I should like to know how much is allocated this year, because the amount is not listed in the Treasurer's document as it had been listed until 1973-74.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Having read the comments made by members last Wednesday afternoon, I have asked the department for a reply. The point raised by the honourable member about State effort in relation to the Commonwealth grant was exercising my mind before he got up.

Dr. TONKIN: I am pleased to hear the Minister say that an investigation will be carried out into the profitable use of methane gas generated from treatment works. He has said that South Australia is particularly fortunate to have natural resources which will last us for some time ahead, but I think the Minister of Environment and Conservation would take issue with him, because I think it is important that whatever we do we make certain that we preserve the natural resources we have and start an energy re-cycling programme as soon as we can. This occasion provides an ideal opportunity for doing that.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I was referring not only to natural gas. I take it that the honourable member suggests that we should not be using one energy to produce another, and that matter will have to be looked at eventually. Large reserves of coal, whilst they may not be first-grade quality, exist in the Balaklava and Lake Phillipson areas. Whilst there is some doubt at this stage about the economics of recovery, because of the ground-water problem at Balaklava and overhead problems concerning Lake Phillipson, the reserves are known and they could be utilized. I was talking about that, rather than about natural gas, when I made the point earlier.

Mr. EVANS: We received \$1 600 000 from the Commonwealth Government last year, and I ask the Minister to assure members that there will be no reduction in the works to be carried out by the E. & W.S. Department through the default of the Commonwealth Government to meet its obligation amounting to \$2 000 000. In part, the Minister, who was a little peeved, previously said:

There will be no need to alter our sewerage programme for this financial year. We pointed out in connection with the Loan Estimates that, if we thought the amount was not forthcoming, we would adjust not the programme but the Loan funds. That is what we will do. There will be no change in our plans for sewerage this year, and I give that assurance to the honourable member. Is he absolutely sure he has heard it?

I said "Yes". Can the Minister give an assurance that, because of our default, to a degree, in making only \$5 000 000 available, the original programme will not be affected?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Apparently, the honourable member is suggesting that the Commonwealth may not come to the party because of some default of ours.

Mr. Coumbe: Is there some doubt?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No, not that I know of. No doubt, information is available to substantiate the reference to \$3 500 000 for this year, as I do not think the figure would be plucked out of the air. Regarding the \$1 600 000 that we received, we got down to that percentage by thrashing the matter out at a Ministerial conference. Now the Commonwealth has a better idea of what is involved, having had more experience in this field. If the Commonwealth does not come to the party with any allocation at all, I cannot give an assurance that we will maintain the programme set out.

Mr. Evans: That would be disastrous.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It would be disastrous if we did not get the \$3 500 000. Last year, the sum involved was not as great; as we received the money, we were able to maintain our programme.

Mr. COUMBE: Apparently the parties to the Dartmouth dam project will spend about \$16 000 000 this year. Is there to be a moratorium on the interest on capital for the first 10 years?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: On capital repayments?

Mr. COUMBE: I should like to know about that. Although I realize that the Victorian Government is the contracting authority, can the Minister say whether the sum involved is likely to be actually spent this financial year? Will work proceed according to the original programme? Some time ago it was reported that the progress of work might be slowed down.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Coombs report to the Commonwealth Government recommended a moratorium on the building of the Dartmouth dam. At the time, I said unequivocally that the South Australian Government would not agree to any delay at all. Under the agreement of the three States and the Commonwealth, there must be unanimous agreement before the programme can be altered. Since I made my statement, the Prime Minister has written to the Treasurer indicating that, having reviewed the matter, the Australian Government has no intention of following the recommendation of Dr. Coombs about the Dartmouth dam. The main tender for work on the dam was let recently and, as far as I know, work is on schedule. The cost of the project is within the prescribed limit of \$62 000 000, plus 10 per cent. I do not know of any reason why the work scheduled to proceed this year will be interfered with, apart from industrial problems, and so on. However, I

will get a report on the matter. Regarding the moratorium on the repayment of capital, I will look into the matter and let the honourable member know.

Mr. EVANS: Is it intended to proceed with work on Clarendon reservoir soon? Is the sum of \$200 000 set aside for expenditure in the catchment area earmarked for a specific purpose, or is it provided so that, if a property becomes available in the area, it can be acquired to assist in safeguarding the watershed area? In a recent letter, I asked for information about what areas remained to be seweraged in the various electoral districts of the Adelaide metropolitan area. The department stated that it did not keep records on an electoral boundary basis. Can the Minister get me information about what areas and allotments in the metropolitan area now remain unsewered? In addition, when is work on the actual construction (not on planning and design) of these sewer facilities likely to commence?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As I can see no reason why that information should not be available, I will obtain it. Regarding the \$200 000 for the water catchment area, there is a programme to purchase areas surrounding reservoirs in order to create a buffer zone to help prevent pollution of the water supply. That is continuing, and I understand that most of the money would be for that purpose. We have made an announcement about Bakers Gully, because it was better to do that so that people would know, even if planning was for 20 or 25 years ahead. I will get the information for the honourable member.

Mr. GUNN: I am concerned about some projects in my district that have not been mentioned. No funds are provided to extend reticulated water west of Ceduna. I have raised this matter many times. People must cart water from Ceduna for long periods, and these people wonder whether the department has any long-term plans. The Community Welfare Department provided funds to pipe water to Koonibba Aboriginal Reserve, and this matter caused controversy in that part of my district. The Minister gave the assurance that that project would not alter the future situation. At Coober Pedy, the department's desalination plant can provide only a limited amount of water each day, and I ask whether the Mines Department or the E. & W.S. Department has tried to find a large quantity of underground water near that town, which I think is the twelfth largest country town in South Australia and which is in an area where there is considerable dust.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I remember the controversy about the supply of water to Koonibba Aboriginal Reserve, which project was funded by the Community Welfare Department. I think that at one stage landholders intended to refuse to give the right to pipe the water across, but we gave an assurance that that project would have no relationship to future supply. So far as I am aware, no plans have been prepared to provide this part of the State with water. I realize the problem, but I am sure the honourable member realizes that many other parts of the State also have pressing requirements. I will find out what information I can get for the honourable member. Recently I examined a matter dealing with supply at Coober Pedy but, as I cannot recall offhand what it was, I will get the information for the honourable member.

Mr. RUSSACK: Regarding water supply in the Moonta-Wallaroo area, I understand that improvements were to be made from Paskeville to Moonta to increase the pressure of water during summer, and I understand that a study was made regarding that area. I ask whether the

\$100 000 provided for Yorke Peninsula is being provided for northern Yorke Peninsula.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have not the details, but I will find out for the honourable member.

Mr. EVANS: There is concern that, when one of the pumps at the Hawthorndene pumping station (part of the Blackwood sewerage scheme) breaks down, raw sewerage runs into Hawthorndene Creek, and action to alleviate the problem would be appreciated. With the upgrading of facilities, the capacity of the pumping station would have to be increased, and I should hope that the Minister would take up that matter.

Mr. GUNN: I ask whether the department has any plan to move the operations that are now situated opposite the police barracks and to close that depot.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The work involving Kent Town deals mainly with the centralization of workshops and, to the best of my knowledge, there has been no investigation in relocating the Thebarton operations. However, I will find out the position for the honourable member, because that matter must be considered in the planning of the workshops.

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister say what further extensions are being undertaken at Glenelg Sewage Treatment Works, at a cost of \$872 000? I ask whether this is part of the overall programme. I also ask what work will be done, what will be the total cost, when the work will be completed, and by how much output will be increased.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The work at Glenelg plant involves expenditure of more than \$4 000 000 and is almost a duplication of the previous treatment works. On our planning, that will cater for the area to be served until 1995 or the turn of the century. The work had to be done, because the plant was working almost to capacity. I do not know what the capacity will be when the project is completed. During the height of summer we re-use about 90 per cent of effluent on such places as the airport and nearby ovals. However, I will obtain details of the total output and any other information that will help the honourable member.

Line passed.

Public Buildings, \$83 500 000.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Minister of Education say whether Nuriootpa Primary School will be housed in new buildings on a new site, and can he say what progress is being made on the additions to Nuriootpa High School? Does the provision of \$1 250 000 for redeveloping Parliament House include the cost of parking facilities at the rear of Parliament House? Further, can the Minister give details of the provision for divisional police headquarters at Nuriootpa?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): An eight-teacher open unit at Nuriootpa High School is virtually completed. I will ascertain what is the next improvement planned for that school. It is difficult to say whether the construction programme will be adhered to. Regarding Nuriootpa Primary School, the term "major additions" used in the Loan Estimates document is peculiar to that document. As the honourable member appreciates, there will be a replacement primary school at Nuriootpa. Regarding the redevelopment of Parliament House, I point out that the southern plaza is a separate project and is part of the festival theatre complex, but part of the parking area will be available for members. It will not be completed until some time in 1975. The provision for upgrading Parliament House does not cover the southern plaza. I will obtain the information

that the honourable member has requested concerning the divisional police headquarters at Nuriootpa.

Dr. TONKIN: I cannot see any provision for rebuilding in connection with the adult Matriculation school that has been conducted in the grounds of Norwood technical school. Can the Minister of Education say whether the project has been deferred?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Norwood Boys Technical High School, which will become Marryatville High School from the beginning of next year, is to be redeveloped as a co-educational school. When that takes place, the Further Education Department will take over the Kensington and Norwood Girls Technical High School property, which will be a suitable site for the adult Matriculation school. Until a project has been actually approved by the Public Works Committee, the project cannot appear in the Loan Estimates document. So, there are always projects which have actually started during a year but which do not appear as major works to be commenced.

Dr. TONKIN: The Minister has partly reassured me. My question related to the "temporary" classrooms used by adult Matriculation students. Residents in the area have expressed concern that those classrooms might become "permanent temporary" classrooms but, from the Minister's reply, I take it that that will not happen. There is a parking problem in the area, too.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The conversion of Norwood Boys Technical High School to Marryatville co-educational high school is a major project that will be undertaken in stages. It may be three or four years before the final phasing out of the adult Matriculation school takes place. Under the new arrangements with the Commonwealth Government announced only a few months ago, adult Matriculation students who are at an establishment under the control of a technical college or a further education centre are eligible for payments under the tertiary allowance scheme, while adult students attending a normal school under the control of the Education Department are not eligible. So, every student attending the Norwood adult Matriculation school is automatically eligible for payments under the scheme. This means that not only will the Norwood adult Matriculation school have to continue somewhere or other but also other adult Matriculation schools will have to be commenced as well.

Mr. VENNING: What is the situation regarding a new primary school at Clare?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: We intended to upgrade facilities at Clare Primary School, but have not been able to give this project as high a priority as has been given to other upgrading projects. A decision has to be made in circumstances in which we do not have enough money for all projects, but we will try to commence this work as soon as we can.

Mrs. BYRNE: I appreciate the many projects to be undertaken in the District of Tea Tree Gully, which is a developing area with an increasing population. In the past 12 months, Holden Hill and Ridgehaven Infants Schools, Surrey Downs Primary School addition, and Banksia Park High School have been completed. Work at Strathmont pre-school (the total cost of which will be \$65 000) is in progress, and new pre-schools will be commenced at Para Vista and Ridgehaven this year. Allocations for pre-schools have not appeared before in this document. Not only will the Tea Tree Gully district benefit: other areas of the State are to be involved. A new primary school at St. Agnes has commenced, and Holden Hill North Primary School is required because of a new subdivision, and a

special school is to be erected at Gilles Plains. I presume this is the special school at Modbury South, which seems to appear under the wrong heading. Highbury Infants, Modbury South Infants, Modbury West Infants, and Redwood Park Primary are schools for which planning and design is proposed during 1974-75, and councils associated with these schools will be pleased to receive this news. I should like to have seen Fairview Park school included in this list, but I am sure it will be included next year. Can the Minister say what work is planned at Modbury High School this year?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will consult with officers of my department about the nomenclature of Gilles Plains Special School, and will ascertain what is the situation concerning Modbury High School, although I understand that it is under category (a), which means that there will be a combination laboratory resource centre and additional science facilities and teaching areas.

Mr. McANANEY: Can the Minister say what additions are planned at Crafers and Mt. Barker Primary Schools?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Crafers Primary School is to be upgraded. This is a necessary project because of the difficulties of the site and the need to provide improved accommodation. At Mt. Barker Primary School the plan is for a four-teacher open unit.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: From the list it seems that not one pre-school is to be erected in a Liberal district: I could be corrected concerning Nangwarry. However, a great shortage of pre-schools is apparent in my district and there are long waiting lists.

Mrs. Byrne: Your district is—

Mr. Coumbe: All children are equal.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I am amazed at the interjection by the member for Tea Tree Gully, who claims that my district is a wealthy one and does not need pre-schools.

Mrs. Byrne: You said that. I didn't.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Pre-schools are needed in my district just as much as in other areas. New pre-schools are to be commenced at Alberton, Elizabeth Downs, Elizabeth West, Goodwood, Ingle Farm, Nangwarry, Para Vista, Ridgehaven, Salisbury North-West, and Trinity Gardens—not a single Liberal district. Will the Minister give urgent consideration to constructing new pre-school buildings in the District of Davenport as well as in other Liberal areas?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The procedures adopted in relation to the development of the pre-school programme are the product of recommendations of the Pre-school Committee, chaired by Judge Olsson, and with representation from the Education Department and the Kindergarten Union of South Australia Incorporated. It also has a representative of the Kindergarten Teachers College. The committee is an advisory one at this stage but will be given statutory force later this year. It is a committee on which departmental representatives would be in the minority.

The policy we are adopting is one of flexibility as to whether we have an Education Department pre-school or a Kindergarten Union kindergarten. In areas where a local committee has been established, and where the local committee wishes to remain affiliated to the Kindergarten Union and establish a kindergarten in that way, the kindergarten (or pre-school) will be a Kindergarten Union facility. As a consequence, it will not appear on the list, because the list deals only with Education Department pre-schools.

Mr. Dean Brown: In other words, we can pay for our own.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I find the member for Davenport expresses points of view which could possibly be construed (if one was so minded to construe them) as

poisonous and involving the worst form of Party-political prejudice. Funds for Kindergarten Union kindergartens, unless they already have money in hand, are being fully provided. There is no requirement for additional money raising for Kindergarten Union kindergartens. The honourable member's comment is completely false and I think he should have been better informed on this point.

Until two years ago the State made no contribution to the capital cost of providing kindergartens: they were provided purely as a result of the action of local committees through the Kindergarten Union. There was no grant towards capital costs, although there was a subsidy towards running costs. Two years ago this Government introduced a \$1 for \$1 subsidy up to \$8 000. Prior to that, no capital assistance of any description was given. There was no assistance from any Commonwealth Government until the last financial year.

Mr. Coumbe: What about the college?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The college was provided, but kindergartens had to be built entirely through the efforts of local committees. The only charitable organization involved to any significant extent in providing funds towards kindergartens was the Commercial Motor Vehicles Foundation. In previous times, I have been able to call for its assistance for building at Richmond, Peterborough, and Taperoo. The previous arrangement was that those sections of the community that were relatively better off tended to have more kindergarten places a thousand of population than those relatively less well off (I am not talking about wealthy or poor). The present situation is that Kindergarten Union kindergartens, the main source of pre-school places at present, are unevenly spread throughout South Australia. They tend to be located more frequently in those parts of the metropolitan area that are relatively better off than others. Any committee looking at the question of need, and looking at the areas in which no committees are at work but in which there is a pre-school need, will find that those areas tend to be concentrated in the types of area shown in the list. It may well be that they happen to be Labor-voting areas, but they also happen to be areas where the previous system of providing kindergartens did not work. It is not a question, in many of these places, of there being inadequate kindergarten facilities: in many cases there are no facilities at all.

The honourable member's district, like my own, would be relatively better off in terms of the provision of kindergartens than most other electoral districts. Although it is true that some fees are paid, it is also the case that a subsidy of about 75 per cent on running costs has been provided for these kindergartens by the taxpayers generally over all the areas in which these kindergartens are operating. We may well argue that those better-off areas have had more than their fair share of resources under this heading over the years. Be that as it may, I have been pushing hard (and it is contained in our current submission to the Australian Government) to establish that, if the Education Department is to establish pre-schools that are non-fee-paying, we must eliminate the fees being paid in union kindergartens. The total cost of eliminating such fees would be about \$300 000 a year, and the proposal would be to phase out those fees over a period of five years in more or less equal steps. Whether or not that will be possible remains to be seen.

Mr. Dean Brown: What about those that are not getting the subsidy at present?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Every kindergarten affiliated to the union has been brought under subsidy this year.

Mr. Dean Brown: I am talking about the others.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: They must get themselves affiliated and bring themselves up to standard. It is not intended to provide finance for pre-school purposes other than through the union or the department. Private kindergartens or non-affiliated kindergartens must allow the Education Department to move in or get themselves up to scratch to become affiliated to the union and receive help in that way. It is necessary in this overall area to have some safeguard to ensure reasonable standards and to see that the funds are spent appropriately.

Mr. VENNING: As regards kindergartens, my local committee received correspondence from Commonwealth authorities, prior to the last Commonwealth election, stating that \$3 000 would be made available to that kindergarten.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What Commonwealth authorities?

Mr. VENNING: The Minister's Commonwealth colleague in Canberra, I understand, made some money available prior to the last Commonwealth election.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Which kindergarten are you talking about?

Mr. VENNING: The one at Crystal Brook. There was correspondence to the effect that it would receive \$3 000 from the Commonwealth, and that announcement was made prior to the last Commonwealth election.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Several kindergartens are financed through the Kindergarten Union. I will check on the position at Crystal Brook and let the honourable member know; I have not the information with me.

Mr. BOUNDY: I see that \$881 000 is to be divided between six area schools. It is probably incorrect to assume that six divided into \$881 000 is the way to do it but, if it is done that way, over \$140 000 is provided for each school. Yorketown Area School is one of the schools listed here. In Goyder, we are never satisfied with what we get but we do appreciate that Yorketown Area School is to be proceeded with. On what will this money be spent with regard to that school? I imagine it will be for preliminary site works. Where Samcon construction is to be used, are these site works to be undertaken by the Public Buildings Department or by local contractors or the local council?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Site works depend entirely on the position of the construction gangs used by the Public Buildings Department. If private contractors are needed to do those works, tenders will be called but, if a construction gang is available and work is necessary to keep that gang going, that gang will be used. I draw the honourable member's attention to page 23 of the Treasurer's Statement, Appendix 1, which shows Yorketown Area School additions as costing \$1 324 000, when these Loan Estimates were prepared. I point out that, in this list of area schools, Snowtown is virtually completed (most of the expenditure on Snowtown having occurred in the last financial year). Tumby Bay is already occupied, and expenditure this financial year will be minimal. Work at Streaky Bay is in progress and there will be a fair amount of expenditure this financial year. Lameroo and Hawker have also been completed. So the main expenditure under that head, which may turn out to be even greater than that, depending on whatever shuffling there is of the school-building programme during the year, is on Streaky Bay and Yorketown.

In any project a rough estimate must be made of what is to be spent in this financial year and in the next financial year but, once work starts, that is never allowed to affect the rates at which the work is completed. So, the amount to be spent on Yorketown this year may well be above the figure tentatively allowed.

Mr. CHAPMAN: In answering previous questions, the Minister has dealt at length with pre-school and junior classes. I am concerned about the expenditure proposed for high schools, in view of some practices going on at those schools which, I understand, come under the jurisdiction of the Minister and should be looked at closely when we are considering spending so much money. For example, \$881 000 is proposed to be spent on area schools and \$3 251 000 on new high schools. Those are large sums. Before agreeing to such great expenditure, could the Minister answer a question?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If the question is what I think it will be, it will be out of order.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. CHAPMAN: Irrespective of what the Minister may think I am going to ask, I remind the Chair that what I intend to ask the Minister is serious. It may embarrass the member for Tea Tree Gully, so I offer her the opportunity to retire from the Chamber. I do not view the matter as humorously as the Minister apparently does. As a result of an incident that occurred at one of these high schools on which this money is to be spent, I bring to the Minister's notice a book that is used in the Matriculation class—*Poetry of the Underground in Britain*.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member is out of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Mr. Chairman, I suggest the member is going on to discuss a matter that has nothing to do with this item of capital expenditure.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The Chair is aware of that.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I realize that ordinarily one should not leave the lines under discussion but I am concentrating on expenditure on high schools, where Matriculation students are being taught. I should like clarification from the Minister—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member is out of order. He must confine himself to the lines.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Therefore—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! I trust the honourable member for Alexandra will not continue with a matter that has already been ruled out of order.

Mr. CHAPMAN: With every respect, Mr. Chairman, you do not know yet what the question is.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The Chair has heard sufficient to realize that the question is out of order.

Mr. Chapman: I'm being gagged!

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! Is the member for Alexandra reflecting on the Chair?

Mr. CHAPMAN: No, on the Minister.

Mr. VENNING: The Education Department has a programme for teacher housing throughout the State. Can the Minister say what is the current position regarding this programme and whether the \$1 000 000 allocation is for teacher housing or units in the country?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The teacher housing programme is being expanded this year, both as regards the construction of new residences and the purchase of existing

residences which are, according to our advisers, in satisfactory locations. I do not think that the change in financial allocations will make any difference to the situation at Booleroo.

Dr. TONKIN: No-one could be more pleased that I to read the items Glenside and Hillcrest Hospitals and to see that sums have now been allocated and are proposed to be spent. When is it expected that work on these projects will commence and finish? Under Glenside Hospital are the psychiatric sub-acute wards, which were announced recently to be built on the so-called honey-comb principle. Under Hillcrest Hospital, \$600 000 is allocated for the new admission ward. Can the Minister say whether the \$600 000 allocation is in addition to the Commonwealth Government grant announced recently, following expressions of concern from the members of the staff at Hillcrest and members of the public, or is it to be incorporated in the Commonwealth Government grant?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The expenditure at Glenside is for the redevelopment of the hospital to include the erection of a single service under the two sub-acute buildings. Regarding Hillcrest Hospital, I will ensure that the information is made available to the honourable member. My recollection is that the money for Hillcrest was provided by the Australian Government prior to the end of the last financial year.

Dr. Tonkin: Yes.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: However, I am not sure whether additional funds will be forthcoming from the Australian Government this financial year.

Dr. Tonkin: That's what I want to know.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will ask the Minister of Works and let the honourable member know. For hospital buildings generally, the sum proposed to be spent is \$21 000 000, and the amount of recoveries (mainly in Commonwealth Government assistance) is \$2 600 000, giving net payments of \$18 400 000. As I am not sure how the \$2 600 000 is to be allocated, I will inquire for the honourable member.

Dr. TONKIN: Regarding Queen Elizabeth Hospital, considerable stuns are to be spent on the Nuclear Medicine Department, radiology room and equipment, and major extensions and alterations. I ask whether the allocation is in the form of a completion payment, because I understand that most of this work has been completed.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I assume that this is so. However, I will ascertain whether that is the case. If I ascertain that the position is as the honourable member has suggested, he will hear nothing.

Dr. TONKIN: For Port Pirie Hospital, \$365 000 is allocated for development. It seems that we have seen this hospital appear on the Loan Estimates year after year. Being concerned to know whether an end to this project is in sight, I ask the Minister to obtain a report for me.

