

**LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL**

Tuesday, September 9, 1975

The PRESIDENT (Hon. F. J. Potter) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

**ASSENT TO BILLS**

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:

Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act Amendment (Sex Discrimination),

Stamp Duties Act Amendment.

**PETITION: SODOMY**

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT presented a petition signed by 138 persons objecting to the introduction of legislation to legalise 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 and read.

**QUESTIONS****MEDIBANK**

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before directing a question to the Minister of Health.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: From the information on Medibank circulated by the Government in the previous Parliament, I understood that the Commonwealth would assume responsibility for the first \$16 in any hospital recognised under Medibank, the balance of the cost to be borne equally between the State and the Commonwealth. Can the Minister say whether this is the correct apportionment of costs under the State-Commonwealth agreement on Medibank?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: A sum of \$16 is paid to every patient in any hospital, irrespective of whether the hospital is a Government or a private one.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I think \$18—

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I told the Leader that the \$16 to which he referred was being paid. The position in relation to recognised hospitals is that the amount paid is not \$16 plus the other half. The Commonwealth pays half and the State pays half of the costs. For other than recognised hospitals patients receive \$16 a day off their account, but for standard ward accommodation in recognised hospitals patients do not pay anything at all, so there is nothing from which the amount can be deducted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: In view of the Minister's reply, which I could not understand, I ask him what the State Government will be called upon to pay toward the bed cost of a hospital where the bed cost is \$46 a day.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: In a recognised hospital, it will be \$23.

**SWEETHEART AGREEMENTS**

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to directing a question to the Hon. Mr. Dunford.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: An article in the *News* on August 29, stated that the Hon. Mr. Dunford had commented on statements made by the Premier regarding

proposed legislation on sweetheart agreements. The report stated:

... Mr. Dunford said, "Mr. Dunstan has gone too far. He did not consult with his Parliamentary colleagues or Caucus on this move."

Today's *Advertiser* reports that the Premier has made a statement to the effect that he felt there had been a misunderstanding over the Government's plan. The report states:

"This policy has been previously discussed with the Party executive, the Caucus, federal members and officers of the TLC", he said.

Both articles relate to the same event. Was the Hon. Mr. Dunford correctly reported in the *News* on August 29; if so, why did he mislead the public?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I was misreported.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Can the Chief Secretary inform the Council of the Government's policy in relation to sweetheart agreements, as there appear to be some comments that do not tally in the reported statements of the Premier to the press?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: This is a matter for my colleague, the Minister of Labour and Industry, and I shall obtain a report for the honourable member.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Can the Chief Secretary say whether, in view of the widely differing views expressed in the Labor Party about the suggested sweetheart legislation, which is to be introduced to curb industrial problems in this State, members of the Labor Party such as the Hon. Mr. Dunford, who do not agree with such legislation, will have the opportunity of a conscience vote on this matter when it is considered by this Council?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Mr. President, it has been said from time to time that this is a House of Review.

**PHOSPHATE FERTILISER**

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I asked last month regarding the search for phosphate rock in South Australia?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: My colleague, the Minister of Mines and Energy, informs me that the search for phosphate rock was intensified in South Australia when overseas supplies were curtailed during the First and Second World Wars. In the latter period the Mines Department, in collaboration with the British Phosphate Commissioners, undertook a programme of testing that included drilling of a number of deposits; and from 1957 to 1974 this department and private companies engaged in the reappraisal of known deposits and searched for new supplies.

Unfortunately, all known deposits of the local product suffer by comparison with imported rock. They generally contain from 10 per cent to 25 per cent phosphorus pentoxide (or about 4 per cent to 12 per cent phosphorus) together with an objectionable range of from 5 per cent to 25 per cent of alumina and iron oxides. On the other hand, imported and Duchess, Queensland, rock contains 33 per cent to 38 per cent phosphorus pentoxide and less than 5 per cent oxides of iron and aluminium. Further, the South Australian deposits appear to be limited in extent.

The Mines Department has given geological assistance recently to operators at the Myponga deposits, but is not engaged in any programme of regional investigation. In 1974, the production of phosphate rock from Moculta totalled 1 500 tonnes, but it is of too low a grade for manufacture as superphosphate. There are no known occurrences of phosphate in the Lake Torrens area, and available analyses indicate low phosphorus pentoxide contents in the

Cambrian limestones of the region. However, one company is engaged in sampling in the Andamooka area at the present time and the results are awaited with interest. There are some problems associated with access into the restricted area of the Woomera Research Establishment, and representations have been made on behalf of the company for some modification of the restrictions.

#### TRAVEL SOCIETY

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to directing a question to the Minister of Health, representing the Attorney-General.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: On August 7 last I directed a question to the Attorney-General expressing the concern of some members of Co-operative Travel Society Limited about the affairs of that society. I asked the Attorney whether he would investigate the matter. Some time has passed and I have not yet received a reply. I have written two letters to the Attorney, the first enclosing a copy of a letter from a former director of the society, which set out some useful information, and the second informing the Attorney that I had a considerable file of documents which I was prepared to make available to him, or any of his officers, on request. On August 27, I received a reply from the Attorney saying that the matter was being inquired into but, in the meantime, several approaches have been made to me by members of the society indicating their concern and providing further evidence that an investigation is needed. So that I can satisfy my constituents, I require an immediate answer to the question. Will the Minister of Health endeavour to provide this answer?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will take up the matter with my colleague.