The sum of \$300 000 has been allocated for community health projects. Members will have received a press statement from the Commonwealth Minister for Health (Dr. Everingham) regarding South Australia's community health programme for 1974-75. He approved grants of \$1 832 550 for these projects at Ingle Farm, St. Agnes, Coober Pedy, Ceduna, Tumby Bay, Cummins and Keith, together with minor programmes. Can the Minister say to what extent the community health project allocation in the Loan Estimates ties in with the Commonwealth grants? The Commonwealth grants cover such items as staffing, rental, premises, furniture and equipment. The sum of \$300 000 spread over all these centres could not possibly be for buildings. On what basis are the State and Commonwealth contributions calculated?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will check for the honourable member. Part of the Commonwealth money for the health centres is for recurrent expenditure, not capital expenditure. I think that the Estimates may have been affected by the fact that we do not have precise information about what has been included in the Commonwealth Government's Budget. It may well be that the sums available will turn out to be different from those appearing in the Loan Estimates. The Minister's announcement, until the Budget actually appears, particularly in current circumstances (because all kinds of discussion are going on about the rearrangement of priorities and the like), is probably not sufficient on its own to enable action to be taken. I will check on this matter for the honourable member.

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

Dr. TONKIN: Is the Norwood project centre to take the place of a day attendance centre, or will such a centre still operate as a separate entity and, if that is the case, where will it operate? Press reports on the subject did not make clear whether the Norwood project centre would be basically a day attendance centre for difficult children referred by the Juvenile Court, or even juvenile aid panels, or whether it would be for children referred from the psychology branch of the Education Branch.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will get a report.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: A sum of \$3 950 000 is provided for an office block in Flinders Street. Is that the new education building?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Yes.

Mr. EVANS: I acknowledge that an open-space unit has been completed this year at the Blackwood High School at a cost of \$240 000 and that major additions are presently being carried out at that school at a cost of \$866 000. When is it expected that Coromandel Valley Primary School and Flagstaff Hill Primary School will be completed? Is it true that Flagstaff Hill Primary School will now be given priority over Bellevue Heights Primary School? I had been led to believe that the Bellevue Heights school would be commenced and completed first. If the priorities have been changed, what is the reason? When is it expected that work will commence on Coromandel Valley South Primary School, and when will another secondary school be built at Coromandel Valley to help to ease pressure on Blackwood High School? Is it planned to make additions to Hawthorndene Primary School, which will have capacity enrolment at the beginning of next year? Additions or temporary buildings are needed at that school. Although Aldgate Primary School was to be replaced with a new school, the feeling in the community now is that, if the department develops a playing field on the new site (about .4 kilometres from the present school), the new primary school can be forgotten for the time being.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Aldgate school situation is tied up with developments at Bridgewater. Originally, it was intended that we should combine, on the new site, the Aldgate and Bridgewater schools. Whether that scheme eventuates remains to be seen. Although some changes may have taken place in local attitudes, that does not necessarily mean that we must change our point of view. Regarding Blackwood High School and the situation at Coromandel Valley, I think developments to the west will be significant in relieving the position. Probably (I will check on this) the school at Flagstaff Hill will be required before the school at Bellevue Heights. The Reynella High School proposal will be the main factor in relieving the pressure at Blackwood High School

and will probably eliminate the need for a second high school at Coromandel Valley. I do not know of the pressure on accommodation at Hawthorndene school. I will check the matter and provide more detailed information later.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Are the pre-school education grants expected from the Commonwealth related directly to a pre-school of, I think, a minimum of 60 students, or has the Minister been able to persuade the Commonwealth to assist smaller kindergartens by making direct grants to enable them to carry out building programmes? At Pinnaroo, money was raised for a kindergarten but the price escalated beyond reach temporarily. As I recall, the Minister undertook to see whether he could persuade the Commonwealth to alter its policy with regard to kindergartens.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: This is a case where priorities must be decided in a situation in which everyone wants something, but in which initially there is a limited capacity to provide assistance. In view of the uncertainty regarding Commonwealth assistance this financial year, it is not really possible to answer the honourable member.

Mr. Nankivell: Wasn't there a size restriction?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am aware of places where it was intended to cater for about 40 students. The possibility of a more flexible policy regarding kindergartens operated by the Kindergarten Union is a matter of some significance. I will see that the honourable member's question is checked, and I will give him appropriate information when I am able to do so.

Mr. GUNN: When does the department intend to start building the Karcultaby and Miltaburra Area Schools? Also, when is the new school likely to be completed at Ceduna?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Planning with regard to Karcultaby and Miltaburra is unchanged. However, neither project has yet been before the Public Works Committee. As they are both Samcon constructions, the gap between Public Works Committee approval and construction is different from the position in the case of solid-construction buildings. As we have done in the past, we can proceed with parts of the Samcon programme in a way that gives flexibility, but this is not possible with solid-construction school buildings. The replacement of Ceduna school is regarded as urgent. As I said when I was there last year, the minimum period before the school will be available is three years, and it is more likely to be four years. I told the people in some detail why this would be the case. Although that situation has not changed, over the past year we have tried to ensure that the planning for Ceduna will go ahead as rapidly as possible.

We hope that the new school will be available at the time I mentioned last year, namely, in three years from last year, or some time in 1976. However, I will not make a definite promise on that in view of the problems in the building industry, inflated building costs, and the lack of knowledge whether the funds available for school building will increase in line with increases in building costs. If I give a firm date, I am bound to be called a liar, and I do not intend to have that happen. I would rather be a little more doubtful regarding the exact date on which the new school will be provided rather than make a promise now that cannot be honoured in two years time. Certainly, if things go right (and I emphasize that qualification), we hope to have the new school available no later than the end of 1976. However, things may not go right.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: There was a scheme to sewer the cell blocks at Yatala Labour Prison. Will the Minister say whether the allocation for this institution is for such a project? Also, the dental clinics referred to at several country towns and at Port Adelaide are, I take it, connected with the school dental service. If they are not, will the Minister say what the allocation is for? I refer also to the allocation of \$115 000 for a new printing office for the Government Printing Department. Is this an extension to the Government Printing Department at Netley?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I imagine that the allocation for the new printing office is provided because more money is still to be spent on that project this financial year. However, I will check that for the honourable member. If the dental clinics to which the honourable member has referred are school dental clinics, they will be part of the school dental service. Apart from that, some new training establishments (one of which is at Somerton Park, for example) which are to be involved in the expansion of training facilities for dental therapists are to be built. There are two aspects of the service, and the first is the provision of additional training facilities, as South Australia has been used as a centre not only to train therapists for this State but also to provide a source of training for therapists from Australia generally.

Mr. Goldsworthy: That's a different line, though. This is for dental clinics.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Then it relates to schools. The honourable member referred initially to the allocation for additions to Yatala Labour Prison. I can understand his interest in this matter, and I shall be pleased to obtain a report on it for him.

Mrs. BYRNE: I refer to the allocation for the Community Welfare Department. I notice that various alterations and additions are to be carried out, and that a new centre is to be built at Port Augusta. I draw the Minister's attention to the department's Modbury branch, which is located in a house that was purchased by the Highways Department when the Main North-East Road was widened. Unfortunately, this house is unsuitable for the operations in which the departmental officers wish to engage, and it is hindering their work. Will the Minister ascertain whether the purchase of land for a new departmental building at Modbury has been considered, and whether any plans exist for the erection of a new building?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will get that information for the honourable member.

Mr. BOUNDY: I refer to the allocation of \$95 000 for additions to Northfield Research Centre. I am concerned that, with the Agriculture Department's impending move from the city to Monarto, Northfield Research Centre may fall into disuse and be used for other purposes. It is heartening to see that some expenditure is provided for the centre. I hope this is the forerunner of even more expenditure there so that this will remain an on-going project for the benefit of agriculture in this State. I am interested to know for what this money is intended. In my maiden speech I referred to sitona weevil research. I said that, although much work had been done on this matter, continuation of the work depended on further facilities being provided at Northfield for an insectory. Will the Minister ask the Minister of Agriculture whether any money is to be spent on the insectory for further research into the biological control of sitona weevil?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I shall be only too delighted to accede to the honourable member's request. It is a pleasure to hear some other member taking an interest in agricultural matters. I have little doubt, now

that the Liberal Movement is involved in these matters, that the standard of debate on them will improve considerably.

Mr. COUMBE: I refer to the allocation of \$500 000 for preliminary investigations and design under the heading "Hospital Buildings, General". This line, which appears year after year, covers preliminary investigations and designs on many projects some of which are proceeded with and some of which are not. In the lines preceding this line several buildings are referred to. We will soon be faced with the Redcliff project and the establishment of the new city of Monarto, which are of much public interest and about which there has been much controversy. Naturally, if these projects go ahead, provision will have to be made for hospitals. If some of the statements made about the Redcliff project prove to be correct, Port Augusta Hospital and Port Pirie Hospital will need to be considerably expanded, and the provisions in the Loan Estimates will be inadequate. Can the Minister say whether investigations are proceeding into the provision of additional hospital facilities at Port Augusta and Murray Bridge? Further, can the Minister say what progress is being made on the Nailsworth co-educational high school?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: In reply to the honourable member's questions about Red Cliff Point and Monarto, my answer is "Yes"; preliminary investigations are proceeding, but they would not be covered by this line. Inter-departmental committees are at work on these matters, as the projects will create additional demands for public services of one kind or another. The cost of the preliminary investigations (to determine the demands) would not be covered by this line, which is concerned mainly with architectural investigation and design costs. If the hospital investigations, as I understand they are, are at the same stage as are the schools investigations, we have not reached the stage of determining precisely where the sites will be and how they will be used. Therefore, we have not reached the stage of spending money under that line. As the honourable member will appreciate, the Nailsworth project is a staged project; it is hoped that stage 1 will go to tender fairly shortly and that stage 2 will follow toward the middle of next year. So, at least it is getting near the stage where the first sod may be turned.

Mr. HARRISON: I express my appreciation to the Minister of Education for what is happening in the education field in my district, particularly in connection with the Seaton co-educational high school. Can the Minister say when development plans for Woodville Primary School will be implemented?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am not sure of the latest position, but I will check and bring down a report for the honourable member.

Mr. ARNOLD: The Minister will recall that last year a well attended public meeting at Berri discussed the question of a special school with departmental officers. Can the Minister say whether the new Riverland special school has reached the stage of planning and design? It was stated at the public meeting that we could expect action on the project in the following two years.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am not aware of any promises concerning two years. I do not think it was made by me.

Mr. Arnold: One of your officers said we could expect some action.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I have not said it.

Mr. Arnold: It was recognized.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: By whom?

Mr. Coumbe: But the Minister of Works—

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The member for Torrens is a responsible man: he is Deputy Leader, or something.

Mr. Coumbe: I am more responsible than you are.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I do not think so. The special school that we are talking about is nothing to do with the Minister of Works; it is determined by the Minister of Education. The honourable member, as a previous Minister of Works and a part-time Minister of Education, ought to know that, and he also ought to know that the Minister of Education is not bound by what someone says as perhaps a promise which is blown up in all sorts of ways; the honourable member knows that full well. I will check, but I have not at any stage heard a suggestion that something would be done in two years. It has not come to my attention. I will give the honourable member a reply as soon as possible.

Mr. MATHWIN: Paringa Park Primary School was on the 1972 list, was taken off in 1973, and was again listed in 1974. The Minister will no doubt have read a report on the matter. Can he say what plans there are for the school and what additions will be made?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Crimes): Order! The honourable member is not entitled to ask a question about a matter that is not listed.

Mr. MATHWIN: I said that the school was listed in 1972, was not listed in 1973, but is listed in 1974.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I simply make the point that the honourable member is not entitled to ask a question about a matter that is not listed.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: There is a problem in connection with Paringa Park Primary School. We put up propositions for the complete redevelopment of the school on a new site, which propositions were rejected unanimously by the Public Works Committee. We then redeveloped the proposition for a staged upgrading of the school on its existing site. The honourable member will no doubt hear shortly, if he has not already heard, that that proposition has already been rejected unanimously by members of the Public Works Committee, including the honourable member's own colleagues who are on that committee, one of whom is the member for Heysen. I think the committee has gone beyond its normal terms of reference. Its decision has been made not on whether Paringa Park Primary School should be upgraded but on its urgency relative to other schools. The Government has now to decide whether to go ahead despite this report, or pending report.

Mr. Coumbe: Has that report been tabled?

Dr. Tonkin: If not, you are contravening Standing Orders.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I do not care whether I am offending against Standing Orders or not on this matter.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You are the first to invoke Standing Orders when you are crossed.

Dr. TONKIN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Acting Chairman. I do not think the Minister should say that he does not care whether he offends against Standing Orders or not.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! It is up to the Chair to state whether Standing Orders are contravened or not.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: This project has been delayed for a long time, despite the efforts of the department. The first time the Public Works Committee had legitimate criticisms, but the second time, although it may have been able to say that the priority of this school was not as high as that of some of the others, I do not believe the committee was correct in recommending there be no

upgrading of the school. How it could justify that decision about a school with wooden buildings and other buildings similar to those at Enfield (which has been completely rebuilt) is beyond my understanding. I intend to investigate in detail the situation, and I may make certain recommendations to the Minister of Works and the Government.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Can the Minister say how the \$40 000 is to be spent at the Loxton Research Centre?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: As I have not heard what is intended in relation to this centre, I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: In expenditure on schools, hospitals, and other public buildings, no reference has been made to the District of Davenport, except \$23 000 to be spent at McNalley Training Centre, which my constituents do not use. Earlier this year it was announced that the Northfield Research Centre would be shifted to Monarto. Can the Minister say why the Government has now adopted a two-faced policy and is to spend \$95 000 at this centre, and what is the money to be spent on?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I replied to a similar question from the member for Goyder, who was concerned about an insectory at Northfield.

Dr. TONKIN: The Minister earlier gave me a detailed reply about the possible future of the Matriculation college at Marryatville High School. Can the Minister say whether any money is to be spent this year on the site of the present Norwood Boys Technical High School, the proposed Marryatville Co-educational High School, or the present Adult Matriculation Centre?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Actual expenditures on lines are sometimes shown after the project has been examined by the Public Works Committee. It is possible for money to be spent during the year on projects if this committee's approval is subsequently obtained. Legislation requires the Government to obtain a report from the Public Works Committee on any project costing more than \$400 000, but there is no legal requirements for the Government to take any notice of that report. I said previously that the development of the project at Marryatville Co-educational High School might take three to four years, and my reply indicated that it was part of our planning.

Dr. Tonkin: Is any money to be spent this year?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Present planning could lead to some expenditure on stage 1 of the conversion towards the end of this financial year, or the expenditure may not take place until next financial year.

Mr. ARNOLD: Concerning the Riverland Special School at Berri, the meeting held last year was basically to allow officers of the department to try to convince people that the special school should be rebuilt as part of Berri Primary School and not as a separate identity, but the public meeting voted strongly in favour of the school's being rebuilt as a separate identity in a different part of Berri from the primary school.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If the people of Berri are not prepared to accept departmental advice in the matter, they will probably have to put up with some delay in the project.

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Minister supply further information regarding the amount of \$400 000 allocated for a new office building for the Transport Department?

Mr. RUSSACK: The Minister made a statement about two months ago regarding the building of the high school at Kadina, but I notice that it is listed for planning and design in the financial year 1974-75. Has the Minister any further information or any suggested date of completion of the project?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: In reply to the member for Torrens, the only information I have is that \$400 000 is provided to commence work on the new office block for the Motor Vehicles Branch. I shall check the details for the honourable member. The position regarding Kadina High School is the same as it was when I spoke at Kadina.

Mr. ARNOLD: Is the Minister saying that, if the Berri people had been prepared to go along with the departmental advice that the special school should be part and parcel of Berri Primary School, we probably would have seen some progress at this stage?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The position with special education is quite clear. We have attempted as far as possible to ensure that special education takes place within the normal school environment. We believed that was possible at Berri, but the propositions were not accepted by the local people. They want the special school to continue on the separate site. They want it to be rebuilt.

Mr. Arnold: They have a new site.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am sure the honourable member will understand that we have a departmental view that is fairly strong in suggesting that the inclusion of a special school as part of the primary school would be a more satisfactory solution. That solution was acceptable at Murray Bridge, but it was not acceptable at Berri. The Berri people want the special school rebuilt on a new and separate site, and they want the project given the same degree of urgency as it would be given if it were included as part of Berri Primary School. We would be inclined to give the Murray Bridge proposition a higher priority, and that is what has happened. I do not think the honourable member has any cause for complaint. The rebuilding of Berri Special School on a separate site is not a project to which the Education Department or I will give high priority. It will go ahead at some stage, but we will not give it a higher priority.

Mr. Arnold: So the people in that area will pay the penalty.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I do not think so. Perhaps the people in that area may care to reconsider the matter. I do not know.

Mr. Arnold: Those are the terms.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: No, they are not the terms at all. The honourable member should appreciate this point. Although he may not be prepared to tell his constituents about it, he should appreciate that there are sound educational reasons for suggesting that, to the extent that children can be accommodated in a normal school, they should be so accommodated even though special arrangements have to be made within that normal school. This view is firmly held by departmental officers, and I fully support it. The honourable member, confronted with that view, cannot expect us, where we run into resistance to such a proposition in Berri but not in Murray Bridge, to give Berri priority over Murray Bridge. He must face the fact that, if the people of Berri are really saying to the Government, "We are not prepared to go along with the proposition that the special school should be part of the primary school", they turn the project into one that may have a different priority in the department's view. It is a fact of life, not a matter of blackmail.

Mr. Coumbe: Do what the department says, or else.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Not at all. No doubt the Deputy's position is that the Government must do what the Berri people say, or else. The answer to that is "Nuts!"

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The purpose of the debate is to enable honourable members to ask questions on the lines, and I ask honourable members to refrain from going outside the line under discussion in the Estimates.

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Minister say when the new Adelaide Juvenile Court building will be commenced, when it will be completed, how many courts will be provided in the new building, and what other facilities will be included? Other supporting services are associated with juvenile courts, and the family court concept will involve much social work and other supportive exercises from the Community Welfare Department. What provision has been made for such services?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: There is no provision that I can see in these Estimates. I shall check the matter for the honourable member.

Mr. RODDA: Can the Minister say where the new structure for Lucindale Primary School is to be situated, and what progress has been made in the preliminary investigation?

Mr. BLACKER: Is the dental therapy school on North Terrace a new building, or what is involved in the expenditure of \$2 000 000?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Lucindale Area School has been listed as a replacement: it is still on the list of projects waiting to be included in a design programme. I will see whether there is any further information I can give the honourable member. The dental therapy school on North Terrace is to be the principal training establishment for the School of Dental Therapy, which is at present in Hindmarsh Square. There is to be a significant expansion in the amount of training at the school, and there will be a subsidiary establishment in Somerton Park on the old railway land at Glengowrie. These projects are to be financed by the Commonwealth Government. The dental therapy establishment in South Australia for the training of dental therapists will be expanded to an extent greater than the needs of South Australia, because South Australia is to be a centre for the training of dental therapists not only in this State but from other States as well.

Mr. BECKER: What stage has been reached in the preliminary investigations and design of the rebuilding of Plympton Primary School, sketch plans for which were to be drawn up? Does the \$200 000 include money for this project?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It may be included as a possibility, but I doubt very much, in present circumstances, that much will happen this financial year. The West Torrens council made some preliminary decisions about the closure of Chapel Street and Owen Street, in Plympton. Now the objections are flowing in to the council, and it is unlikely it will stick to its original decisions. Whether or not that will prove to be the case I do not know but it is difficult for us to plan properly at this stage until we can find out the response of the West Torrens council to those objections. One or two council members have been actively looking after them. All I can say is we have been preparing a second line of defence, a sort of compromise position, in the expectation that we shall run into further trouble with the West Torrens council, and perhaps some type of compromise solution may get the support of the council and the local residents. At the moment, what the council will do is an open question, in view of the fairly hostile reaction of local residents. Road closures for school purposes by local

government have rarely been a fruitful experience. Our experience with road closures has been that three or four years is par for the course as regards the whole process.

Mr. MATHWIN: I refer to the items relating to the Road Safety Instruction Centre, for which \$45 000 is allocated, and a new office building (\$400 000). As there are already two large buildings in that area, and a further building is to be erected at a cost of \$400 000, what is the \$45 000 for?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will get a report for the honourable member.

Mr. RODDA: The \$4 000 allocated for additions to the Struan Regional Centre will do little more than provide for some additions on the ground floor. Does the Government have a programme in this financial year from some other source to upgrade the top storey of Struan House, which is necessary if it is to fulfil its role as a regional centre for the Agriculture Department?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am tempted to say that the \$4 000 is for facilities for visitors, but I will check the matter for the honourable member.

Mr. BECKER: Does the \$250 000 for minor alterations and additions to school buildings include provision for Demac units for West Beach Primary School? A double unit was promised for that school in June, and it was expected that another unit could be ready for the commencement of the next school year in 1975. As the Minister is aware, this school has grown considerably to over 600 students. Can he say what has happened with regard to the promised accommodation? Is this year's allocation for that accommodation?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member is referring to the \$250 000 allocation for the Further Education Department, but that sum does not include a double unit for the West Beach Primary School. The relevant line is the \$3 900 000 allocation for minor alterations and additions, grading and paving, fencing, drains, roadways, etc., under the Education Department. However, I assure the honourable member that the double unit for the school is included in that allocation and would already be on site but for the recent transport difficulties.

Line passed.

Environment and Conservation, \$600 000.

Dr. TONKIN: I am most concerned that no sum has been allocated to investigate the ecological aspects of the Redcliff project.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! Although I have allowed some latitude in this debate, I cannot allow questions or discussion on matters not included in these Estimates. The honourable member for Bragg.

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say what proportion of the \$100 000 allocation to the Coast Protection Board is to be spent on investigating the ecological effects of the Redcliff project? I presume that the Minister has received a report, although he did not know anything about it, prepared by a competent committee under the chairmanship of the Director of Environment and Conservation. I can only presume that a certain proportion of the allocation must be spent on the investigation the committee recommended for the adequate ascertainment of all the factors relating to the Redcliff project. The sum of \$100 000 *in toto* does not seem much for coast protection, but I am interested in knowing how much of that sum will be spent on the Redcliff and Spencer Gulf ecological investigation.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHTLL (Minister of Environment and Conservation): I should have thought that the

honourable member would appreciate that the Coast Protection Board would not be undertaking work under the Loan programme but that the work being undertaken with regard to the Redcliff project was listed carefully (and he may care to look at *Hansard*) in a reply to a question asked in another place last week. Several projects are being undertaken, but the actual study of the gulf has been made by a committee set up to assess a reconnaissance survey performed by the Engineering and Water Supply Department about 18 months ago. A further committee, to which the honourable member has referred, was set up to recommend to the Government a means of ascertaining, first, the reduction of pollution in the gulf, and secondly, what steps should be taken for a total environmental consideration and study of the gulf itself. Recommendations at that level are now being considered by the Government with reference to what approaches should be made to the Commonwealth Government for likely involvement and over what time such a study should be undertaken.

Mr. COUMBE: A \$400 000 allocation has been made for the purchase of land for national reserves, construction of buildings, and other improvements. Can the Minister say what land is to be purchased and where such land is sited, and can he give any additional details?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: It is difficult for me to divulge the detail the honourable member seeks (as is the case at the commencement of each year with the purchase of land for national parks), because many areas of land are being examined and favourably reported on by the National Parks and Wild Life Service. As a result, it is necessary for me, when discussing this matter with officers of the service, to set priorities on the most important areas of land that should be purchased in each forthcoming year. What makes it even more difficult for me to disclose the most likely areas to be purchased is the unknown factor of the extent to which the Australian Government might help through the national estate during the year.

Members will recall that last year was the first time money was made available to the State for national park purchases. With additional funds likely to be forthcoming, instead of buying numerous small areas that have been investigated and approved for purchase we may redirect our attention to buying one large significant area or one or two such areas.

Mr. Coumbe: Have you any major ones in mind.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Yes, we have indicated that the Government is concerned to buy areas in the Deep Creek area, and that would exceed the sum provided this year. If the Australian Government supports our programme, this may well be an area in which we will concentrate our efforts considerably during the year.

Mr. MATHWIN: Regarding the \$100 000 allocation for the Coast Protection Board, I wonder how far the Minister is going in this matter and how far he has deflated what he would term his programme for the forthcoming year. The Minister will be aware that the sum spent on the replenishment programme last year was \$230 000, merely for the movement of sand from one area to another (incidentally, the Somerton area would have lost two-thirds of the sand). This area is unprotected, and I understand that the Minister and the board know this. If there is to be an extension of the rip rap from the vicinity of Rossall Road to near the Minda Home area, it could be a costly business, as the Minister no doubt knows. I cannot see how all this work can be done for \$100 000. Press reports state that the Coast Protection Board is expected to spend \$7 000 000 over the next couple of years. Work must be done to keep the dunes where they are,

as in the area between Somerton and Minda Home nearly a metre of beach has been lost in the last month.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Naturally, the Coast Protection Board could not undertake its expected programme with only the \$100 000 provided in the Loan Estimates. As the board is a statutory body, it has been decided to provide to it \$500 000 from other sources. Accordingly, the total expenditure in this field for this year will be about \$600 000. It is necessary for us to provide sums of this magnitude for continuing work to ensure the protection of our beaches. I am sure that, having regard to the difficulties in his area, the honourable member will support this expenditure.

Mr. BLACKER: Does the allocation of \$400 000 for national reserves include the provision of water facilities for the Cape Barren geese in the Sir Joseph Banks Group, or will that project be covered under the running expenses of the department, with a warden inspecting the natural waterholes?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I should think that the honourable member's second alternative would apply. Only five or six weeks ago, I asked officers of the National Parks and Wild Life Service to examine the position of the water supply for the Cape Barren geese. I understand that a visit has been made to the area. I am currently awaiting a report about how the problems may be solved, and I will keep the honourable member informed.

Mrs. BYRNE: Is it intended to build a herpetarium or nocturnal house on one of the national reserves? I have raised this matter before in this place, as I believe there should be permanent buildings for this purpose, instead of our just having an annual display of reptiles.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The honourable member will know that the proceeds of last year's display held at Wayville by the herpetarium group and the National Parks and Wild Life Service were intended to go towards providing a permanent centre. Since then, I have had no report on what progress has been made. I will look into the matter and let the honourable member know of any decisions that have been taken.

Mr. MATHWIN: Has the Government approached the Commonwealth Government about financial aid for beach improvement work and, if it has, does it expect to receive such aid?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Discussions have been held with the Commonwealth Minister about this matter. The Australian Government recognizes the problem of beach erosion in the various States, submissions having been made for financial support so that areas can be purchased to ensure beach protection, but it seems unlikely that we will receive direct financial assistance this year. Although the Australian Government is looking at the matter sympathetically, many other applications for national estate funds may have a higher priority. In fact, assistance we are seeking from the national estate would cover projects, such as national park requirements and the establishment of additional wet lands, that would have a higher priority at this time than have foreshore projects.

Line passed.

Other Capital Advances and Provisions, \$19 300 000.

Dr. EASTICK: As I have said before, I do not think it will be possible to proceed with the Monarto project and the Redcliff scheme at the same time, having regard to the great financial requirements for services, schools, and so on. Last week, the Treasurer was quoted in the newspaper as saying that the crunch with regard to the Redcliff project would come within two weeks. We are presently considering funds associated with Monarto, the Redcliff project, and the natural gas pipeline. Although

\$5 000 000 is allocated in respect of the Natural Gas Pipelines Authority of South Australia for advances towards work in connection with the Redcliff project, not one of the Ministers has stated clearly that the proposal to provide money for any of the three projects in question is likely to proceed. I believe that, before we are asked to proceed with this matter, the responsible Minister should tell the Committee what is happening regarding these three major projects.

The Commonwealth Government has clearly pulled the rug from under the feet of the South Australian Government; Mr. Connor has once more wrecked a programme that has been outlined for South Australia. If a new pipeline associated with the Redcliff project is to be constructed, it is essential for the Government to know that it is warranted. Indeed, in a report dated August 5, the Director of Mines said that drilling must commence as soon as possible if the developers were to meet their total commitments and that, if developmental wells were not drilled in time, Adelaide would receive insufficient gas for the 1975 winter requirements of the South Australian Gas Company and the Electricity Trust. Therefore, the Government could be putting money into a questionable project. Although many questions have been asked regarding the sufficiency of supplies, we have been told that sufficient gas is available, and it has always been accepted that further supplies must be determined. This would naturally follow once firm commitments were made.

Last week, the Treasurer said that one of the major areas of concern between the members of the consortium, this Government and the Australian Government was the liquid petroleum gas component figure. The developers of these areas, particularly the Delhi Santos company, have consistently said that they are not in a financial position to prove the supply of gas and other products in the area until there is a certainty of use, until the Australian Government reintroduces the exploration incentives that applied previously, and until they know that an adequate figure will be paid for the product. All these matters are concerned with the Redcliff project and, if further information is available proving that the Redcliff project will not proceed, we should be reviewing the whole situation.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Development and Mines): It is necessary for me to deliver a little lecture on geology for the Leader's benefit because, as far as I can see, he is confusing exploration drilling with developmental drilling. The statement made by the Director of Mines to which the Leader has referred and on which he has hung his doubts regarding the possible future supplies of gas for the petro-chemical project related not to exploration drilling but to developmental drilling. There is no doubt that the figures I presented a couple of weeks ago regarding the estimated total reserves at the Cooper Basin are as accurate as we can make them, so there are reserves for the Sydney and Adelaide markets and for the petro-chemical project.

However, those figures have been obtained as a result of exploratory drilling. Once a field has been proven it is still necessary to come back some time prior to development to do the necessary drilling so that the pipes can be put into the ground and the gas can go where it must go. It is that sort of developmental drilling to which the Director of Mines was addressing his remarks: drilling that must take place for the immediate supply of the Adelaide market. There is no suggestion that, because that work must be done in the next few months, this somehow places in doubt the basin's total reserves. That is a different exercise, related to exploration rather than to

development. So, I hope the Leader will put any ideas such as that out of his mind. His statement bore no relation to our concept of what the total reserves of the field happen to be.

Dr. Eastick: It could still be critical to Adelaide—

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: It could possibly be, if the weather pattern which persisted until recently was to continue. Certainly it would be drastic, but it has no bearing on supplies for a petro-chemical plant which does not require supplies of hydro-carbons until 1977 or 1978. Developmental work must eventually proceed, but not within the next few months. Regarding the liquid component of the hydro-carbons, it is true that there are technical problems associated with that, because when we are talking about natural gas fields we have not got a homogeneous deposit such as in a lignite field or a coal field; we have hydro-carbons in varying proportions. The trick is to bring them on stream in such a way that we are able to get, if it is a petro-chemical plant, a reasonably uniform composition of the liquid fractions that are going into the plant.

So, if what the Leader is saying is that there are technical problems requiring much investigation in connection with the feeding of liquids, I agree. Those problems are still being looked at, but I hope the Leader was not suggesting that, because there are problems there, that means either that we have not the wit to solve them or that there are not the liquids there to supply the plant. The wit is there to solve the problems, and the liquids are there to provide the supplies for the plant that we want built. In addition, we have had, admittedly, only verbal commitments but nonetheless enthusiastic commitments from Mr. Connor that he is anxious to link our field with the Palm Valley or more particularly the Mereenie field (because that is where the wet stuff is). The link will provide further feed stock for a much longer life of the plant. So, I do not see any problems about the long-range availability of liquids for the plant.

When we look at the sort of commitment we are requesting from the Australian Government, if it is willing to make that commitment it will not place itself in a situation where it is unwilling to prolong the life of the plant by withholding funds for an additional pipeline for another field, or where it is unwilling to support additional exploration on our own field to ensure the maximum life of the plant. What is proposed is simply making maximum use of an appreciable investment concerning the Australian Government. So, in relation to the specific points raised by the Leader in regard to the Redcliff project, I think we have that fairly well under wraps.

In regard to support for infrastructure, it is true that there is no final nodding of the head by the Australian Government. What we have put here is a notional allocation to the Natural Gas Pipelines Authority of South Australia which, in terms of section 6 of the Public Purposes Loan Act, can be moved to another area of infrastructure if we need to do that. We cannot make that decision until we know the final shape of the Australian Government's support for the whole project. This is, of course, only a fraction of the total commitment from this Government for infrastructure for the plant over the period between now and when it is commissioned. The Leader raised other questions in relation to Monarto and the South Australian Land Commission, but he raised them in the light of the criticisms and queries he raised in relation to this project. I am not sure whether he wants to go on with those queries in the light of what I have said.

Dr. EASTICK: Yes, I would like to go on with them. The Minister has said that, under section 6 of the Public Purposes Loan Act, he can move the allocation to another area of infrastructure. Therefore, a clear determination is required that the expenditure of any part of the \$5 000 000, or other notional sum (actually, I regard \$5 000 000 as more than a notional sum), will produce value at the end point; in other words, that the project will be a goer. So, shifting from a pipeline to another infrastructure is hardly an answer to the whole question, which now comes back to whether the Redcliff project is a goer.

Accepting the information that the Minister has given about the supply of gas to Sydney and Adelaide and the availability of it in the correct proportions subject to the technical skill being applied, we then want to know whether the project will proceed in the light of the major problems of heat transference. How will the heat be dissipated? It must be remembered that there is no flushing in the gulf; the same water comes backwards and forwards past the same point. Can the Minister say whether any of the materials emitted from the complex will harm the ecology? In connection with the cooling process, will some of the material be allowed to filter back into the aquifers? Will it go inland or back into the sea, and what effect will it have on the deeper structures and the areas where it will be ponded to cool? What about other materials that play an important part in the project? Is there adequate salt at the point where there was said to be salt? Is the salt quality and the nature of the material adequate to sustain this type of project? Is there any significance in the fact that the Commonwealth Railways and other organizations are considering the feasibility of a railway line from Thevenard, because it may be necessary to bring salt from that area? What will be the added cost of the project and its viability if salt has to be hauled from as far away as the Ceduna area to the Redcliff project? These are important issues this Chamber must know about, because it will be responsible for considering the indenture agreement.

We should know about them now and not have to wait until the agreement is introduced. We have not had anything like adequate replies to these questions. I could ask the questions that are Questions on Notice for next week: how many sites other than Redcliff were considered for such a project; who was responsible for deciding on the sites that were considered; and who made the final decision in respect of Redcliff or was that the only site considered? Replies to these questions will be given, but it is important that we have replies to my second series of questions.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The Leader has raised questions on the environment and the supply of basic materials to the plant. Concerning the cost of transporting salt, one of the factors in determining the Redcliff site was in respect of reducing the cost of bringing hydrocarbons to the plant, because for every extra mile of pipe constructed the costs increase. The supply of salt is a matter for the company to determine.

Dr. Eastick: Are the local salt deposits any good?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Most of them are reasonable. Immediately north of Redcliff is a salt field that was producing some years ago. Across the gulf, Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited has a field that is capable of further development, and further north there are subterranean brines on Lake Torrens. No doubt the consortium would also consider the Thevenard field, because it has to determine this matter in terms of cost. It is not for the Government to dictate to the consortium.

Dr. Eastick: Surely you have—

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: It is for the consortium to determine, because it will get the best deal it can from whatever salt suppliers are available. If the consortium wants to come to us for help about negotiating the best deal for the production of salt, it will do so.

Dr. Eastick: What help can you give it?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: That would depend on the nature of the help it was seeking. We have not yet been approached for help, because the consortium has indicated that it can take care of its salt supplies, although the Mines Department has shown a close interest in all that has taken place. The work that Delhi has done on subterranean brines at Lake Torrens has been innovative for technology in Australia, and we are watching it closely for the benefit of our officers as to the use we may make of technology in future.

It is not for me to speak for the Government on environmental matters, but we have taken a strong line with the consortium about the environmental clause in the indenture. The Leader has asked whether the environmental problem has placed the project in jeopardy. From the South Australian Government's point of view the answer is "No", and as far as I am aware there will be no problems with the Commonwealth Government about this clause in the indenture, although that Government has to see the final draft of the clause in a day or so.

I cannot speak for this Parliament, because the indenture will be the subject of legislation that will have to pass through both Houses of Parliament, and, being a hybrid Bill, it will be investigated by a Select Committee on which the Leader, through his members, will be represented. There will be adequate opportunity for the Leader and his Party to address themselves to all these questions when the matter comes before Parliament, and the form of the environmental clause in the indenture is made known to them. They will be able to call whatever evidence they wish before the Select Committee, and Parliament as a whole will have the benefit of whatever that committee can do.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You don't really know the answer!

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I am saying that the Government believes it is negotiating an indenture that will cause no environmental problems, because it is different from indentures that have been negotiated in this State in respect of other industrial ventures. However, if the honourable member is not happy with my assurance (and I cannot release the text of the clause to him now), he must realize that this matter will be determined not by the Government but by Parliament and by a Select Committee.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I move:

That the vote of \$500 000 for Natural Gas Pipelines Authority of South Australia be reduced by \$100.

I am not willing (as the Leader has been), to ask questions and accept the replies to those question, in part anyway, by the Minister. I believe that the Government has handled the whole Redcliff matter very badly indeed and that it deserves the censure of this Committee.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: This line is for \$5 000 000.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am sorry, yes. I will alter my motion to include \$5 000 000, and will put another nought on the \$100 and make it \$1 000, if you like.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That won't make anyone sweat.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister may joke about this, but it is one of the most important projects we have planned in South Australia in recent years. Whatever

the outcome may be, the Government is very worried about the situation. That is perfectly obvious, and the Minister of Education does not help his Government's cause by such interjections.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You're just carrying on where Steele Hall left off.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: He did not do badly. It was he who first pin-pointed the weakness in this project, I remind the Minister, and he did that within a day or so of its announcement by the Premier during the election campaign. What the former member for Goyder said is coming true. There is little doubt of that, and I mean this motion to be a censure on the Government. It is a motion of no confidence in the Government. It is not just the form, as it was in the case of the member for Fisher this afternoon. Members on this side of the House (of the L.C.L., the Liberal Movement, and the Country Party) have been trying for weeks to find out what is happening about the Redcliff project, and this is the first opportunity we have had to debate the subject. Several of us tried last week, and we were fobbed off. May I remind members of my attempt last Wednesday to deal with the matter.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Oh no!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Oh yes! I moved the suspension of Standing Orders so that I could move a motion.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You are not going to remind us of what you said last Wednesday, are you?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I remind the Minister that in a debate of this nature there is no time limit, and he is not going to put me off with silly interjections like that. He is not wasting my time by going on with them. I have plenty of time, and I am going to put my case.

Mr. Langley: What about tomorrow night?

Members interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Perhaps the Minister of Education would be quiet for once and let me get on with it. Let me remind honourable members—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Let me remind members of the Committee that last week I endeavoured to move the suspension of Standing Orders so that I could move a motion. The motion I desired to move was this:

In view of the doubts now being expressed about the future of the Redcliff project and the urgency of coming to a final decision, this House calls on the Government to make a full and frank statement forthwith on the progress of negotiations with the consortium and the Commonwealth Government, with particular reference to environmental and financial aspects.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I draw the honourable member's attention to Standing Order 147, which provides:

No member shall allude to any debate of the same session, upon a question or Bill not being then under discussion, except by the indulgence of the House for personal explanations.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I was not alluding to the debate: I was simply reading the motion I wanted to move last week. I do not wish to do any more than that at this stage except to remind the Committee that, in opposing the motion for the suspension of Standing Orders, the Treasurer said I could ask him any question I wished on this topic and he would answer it. That was the burden of his reply. What happened next day?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! I remind the honourable member of the contents of Standing Order 147, which I have quoted, and I would ask him to pay attention to that Standing Order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I certainly accept that, and I have said all I want to say on that. The next day, on Thursday—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am not going to allude to that debate, but to a question I tried to ask, which is not the same thing, as the Chairman will know.

Mr. Goldsworthy: The Chair is being very polite to you.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I appreciate that. It is something I do not always get in this place. The very next day, when I tried to ask a question of the Treasurer on this matter in acceptance of his invitation, what did I get? He was out of the Chamber when I was called, an experience I have had five times this session when I have wanted to ask him a question. I asked the question of the Deputy Premier and got no answer at all. I was simply told the matter would be referred to the Treasurer, or something like that. I was put off, in other words, as best could be done.

Now, I have only mentioned these things (and I apologize if I have trespassed on Standing Orders to do so) to remind members here, particularly those on the Government side, that the Government has not been frank in what it has said in this place and it has not been prepared to answer questions or to give members on this side the opportunity to ask them and to get answers. This is the only way I can see that we can possibly get any answers on a matter of great importance indeed to the future of the South Australian community. At the moment there is probably no matter more important to us than this one, and I know that members of the L.C.L. will support me in saying that, at least.

I intend to deal with the two aspects I tried to raise last week in the motion to which I have referred: first, finance for the project; and secondly, the environment. First, let me outline briefly the history of this project for which \$5 000 000 is to be put aside. It was announced by the Premier during the general election campaign in February, 1973. Since then, the Government has pinned all its hopes for industrial development in South Australia on the Redcliff project. Only a few weeks ago the Treasurer in writing a foreword to a supplement in the *News* on industrial development in South Australia, said as much, when he said:

Perhaps the most exciting is the petro-chemical complex at Redcliff. The project itself and its spin-off benefits will have immense importance to Port Pirie and Port Augusta. That was after he had canvassed the subject of industrial development in this State. There is no doubt at all, in their own words, that members of the Government are relying on this as the project, with all its planning for industrial development, for the enormous expansion in the Public Service that has gone on in this field. The justification for that is the Redcliff project.

What are we getting? From the very first announcement of this project we have seen a series of events that confirmed the doubts about it and, I may say (and I shall go on to substantiate this), about the probity of the Government with regard to it. These doubts were voiced immediately by the now Senator Hall, and he was bitterly attacked every time, either in this House or outside, he expressed them. I will not go through those doubts, but let me remind the Committee of some of the highlights of the doubts about the project. I can show that by referring to some newspaper cuttings and, I am glad to say, the debates from the previous session in this Parliament. I know I will not be trespassing if I refer to the debates of

last session. Let me start with a motion that we had in this place, moved in October of last year by the member for Torrens, which states:

That this House express deep concern at the actions of the Commonwealth Minister for Minerals and Energy (Mr. Connor) in relation to the proposed Redcliff petro-chemical development, and urge the Government to take all possible steps to resolve the present threat to its establishment.

To that motion the then member for Goyder moved an amendment, which was to provide that the industry had at least, or in excess of, 50 per cent of Australian ownership and the condition that no liquid petroleum could be exported by it. When that amendment was put, there were only three members in the Chamber (the member for Flinders, the member for Goyder and I) who supported it; every other member on the Government side and in front of me voted against that amendment to ensure at least a 51 per cent Australian ownership in the Redcliff project.

Within a few weeks, though, when it had been told by the Commonwealth Government what it had to do, this Government changed its tune and said, "Yes, of course it must be 51 per cent. We have always thought so." It did not vote that way when the motion was before the House, but since then we have had no trouble from it on that score, anyway. Where did we go from there, in October? On October 18, the Leader of the Opposition asked one of a series of questions that he has asked, properly, on this matter. At page 1329 of *Hansard* he asked the Treasurer a question about the Redcliff project. This was in part (I hope I shall be forgiven for not quoting the whole of the Treasurer's answer; I am not taking it out of context) as follows:

There has been no communication from the Commonwealth Government concerning the development of a petro-chemical complex in the North-West of Western Australia. In fact, I point out to the Leader that there has been a specific commitment by Mr. Connor and the Prime Minister to the development of a petro-chemical complex at Redcliff.

That is plain enough, but the Leader of the Opposition got in an interjection, the one word "Binding"? The Speaker stopped him, but the Treasurer answered the interjection and said:

Yes, quite binding.

The last sentence of his answer was as follows:

On this score, I have it in the Commonwealth Minister's own handwriting that he is committed (and commits the Commonwealth Government) to the support of the development at Redcliffs.

That is what the Treasurer said in this place on October 18. He could not have used words that were more binding (I use subconsciously the word used here) and more directly asserting that the Commonwealth Government would support, and was committed to support, at that time the original Redcliff project. I cannot imagine how anyone could use words more expressive of that sort of thing than he used on that occasion. Whom was he kidding? Did he really believe what he said at the time? Was he being misled by the Commonwealth Government or was he misleading us? It must be one or the other; there is no other explanation. He told us in the middle of October last year that the Commonwealth Government was committed to this project—no "ifs" and "buts", no conditions: the Government was committed, and he had it in Mr. Connor's handwriting. Either the Treasurer was lying to us or he was being lied to by the Commonwealth Government—there is no other way of putting it. What happened next? On November 27, the then Deputy Premier (I think he was acting as Premier on that day) moved a motion in this House. What was the context of it? It was as follows:

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 overseas 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.

That was a motion which, after a debate, to parts of which I will refer in a moment, was carried by the majority of the members of this place. All the members of the Australian Labor Party voted for it, as did the member for Goyder and I. I think we were the only two on this side of the House who did: I do not think the member for Flinders supported the motion; the Liberal and Country League certainly did not. Presumably, members of the Labor Party were in agreement with the motion that they supported. Let me remind them of one of the clauses of that motion:

that the successful passing of these Bills is essential—

the word used then, introduced by the Deputy Premier—

for the proper development of the Redcliffs project in this State.

There it is, and I understand that those Bills have not gone through. I do not know whether they are not now essential, whether that was not true, whether we were misled on that occasion, or whether those members now find they are wrong. Certainly, those Bills have not gone through; yet in November the Government believed it was essential to the project that they should. What did the Deputy Premier say in support of this motion? On page 2006 of *Hansard*, he said:

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.

He did not go quite as far as the motion went: he said the project was in jeopardy. He continued:

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.

Then, at the foot of the left-hand column of page 2007, he said:

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.

The final sentence I quote is as follows:

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.

That was the motion which the Government sponsored at the end of November last year and which was supported in such language as that. The Bills did not pass and, even more significantly, the A.I.D.C. has announced in the last few days that it is pulling out, or has pulled out, and has lost interest altogether in the project. Those are the quotations I make from *Hansard*. I now turn to some cuttings and opinions about Mr. Connor and others. First, let me refer to an article appearing in the *Advertiser*

of October 18 last, under the name of Bruce Guerin, with the heading "Not room for two Red Cliffs". The article states:

There was not room for a second world-size petrochemical plant in Australia in addition to the proposed Redcliffs complex, the Premier (Mr. Dunstan) said yesterday.

Then the writer goes on to talk about it and, strangely enough, two months later, in December, his Minister of Development and Mines said precisely the opposite, according to the paper anyway. It may have been wrong, and he will have the opportunity to say whether or not it was accurate. I remind the honourable Minister of what he was reported to have said in an article in the *Advertiser* of December 12, 1973, which states:

The Redcliffs project probably would benefit from the proposed \$2 500 000 000 industrial development at Pilbara, Western Australia, the Minister of Development and Mines (Mr. Hopgood) said yesterday. He had been asked whether the Western Australian competition could damage the Redcliffs market potential. Mr. Hopgood estimated that the Redcliffs development already was four years ahead of Pilbara. The greatest benefits to South Australia would be the encouragement a second major project could give to mineral exploration and consolidation of natural gas and fuel reserves.

I put the two together, because one opinion was expressed by the Treasurer and the other by his offside. The *News* editorial on October 15, 1973, is a good one. It states:

The Connor confusion—Mr. Connor has made a very successful job of throwing the whole Redcliffs project into jeopardy. The Federal Minister for Minerals and Energy has the duty to ensure the \$300 000 000 South Australian petro-chemical project is in the best interests of the country. But so far Mr. Connor only seems interested in what may or may not suit Mr. Connor. And no-one is at all sure what that is.

The editorial continues in much the same vein. The *News* of October 18, 1973, under the heading "Redcliff pledge by Connor", contains a report of what I read from *Hansard* earlier. There was no doubt that the Commonwealth Government was bound; it would help us, in the Treasurer's own words, in this situation. I need not go over all that again. A report in the *News* of October 18, 1973, states:

Not told of second plant—Dunstan. The Premier said yesterday he had not been told the Commonwealth planned a petro-chemical plant at Dampier, Western Australia.

That again was in reply to the Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Is this just wasting time?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not think Government members like it.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: We must sit here and listen to it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: We have been here all day and, until we reached this line, the Government succeeded in keeping all the debate away from the Redcliff project. The project had not even been mentioned. Well, that had to come to an end sooner or later. The next matter to which I refer is an extract from the Commonwealth *Hansard*—a question and reply, probably a Dorothy Dixier, on November 8, 1973. The question was asked by Mr. Wallis (member for Grey). In the House of Representatives on November 8, 1973, he asked:

Can the Minister for Minerals and Energy give further information on the negotiations between the South Australian and Australian Governments on the establishment of a petro-chemical industry at Redcliffs in South Australia?

The following was Mr. Connor's opening:

The problems associated with the establishment of a petro-chemical refinery at Redcliffs in South Australia are now very close to solution.

Whereas the Treasurer a few weeks previously had said that the Commonwealth Government was bound to it.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: That's a very telling point!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Let me make another.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! Interjections are out of order. The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I cannot help seeing the irony in the last sentence of the Minister's reply, as follows:

Also there will need to be an appropriate indenture of agreement executed between the Sovereign Government of South Australia and the respective members of the consortium.

It has been a long time since the Government could be called in any sense a sovereign Government. The Government is completely dependent, as we are seeing in this matter, on its masters in Canberra; yet, that is what Mr. Connor said. On November 27, 1973 (only 19 days after Mr. Connor's reply to Mr. Wallis), we had news of a further threat to Redcliff, as follows:

Further threat to Redcliff—The \$300 000 000 petrochemical project at Redcliffs is again under threat. A delay in providing funds for the Federal Government's Australian Industry Development Corporation could threaten the operation at Redcliffs, the Minister for Overseas Trade (Dr. Cairns) said in the House of Representatives yesterday. He said this at about the same time as the Deputy was saying here that it was essential for Redcliffs that the Bills go through the Senate.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You believed it was essential, too, didn't you?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes; we supported you.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You voted for it, so you believed it?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, and Senator Hall, as the representative of the Liberal Movement, supported the Bills in Canberra last week. In reply to a question on February 28, from the Leader of the Opposition, the Treasurer said, at page 2241 of *Hansard*:

Well, at present the new consortium has not been finalized.

I bet he could say that again now. The Treasurer continued:

As I have already explained, the Government was not willing to put before the House an indenture referring to the original consortium and leave the addition of other members to make up the 51 per cent of Australian equity until after the passing of the indenture. That has been indicated to all members involved. Indeed, it was clearly stated at the meeting at which all persons involved were present ... I have not the slightest doubt the project will proceed.

Later on the same day, in reply to a question asked by the member for Bragg, the Treasurer said:

The Minister of Development and Mines and I had a conference with Mr. Connor only last Saturday on the development of the Redcliff project. Mr. Connor has assured the producers and the consortium: he has publicly stated his support and that of the Commonwealth Government for the Redcliff project.

We are not getting the same story now. Last week, the *Advertiser* contained an article headed, "Redcliff petrochemical project is on the verge of collapse". There was a most indignant flood of denial in this place by the Treasurer, who spoke in most disparaging terms about Mr. Ian Steele, under whose name the article appeared. In the *News* of that day, an article headed "Crunch is nearer" states:

"We are now getting to a crunch situation with Redcliff," the Premier (Mr. Dunstan) said on his return from Canberra today ... Mr. Dunstan said if the answers were seriously delayed the Redcliff project could be in danger.

The reference there is to the investigation and inquiry. In October, the Premier had said that the Commonwealth was basically bound to the project. Asked whether he was still confident that the project would succeed, the Premier said:

The State Government and the Federal Government have publicly committed themselves to this project. I am simply to make sure that commitment becomes a reality.

In other words, a commitment does not mean a commitment; I do not know what it means. I suppose the Premier must try to make the Commonwealth Government live up to its word. What a fine crowd to govern a country when they cannot be trusted. Apparently its own supporters in this Chamber cannot trust it, as that is the only interpretation that can be put on the Treasurer's words, unless he was misquoted. No doubt the Government has been congratulating itself because there has been no debate on this matter. In the *Advertiser* four days ago, an article headed "A.I.D.C. pulls out of Redcliff" states:

The Australian Industry Development Corporation has withdrawn from the Redcliff petro-chemical project. The I.C.I.-Alcoa-Mitsubishi consortium confirmed this yesterday and said negotiations were proceeding for other sources of Australian equity.

We were told last week that the whole thing had to be sewn up within a fortnight. There has been the devil's own job getting a consortium together. The A.I.D.C. has pulled out, and now we have this airy fairy talk of people looking around for other partners and capital. The article continues:

"If the project goes ahead we don't expect any difficulty reaching satisfactory arrangements with Australian organizations to meet the Commonwealth Government's requirement of at least 51 per cent Australian beneficial ownership," a spokesman for the group said.

If that is not whistling in the dark, I do not know what is. This is happening at a time when the economy of the country is in a mess (whoever is to blame), and this will be the third time, I think, that a consortium has been sought. Yet we get this sort of vagueness about there being no trouble in obtaining the money to get at least 51 per cent Australian equity. Who is fooling whom? I said earlier that it was essential that A.I.D.C. come in to give financial support to the project. Last Saturday, in the *Advertiser*, Ian Steele ended up by asking several questions which I will put now and which I hope one of the four Ministers in the Chamber will answer:

Why has Mr. Connor refused to answer basic questions vital to the signing of the indenture? Why has the A.I.D.C. lost interest? Why has the Prime Minister called for an investigation, and why has the September deadline been ignored?

From what I have said, if one looks at this matter with even a modicum of common-sense, it is obvious that the chances of the Redcliff project going ahead are almost nil. If we accept what the Government said six months ago in the light of what has happened since, how can the project go ahead?

Having dealt with the financial aspect, I now turn to the environmental factors, which I believe are equally important. From the beginning, there have been serious doubts about the location proposed for this project. It is now perfectly clear that the site was chosen for reasons that did not include environmental reasons. An attempt is being made to justify the site. In the Army, we do appreciations. A person comes to a solution without following any logical sequence, and he then tries to fit the reasoning to the conclusion. That is what the Government has done in siting the Redcliff project. In the

Reader's Digest of November, 1972, appears the following article, which underlines the importance of environmental factors, headed "Japan, the polluted land":

Plants wither and die, fish and birds disappear, people die of lung diseases—this is the price that Japan is paying for its industrial miracle ... At Yokkaichi, for example, doctors tell me that 58 persons have died from asthma, chronic bronchitis or emphysema since the building there of the country's greatest petro-chemical complex. A recent study revealed that lung-cancer deaths are now occurring at the annual rate of 11.2 per 100 000 persons in Yokkaichi (population 230 000) compared with 7.9 per 100 000 in relatively non-polluted areas. It is early afternoon and a light rain is falling. White and grey puffs and wisps of smoke mingle with the steel-coloured clouds, enveloping a vast expanse covered with oil tanks and power lines. ... "Yokkaichi was such a beautiful place," recalls Professor Tsuru, who leads a non-government committee for research on kogaï.

That is the name of one of the diseases. I know Professor Tsuru, as he came to South Australia as Dyason lecturer. With other members, I entertained him on that occasion and found him to be a well-balanced and intelligent man. The article continues:

It was a nice recreational town with such beautiful beaches and pine trees, and a fishing village down below. Then industry intruded into the quiet and beauty. Production must be weighed against what you sacrifice in return. I simply tell the Minister that (and there will be an echo of it in something to which I will refer shortly) to show the magnitude of the danger: I do not say that this will happen here, but we must ensure that it will not happen before we have a petro-chemical works. On September 12, 1973, the former member for Goyder moved a motion (page 711 of *Hansard*), the most relevant part of which was as follows:

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

I will not read paragraphs (a) and (b) of the motion. However, paragraph (c) was as follows:

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

The Treasurer replied to that motion immediately. I know the Treasurer well enough to realize that was nervous about it, because nearly all of the Treasurer's reply was made up of personal abuse at the former member for Goyder. Other honourable members might well have applauded that for all I know, but that was the only reply the Treasurer gave for a page or so. Then (page 714 of *Hansard*) he went on to say things like this:

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

Well, that is not on environmental matters. The next extract from the Treasurer's speech in *Hansard* is as follows:

As to an absolute assurance that the environment and ecology of Spencer Gulf and the surrounding district will be fully protected, I have given that undertaking on many occasions.

I hope that the Minister gives an answer later on that. On page 715 of *Hansard* the Treasurer is reported as having said:

We already know—that is, in September—that the Redcliff project will not so interfere with the ecology.

How could the Treasurer possibly have known those things in September when the studies had not even been done yet? Despite this, that is what he was willing to come into this House and say. I will now refer to the events of more recent times. In my Address in Reply speech I dealt at some length with the Redcliff project and referred to some information that Dr. Lewis, the Acting Head of the Organic Chemistry Department of the University of Adelaide had given to me. I sent him a copy of my speech, and I have since received a letter from him in reply. I intend to quote from that letter dated August 15 (it therefore being only five days old) because it is relevant to this consideration.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Who is Dr. Lewis?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is a pity that the Deputy Premier and other Government members have not listened to these people earlier; if they had, they would not be in the trouble they are in today.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Who is he?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Dr. Lewis is the Acting Head of the Organic Chemistry Department of the University of Adelaide.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: What does that make him?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am not willing to argue with the Deputy Premier regarding this gentleman's qualifications. Let me read what Dr. Lewis said, and the Deputy Premier can then answer that, if he likes. Dr. Lewis wrote as follows:

Thank you for your interest in the possible effects of the proposed Redcliff petro-chemical development on the environment, as shown in your contribution to the Address in Reply (July 31). Having read the Premier's reply to a question from Mr. Blacker on July 31 (S.A.P.D., p. 184), I feel that the need for a full (and hopefully unbiased) environmental impact statement on the Redcliff project is greater than ever. The Premier's rosy picture—

and when I read this, I was reminded of the Treasurer's previous answer—

of the environmentally "harmless" petro-chemical works at Wilton in England cannot be easily reconciled with the very ugly picture which the Rev. A. R. Wintle has painted of the British Petroleum Chemicals complex at Baglan, Port Talbot, South Wales. As Baglan, Port Talbot, is not very far away from Wilton, one wonders why the Premier did not visit this place also in order to make his investigation a little more comprehensive.

I am enclosing a photocopy of page 227 of the June, 1974, issue of the scientific journal *Chemistry in Britain* in which a letter from the Rev. A. R. Wintle to the Editor and a reply from an un-named B.P. spokesman appeared. The additional attached photocopy is of the title page and index of that issue, from which you will readily appreciate that this journal is highly reputable scientific publication. The Editor of *Chemistry in Britain* would certainly not publish any irresponsible or completely unjustifiable criticism. The Rev. A. R. Wintle's letter refers, among other things, to polyvinyl chloride dust fallout and to the presence of vinyl chloride monomer in the atmosphere. Both abbreviations used, namely "pvc" and "vcm", are standard. The hepatocarcinogenic action of vinyl chloride monomer is now widely known.

Let the Deputy Premier, who has been quietly sneering as I have been reading the letter, listen to the last paragraph of the letter, as follows:

The Premier and other members of the South Australian Government may possibly argue that there is no intention of producing polyvinyl chloride at the Redcliff plant. We must bear in mind, however, that ethylene dichloride (EDO) is an immediate precursor of vinyl chloride monomer; and subsequent extension of the Redcliff plant for production of the latter chemical and its polymerisation to polyvinyl chloride would be a logical industrial development.

I am willing to table that letter if any honourable member, and particularly the Ministers, wish to see it. Let me tell members opposite, if they do not already know it (and I suspect they already do), that few members of either

the University of Adelaide or Flinders University, who have no axe to grind, are happy about the siting of the Redcliff project. This does not matter to them personally but, as professional men, they have expressed grave disquiet regarding the matter. Dr. Lewis is only one example of these men, others of whom I quoted during my Address in Reply speech. Next (and we are getting almost up to date now) we come to Mr. Warren Bonython's press release of August 15. I checked this report, a copy of which was sent to me and to all other members, with Mr. Bonython today, and he is satisfied that it is completely accurate. Part of the report states:

The Conservation Council of South Australia Inc., while not opposing the concept of a petro-chemical works to utilize the heavy gas fractions from the Moomba basin, is deeply disturbed by the way Mr. Dunstan's Government has proceeded to make decisions on this particular proposal without sufficient prior environmental assessment and without effective participation by informed and concerned members of the public.

That is all I will quote. Other members will have seen what Mr. Bonython has written on behalf of the Conservation Council. We can bring the matter right up to date by considering Dr. Fay Gale's letter in this morning's *Advertiser*. She is known to many of us, and I had the benefit of her help and advice when I was Minister of Aboriginal Affairs. She is respected by everyone and is not given to flights of the imagination. In her letter, on behalf of the whole staff of the Geography Department of the University of Adelaide, Dr. Gale says:

Following the statement by Mr. C. W. Bonython on the Redcliff project (*Advertiser*, August 16, 1974), the Department of Geography seeks to clarify some of the issues he raised.

I was surprised that the Minister did not make a Ministerial statement on this letter today, but I suppose he hoped it would be overlooked. The letter continues:

In October, 1973, we were asked to assist in preparing an environmental impact statement concerning the terrestrial landscape of the area. The petro-chemical consortium was under great pressure to produce such a statement quickly. We were most concerned at the choice of the site for such an industry and agreed to look at the problems.

Since little information was available to make any recommendations about the area we stated immediately that we could not carry out a study in the limited time offered but could only set out guidelines for a proposal on what should be done. The major features of our proposal were later corroborated by the South Australian Department of the Environment in May, 1974. No comprehensive impact study has yet been carried out by anyone.

Yet the Treasurer came into this House and repeated an assurance he had given (he said repeatedly) that no harm would be done. How could he, in honesty, give such an assurance to us or to anyone when the environmental impact study had not been done? The letter continues:

We are not opposed to the development of a petro-chemical complex.

I do not suppose any of us are; I certainly am not opposed to the development of a petro-chemical complex if I am satisfied it is safe. The letter continues:

The plastics industry is clearly an important part of modern living. But we are concerned at the manner in which a Government can choose locations for this or any other industry without due consideration being given to the environmental factors and therefore ultimately to the economic and social consequences for the community at large. Such important decisions appear to be made without adequate, if any, data and before any planning studies.

That is precisely what I said. The letter continues:

The consortium did not have control over the choice of the proposed location. It was given a site and was expected to produce an environmental impact statement in a short space of time. The apparently arbitrary nature of the decision to locate the industry in the so-called "iron

triangle" at Red Cliff is shown by the fact that no regional or site study was made before the decision was announced. The sensitive and vulnerable nature of the semi-arid terrestrial environment, coupled with the delicate marine ecosystem, surely deserved much greater care in determining the site.

Members will have read the letter, but I have quoted it in full to give the Ministers an opportunity to deny what Dr. Gale has said, and there can be no excuse, if they are in a position to deny what she has said, for not doing it tonight in this debate.

Mr. Evans: They will not do it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: We will see about that. I do not think they will, but they have the opportunity now to deny what she has said. I believe the Government has acted abominably over this whole thing, and the editorial in this morning's *Advertiser* sums up the reasons why. The editorial says:

It is now nearly 18 months since plans for the proposed multi-million dollar Redcliff petro-chemical project were unveiled by the Premier (Mr. Dunstan) during the 1973 State election campaign as evidence that "South Australia is doing well with Labor". They seemed to harmonize pleasantly with assurances to voters that, with Labor Governments in power in both Adelaide and Canberra, South Australia was likely to prosper more than ever before. At least so far as these assurances were federally inspired, the reality has proved less palatable than the promise.

I am afraid (and I say "afraid" advisedly) that the project is on the rocks: it is at an end. I have therefore moved this vote on no confidence in the Government because I believe it has misled the people of South Australia from beginning to end. I believe that it has acted very unwisely in what it has done, and I believe that it deserves our censure for the unwisdom of its actions and for the catastrophic results which we now see, particularly the lack of communication between the State Government and its Commonwealth colleague. If ever there was to be a project on which one would think that those two Governments could work together, it would be something like this project, yet this is the result we see of Labor in Government. I hope that every member on this side will support me. I do not expect that any members opposite will support me, because they put Party ahead of the interests of their State. If it were not for their strong Party discipline, I think a number of them would support the motion. I hope that at least on this side we will be able to show our displeasure with the way the Government has acted over this matter.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham has moved to reduce the item Loan to Natural Gas Pipelines Authority of South Australia, \$5 000 000 by \$100. The question before the Chair is that the amendment be agreed to. Honourable members must confine their remarks to this question until it is disposed of. The honourable Minister of Education.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): I do not think it is necessary to make any long reply to the member for Mitcham. I have rarely heard him argue so badly as he has this evening, with so little basis in fact and with so great a reliance on quotes of one sort or another, either from *Hansard* or from the press. I suspect that the real basis of the honourable member's position is that he really would have liked the Redcliff project to fail at a very early stage. He was rather carrying on from the position adopted by the former member for Goyder, which position was that it was completely untrue that the Government had any sort of commitment from anyone. Members will remember the history of the matter, so it is not necessary to canvass it again tonight. The basis of the

honourable member's censure motion was very difficult to discover. He made a great point of quoting statements of the Treasurer, saying that the Treasurer believed he had a binding commitment of support from the Australian Government. Well, so he did believe, and so he does believe. Is that a basis for a censure motion on the State Government?

Mr. Gunn: You can do better than that.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The member for Eyre never concerns himself with valid argument: he makes wild assertions. However, perhaps he will be so kind as to allow me to reply to what I thought the member for Mitcham was saying. The member for Mitcham made a great song and dance about the Treasurer's statements, which were repeated a number of times in public and in private, that it was his view and the State Government's view that the Australian Government had a binding commitment to us on this matter to support the project. The member for Mitcham subsequently quoted the Commonwealth Minister (Mr. Connor) in answer to the member for Grey (Mr. Wallis) stating clearly that Mr. Connor supported the project. What possible basis is there for a censure motion if it has anything to do with the honourable member's remarks on that point? On whom is the honourable member moving a vote of censure? Is it this Government, because it believed genuinely that it had a binding commitment?

Mr. Gunn: You now admit it has not.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: We admit no such thing.

Mr. Gunn: You just said it.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I did not say that. I do not mind competent interjections, but incompetent idiocy is too much to put up with. Does the honourable member believe the motion of censure should be directed at the Commonwealth Government because it does not fulfil the binding commitment we believe we have, or what does he mean? We believe we have a binding commitment, and the falsity or truth of that belief is still to be demonstrated. What is the basis for a censure motion on this Government? The Commonwealth Government's support or otherwise is still to be resolved. Another point raised by the member for Mitcham related to the Treasurer's reply to a motion, suggesting that the passage of the Australian Industry Development Corporation and National Investment Funds Bills was essential to the future of Redcliff, and that our support for that motion was, in some sense, a basis for a censure motion. That argument is patently ridiculous. The honourable member is trying to say that, because the A.I.D.C. Bills failed and it seems possible that finance for Redcliff may well be found, in some sense the fact that we believed that the passage of the Bills was essential was cause for a censure motion. The member for Mitcham should use that argument against himself; he supported the same motion and, apparently, he is saying that, when he supported that motion, he did not believe in it but supported it because the member for Goyder supported it.

One way or the other the honourable member clearly demonstrated on that point that his motion was without foundation, because, if there was a basis for censure of this Government because Government members supported that motion, the basis of censure was clearly also on the honourable member, as he supported the same motion. Apparently, the basic issue involved in A.I.D.C. financing, if the honourable member was aware of it when he voted for that motion, has subsequently escaped him. I should have thought that, in any project in which such large amounts of capital was required, the rate of interest and terms on which any money borrowed had to be found

would be of fundamental importance. I suggest that, if A.T.D.C. amendments had been passed, the viability of the Redcliff project from the point of view of the consortium would have been improved, because it would have given rise to the possibility of funding at lower interest rates than would otherwise have been possible. No doubt that was the basis on which the honourable member supported the motion moved by the Deputy Premier last year, but he has forgotten it now, and it has now become a basis for censure.

If there is any basis for a censure motion, it would seem from the honourable member's statements that this Government could not have been genuine in believing that the project could be financed, or that it had to be financed in certain ways. I do not know who is a better judge of the Government's genuine intentions about this matter. Negotiations have been going on between Ministers and Government officers and the consortium for many months, and if this not an indication of the Government's genuine intentions or those of the consortium, I do not know what is. I cannot see any possible foundations for a censure motion, and I think the honourable member was whistling in the wind, to use his words, and lacking in things to say. His financial arguments were entirely without foundation.

I turn now to environmental matters. Neither the honourable member nor anyone else who criticizes the Redcliff site is willing to suggest an alternative site. Perhaps they would like it to be at Port Adelaide and, whatever the environmental problems are, they would be easier. Perhaps the member for Glenelg and the member for Hansen would suggest the Patawalonga as a site. The question of availability of liquids, salt, water, and labour, and other aspects that meet the cost problems of the consortium, are relevant to the issue. A critical question regarding environmental matters would be whether or not the environmental clause in the indenture could be so negotiated that it would give the kind of protection required by the community. The question whether the site is at Redcliff, Port Adelaide, or somewhere else on the coast is irrelevant, compared to the question whether the nature of the indenture is such as to give appropriate environmental protection. I know that the member for Mitcham was involved in indentures that gave no environmental protection, and no doubt he is aware of indentures signed in other States that gave no environmental protection. Perhaps he thinks that it cannot be done. The Government's negotiating position on the environmental clause has been a strong one, and the basis of an effective agreement between the Government and the consortium is close to finality. In general debate and through a Select Committee, members will have the opportunity to see the basis of that indenture. No doubt if they do not like it, and if their colleagues in another place do not like it, they will refuse to pass it. What possible basis is there at this stage about clauses of an indenture, of which they are ignorant, to suggest that there should be a motion of censure of the Government?

Apparently the member for Mitcham wants the Government to say at this stage, before absolute finality is reached with the consortium, that all members should be told about the various drafts through which we have gone in the negotiating process. The member for Mitcham knows that such a proposition is patently ridiculous. He knows it is not acceptable and not workable in any negotiating procedure. All he wants to do is denigrate either the project or the Treasurer, and suggest to members and to the public at large that the Treasurer's commitment on environmental matters was not given genuinely.

I throw that back in his face as something that is completely without foundation. I will leave it finally to members and to the public to judge, when the indenture is finalized and introduced, whether or not the Government has been concerned, for the first time in the history of this State or in the history of this country, to produce an indenture with effective environmental protection. Members opposite had not even heard of protection of the environment until the last election. They have only just got on the band waggon and they seem to believe that the Government's professions of concern and the commitments it made at the 1973 election are commitments and professions not held with sincerity. That is simply not the case. The position taken by the Minister of Environment and Conservation with members of the consortium in the negotiations has been a strong and determined one; I know that is the case because I have been there with him. The remarks of the member for Mitcham in this respect were completely uncharitable and shallow, and were made in ignorance and in an attempt to denigrate his fellow members in this Parliament.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: He has never done anything else, quite frankly.

Mr. Gunn: What are you doing?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am explaining precisely what the position is at present and precisely what members, including those who say they are honourable members, will have the opportunity of doing when the indenture Bill comes before this Parliament. I suggest to the member for Eyre, if he is capable of any unbiased judgment whatever, that it will not be a bad idea to wait until he sees the indenture Bill before he jumps to any conclusion. The position, we have in this House (not with all members, because I do not believe all members are so small-minded as to approach the problem in this way) with one or two members, including the member who moved this motion, is that they are against any industrial development in this State when they are in Opposition. They want to do their best, by fair means and foul, to bring any proposed industrial development to a halt. I include the member for Eyre in that respect.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I have observed in this place that, whenever the Minister of Education is following a speech that has been, in my judgment, an effective one, the first thing he does is resort to abuse. I have had this experience when I have made what I thought was a reasonable speech. When the Minister of Education has followed me his remarks always have been by way of abuse, and that is precisely the way in which he has approached this matter. In my judgment, we heard the member for Mitcham at his best tonight. We must be fair-minded about these things. I do not believe the member for Mitcham is always at his best, for he descends to a degree of pettiness that is unbecoming. However, tonight he made one of his more telling speeches and the reaction of Government Ministers has been vivid testimony to that. First, they tried to laugh their way out of it. Then, by way of interjection, they tried to storm their way out of it. It was patently obvious that Government members were most uncomfortable on this issue.

However, when he was speaking, the Minister of Education did not try to laugh it off, and he got quite excited towards the finish. I must confess that, in my judgment, the most significant argument for this motion is the environmental argument. The rest is ancillary; it was pertinent, but the major item is the environmental question. The Minister of Education has said the Government will introduce an indenture Bill and we will be able to look

at it; too bad if our questions are not answered. This industry is quite new to the State. We heard about legislation that had come in previously when no indenture had been required.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Indentures have been passed in this House in connection with industries now in this State. Get your facts right!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It is obvious the Minister has been touched on the raw. This is a completely new industry for South Australia, and if the Minister would cool down and listen to what I am saying he might be able to understand.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You do not know what you are talking about.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am suggesting that this is a completely new industry coming into the State and there are serious doubts about it in the minds of the people and the members of the Opposition.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You wait and see what we are going to do.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! Interjections are out of order. I ask members not to interject. The member for Kavel.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Minister is asking us to put the cart before the horse. We do not know whether there will be any environmental impact, what will happen to the prawns in the gulf, etc. I well remember the present Minister of Development and Mines sounding off at great length about the effects on the ecology of opal mining; we should not tamper with the ecology. The member for Eyre was at the time making a telling speech on opal mining. Now members opposite are trying to bluster or laugh their way out of it. The Minister tells the Leader this evening, "Don't worry about the matter; it will be all fixed up in an indenture when it comes before the House. Don't worry, about the ecology". If that is not putting the cart before the horse, I do not know what is. No proper study has been made of the impact on the environment, as has been pointed out by the member for Mitcham, by Dr. Fay Gale, whom I know personally, and by members of the public.

All the people want is answers to questions, but the Government has not got them and is not likely to get them. It merely laughs and blusters its way out of it. When the Minister says, "We will fix it up in an indenture," we say that is not good enough. These are the questions to which the public is demanding answers, and that is a matter on which the Minister of Development and Mines has in the past been so sensitive: people must not dig up a few opals, because they are messing up the desert. He even threw doubt on agricultural pursuits—are we doing the right thing by growing food and destroying the ecology? That was the burden of his argument. The Government is touchy on this matter and other pertinent matters but they are not necessarily the major reason for moving this censure motion. They demonstrate clearly that the Commonwealth Government is trying to welsh on a deal that it obviously made with the State Government a year or so ago.

Mr. Payne: Robin's doing a good job.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: If a member in this place says something that we think is correct, we have to go along with it. The fact that I support the member for Mitcham now is only incidental to the argument.

Mr. Payne: Are you getting touchy now; have we touched on a nerve now?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: No; nothing that members opposite say will upset me. The Treasurer had it in writing that this scheme was a goer, but the Commonwealth Government is backing out of it. We have not reached that happy state where we do not need industrial development. Some people believe we do not need it, that we are using up too much of the earth's resources, but we have not yet reached that Utopian state. We have learnt something from industrialists overseas since the last war, and valuable lessons are still to be learnt. In South Australia we have not moved into this sort of industrial development to anything like the extent to which the United States and Japan have. This is one of the first questions asked nowadays. It is all right to talk about what happened to South Australia in the past, but no development of this type has occurred in South Australia, and the potential harm to the environment from the project is tremendous. That is the main reason why I support this motion. The Government has not done its homework and has not the answers.

Members interjecting:

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Members opposite can laugh, but that is true. They say, "Very well; go ahead and build the complex. If we have environmental problems, we have to solve them. Whether or not they are soluble, we have to solve them." We are asked to accept that, but that is not good enough. If the Government has the answers, why does it not give them to us?

Members interjecting:

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Government is now descending to abuse. If it or the consortium has undertaken a reasonable environmental study and if the Government has evidence that this project is completely safe environmentally, let us have that evidence. The Government may be saved from its dilemma by the fact that the Commonwealth Government is welshing on it. I hope the project can proceed and that the answers to these questions can be found but, before the Government launches into it, it must know the answers. It owes it to Parliament to give those answers. For these reasons, I support the motion, pending more satisfactory replies than we have had (or are likely to have) from the Government.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister of Environment and Conservation): First, let me say that I have been associated with indentures introduced by members of the Opposition in years gone by which, when we look at them today, are seen to be the most appalling documents, to which very little thought had been given. We have learnt good lessons from them. If I had been associated with a Government (as Opposition members were) that was willing to sign away all protection for the community, I, too, would be concerned. However, we have made clear, both publicly and here, that we intended to provide every possible environmental protection in all matters, especially the Redcliff project. We have taken steps to try to involve the public at every opportunity. Members have been invited to visit the department to examine the studies being undertaken and to see what we are doing in connection with our environmental impact statements.

Mr. Dean Brown: I did, and couldn't find anything much at all.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I understood that the honourable member did not attend personally but sent a research officer along.

Mr. Dean Brown: I visited subsequently. I asked for a report but didn't get one.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Neither he nor his research officer could understand it. We have constantly conferred with outside conservation organizations on the various aspects of the Redcliff proposal. I am certain that the member for Kavel has not visited the office, because, clearly, he has no idea of what an environmental impact statement is.

Dr. Tonkin: The only way you'd understand it would be if it were to hit you on the ear.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I assume that the member for Kavel has not availed himself of the opportunity to visit the office.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Did you mean Mr. Warren Bonython when you referred to conservation organizations?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: On the day I received the circular from Mr. Bonython I also received a letter from the Secretary of the same council couched in different terms from the correspondence all Opposition members have obviously received.

Mr. Dean Brown: It was less polite, was it?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: No; it dealt in terms of the co-operation the Secretary of the organization had had from the department and referred in detail to the various discussions, and expressed general satisfaction with those discussions. Clearly, no discussion took place between the writer of that circular and the organization.

Mr. Dean Brown: What about the Geography Department?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I will come to that matter shortly. The member for Mitcham has taken this opportunity to attack the Treasurer for saying that he had given assurances on several occasions with regard to the protections that would be embodied in the development of this project. I point out to him that the Treasurer did this in all honesty, after discussions in Cabinet, and with my total support, because he was saying that we would provide within the indenture the total protections to ensure, first, that all existing and future legislation concerning the environment would apply to the companies involved in the project, together with the studies to be undertaken before the project commenced and during the project's development, taking into account the kinds of change to which the member for Mitcham referred in a letter that he quoted. This may well occur. Continuing processes are embodied in the indenture to ensure that all these aspects will be thoroughly canvassed.

More importantly, we have constantly said, as a Government, that, because of the importance of the environmental aspects involved in the project, we would, as soon as agreement on the indenture had been reached with the consortium, publicly release it not only to members but to all conservation groups, State-wide and nationally, so that the Opposition would have the opportunity to study the protections included in the indenture and to seek advice on it from outsiders. In addition, as has been pointed out by the Minister of Education, opportunity will be provided for a Select Committee to take evidence on the protections to be included in the indenture.

Dr. Eastick: When is "crunch" day?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I do not know what the Leader means, although no doubt he knows. Such total environmental protections as are intended have never been included in any South Australian legislation or that of any other State of Australia.

Dr. Eastick: How soon will it be before the indenture is introduced?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: As soon as possible, possibly some time during the next week or two.

Mr. Dean Brown: You've done no work at all on the environment.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The honourable member is obviously unaware of what is going on and, once again, I simply refer him to a reply given in another place last week that listed the number of tests completed or being undertaken. These tests will continue up to the time the environmental assessment has been made and the impact statement publicly released, so that the members of the community will have every opportunity to express their viewpoints. At that time, members will appreciate that we are clearly embodying three safeguards in the legislation: first, providing total community involvement; secondly, allowing total Parliamentary involvement in the standards we will be requiring, associated with the complex; and thirdly, providing total protection to take into account any future development that may take place within the processes of the plant itself. I assure members that the Treasurer's consistent statement that he could give the public the assurance that the environment in this area would be fully protected will become obvious when we provide the Opposition and members of the community with a copy of the indenture clauses.

Dr. TONKIN: I have never heard such claptrap in all my life. The Minister has been trying to do the old peanut under the thimble trick on us. Who does he think we are?

Mr. Venning: I think he did a good job in the circumstances!

Dr. TONKIN: I do not think so, because he spent most of his time telling us that the indenture, when signed, will give all protection to the ecology. What is the one little fundamental thing he forgot? If this Government has the guts to enforce its legislation on protection of the environment and the ecology, it may well have to turn around and say to the consortium, "Finish. No go. You can't go on."

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: That's exactly right.

Dr. TONKIN: Do members believe that the Government will turn around and say that? We have seen the actions of a Minister who requested a report from the Spencer Gulf Pollution Committee (which report was available to him, if he had wanted it, in November). The Minister still says he does not know about it. However, in reply to a Question On Notice today, he said:

The recommendations which have been given to the Government by the committee and which are for further action by the South Australian Government would naturally be available to the Australian Government at its request.

In one week we have gone from a total denial of the existence of a report—

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Where is there reference in that reply to a report?

Dr. TONKIN: I suppose that the recommendations of a committee are not a report; is that what the Minister is saying?

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Exactly.

Dr. TONKIN: That is just like the rubbish the Minister talked earlier. It is a change to see so many Ministers and Government members in the Chamber. I see that Ministers are now leaving, but at least the Minister of Environment and Conservation has stayed. It is sad to see that members opposite think their case is so weak that they have to walk out. Members opposite think this is a joke.

Mr. Payne: Your aspirations in terms of the leadership are a bit of a joke.

Dr. TONKIN: I am sorry for the member for Mitchell, because I think jealousy is a curse. The Spencer Gulf Pollution Committee comprises most distinguished men who are eminently qualified to speak on this subject. The members of the committee are as follows:

Dr. W. G. Inglis (Director of Environment and Conservation), Chairman; Dr. J. A. T. Bye (Senior Lecturer in Earth Sciences, Flinders University); Dr. C. O. Fuller (Principal Medical Officer, Environmental Health, Department of Public Health); Mr. D. J. Martin (Senior Industries Services and Decentralization Officer, Industrial Development Division, Premier's Department); Mr. B. I. Moyses (Engineer for Planning and Development, Marine and Harbors Department); Mr. A. M. Olsen (Acting Director of Fisheries and Director of Fisheries Research); Mr. R. C. Williams (Engineer for Water and Sewage Treatment, Engineering and Water Supply Department); and Professor H. B. S. Womersley (Botany Department, University of Adelaide).

That committee has produced a report (whatever the Minister says or is not willing to say) that has been available since November.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: A report or recommendations?

Dr. TONKIN: One of the things the report says is that it will take at least three years of extensive field work and study in the gulf before it can be decided whether the project can go ahead without interfering with the ecology.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: What nonsense! Where did you get that sort of stupid information?

Dr. TONKIN: If I can get it, the Minister should be able to get it more easily. If the Government believes that the possible benefits to the State of the Redcliff project will be so vast that they will outweigh some of the ecological disasters that might occur, it should be honest and say so.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: That was your Government's attitude for years.

Dr. TONKIN: It is no good for members opposite to refer to past Governments. The point is that there has been a tremendous increase in awareness of the importance of ecological balance and environmental protection. The Minister should know this, as he was the first Minister appointed to this portfolio.

Mr. Duncan: Appointed by this Government.

Dr. TONKIN: The Government that happened to be in at the time. The Minister should safeguard the public with regard to the environment.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! There are far too many interjections.

Dr. TONKIN: The Government is embarrassed by what has taken place. If the Minister did not know about the report to which I have referred, he should admit that. We have no option but to believe that the Government is being entirely hypocritical with regard to the Redcliff project. In any case, I have a feeling that the Commonwealth Government will say whether or not the project will go ahead, and that it will say that regardless of the ecology. Both the Commonwealth and the State Governments are hypocritical, and I do not know which is worse.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Development and Mines): We could call this the Marco Polo debate, as it has ranged as widely as did that famed adventurer. The member for Mitcham moved a censure motion against the Government on the ground (and I think I am quoting him as closely as I can, given that one must rely on one's direct memory instead of the written text, as we are proceeding with this debate without its having been adjourned) that it has handled the Redcliff project badly and, in fact,

that it has acted abominably. The House is asked to address itself to the full facts that have been advanced in support of these assertions by the honourable member. I suggest that the case is unproven.

We have heard many things about all sorts of things, but very little has been said to substantiate a reasonable interpretation of what "acting abominably" or "handling the thing badly" might mean. What would be my interpretation of the Government's handling the project badly? I assume the honourable member means that by some sins of omission or commission, the Government has placed stumbling blocks in the way of a successful conclusion of the project: that it has done certain things that will inevitably prevent the project from getting off the ground. We have heard little in substance regarding what the Government has done to jeopardize the project or what it has failed to do in the way of things that are within its power to advance the project. If Opposition members care to be a little more explicit on this matter when they speak, and if the member for Mitcham in his reply is a little more specific, perhaps they may have an effect on Government members. However, thus far, we have not heard many specifics regarding the stumbling blocks that the Government has put in the way of a successful conclusion to this project. We have heard about Mr. Connor and Mr. Warren Bonython, as well as about reports, recommendations or whatever they might be; we have also heard about Dr. Gale. However, we have heard little about the Government's performance, especially in relation to support for those people who are trying to get this project off the ground.

What are the dreadfully bad things the Government has done to embarrass the consortium? What are the ways in which the Government has failed to support the consortium in relation to the objects that it has in mind? I now switch the clock back to the great *laissez faire* days which, I understand, are still somewhat dear to the hearts of Opposition members, although I am inclined to think they are fig-leaf Socialists rather than *laissez faire* free enterprise people. If in the past a person had a proposition for industrial development, I assume he came along and built the thing, and that was it. There would have been no suggestion that there should be an indenture agreement with the Government. He might not have had to ask anyone's permission at all, depending on how far one turned back the clock, the extent to which the structure of local government had been developed in that country, and what controls existed by way of building legislation, and so on.

As one comes closer to the present, one sees that there are certain sorts of control that Government seeks to impose on any sort of industrial development. They may be not ecological or environmental controls but controls dealing with the types of building that can be constructed; they may have something to do with the health regulations or be concerned with the health of the people in a certain industry; or they may have to do with industrial conditions over which the authority concerned wants to exercise control. There are certain types of control that may be in operation: an entrepreneur may come along and say, "This is fairly big business. We think that for the prize you will get for industrial development, some of these things should be set aside; we want a specific piece of Government legislation that will enable this to happen." That is the sort of thing that we have seen happen in this very State.

We have seen (and this is a matter on which the member for Whyalla has been so eloquent from time to time) the setting aside of certain requirements for the payment

of council rates as a means whereby an industry could be caught for development in a certain area. Those are the sorts of reason, traditionally, for having indentures. The second area in which Government may become involved with an entrepreneur is when the magnitude of the task involved is so complex or so great that private enterprise cannot of itself get the thing off the ground. The scheme may require Government support in the way of expertise, finance or something else that will enable it to proceed. This is the second reason why private enterprise may want to move in concert with the Government and come to some sort of agreement with it. The point that must be made regarding this project is that it is certainly unable to get off the ground without Government support, and this has always been so.

These are the conditions under which the original negotiations were entered into. One thing the Government wants to know of those members who might potentially support this motion is the way in which it has failed to provide the sort of support that is required, and, given the sort of constraints applying to the State Government regarding the use of Loan funds and the nature of the Commonwealth-State agreement, in what way the Government has stepped out of line in the approaches it has made to the Commonwealth Government for additional support that is beyond its means. What has the Opposition to say regarding the magnitude of the financial support to which the Government considers it is able to commit itself? Is the Opposition saying that the Government should find another \$50 000 000 from somewhere, that it has over-committed itself, or that it was wrong to consider giving any support for infrastructure at all?

Can we hear a clear statement from the Opposition on these matters, because we will then be better able to evaluate our position regarding the motion to which we are supposed to be addressing ourselves. These are the sorts of consideration into which I think this debate should have moved. This is a debate on the ways in which a certain Government has performed in support of a proposition for a certain private enterprise group. These are the various ways in which the Government has operated and can continue to operate. How does this Government compare, in the light of the sorts of guideline that I am setting out? Has it exceeded its mandate? Has it not come up to scratch? Are there other ways in which it should have progressed? Opposition members have not given the Government any ideas as to its performance in these fields.

Some of the matters to which I would have referred have already been covered adequately by the Minister of Education. However, the member for Mitcham raised one or two specific points to which I would like to address myself. In one or two cases he merely asked a question, so the honourable member will be able to give the House the benefit of additional information in the event of his replying, as it is difficult at present to unscramble what he meant on certain aspects. He referred, for instance, to an enormous expansion in the Public Service. It was not clear, however, in what way he tied that matter to the development of the Redcliff project because, although it is true that Government officers have been working hard so that this project might get off the ground, there has been no increase in the Public Service because of this project.

There has been some restructuring of effort, and it has been found (and this is not a novel discovery) that the traditional structure of the Public Service is not appropriate to solving all the problems that have arisen. There has therefore been an extensive use of committees, one of which I have chaired myself, so that the project might

proceed. The point is that these committees have been manned from the existing staff of the Public Service. If I interpreted the honourable member correctly, he was saying that, to get the thing moving, the Government had to increase the Public Service enormously and, if the thing fell flat, the Government would finish up with egg on its face and with many public servants for whom it would have no employment. That is not the case, but perhaps it was not the point the honourable member was trying to make. He will have another opportunity to explain the matter during this debate.

The honourable member also seemed to make the point that this project was absolutely critical to the industrial strategy of this Government. True, the project is the largest thing that has been potentially attracted to the State during the life of this Government, but it is not critical to our industrial strategy in the sense that many other projects will fall to the ground if it fails. It stands by itself. It is something that we believe can initiate additional regional development in that part of the State, but there was already a considerable growth factor in that region, as another member underlined. It is certainly not critical to our industrial strategy in the metropolitan area, but that does not mean that we do not give it a high priority. But again perhaps the honourable member would clarify exactly what he was getting at.

He referred to what he said seemed to be a difference between the Treasurer and me in regard to the relationship between the Redcliff project and some other petro-chemical plant, possibly on the north-west shelf as part of the developing Pilbara region. In a sense, the honourable member answered the question he posed in the information he gave members. It was clear from the quotation from my statement that I was addressing myself to a situation under which the Redcliff project had a four-year lead on any other project that might come up. The situation to which the Treasurer addressed himself was a situation in which both projects might hit the deck at the same time. Clearly, that is not on in terms of any sort of possibility for the success of both plants.

One certainly would not want to rule out the possibility, if we are able to get the Redcliff project going by the end of 1977, that by 1981 there could be a similar and possibly larger development on the north-west shelf, because of the much greater reserves of hydro-carbons there. That is possible, but again I would make perfectly clear that the Treasurer was asked a question in relation to the two projects hitting the deck at the same time; that obviously answers itself.

The honourable member then went on to quote from an editorial about Mr. Connor; the editorial seemed to be no more than abuse of the Commonwealth Minister, and it was not clear exactly how much further that got us, unless the honourable member was simply being as scrupulously comprehensive as he could and ensuring that we got all the cuttings he had collected. It did not seem to add anything further to what was said in the debate.

I have not spoken at length on environmental matters, because my colleague has dealt with them, but there was a reference to the effect on ecology of vinyl chloride monomer and polyvinyl chloride, key intermediate and end products of the plastics chain. I do not know whether the honourable member also meant to say that they could have an effect on the health of the people in the industry. In relation to vinyl chloride monomer, these doubts have been raised recently. The quotation that the honourable member used admitted that there was to be no vinyl chloride monomer or polyvinyl chloride produced by the Redcliff project; the

quotation stated that ethylene dichloride, which will be produced there, is the beginning of the chain. It is from this product that vinyl chloride monomer and polyvinyl chloride are polymerized. It was suggested that, once there was a plant there, there would be an inevitable and irresistible urge to have the production of the other products take place there; that is a *non sequitur*.

Any indenture that has an environmental clause in it must be sufficiently flexible so that, if in 10 years time or less the consortium proposes to the Government that a vinyl chloride monomer plant be added to the existing structure, this would have to be examined in terms of the guidelines laid down by the indenture and according to whether it could be shown that this would lead to the environmental results that the honourable member has quoted. If it could lead to such results and if it violated the guidelines laid down in the indenture, the Government would say, "This simply cannot proceed." The indenture that will be introduced is, in fact, of this nature: it is not a once-and-for-all thing. The indenture does not set it in concrete, as does the indenture relating to Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited.

The indenture that is to be introduced enables a reassessment to be made at various stages of the process, and there would obviously be a reassessment when a proposition was brought forward that vinyl chloride monomer or polyvinyl chloride be produced. In fact, there is no intention at this stage that vinyl chloride monomer be produced. Actually, some time ago Imperial Chemical Industries agreed with B. F. Goodrich for the production of vinyl chloride monomer at Altona, and that has certainly removed any possibility of vinyl chloride monomer production in South Australia for the next 15 years at least. Apart from that, even if that had not taken place and the consortium was looking at the possibility of the future production of vinyl chloride monomer from its own machinery, under the legislation the whole matter can be properly investigated. We are certainly not selling our rights in the indenture, as I have seen it, to being able to assess properly the situation at that point.

There is very little I want to say about the contributions of the member for Bragg and the member for Kavel. The member for Bragg gave the second to worst speech I have ever heard in this House; I will not remind him of the worst one, but it was made nearly three years ago. The member for Kavel spent the first 15 minutes of his speech scratching the back of the member for Mitcham, and he then tried to make a point about the petro-chemical plant being a completely new industry to this State and therefore not strictly comparable to what happened previously under Liberal Governments with other indentures. In a sense, that was answered by the member for Bragg, who ignored that argument altogether and talked about an entirely different argument as regards a new awareness of environment. Some people have become aware more quickly than have others.

Most of these industries, when established under indentures, were completely new industries to the State. This is the typical way in which an indenture has come to be negotiated. Someone comes forward with a fairly large industrial proposition involving a new technology and Government involvement because, first, it is a pretty big fish worth catching and, secondly, a new technology is involved. As a result, the Government says, "We will give you concessions and, to ensure that a future Government does not remove them, we will negotiate an indenture." When the industrial complex at Whyalla was set up, B.H.P. Company's indenture was negotiated; that was a new technology and a

new industry for this State. I cannot imagine exactly what the honourable member was addressing himself to, but for some reason he did not clinch the point. I am not too sure whether he thought better of it half way through and decided not to go on with it or whether he was distracted. My basic point is that, from the brief time I have been intimately associated with negotiations with the consortium (since last October when I first became a Minister and was given this portfolio), I cannot see how in any way this Government has acted in a way to place the project in jeopardy. I point out again that this is what the motion is all about. My officers have been constantly in touch with members of the consortium. Since the beginning of this year I have had a fortnightly meeting with members of the consortium at top level, so that there has been the chance for its management to indicate, at Ministerial level, the problems that were continuing to bedevil the project. With a project of this magnitude we must accept that there will be these problems.

In relation to the Commonwealth Government's attitude to this project, where there is a difference between the two Governments (and a difference of emphasis can be perceived), it is the difference in the application of the time scale. We have always had assurances from the Australian Government that it wanted a petro-chemical plant at Redcliff. Mr. Connor has told me three or four times that this would be the linch-pin in his plan for a national pipelines grid, and that such a grid would make no sense unless there was a way of dealing with the liquids available from the various fields as a commercial proposition and not in storing them somewhere.

The honourable member could have referred to statements made by Mr. Connor in this city, reported in the press and on television a week before the recent Commonwealth election, when he made clear that the Australian Government regarded the Redcliff project as a key part of the project for a national pipelines grid. Who knows in which direction some of the liquids will flow? It is not impossible that eventually the Australian Government plans based on Redcliff would be able to draw on the resources not only of Cooper Basin, Mereenie, and Palm Valley but also of the north-west shelf, if there is a commitment to a pipeline to that shelf. Mr. Connor has made clear to me more than once (and he has said this in the press) that he has this commitment.

The Commonwealth Government wants to see this project go ahead, but it has become clear to us in recent months that the appreciation of the time scale involved on the part of the Australian Government is marginally different from what we have had in mind. As we see it, it is necessary that the consortium has ethylene di-chloride on stream to meet the markets at the time it has indicated. It is considered that work should proceed on the site as from the last quarter of this year. What went on last week and the week before were additional negotiations from this Government so that we could impress on the Australian Government that the commitment already made must be honoured in such a way as to enable ethylene di-chloride to go on stream when the consortium told us that it should go on stream. I thank members for the way they have received my remarks, and I urge the Committee to reject the motion.

Dr. EASTICK: The Minister first suggested that what was required was a clear statement, but then he proceeded to drag red herrings across the trail and introduce new material in no way related to some of the important questions that have been asked. I accept some of the difficulties experienced by the Minister, and other Ministers,

about the real purpose of this exercise. I accept that the removal of A.I.D.C. from the arrangements is of no consequence, because the Commonwealth Government has changed its whole system of oversea funding, reducing the amount to be retained in the Reserve Bank so that the sum available to the consortium will allow it to proceed without the additional funds it would have had to find from a source such as A.I.D.C. This evening was an exercise in credibility and frankness, and I am more than a little surprised that we have had only short-term visits from the Treasurer, because he is so vitally involved.

For a long time we have asked many questions about the viability of this project and its progress, and we have indicated that there are serious doubts in the minds of people in the community, including those in professional positions, about the Government's statements concerning this project. Indeed, earlier this evening the Minister of Environment and Conservation indicated that his Government had been responsible for environmental impact studies, which had been instituted because of the growing and grave concern. On March 26, 1974, *Hansard* reports that I asked the following question, under the heading "Environment Studies":

What guidelines have been laid down for the conduct of environment impact studies in respect of South Australian projects?

The Minister's reply is reported as follows:

The Environmental Protection Council has recommended to the Minister of Environment and Conservation guidelines for the introduction of an environmental impact system. The Government has considered these guidelines and accepted them in principle,—

in other words, at that date the Government did not have a final environmental impact study system that was total in its concept—

and they are now being circulated to many interested organizations for comments.

So, on March 26, 1974, the Government said that it would circulate the guidelines to organizations and ask for their comments! The reply continues:

It is expected that this system would be applicable to both Government and private development.

It was said not that it would be applicable to any system or any project under way at the time but that it would be applicable at some time in the future. Let us now refer to a document entitled *Redcliff Petro-chemical Development, Plan for Environmental Study*, dated May, 1974, with the reference SADEC 1. On page 5, under the heading "Introduction" the document states:

Some two and one half years ago the site at Redcliff in South Australia was nominated by the South Australian Government as a suitable location for a petro-chemical plant.

The first public notification of such a project was in February, 1973, just 18 months ago, but the statement circulated by the Minister stated that the Government had been in possession of the facts 12 months before the date on which it announced that it was considering the project. Reference was made to a document circulated in the November, 1972, issue of the *Reader's Digest* regarding problems that had occurred in Japan. Certainly, senior research officers in the Minister's department and the Director would have been aware of the difficulties associated with such a project. The Treasurer, in his travels around the world looking at various industries for Australia, recognizing one year before the date announced that the Redcliff site had to be determined, would be aware of the dangers associated with the project, yet in March, 1974, the means of an environmental impact study associated with such a project had not been determined. I shall not canvass at any length the

information sought from the various Ministers regarding environmental studies, when they were commissioned, who was working on them, and whether or not reports had been received. I believe members opposite have been hood-winked because, without doubt, someone has been sitting on some of the information that should have been in the hands of the Ministers.

Dr. Tonkin: Would you care to have a guess?

Dr. EASTICK: I can suggest names, but I will not do so; I shall leave the Ministers to sort it out amongst themselves. It is all very well for them to tell us there is no problem. What this exercise is all about, quite apart from whatever connotation the member for Mitcham may have put on it (and it was inherent in the questions I asked the Minister of Development and Mines before this motion was moved), is a question of credibility, and a serious question of the frankness of the Treasurer and other Ministers as to the facts known.

Last March, Parliament was called back into session to consider an indenture. The reason we did not look at that Bill is history. It was significant that, a few minutes ago, the Minister quoted what was taking place in relation to the indenture, and then corrected himself by saying, first, that there was machinery, and adding "as I have seen it". Here is the Minister responsible for this major project who has just told us that, once a fortnight, he meets with the top people of the consortium. He is having all these discussions, yet he is not sure what the indenture Bill is. He says it is "as I have seen it."

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: What else could I say?

Dr. EASTICK: Where is the full document? If there are doubts in the Minister's mind whether he has seen the one that is pertinent—

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: The agreement has yet to be signed between the Government and the consortium, so I cannot guarantee that the document I have seen is word for word the document that will be produced for members.

Dr. EASTICK: I would not suggest the Minister could back out quite so simply. I was rather surprised when he came into the discussion again, because it appeared he had been told to stay out of it with so many of his colleagues buying into the debate. The errors of the past have been thrown at us tonight. The Minister of Works, who was a Minister in a former Labor Government, should not criticize the activities of a Government of a different political persuasion. If he were to cast his mind back only a few years, he would recall that the West Lakes indenture, which he had played a part in preparing, had to be completely rewritten when a different Administration took office. The way it had been prepared would have been against the best interests of South Australia. One could also refer to a decision taken by the Treasurer on a line from the coast in connection with off-shore minerals, a matter in which South Australia was greatly disadvantaged by the arrangement he negotiated on its behalf. It is all very well for Ministers to say what happened in the past: they must be careful that some of the skeletons in their own cupboards do not rattle more loudly than those to which they are referring.

I would have expected that the Treasurer, the senior Minister responsible for the initial promotion of this project, and certainly the Minister who has accepted all the questions on it from members on either side in recent times, would have made himself available for this discussion. I am not convinced that all the comment we have had from the Minister of Education, the Minister of Environment and Conservation, and the Minister of Development and Mines, constitutes a credible answer to the questions raised. The

member for Kavel indicated the attitude of members on this side, and the member for Mitcham said the same thing. We are prepared to have this industry, and we welcome the opportunity. We welcome any industry to South Australia so long as the detail associated with it is clearly and frankly conveyed to members of Parliament, the people responsible for the signing of the indenture. It has not been denied by either the Treasurer, in answer to questions, or the Minister of Development and Mines, that the deadline should be no greater than two weeks from the announcement made last Wednesday. We are not in a position to know when the Indenture Act will be introduced. We will adjourn on Thursday of next week for a week, and then the Budget will be debated, as it is important that it be approved as soon as possible so that the public servants of this State can be paid. We do not know how long the Bill will be allowed to remain on the Notice Paper. The Emergency Powers Bill has been on the Notice Paper now for some time without action.

Mr. Coumbe: Some emergency!

Dr. EASTICK: No emergency at all. We do not know how many witnesses will be called before a Select Committee, which we are told will deal with the Bill.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It has to go to a Select Committee.

Dr. EASTICK: Yes, but after the Bill goes to a Select Committee, are we to believe that the Minister of Education, in his usual way, will push it through in a few days?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: The Leader is making up stories.

Dr. EASTICK: The Minister knows that, when a Bill goes to a Select Committee, every person with a legitimate case to put will be heard. When will that document be signed? What is the credibility of the story that it must all be tied up within two weeks to allow the work to commence in the last quarter of this year so that it can meet the on-stream requirements of production? In March of this year it was put to the Treasurer that the delay occasioned by the intrusion of Mr. Connor and the Australian Government was such that it would prevent the project's proceeding according to the programme that we had been told was so vital. Not one word said here this evening suggests that the prediction I made on that occasion will be other than correct, and nothing that the Minister said a moment ago about commencing in the last quarter makes any difference to the fact that the indenture, which is such a vital part of this project, has no earthly chance of being signed before the commencement of the last quarter.

Apart from the connotations that may have been attached to this debate by the member for Mitcham in moving his motion and apart from the "around the world in sixty minutes" speeches that we have had from the Minister of Education and other Ministers, the real issue is credibility and frankness. I repeat that I am not satisfied that we have had that frankness expected of Ministers in this House, and I doubt the credibility of several statements that have been made in this issue.

Mr. EVANS: My comments in supporting the motion will be brief. Earlier this evening, the Minister of Education asked whether the Opposition was prepared to suggest another site instead of Red Cliff Point? I am speaking now of the aspect of environment. The Government has departmental officers, so it has the opportunity to carry out environmental studies. It can also employ people independent of Government departments to carry them out, but the Opposition does not have that opportunity. The Government knows, as we have known all along, that it has not had a proper environmental study carried out, but it seems

that until recently the members on the front bench opposite were hoodwinking their own back-benchers, the public, and the Opposition. For the Minister of Education to suggest that the Opposition should recommend another site is totally wrong. The Opposition does not have available to carry out the required studies the experts that the Government has, although it did not use them. It gave one group an opportunity to carry out such studies but allowed it only about three weeks in which to do that.

There have been many instances recently of the Government's making statements and not being able to back them up with fact. I believe the Redcliff project has been promoted before environmental impact studies have been carried out; and that must be the first thing to be done. Before any other planning proceeds, we must be sure there will be no great adverse effect on the environment in that area. That must be the first major work done, but that has not happened, and the Ministers have all admitted it tonight by not standing up and saying it has been done. That is the main reason why I object to the Redcliff project—that no proper study has been made, regardless of what is in the indenture. If it is in the indenture, it will be impossible for the consortium to go on with the project, but I do not think the indenture will make it face up to the environmental responsibilities that we should be able to expect of it. Even though the Minister said last week that he did not have time to carry out an environmental study, I ask that one be carried out. It is important that such a study be made.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): This is a censure motion on the Government of this State because that is the Government largely responsible for many of the delays in the progress of the scheme for the establishment of a petro-chemical plant at Red Cliff Point. The State Government has continually blamed the Commonwealth Government for the delays. We have heard the Treasurer enunciate those delays in this Chamber many times, but we should look at the State Government's own record. I quote from the report on the Redcliff Petro-chemical Development Plan for Environmental Study. This report was printed in May, 1974; I recall seeing it in late January or February of this year in the Minister's office, so it has taken at least three months to even print it. It states:

In order to assess the effects of the project on the environment, studies are required of the following areas: (1) major process plant and site; (2) sources of raw material used in construction and plant operation; (3) the gulf waters; (4) marine loading facilities; (5) the pipeline routes; and (6) the surrounding urban areas and amenities.

The summary of the report states clearly how important it is that these studies be carried out. If we are to do an environmental impact study, we need to assess the environment before any alteration takes place. How can we possibly assess the plant site environment if work is to start in the last quarter of this year? The summary concludes:

Studies and monitoring of environmental factors should be continued after the commencement of the plant.

[Midnight]

In other words, the report clearly suggests that all six factors should be carried out before any work starts. Although this report has been available for six months, the Government has not acted on it; yet it is expected that work will commence on the petro-chemical plant within the next three or four months. This leaves the State Government three or four months in which to carry out the necessary environmental studies, but it has no chance of completing such studies within the specified time.

A further delay can be seen from replies given by the Minister of Environment and Conservation with regard to the Spencer Gulf Water Pollution Committee. Only last week, in reply to a question I asked, the Minister said that no report was available, but that the committee might come forward with recommendations. I ask whether a report can be a series of recommendations; I doubt whether we were talking about the same thing. The Director of the Environment and Conservation Department (Dr. Inglis), as Chairman of the committee, issued 36 pages of recommendations on what action should be taken with regard to studies of the environment of Spencer Gulf. It is interesting to study some of the recommendations on water pollution studies. I will read the following three recommendations.

Point 4. Physical, oceanographic and chemical studies should be carried out as programmed with a minimum of delay, aiming at clarifying the general position within two years of the commencement of detailed studies.

Point 5. Biological and geological studies must necessarily be spread over a considerably longer period of at least three and probably four to five years. However, biological studies can proceed satisfactorily after the physical, oceanographic and chemical studies are completed, subject to the necessary monitoring of critical areas.

Point 6. Monitoring of chemical and biological aspects adjacent to known pollution sources should continue indefinitely after the full basic survey.

One of the committee's recommendations is that studies should proceed for four or five years before the plant is in operation, yet the Government has been sitting on the recommendations since last November.

Dr. Eastick: I thought the Minister said that he didn't have a report.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Yes, it has been sitting with the Director of his department since last November. The Minister is so naive, has done so little home work on the subject, and has taken so little interest in this matter that he does not realize that the report actually exists.

Mr. Goldsworthy: He's been too busy with his environmental impact statements.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Yes, but they are nothing but glib statements that mean absolutely nothing. The Government believes that it is protecting the environment of Red Cliff Point and the gulf by simply coming out with glib statements. It is time the Government did the necessary basic surveys before any alteration to the environment takes place. The recommendations in the report also outline the staffing requirements. The report recommends two post-doctorate fellows for two years to carry out physical, oceanographic and marine biology studies; a half-time assistant senior chemist is necessary to carry out work on water quality. In the field of marine biology and fisheries, two research officers are required. A third research officer is required for plankton ecology, and one phycologist is also required. The proposed budget for all these studies involves an initial capital expenditure of \$163 000 and a recurrent expenditure of \$148 000 a year.

This is interesting, because we are now debating capital works in the Loan Estimates, in which no allocation is made for the necessary capital works to carry out these studies over four or five years that are urgently required before the plant can operate. We heard from the Minister this evening how important it is that the petro-chemical plant operate as soon as possible; I believe that the required date is 1978. However, nowhere in the Estimates is provision made for capital expenditure on these environmental studies. So, it is not the Commonwealth Government that has made such a complete and utter bungle of the planning and reports of the project.

Mr. Goldsworthy: That Government's not done badly!

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I agree. The State Government has held up the reports and has not carried out the necessary environmental studies. It has been grossly negligent regarding the environmental aspects of Redcliff. It is not that the Government has not come forward with sufficient statements but that it has not carried out the necessary work. For all these reasons, I support the motion.

Mr. GUNN: I support the motion, because it is clear from the debate that the Government has much to answer for. If there has ever been a time when the Government has been on edge and has not had the answers to put before the House, it has been during this debate. Only this afternoon I received a reply from the Minister of Environment and Conservation to a question I placed on notice last week. He is the so-called protector of the environment in this State, the Minister who is supposed to be responsible for protecting the ecology of the gulf, and the Minister who, in my opinion, has completely failed. My question referred to the fishing industry and to the discussions the Minister and his department had had with it. The Minister replied:

Fisheries Department research officers completed a two-week survey of Upper Spencer Gulf in the region of Red Cliff Point about 30 kilometres south of Port Augusta on September 30, 1973. The survey was intended to provide basic data upon the ecology of the region so that a detailed programme of investigation of the marine environment in the region may be designed.

Not "would be", but "may be". The Opposition has not seen any reports to clearly allay its fears, because it did not support the Government's concept that it would have industry at any cost, which the Treasurer had asked the Opposition to support. This is a disgraceful state of affairs, because the introduction on page 5 of the report clearly sets out that the Government made up its mind to build a plant at Red Cliff Point and tried to justify its decision subsequently. The report states:

Some years ago the site of Redcliff was nominated by the South Australian Government.

That is a complete admission that the Government is not concerned about the environmental effects on the Gulf. Under the heading "Toxicity Tests", at page 20, paragraph 5, the report states:

Synthetic effluents are being tested for toxicity on fish in the I.C.I. (U.K.) Brixham laboratories to aid in determining safe emission levels.

We are entitled to know how long it will take for those investigations to be made available to Parliament. Has the Government received this information? Opposition members have not received it. Under the heading "Commercial fishing", paragraph 6 states:

A description of the present commercial prawn and fishing industry in the upper part of the Gulf should be made.

Yet this Government is willing to put in jeopardy that important industry. In reply to me today, the Minister said that the report was available for study in the office of the Environment and Conservation Department. However, that report is not available for members of the public to take away and study, as they should be able to do, because daily we have seen responsible and interested groups criticize the Government. All members who believe in protecting the Gulf should support the motion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have enjoyed listening to the speeches of members on this side, whose support I appreciate. I have also enjoyed listening to the speeches of the Minister of Education, the Minister of Environment and Conservation, and the Minister of Development and Mines,

who have attempted to reply to what has been said by Opposition members. I enjoyed those speeches because they so obviously failed to answer the points made by me and subsequent speakers. The three Ministers tried to use semantics to defeat the motion, knowing that they had no arguments to rebut the matters raised. It was a sorry performance by the Minister of Education, who, as patron of the South Australian Debating Association, must know how poor his speech was. Much was made by the Ministers about previous indentures. As I was a member of the Select Committee on the Broken Hill Proprietary Company's Steelworks Indenture Bill regarding Whyalla, I take responsibility for the decisions made. All members at that time must accept responsibility. In those days, however, we did not realize the importance of the environment and what damage we might do to it.

One of the members of the Select Committee was Mr. Loveday, one of the most respected Labor members to have been in this Chamber. Let it not be said that only Liberal and Country League members supported that Bill. To show that no-one gave any thought whatever to questions of the environment, which was not then one of the matters considered, I will quote the final paragraph of the speech made by Mr. Loveday in support of the indenture on October 21, 1958, after the Select Committee had considered the matter. He said:

I do not intend to labour this matter because members have had an opportunity to study the Bill, the Indenture and the report of the Select Committee. I have gone into the matter thoroughly and am satisfied with the arrangements reached. I feel sure that the project will be of tremendous benefit to Whyalla, the State, and to Australia. The benefits will be of a magnitude too difficult to assess at present. The bargain that has been struck is probably the best that could be struck in the circumstances and I am sure we can support the measure in its entirety.

It is unfair of Ministers to try to put the blame on L.C.L. members for supporting that indenture, as it was the responsibility of all members in this place at the time and of members of the Select Committee, which was an all-Party committee. This debate has shown that my motion is abundantly justified.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (17)—Messrs. Allen, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Millhouse (teller), Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, and Venning.

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

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Motion thus negated.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I refer to the allocation of \$50 000 for the Angaston Hospital. When attending the hospital's annual meeting last Friday, I said that I had seen this line. However, those present did not know what the \$50 000 was for, although they thought it might be a grant to reimburse the hospital for expenditure incurred in providing services to pensioners. Indeed, the hospital loses a large sum because the Commonwealth Government's subsidy is insufficient to cover the cost of treating pensioner patients. Will the Minister ascertain what the allocation is for?

The sum of \$100 000 has been voted for the Gumeracha Hospital; this is no doubt related to fairly extensive alterations at the hospital that are nearing completion. The sum of \$250 000 is allocated for the Mount Pleasant Hospital, which is embarking on an extensive rebuilding programme. However, this \$250 000 grant, on a \$2 for \$1 basis, seems

to be inadequate: the hospital is concerned about the escalating cost of the project. Although it was estimated initially to cost about \$600 000, the latest estimate is about \$800 000. The hospital has a guaranteed loan from the Government, but I do not think it will be able to meet the increase caused by inflation. A contract has been let and construction has commenced, and I understand that the whole project is to be completed in about 15 months.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will obtain that information for the honourable member.

Dr. TONKIN: I notice that \$108 000 has been allocated under the item "Non-Government Hospital and Institution Buildings" for minor works and projects that may be approved. Considerable concern has been expressed in the community regarding the proposed rebuilding of Memorial Hospital at North Adelaide, about which the member for Torrens, too, is extremely concerned.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Where is Memorial Hospital referred to?

Dr. TONKIN: That is the question I am asking. Is Memorial Hospital likely to come within the category of projects that may be approved? I understand that this matter was brought before the Minister some time ago but that no approval has yet been given. Is the hospital's rebuilding programme still being investigated, and is it likely that it will receive the Government's support, as so many people think it should? If the hospital does not receive the support, it will be a miserable thing. I hope the Methodist Church and the hospital will still go it alone and conduct their appeal; they deserve all the support they can get. I hope this line signifies that there is still hope that even now this worthy hospital and nurse training school will be supported.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will obtain that information.

Mr. EVANS: I refer to the loan to the South Australian Land Commission. Money is made available to the commission, which has power under the regulations to instruct private developers to submit to it plans of any commercial development. I refer to the relevant regulations, as there is a real concern that the commission has gone overboard regarding the sort of detail for which it is asking.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What has this got to do with the Loan Estimates?

Mr. EVANS: The State makes money available to the commission to enable it to operate, and at present there is no other way in which it can be taken to task on this matter.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It is not a capital item.

Mr. EVANS: It is, as the commission can acquire a proposed development project from a private operator. The allocation can therefore be used for such a purpose. Regulation 3 (1) provides:

The particulars of a commercial development served pursuant to subsection (7) of section 12 of the Act, by the proprietor of land constituting a planning unit, upon the Commission shall be—

(a) a full description of the dimensions, size, location, nature and certificate of title reference (if any) of the land constituting the planning unit to which the commercial development relates;

To that point, there is no complaint. Paragraph (b) provides:

full particulars of the use to which the land is proposed to be put and the nature, location, dimensions and type of construction of any building to be erected thereon;

Therefore, if a developer intends to develop a 32 hectare section, with seven houses to each .4 ha, so that there will be 560 houses in the development, he must produce a plan

showing each house and its design and cost, as well as the cost of land and services. It would be absolutely impossible for any developer to do this. Paragraph (c) provides:

a reasonable estimate of the cost of the commercial development, excluding the cost of land.

What organization can estimate the overall cost when there are 560 allotments and such a high inflation rate to be considered? Paragraph (d) provides:

particulars of any siteworks, roads or landscaping to be laid, made or placed on the said land.

That is not really objectionable; it is fair for the commission to ask where the roads and park lands will be. It is paragraph (b) that is totally unacceptable, yet it is being implemented. These impositions will force the private developer out of the field altogether. The Government would like to see that happen, but the penalty will be paid by the private home owner. Under the same regulations the commission can decide what type of tenure will apply, and it can convert it to leasehold land if it so desires. The Government's activities regarding housing are the worst on record and, if the Minister thinks that the current inflationary trend is something to be proud of, I am disgusted with his approach to the average man in the street. If the Land Commission operates in accordance with these regulations, the price of houses will escalate even further. The commission has already shown what a disgraceful thing power can be if it is given to the wrong people.

Dr. EASTICK: Regarding the Municipal Tramways Trust, in his second reading explanation, the Treasurer states:

For the four years 1973-74 to 1976-77, the capital programme of the trust envisages the net expenditure of about \$22 500 000 at present price levels for the transfer of licensed services, the purchase of new buses, the acquisition of land for depots, the construction of buildings and purchase of plant. If the whole of this programme were accepted by the Australian Government for support under the urban transport arrangements, then two-thirds of the cost, say \$15 000 000, would be covered by grants and one-third of the cost, say \$7 500 000, would be a charge to State funds. However, we have not been successful as yet in getting approval for the costs of transfer of licensed services to be financed under the special urban, transport arrangement and the net cost to the State over the four-year period could be as high as \$9 000 000.

The buses to which the Treasurer referred are essential. There must be some reason why the Australian Government does not look upon this item as one conforming to the general guidelines.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The answer is that we have not yet had a reply, but I will check with the Minister of Transport.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I intend to move that the item relating to the Monarto Development Commission be reduced by \$100, but I do not believe that I should move a censure motion on such an important matter at this hour. I therefore move:

That progress be reported.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (16)—Messrs. Allen, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Brown (teller), Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, and Venning.

Noes (20)—Messrs. Boomhill, Max Brown, Corcoran, Duncan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson (teller), Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, McKee, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.

Majority of 4 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I move:

That the vote of \$1 000 000 for Monarto Development Commission, Loan to, be reduced by \$100.

A tremendous doubt clouds the future of Monarto. The reply to the question asked by me today indicates that the Government has spent \$5 742 600 on Monarto, \$511 400 on the Monarto Development Commission, and a further \$315 200 on associate consultants. This year the Government has allocated \$8 830 000 for further development at Monarto, including land acquisition, planning and research, design, development, site maintenance and operation, and administration. This allocation has been made apparently without any assurance from the Commonwealth Government that money will be available. In his second reading explanation the Treasurer states:

As with the Land Commission, it is essential that the Monarto programme be planned on a long-term basis by both Governments, and an early conference is required. In the meantime we are uncertain of the extent to which the Australian Government will provide financial assistance this year The planned development can proceed only with the full and continued support of the Australian Government. In the event that this support is not forthcoming to the extent necessary to finance this programme, the Government will have no alternative but to require the commission to drastically curtail its operations.

This is the first warning from the Government that we will have another Redcliff on our hands. We have seen the Australian Government bungle the Redcliff project so that there is virtually no chance of it proceeding. The reply to a recent question of mine about the financial requirements for Monarto for the next five years indicated that this matter was still being negotiated with the Australian Government. I understand that, for Monarto to proceed, the Australian Government will have to supply about \$30 000 000 a year for the next five years, but this Government is willing to proceed without that commitment from the Australian Government, and present indications are that the Australian Government may not be willing to back Monarto to the full. Some of its other programmes have been curtailed despite promises made before the recent Commonwealth election. The Australian Government is also committed to other growth centres having a far higher priority than its commitment to Monarto. Such centres include Albury-Wodonga, Bathurst and Orange. Furthermore, there is now other information to suggest that the Australian Government will not provide the necessary finance. The *Australian Financial Review* of August 8, 1974, contains an article prepared by Professor W. Alonso, commissioned by the Cities Commission of the Australian Government. That article, quoting Professor Alonso, states, in part:

In my opinion two positions which have sometimes been put forward are incorrect. One says without proof that it is perfectly clear that big cities are far too big and that new cities are much preferable alternatives to their continued growth. The other says that since it is not clear we should do nothing. Rather the case seems to be that there is a possibility that certain activities and population would be better located elsewhere than in the present major centres of development.

Clearly, the report commissioned by the Australian Government recommends against the expenditure of large sums of money in entirely new cities. I refer also to statements made by Professor Scott, Professor of Geography at the University of Tasmania and an adviser to the Australian Government on urban and regional development. He states:

The Monarto site and terrain do not seem suitable Monarto will not be viable in the short term There are other areas which could have been considered more seriously than Monarto A very big question mark hangs over Monarto.

When an adviser to the Australian Government makes such statements about Monarto one must question whether the Government will continue to back Monarto, even though its backing to this point has been halfhearted, as can be seen from the finance supplied; it has been asked to commit \$14 500 000 for the first five years for planning and development and land acquisition. Therefore, on financial grounds a question mark hangs over Monarto.

It would be wrong for the State Government to continue to commit large sums of money to this development when it has no assurance that the more massive finance will become available from the Australian Government. In previous debates, especially during the Address in Reply debate, I have given fully documented statements on why the location of Monarto is unsuitable. First, the soil type of the area is quite unsuitable for a new city, being very susceptible to wind and water erosion. Wind erosion occurred only two years ago. The soil has a very low permeability, involving problems with run-off, water-logging, and also water erosion. The bedrock is far too close to the surface; 40 per cent of the area proposed for Monarto has bedrock within 1 metre of the surface. These are facts from reports commissioned by the State Government. Very heavy ripping or possibly blasting will be required to sink the services into the bedrock.

It was originally planned to dispose of the sewerage effluent in the Bremer Valley by the use of irrigation. In reply to a recent question, the Minister indicated that no plans had been finalized for the disposal of that effluent, even though the Treasurer, in the second reading explanation on the Monarto (Land Acquisition) Bill, stated quite clearly that one reason for choosing the site was the easy disposal of sewerage effluent. The area is also susceptible to a temperature inversion likely to create a smog over the city. The prevailing winds from the south would blow soot or smog from the industrial area on the southern side right across the residential centre.

Further, the Monarto site is too close to Adelaide. Studies at the University of Minnesota have established that no new town should be within 90 minutes travelling time by motor car of another established city; otherwise, the new city simply becomes an outer suburb. Monarto is only 45 minutes travelling time from the centre of Adelaide. Many people living in Monarto will work in Adelaide. The new city was planned originally on the basis that 80 per cent of the working population would work there, but recent indications have been that only 50 per cent of the work force living in Monarto would work there, while the remaining 50 per cent would come to Adelaide.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: That is just plucked out of the air.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: That is not so, but I am not willing to divulge the source of my information. I could not release it to the Government, because I know what action it would take. If the press or anyone else should require verification I would be happy to release the source of my information. It is a most authoritative source, far better than the Minister can produce. I hope members opposite are concerned about it—

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: We are.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: —because, if Monarto does have 50 per cent of its work force working in Adelaide, it simply means it becomes an outer suburb of Adelaide and destroys the whole concept of developing a new residential town. Another reason why the development of Monarto should stop now is a change in the growth rate of Adelaide since Monarto was first thought of. It was planned on the basis of the 1962 growth rate of Adelaide. In 1962, Adelaide

had a growth rate of 3 per cent a year. That growth rate has now dropped to only 1.5 per cent a year, for the year 1973-74.

It was interesting to read a press release as recently as August 16 in the *News*, the headline being “Our birth rate at its lowest”. That report, based on the figures of the Commonwealth Bureau of Statistics, indicates that the birth rate within South Australia has dropped even further than it did last year. This downward trend has been continuing since 1972 and is apparently due to the revised immigration policy of the Australian Government and the revised attitude of people towards the number of children they have. It is apparent that this downward trend in our population increase will continue. This means that at our present level Adelaide has an increase in population of just over 12 000 a year.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Do you think that is a good thing?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I am not commenting on that at all; I am merely relating it to Monarto. If its planned development proceeds, Monarto expects to have a growth rate of 9 000 people a year (that being a figure from the reports on Monarto) and the Adelaide growth rate is 12 000 a year, so it is obvious that both cities would not have a viable and economic growth rate, particularly if Adelaide's growth rate continued to drop. Therefore, the whole basis on which Monarto has been planned—the need to take off the rapid increase in Adelaide's population—is now under question, and the facts suggest there is no need for an entirely new town like Monarto to take off the so-called tremendous increase in Adelaide's population. I suggest the State Government would be far better engaged in encouraging future development in already established town centres. One could look at such areas as the iron triangle, particularly Port Pirie, or the green triangle around Mount Gambier. I am saying not that that is exactly where I would centre all development but that at least the Government should now be looking at those areas.

Another reason why the development of Monarto should be halted at this stage is the likely effect on Adelaide itself. An economist named Mr. Fisher in 1972 submitted a paper supporting the development of Monarto. However, Mr. Fisher, after looking at the most recent population increases in Adelaide, asking a question at a recent seminar on Monarto said that at this stage future development of Monarto should cease until the likely effects on Adelaide were carefully assessed. He suggested that Adelaide would tend to stagnate and that, if Monarto proceeded, the effects on economic growth within Adelaide could be disastrous. He cited the suggestion that all builders would tend to move to Monarto; certainly, other development industries must move to Monarto to proceed, and therefore that implied that Adelaide would have a declining population and a declining economic growth. I would certainly be opposed to Monarto if the 800 000 people living in Adelaide had to suffer economically through its development, as I am sure they would.

Finally, I state my other major reason for opposing Monarto, one that the Government has carefully skirted around—what the social climate of Monarto is likely to be. The Government has promised that initially the work force will consist of about 2 500 public servants, but those public servants are being moved there against their will. Again, I can quote from a survey carried out by the Australian Institute of Agricultural Science, in which it was found that, of the respondents, 66 per cent did not wish to move to Monarto; and 62 per cent believed

that the Agriculture Department could not possibly function at Monarto as well as it could in Adelaide. So the Minister, in asking for facts, has got them. I ask him to submit facts that will support his case. I guarantee he cannot, because it is recognized throughout the Public Service departments being moved to Monarto that they do not wish to go. If the Minister is so naive as to believe that they wish to go, I suggest he go back to talk to some of the public servants involved.

Mr. Mathwin: In his own district of Marino, he will know.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I continually run into public servants from the three condemned departments who plead with me and other members, "For goodness sake, do something about trying to stop the future development of Monarto." However, that by itself is not an adequate reason; there are other reasons I have put forward. Apart from there being 2 500 disgruntled public servants, we have the recent report released to me, and therefore, I believe, to the press, for the first time ever called the *Social Planning for Monarto Report*. It clearly indicates that any new city is bound to have major problems at the social level; furthermore, that Monarto is likely to have great imbalances in its social structure, and the reason for this is that it is a town largely comprising public servants.

One needs only to look at Canberra to see the disastrous effects there. Canberra is a strange town full of public servants, with few industries to supply the balance needed in the work force and the people necessary to make up a mature, established, sound city. Furthermore, Monarto is likely to have a high turnover rate in population. I quote from the *Social Planning for Monarto Report*:

A high rate of population turnover would be especially due to a general deficiency in the establishment and integration of basic community patterns and structure, facilities, and services.

So the Government's own report on the social climate of Monarto openly condemns it. Despite all this overwhelming evidence that Monarto should not proceed at this stage, the Government apparently insists on pushing ahead. As I have said previously, it has become so obsessed with Monarto and with the idea of getting a new town that it no longer can see its deficiencies and shortcomings. It has become quite neurotic about it, and rightly so, because so many of its other proposals advanced as election promises have fallen flat. The Government cannot possibly allow Monarto to become yet another of its failures.

It is for these reasons that I have moved the motion. This most important issue is likely to affect South Australians (particularly those in Adelaide and those who may live in Monarto, if it proceeds) for many decades to come. I could have referred to other areas, but I have simply skimmed across the surface of the major issues. I understand that a great wrangle is going on now over whether the new transport authority or the Monarto Development Commission will plan the transport for Monarto. At this stage, the commission has won out; so that august body, the transport authority, created to consider transport requirements for the whole State, has been cut out because Monarto is an exception. I could continue and cover other similar areas about which I daily hear, not rumours but facts regarding the planning and development of Monarto.

I was interested to have someone telephone me shortly after I made my first speech on Monarto, in which I called for it to be stopped. This person, who turned out to be a senior person working on Monarto, said, "When I read your statement, the trouble was I knew that it was dead correct." This is the most damning statement one could ever have on

the proposed development of Monarto from a person working on the proposed new city who has no confidence or faith in it.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: That puts everyone in the commission under a shadow.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: That is right. I thought about that statement for a long time.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: You'd better name the individual and let all the others off the hook.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: As one of a group of people who promise open Government, the Minister is willing to cut the throat of anyone who comes out and speaks his mind. The Government has said that it will have open Government in the State, but the moment I suggest that anyone has spoken out against Monarto (he did not release secret documents or anything else) by making a general statement (not in contravention of any Act or regulation: it is simply freedom of speech), the Government threatens a complete purge of the commission.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: I didn't say that.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: This is not the first time the Government has done this. This is the Government that constantly harasses people in Government departments who have given me information. It is about time the Government took stock of where it stands.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Which Government officer said that?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I will not say, because I would be divulging my source of information.

Mr. Coumbe: And the person will be victimized.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The Minister need not accept my statement if he does not wish to.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: I don't see how I can.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: All right, then don't. I believe that history (and I know that other people in general conversation have picked up similar comments) will prove me to be right.

Mr. Payne: You'll do him the service of not naming him!

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The honourable member is trying to discredit the statement by suggesting that it is not correct. If the Government is not willing to face the truth about Monarto this time, it should resign. Evidence shows that Monarto should be stopped now until new evidence is produced on other potential sites, until we have new information to the effect that Adelaide actually requires complete new cities to cater for the growth in population, and certainly until the Commonwealth Government assures us that it will come forward with the massive finance that will be required for Monarto's future development.

Mr. GUNN: I support the motion. It is clear from the information the member for Davenport has made available that grave doubts exist not only within the community but within the group of people involved in the Montaro project. It appears to the member for Davenport and to me that, if the Government is willing to embark on this somewhat doubtful exercise and asks the Committee to support a recommendation to spend large sums that could be deployed in other areas at present crying out for assistance (without going into the details in a proper fashion), it should stand condemned. The member for Davenport referred to a report from which I have quoted briefly and which is worth studying in detail. The report, headed "Preliminary soil and land form survey", was prepared by the Agriculture Department in 1972. If one studies the areas of Monarto and the recommendations on how many of these areas have been designated as unsuitable, such unsuitable

areas comprise a large proportion of the project. It was a scandalous decision by the Government to completely ignore a report it had commissioned.

Mr. Payne: Is this the report you said you had to track down?

Mr. GUNN: I am pleased that the member for Mitchell has made that snide remark.

Mr. Payne: It wasn't a snide remark.

Mr. GUNN: It was difficult to track down.

Mr. Payne: I am willing to stand by what I have said.

Mr. GUNN: I asked for it in the library, which readily obtained it for me.

Mr. Payne: That's not my information from the library.

Mr. GUNN: I was told about the report by a person I will not name. In supporting the motion, it is only proper that I should give my reasons for doing so. One reason concerns the difficulty I had in obtaining the report. I went to the Agriculture Department library, but it was not available there.

Mr. Payne: Why didn't you go to the Parliamentary Library?

Mr. GUNN: I went to ask the person in charge of the extension service at the Agriculture Department, where the bulletins are kept, but no copy was available there. I then went to the Parliamentary Library, but no copy was available there, either. I asked the Librarian and, in his usual courteous fashion, he went to great lengths to find one but he was unsuccessful. A couple of days later I obtained a copy, which I photostated for future use.

Mr. Payne: He got a copy at your request?

Mr. GUNN: Copies are difficult to obtain. The report states:

Silo, 3 310 hectares, unfavourable, dunes, subject to wind erosion; very restricted drainage as indicated by gilgais. Camel, 8 761 ha, unfavourable, large areas of shallow, infertile stony soils, most of remainder infertile and subject to wind erosion. Loydella, 4 559 ha, unfavourable. Brinkley, 4 904 ha, unfavourable, dune crests and other sandy areas subject to wind erosion, large areas of shallow stoney soils water logging and salinity lightly in swales.

That is Monarto. It was difficult to obtain this information; I believe the report was deliberately withdrawn so that it would not be available to the public, because it was very illuminating. The Minister has said nothing about how he will solve these problems. The departments to be shifted to Montarto do not know how many officers will have to go there. In reply to my Question on Notice, the Minister of Works said:

It is not possible to say how many of the people now employed will still be in the department at the time the headquarters is relocated at Monarto.

From what I have been told, few people will transfer, because they will refuse to be conscripted and drafted to Monarto. When I asked what action would be taken against staff members who refused to work at Monarto, the Minister replied:

Decisions on this question will be made if and when such situations occur. At that time any such cases would undoubtedly be considered by the Public Service Board. Again the Government is trying to get out of it.

Mr. Payne: It's a matter for the Public Service Board.

Mr. GUNN: The Treasurer has decided that these departments and the poor individuals who do not want to leave their homes and move their families will have to go to Monarto, but he will leave to the Public Service Board the decision about those who refuse to go. The Government is willing to pass the buck. What sort of cowardly Government is it? I doubt that the Commonwealth Government will supply funds for this development, in view of the deplorable economic situation into which it has

plunged the country. Yet this Government is asking us to approve money that could be spent in other areas to be used on this doubtful project which is too close to Adelaide and which will only become an outer suburb. I hope that the Minister will say how many public servants are to be transferred to Monarto in the three departments that it has been suggested will be sent there. What industries will be situated there? Will heavy engineering industries be established, with perhaps some industries being transferred from the iron triangle? On other occasions, the Minister has loudly supported the project, talking about complicated and expensive types of communication system. He has not said much about this recently. I hope he will give clear assurances about what the Government has in mind.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Members are being asked to approve the payment of \$1 000 000 to the Monarto Development Commission, with an expected repayment to the Treasury from the commission of \$2 000 000, the Treasury being left in credit to the tune of \$1 000 000. Therefore, I cannot see how the member for Eyre can really say we are committing the State to excessive expenditure. In his explanation the Treasurer gave reasons for this accounting. We have a commitment with the Commonwealth Government for acquiring all land associated with developing Monarto. That commitment, which was made some time ago, is being progressively honoured. Last year, the acquisition programme began, moving along perhaps better than expected. We were able to acquire land rather more swiftly than we had thought.

Dr. Eastick: Without any difficulty from the persons from whom you acquired it?

The Hon. D. I. HOPGOOD: As far as I know, no case has yet gone to the Land and Valuation Court. True, towards the end of last financial year certain notices of compulsory acquisition went out. When the first noises emanated from a small group that owned land in the area, the stage of compulsory acquisition had not been reached. If the land is as worthless as Opposition members claim, one wonders why people were putting on such a turn when we approached them to acquire it. Midway through the financial year, although we had had a commitment from the Commonwealth Government that the whole acquisition programme would be financed by it, no actual cash had come across. The State Treasury agreed to make an advance to the commission so that acquisition could proceed. The \$2 000 000 included in the Loan Estimates is the expected repayment to the Treasury of money advanced at that time.

At first, the member for Davenport was fair, although I would quarrel with his basic premises. However, he ended his remarks deplorably. He seemed first to advance three cases: a minimum case, an intermediate case, and a maximum case. The minimum case was as follows: "Do not commit yourself until you know exactly where you are with the Commonwealth." Exactly what "where you are" could mean was not really made clear, and that is important because one can never get commitments for, say, ever and a day, and it would be unrealistic to make a commitment even for a 10-year period. We are not talking about a Redcliff-type commitment where we want from the Commonwealth Government certain finance for infrastructure and that is it: we are talking about an on-going programme to which the Commonwealth Government and the State Government will make their contributions.

One of the things about which we are concerned is the vagaries of finance. One can obtain general approval for a programme that will be financed over a certain time, but

one is up against the problem of finance from year to year. For instance, in a certain year this State's Estimates may be ready before those of the Commonwealth, so there is an area of uncertainty in that regard, and one can never entirely get over this. We have submitted a five-year programme to the Commonwealth Government and it has been well received. The operative area to which the honourable member should direct his stethoscope is the Commonwealth Minister for Urban and Regional Development and his department. He has advisers both from within and from outside the Cities Commission.

Dr. Eastick: He advised you what he was doing?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Ultimately the decisions are made by the Commonwealth Government on the advice of the Minister for Urban and Regional Development and his department, and I assure the Leader that this State has their full support. It is all very well for the honourable member to quote a Professor Scott who happens to sit on the Cities Commission. I could with equal force quote Mr. Hugh Stretton from South Australia, who also sits on the commission. If I said that he was right behind this, and the honourable member said that Professor Scott had his doubts, we would seem to be in a line ball position. One must therefore accept that various types of advice are given to the Minister, who is not bound to accept advice merely because it is given by a professor from Tasmania. Mr. John Mann, who has been closely associated with Mr. Uren for a considerable time, is the Commonwealth representative on the Monarto Development Commission and, if one wants to talk about a pipeline that this Government has to the Commonwealth Government, and particularly to Mr. Uren, one should remember Mr. Mann.

Dr. Eastick: The Minister of Transport hasn't got such a pipeline.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: From advice that has been given to the Treasury, I am fairly confident that I know within \$500 000 how much is to be made available for Monarto this year. This information was not available to the Government when the Loan Estimates were placed before members. The Government is expecting good news in this respect.

Dr. Eastick: How much is it?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I am not willing to divulge the sum at present, but members will know fairly soon. It is certainly within the confines of what we expect to have to spend. The first of the three cases advanced by the honourable member is that one does not commit oneself until one knows exactly where one stands with the Commonwealth Government. Ultimately, that question can never be answered, although certain assurances, about which the Government is confident, can be received in the short term. The honourable member's intermediate case was that the new city is in the wrong place, anyway. If he is going to argue on the basis, why does he bother about his argument regarding the Commonwealth Government? Why not simply base his argument on the premise that it is in the wrong place anyway, and therefore treat the method of financing about which he is so unhappy as irrelevant? He will have established a strong case and need not stick to the weaker case.

Mr. Dean Brown: You're accepting that, are you?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: No, but I am, for the sake of argument, asking why, if we accept the second argument, we should bother about the first one?

Mr. Dean Brown: I'm just proving that I have a water-tight case.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Really. The honourable member's third argument is that we do not need an extra urban growth centre in South Australia, anyway. Indeed,

he said not only that it was unnecessary but also that it was downright dangerous because of its impact on the existing city. The honourable member tried to turn around the argument the Government has used all along to justify Monarto. We have said that one reason why we embarked on this scheme was the benefits that would flow to Adelaide. The honourable member tried to say, however, that it would be disastrous to Adelaide to have this extra urban growth centre, because all the growth potential would be removed from Adelaide. The point I make regarding his third argument is that, if it is valid, why bother about the second argument? That is his strongest case, and arguing about whether we should have an extra urban growth centre which we do not need and which will be disastrous is irrelevant if we do not need it. Therefore, that is another of the basic points the honourable member need not have made if he was really serious regarding his basic points and his major contention.

Of course, I challenge all three of his statements. Having said enough about this State's relationship with the Commonwealth Government regarding finance, I refer, for instance, to what the honourable member said regarding the selection of the site and some of the problems involved in this matter. I point out that the soil conditions were fully investigated as part of Mr. Pak Poy's consultancy with the Monarto Development Commission. I wonder, for example, whether the honourable member has taken the opportunity to go to the commission's premises and examine the great amount of material on display to the public there. They would let the honourable member in, just as they would any member of the public. However, because of the deplorable way the honourable member concluded his speech, I would forgive them if they did not let him in.

These surveys were undertaken and, if the honourable member likes to go to the commission's premises, on the wall he will see maps showing the surveys that were made regarding the cost of construction in various parts of the site. This was one of the two bases on which decisions were taken regarding the location of open space on the one hand and areas for industrial and residential development on the other hand. The other basis was an environmental one. If one has an escarpment that is covered with trees, that land has a high environmental value and, therefore, if one wishes to use it, a high environmental cost is involved because it must be cleared. These two cost patterns have been superimposed to give a final pattern, which is the basic document on which decisions are made as to the location of industrial and residential sites.

The commission is well aware that there are problems that must be solved. This was all taken into account in the location decisions. Regarding the disposal of sewage effluent, over the weekend the honourable member invited the readers of the *Sunday Mail* to be so naive as to assume that, because no final decision had been published as to the exact details of the disposal of sewage effluent from Monarto, it was not, in fact, possible to sewer the town. That is just hogwash. Of course it will be possible to sewer Monarto. It has been possible to sewer other country towns and developments. All right, there are problems, but there are problems in sewerage parts of Adelaide. Some parts of Adelaide are easier to sewer than are other parts; similarly, some parts of Monarto will be easier to sewer than will other parts.

Regarding temperature inversions, I guess that we probably ought to evacuate Adelaide altogether if they were a real problem, because I find it difficult to believe that temperature inversions will be a greater problem at the Monarto site than they are at the Adelaide site. Regarding

smoke from industry, if the honourable member can substantiate his point, which I take it is similar to the criticism that has always been made of the location of the Thomas Playford power station (that it dumps its smoke on to the roof of the house of the member for Stuart), that is not in itself sufficient reason for relocating Monarto somewhere else or for not having it at all. Rather, it is a reason for relocating industry within the site; it could be on the northern side, so that the smoke is blown away from the residential areas.

The north-eastern side will be the last of the areas to be developed; since the present plan does not show the overall development for infinity, the area is shown as undeveloped but, if the honourable member can substantiate his case, the commission will consider an internal relocation of industry. I believe that it has already looked at the problem and, actually, it is not a problem at all. If anything, it is a problem of internal relocation, and it cannot, of itself, cast doubts as to the decision on the location of Monarto.

It is high time we got a clear decision from the Opposition as to its position on decentralization in this State. The Opposition has preached decentralization for 50 years. I can recall a former member for Alexandra (Hon. D. N. Brookman) once telling me that Sir Thomas Playford's decision to locate the refinery at Port Stanvac was decentralization, and he said that I, as member for the district, owed my position as a member to a decentralization decision by the Playford Government, because many industrial workers had moved to a previously Liberal-voting area. However, the Opposition may have had a change of heart since then in respect of decentralization.

At this stage we have no clear indication from the Opposition as to what it wants from decentralization. At one stage I got the impression from the honourable member that what he wanted to go back to was the sort of decentralization that the Country Party espoused until very recently: one simply puts an extra 1 000 people here and a few more there. In other words, one spreads one's effort so very thinly that it has no impact at all. However, I do not think he really meant that, because it is incompatible with his basic assumption that any decentralization is disastrous to Adelaide. To the extent that the honourable member is speaking on behalf of the Opposition, its present policy is that there should not be any decentralization, because the only sort of decentralization that can possibly work is selective decentralization. For 50 years we had Liberal Governments trying to make the old form of decentralization work.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable Minister of Development and Mines has the floor.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Liberal Governments tried to make that old form of decentralization work under an electoral system that should have made it work if anything was going to make it work. If there is anything in the argument that, if the country vote is weighted, that should help decentralization, it should have worked in South Australia. Yet we had such an electoral system throughout the period when people continued to flock to the city.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! I do not think that the honourable Minister's present line of discussion is relevant to the motion.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Thank you, Sir. I do not require to develop that point, but I would seek from the Opposition, since we are now debating a specific motion, an indication whether it has a policy on decentralization,

whether the Leader is really willing to underwrite all that the member for Davenport has said about Monarto over the last few months, and whether this means that there has been a change of heart on the part of the Opposition since it supported the legislation introduced by this Government to establish Monarto. If I liked to dig in the way the member for Mitcham has been digging, I could find some statements, from around that period and since then, made by the Leader of the Opposition and some of his colleagues which expressed considerable support for Monarto. I do not think I would have any trouble in doing that.

Dr. Eastick: We always talk about the concept.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Someone talked about semantics tonight. If ever I have seen an exercise in semantics, that obviously has to be it. This Government believes it is important that Monarto be continued for the reasons we have already stated. We believe that this Chamber was willing to accept it, and did accept it by underwriting our legislation, and that situation has not changed. The member for Davenport concluded in a deplorable way, when twice he directly implied that someone in Government (and the second time he specified someone in the Monarto Development Commission) had given him information. When Government members asked him to be more specific, he reacted by suggesting that we wanted to launch a witch hunt. It is not and has never been my desire to do that, but I emphasize strongly to the honourable member that he has cast a shadow over all employees of the commission, not over the Government, by his remarks.

Mr. Mathwin: Why did you want to know who it was?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I give an undertaking that I will take this matter no further, but what I want to know is what the honourable member is willing to do in order to mitigate the embarrassment that he has caused to employees of the commission. Next time Tony Richardson visits Canberra it is not unlikely that people will say, "We hear that someone in your commission has rung up the Opposition and given them information." What does Mr. Richardson, as the Manager, say in relation to that? If Opposition members cannot see how deplorable the honourable member has been this evening, they are very insensitive. What the honourable member should do is offer the commission an apology for his behaviour. We do not expect him to give a name, although at one stage he said he would be willing to give it to the press and not to the Government. If it were given to the press, we would read about it in the *News* later today or in the *Advertiser* in the morning, so that it would amount to the same thing. I register my strong protest on behalf of a group of people who have given me efficient and loyal service as their Minister, and I ask for an apology from the honourable member on their behalf.

Mr. EVANS: I support the motion, because I believe Monarto should be deferred. I have always said that it is on the wrong site and that it will be another suburb of Adelaide. The Minister of Transport apparently believes the same thing, because he has stated that a commuter road will be needed from Monarto to the city and a connecting road to the southern part of Adelaide, leaving the freeway near Crafrers or Stirling. If that Minister has the courage to make such a statement, why not do not other Government members make the same admission? We are to force people to live in an area of unsuitable climatic conditions and people living at Monarto who desire gardens and lawns will waste one of our most important assets, water. This dry semi-arid area will rely entirely on Murray River water, although there may be a potential for the future use of desalination. I

believe that Monarto was decided on without full and proper studies. Tests are still being carried out that will affect the type of development in Monarto, and the Government has already shown disappointment at the result of surveys and tests already made. All tests should have been made before the development of Monarto commenced.

We need decentralization, but it must be more than about 120 km from the city and more than 1½ hours normal travel time. If it is not, it will become nothing more than a dormitory or commuter city for metropolitan Adelaide, as it will be only about 45 minutes travelling time from Adelaide. We must not look back and suggest that Elizabeth or Port Stanvac should have been built at different places: if we cannot learn by mistakes, we do not deserve to be here. The Commonwealth Government is not willing at this stage to commit itself to Monarto for any great sum, and its actions have caused doubts in the minds of many people whether it will support Monarto at all. Should public servants be forced to live at Monarto? Should incentives be granted to entice people to Monarto at the expense of others in the State?

The Minister has stated that people living in Monarto may have the chance to sit at home and do a study course. If that incentive and other incentives are offered, they will cost large sums, and a situation will be developed that will be similar to that in Canberra, for which the rest of Australia has been bled in order to create an environment in which public servants will support the Government of the day. The public servants who make the decisions live in Canberra and make recommendations to have their city developed to a better standard than applies in any other city in Australia. It does not matter which Government is in power. Monarto would develop on a similar basis. There is no other way to get people to live at Monarto except by telling public servants that they must transfer or leave the service.

Mr. Langley: What was said to the schoolteachers?

Mr. EVANS: I am sure if it was possible to centralize education at Monarto and to send schoolteachers there the present Government would not be beyond such a move. However, I think education is a field in which the Government would be reluctant to upset the officers. The environmental impact study for Monarto has not been carried out in sufficient detail. Even now, the Minister of Environment and Conservation is still seeking and receiving information about the area, most of it disappointing. I challenge that Minister, or the Minister of Development and Mines, to disclose any recent information that has been encouraging or sympathetic to the project. Virtually all the information coming forward is disappointing and does not support the expenditure most of us expected would have to take place in the area. Now, of course, we realize that the expenditure will be even greater. The member for Davenport made the point that the developed area of Adelaide would suffer at the expense of Monarto. A modern transport system will be developed in Monarto, yet the outer fringes of the Adelaide metropolitan area do not have adequate bus services. Pensioners who live in the fringe areas because of lower council rates find there is no way to go shopping, yet we are prepared to go into a grandiose scheme at Monarto.

The Minister of Development and Mines has said that sewerage facilities and other amenities will be put into Monarto immediately, but what is to happen to the rest of the metropolitan area? The Minister of Works admits that, within the Loan Estimates, we will not be carrying

out the same amount of work in the rest of the metropolitan area next year as was carried out last year, so we have started the process of slowing down services in the metropolitan area, for the benefit of Monarto. When an economy is running badly, when a country is in trouble with inflation, when the Minister of Education says we face a recession as bad as that of 1930, when the Commonwealth Government is struggling to make ends meet to save the country from disaster, and when Cabinet admits it has not got the funds to do what it would like to do, no person with common sense could support proceeding with Monarto.

If the project is delayed even for 12 months, the Minister of Environment and Conservation will be able to carry out surveys with the support of the Mines Department and the Agriculture Department. The motion is a form of censure, but there is no other way in which we can take up the challenge. This project can wait, yet other sections of the community must suffer. The Minister of Education has said there is insufficient money to build the pre-schools and schools that are needed, and we have not got enough money to improve the roads. There is no area in which sufficient money is being made available to keep pace with past practice. Monarto should be laid aside until we can afford to venture into such a project without inflicting financial hardship on many people by increasing taxation.

Mr. BOUNDY: I support the member for Davenport in his concern for the concept of Monarto. The concept is wrong, and it is correct to delay the birth. I refer to the words of Professor Scott, who states:

A very big question mark hangs over Monarto. Albury-Wodonga and Monarto, with their heavy reliance on the Murray River, would cause formidable problems of pollution and environmental control.

Competent authorities have stated that, by the turn of the century, the Murray River will be much more of a sewer than it is today. Establishing Monarto is not decentralization in the true sense of the word, and the opinion of Professor Rolf Jensen, reported in the *Advertiser* on January 24 last, was that satellite towns must be self-contained, whereas Monarto will be a dormitory town of the type condemned years ago, dependent on Adelaide's industry and commerce in the most inconvenient way; it will put even greater emphasis on commuter travel and, accordingly, on the unwelcome motor car. Members opposite have referred to what we consider to be the proper concept of decentralization. Professor Jensen goes on to say:

Development of Port Pirie, whose \$12 000 000 harbor development plan has been shamefully shelved, should be our first priority.

I think there is merit in that. Monarto is to have no heavy industrial base. It will attract only light industry and, therefore, must be peopled by public servants. I refer to another article that appeared in the *News* headed "Monarto—Public Service Association makes demands". The Treasurer is reported to have said:

Positions made available to public servants at Monarto should first be advertised, so volunteers for posts have the first opportunities to fill them before other public servants are approached and requested to move to the new city.

What does this mean? Does it mean that people are to be conscripted to Monarto? I suggest that perhaps the Emergency Powers Bill, which has been before honourable members, may be invoked to move people to Monarto, but I hope that never comes to pass.

Communication has already been canvassed by other members. One could be excused for believing that the residents of Monarto need never get out of bed, as they will be able to vote, study and shop from their homes. It should be a restful existence there. Monarto, too, seems

to be heir to some transport problems. The Treasurer was reported in the *News* of June 6 of this year as saying the following:

The State Government wanted new transport technologies for Monarto, and rights of way were being created in the initial plans. Now it was a matter of deciding whether to build in computerized transport at the beginning of work on the city or rely on conventional transport.

Mr. Ray Taylor is reported, in an article in the *Advertiser* as recently as August 14, as saying:

Though it was hoped to provide a reasonable transport system in Monarto, there would be no "high-flying fancy transport" there in the lifetime of many adults.

So it looks as though Monarto, at least initially, will have the transport of an ordinary city and will be heir to the customary transport problems of a city. I claim no particular knowledge of sewage disposal but I am concerned about the siting of Monarto near to the lakes system at the mouth of the Murray River. If any sewage found its way into that area of the river, it could create serious problems, particularly for Lake Albert, which is an enclosed area of water. If effluent finds its way there, serious problems may arise.

I cannot let this opportunity pass without mentioning the move of the Agriculture Department to Monarto and offering the thought that that is a wrong concept, as two-thirds of the State's farmers live north and west of Adelaide. Siting the Agriculture Department at Monarto is a retrograde step. As I can add no more to the arguments already used to support the motion, I merely say that we need many more answers before we can commit ourselves to the city of Monarto.

Mr. MATHWIN: I support the motion. I refer to page 6 of the report that the member for Eyre has used. It amazes me that the Minister has had this report, apparently, since last year, but it still makes no difference to his thoughts on the matter. On page 6 we read the following:

(1) Disher Hill ... A possibility of water erosion along the creek lines. Large areas of outcrop and very shallow soils. Some short, steep slopes into creek lines.

(2) Monarto ... Small areas of shallow stony soils, in south of unit. Possible salinity in valley bottoms.

(3) Pallamana ... Wind erosion likely from sandy areas. Small areas of outcropping rock.

(4) Rocky Gully ... Large areas of rock at shallow depth and outcropping. These areas best left under natural vegetation ...

(6) Silo ... Dunes subject to wind erosion. Very restricted drainage as indicated by gilgais.

(7) Camel ... Large areas of shallow, infertile stony soils, most of remainder infertile and subject to wind erosion.

(8) Loydella ... As for unit 7 but smaller areas of shallow, stony soils.

(9) Brinkley ... Dune crests and other sandy areas subject to wind erosion. Large areas of shallow stony soils. Waterlogging and salinity likely in swales.

Coupled with that report is the fact that there is a doubt about the Commonwealth Government's financing of the whole project. The Minister made great play of his policy on decentralization and of the Opposition's ideas on decentralization. Monarto is close to Adelaide, and a transport corridor is to be constructed so that people will be able to travel there within a few minutes. So, how does the Minister believe that people will go to Monarto to live? Thousands of people are expected to commute from Adelaide to Monarto. Therefore, high-density traffic would cause pollution problems and other problems associated with high-density traffic. Many people have contacted me on this matter. One was a constituent of the Minister's, and he complained that he would be directed to live in Monarto. He has his family in Adelaide; his daughters attend private school; his other children work in Adelaide; and he is a great community worker in

Marino. People are under threat that they will have to move to Monarto if they happen to be employed in a department which the Government says must move to Monarto. The man at Marino has a boat, among other things, and strong connections with lifesaving. I have read that it is the Labor Party's policy not to direct people to labour.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member must confine his remarks to the subject under discussion.

Mr. MATHWIN: I am trying to point out that the Government is forcing people to move to Monarto against their wishes; this is directing labour.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: What about schoolteachers? I was sent to Whyalla as a schoolteacher.

Mr. MATHWIN: The department's policy has now changed. After a time, the Minister went to teach at Westminster School of his own choice.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Answer the principle.

Mr. MATHWIN: The Minister of Education has dropped the principle, as there will no longer be bonding.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Every teacher in South Australia can be required to go to any school in the State.

Mr. MATHWIN: I thought I read in the booklet—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! I again point out that the honourable member must pay attention to the motion, and not digress from it.

Mr. MATHWIN: Monarto is wrongly sited. I cannot understand why the Government did not consider the area around Port Pirie. Obviously the experts and the people who compiled the report on Monarto are of the same opinion. Undoubtedly the people who will be directed to this hole, as it were, also object to it. I support the motion.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I believe that the evidence the Opposition has brought forward fully justifies the reasons for the motion. The Minister tried to defend the actions of the Monarto commission and, in particular, of his own Government. I have no axe to grind against the people who work in the Monarto commission; they have been given a task by the Government and they are trying to carry it out to the best of the limitations that have been imposed on them. I am not complaining or suggesting a no-confidence vote in those staff members, as the Minister would try to suggest.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: But you have thrown a cloud of suspicion over them.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I see no reason why I should apologize. The person in question simply made a one-question statement; he did not give me any other information.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: What about the innuendoes you made about 50 per cent?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The Opposition has brought forward evidence to suggest that the Australian Government has not committed finance to Monarto in the short term and certainly not in the long term. However, I accept the Minister's suggestion that the Australian Government will supply a small amount of finance in the current financial year. I am really concerned about the \$150 000 000 that must come forward if Monarto is to proceed at its planned rate of development. If that money is not forthcoming, the Government by its own admission will heavily curtail the development of Monarto. The Minister criticized me for making an attack on three different levels. I should have thought that that simply highlighted the many weaknesses that exist with regard to Monarto. Most importantly, the Australian Government has not committed finance in a major area. That

Government has not even held a conference to discuss the long-term financial arrangements. A great shadow hangs over the suitability of the Monarto site. The Opposition accepts the first proposition concerning the financial arrangements for Monarto. Even the Minister accepted that. Regarding the proposition that the site is unsuitable, the Minister has implied that we have tried to mislead the people in relation to sewerage. I have not said that, merely because effluent cannot be used in the Bremer Valley, there cannot possibly be a sewerage system. However, there are major difficulties in disposing of effluent if it cannot be used in the immediate area for irrigation. It cannot be run back to the Murray River. It would have to be pumped to the sea or disposed of away from the site in some other way.

The Minister said that I had over-estimated the percentage of the area in which bedrock was within a metre of the surface. He simply disputed my figure of 40 per cent. However, even if the figure were 30 per cent or 35 per cent it would still be a major problem. The Minister did not refer to what I had said about the soil type. He failed to answer criticisms relating to the percentage of the work force that would actually work at Monarto, and to the siting of the new town at Monarto. All those points he left completely untouched. He said that temperature inversion also occurred in Adelaide, but I understand that the situation is worse at Monarto than it is here. Yet it is commonly accepted that Adelaide has a smog problem, particularly on certain days. Finally, the Minister attacked the Opposition, asking for its decentralization policy. This motion, which is related specifically to the Government policy on Monarto, has nothing to do with our decentralization policy.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I might give you an early minute.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I asked for that an hour and a half ago. The Opposition's case stands untouched, the Minister having failed to show why our motion should not succeed. I am pleased to know that members on this side support the motion fully.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (16)—Messrs. Allen, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Brown (teller), Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, and Venning.

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

Majority of 4 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived; line passed.

Miscellaneous, \$5 370 000.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I seek from the Minister of Transport details regarding the allocation of \$600 000 for research and development in the Transport Department. Two years ago the vote in this respect was \$500 000 and, after much questioning, the Minister said that this sum was intended for the development of what was termed an induction motor. Will the Minister now say on which projects this \$600 000 is to be spent? In addition, perhaps he can tell the Committee what happened two years ago regarding the induction motor.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport): I will obtain that information for the honourable member.

Dr. EASTICK: Obviously, the Minister's answer was anything but satisfactory.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What you are saying is that you don't want the information.

Dr. EASTICK: We do, as the Minister is well aware. Indeed, if the Minister was not so sleepy, we would expect it to be forthcoming now. The sum of \$815 000 is estimated to be spent for the purchase of buses for transporting schoolchildren in country areas. Does the Minister recognize the bus service that operates between the Tea Tree Gully and Modbury area and Birdwood as one that qualifies for assistance? Will he say whether the matters referred to in representations that were made to him and to his colleague the Minister of Education about a certain unsatisfactory bus service that is at present operating have been resolved and, if they have, whether part of this allocation will be used to provide transport for children travelling from Tea Tree Gully and Modbury to Birdwood? The present service is anything but safe for the children concerned.

Also, I recently asked the Minister to assure the House that regrooved tyres were not being used on buses associated with the Education Department's transport service, some people on the West Coast having stated that such tyres had been used on Education Department buses there. Will the Minister say whether any doubts have been raised regarding his previous answer and whether such regrooved tyres have been used when other suitable tyres have been unavailable? Bearing in mind that it is illegal to use such tyres, I accept that, if used, it would have been done without the Minister's consent.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): If the Leader has any specific information regarding the West Coast, he should provide it so that the matter can be investigated; otherwise I cannot comment on that matter. Regarding the other matter to which the Leader referred, this line relates to departmental buses and it is not intended to use such buses on a route other than that specified. I would be out of order if I referred to contract buses, which do not come within the scope of this vote. I will therefore obtain the latest information for the Leader and give it to him as soon as possible.

Mr. EVANS: I refer to the item of Department of Tourism, Recreation and Sport—recreational and sporting facilities, etc., for which \$800 000 has been allocated, and concerning which the Treasurer states:

An amount of \$800 000 is included this year to provide capital grants to local government and other organizations towards recreational and sporting facilities. This is an area in which the Australian Government is expected to make an increasing volume of grants.

Have any specific projects been considered regarding this item, or is this allocation available for projects in relation to which applications must be submitted? Also, are applications still open, and what criteria must be met before a community can be assisted with certain projects? Finally, on what basis will money be made available for these community projects?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I understand that there is a cut-off date for assistance under this item. Applications are invited from all over the State for various purposes, and they are considered on their merits and grants made accordingly. However, I will obtain the specific information that the honourable member has sought and let him know within a day or two.

Mr. COUMBE: With the concurrence of the Minister of Local Government and the department, grants are made for certain projects undertaken in council areas. Of course, this is supported by Commonwealth funds in some cases. Can the Minister say what proportion local government has to bear?

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

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am sorry that the Minister of Education has said that he has no intention of providing a school bus service from the Inglewood-Houghton area to Birdwood High School. School buses operate from surrounding districts to that school.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Are they departmental buses? This line refers to departmental buses.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: They are yellow buses with "school bus" painted on them; free transport is provided for some students, but there are gross inequalities in respect of people whose children have to travel from Inglewood and Houghton. It is about time a decision was reached, but I have found that it usually takes longer for decisions to be reached in the Education Department than it does in the Engineering and Water Supply Department.

Mr. BLACKER: Can the Minister of Works give details in relation to rehabilitation work on the Port Lincoln freezing works?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not have the information at present, but I will get a report for the honourable member.

Mr. MATHWIN: Is any of the provision for tourism and recreation to be allocated to the Surf Life Saving Association?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The grant made to that association is provided in the Revenue Estimates.

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Minister of Works say more precisely how the allocation of \$1 400 000 for data processing equipment in the Public Service Board is to be spent?

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

Mr. MATHWIN: I am particularly interested in the Somerton Surf Life Saving Club, which is about to build new premises, for which it seeks assistance. Can the Minister say whether any allocation is provided here for individual clubs?

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

Mr. BECKER: I refer to expenses and discounts of floating conversion and public loans, for which \$500 000 is provided. Will the Minister give details of the provision and will he say where these transactions take place?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I cannot say offhand, but I will get a report.

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Minister say whether the provision for boats and facilities concerning the Fisheries Department covers the purchase of a boat to police the new regulations regarding netting, etc., along the beaches?

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

Line passed.

First schedule passed.

Second schedule passed.

Clauses 1 to 11 and title passed.

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

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I indicate that the Bill as it comes from Committee is not satisfactory to members of the Opposition. It has been clearly demonstrated this evening that there is an inadequate supply of important details concerning many programmes outlined in the schedules. Government members have seen fit to defeat amendments suggested by Opposition members, who have registered their protests in the way that they have, and I again register a protest on their behalf.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 3.4 a.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, August 21, at 2 p.m.