#### TRAIN BRAWL

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Lands.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: My question refers to an item in this morning's *Advertiser*. It is headed "Passengers terrorised in train brawl". It is a very lengthy article and I do not seek to read the whole lot, but what it says in part is:

Windows and doors were smashed during the one-hour ordeal described by passengers as "a nightmare of fear and violence".

Guards and employees of the railways were physically assaulted; women and children were terrorised. Two men were involved and they were subsequently fined in the Keith court. They were brandishing whisky bottles. I believe that three things should occur: people should be able to travel on trains without being molested; Government property should be protected; and railway employees should be assisted, because many railway employees, such as guards and porters, are not physically able or equipped to handle these violent scenes. Will the Minister of Lands confer with the Minister of Transport and the Attorney-General with a view to having police officers on duty on trains travelling to and from South Australia?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague, the Minister of Transport, and bring down a reply.

#### MOTOR VEHICLE HEADLIGHTS

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I seek leave to make a statement before asking a question of the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: It has been brought to my attention that private motorists are able to purchase quartz iodide sealed-beam headlights and fit them to popular makes of vehicles such as those produced by the General Motors-Holden, Ford and Chrysler companies. The makers of these lights claim that they give 50 per cent more light than do the ordinary types of headlight. Because the private car owner is able to fit these extremely bright lights himself, with little or no regard being paid to oncoming traffic when it is encountered, I ask the Minister to bring this matter to the attention of the Road Safety Council, suggesting that instructions regarding the focusing of these lights be the responsibility of the distributor.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring down a reply.

#### CATTLE PRICES

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Last week, the Ministers of Agriculture from most States met to discuss the possibility of establishing a minimum price scheme for cattle sold on the domestic market. Before leaving for Western Australia, the Minister of Agriculture indicated that the scheme that had been proposed had not been properly researched and that, in his opinion, it was not economically feasible. Will the Minister say what was the outcome of this meeting and whether we are likely to see a minimum price scheme for cattle in South Australia?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: What the honourable member has said is correct. Before I left for Western Australia last week, I said I thought insufficient homework had been done on the scheme and that it was not the time to have an Agricultural Council meeting to discuss the proposals as they were presented to us. Evidence that I have received from people who attended that Agricultural Council meeting confirms the statement that I made last week: nothing was achieved at the meeting, and the proposals have not been fully researched. The factors still to be determined are the basic economic problems of whether an increase in beef prices will benefit producers, as it will almost inevitably involve a large decline in domestic consumption. Indeed, the figures before us at present show that, in real terms, in about the last 18 months, the price of beef has declined by about 30 per cent and that consumption has increased by 60 per cent. If that situation was to be reversed, it is obvious the beef producers would be worse off. The only thing that came from the Agricultural Council meeting last Friday was an agreement that a further meeting should be held in October to discuss the reports of the Industries Assistance Commission and an inter-departmental committee which was examining the beef situation. That Agricultural Council meeting will have before it some proposals that will be worth considering, and it will be a much more worthwhile meeting.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: In a recent report in the *Advertiser*, the Stud Beef Cattle Producers Association was reported to have claimed that South Australian housewives were being cheated because of the high prices they were being charged for beef in the shops despite the low beef prices being paid to producers. The association also claimed that South Australian Meat Corporation had the highest killing charges of any abattoir in the country. Will the Minister of Agriculture comment on this claim?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: It always seems to be alleged that Samcor has the highest killing charges in Australia. However, this is not true; it has neither the highest nor lowest killing charges in Australia. I make

the point that the Gepps Cross abattoir is a service abattoir and has the responsibility of killing all animals offered to it. This makes its operation much more difficult, particularly when, because of a drought or for some other reason, a large number of animals enter the abattoir. It is merely because the service abattoir at Gepps Cross can handle this stock that there is not an incredibly high number of delays, and so on, at the market. I have figures comparing the situation at Gepps Cross with that at other abattoirs in Australia. In the local sheep area, the Gepps Cross killing charge is \$3.15 a head. At Homebush, it is \$3.59, and at Cannon Hill it is \$3.10. The cost at Midland Junction is \$3.95. For beef, the killing charge at Gepps Cross is \$24 for local beef, at Homebush the charge is \$24.87, at Cannon Hill it is \$21.36, and at Midland Junction it is \$19.79. As I have said, these figures show that the killing charges at Gepps Cross are neither the highest nor the lowest in Australia.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: Can the Minister say what percentage of each dollar that the housewife pays for beef ultimately goes: (a) to the producer; (b) for killing and transport charges; (c) to the wholesaler; and (d) to the retailer? What percentage increase or decrease does this represent, compared to the same breakdown two years ago?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I do not have the figures at present, but I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

#### **CATTLE DISEASES**

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to make a statement before directing a question to the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Many Timorese refugees have reached Darwin recently, and they continue to flee to Darwin as civil war spreads across Portuguese Timor. On one occasion an Australian Red Cross aeroplane was hijacked and flown to Darwin loaded with escaping refugees. However, one of the serious dangers associated with such entry of people to Australia relates to animal quarantine. Concern is being expressed in rural areas of South Australia at the danger of foot and mouth disease (which is prevalent in Timor and which could be transmitted to Australia on shoes and other footwear, as well as through some emergency rations) breaking out in the Northern Territory as a result of these recent happenings. South Australia is a traditional market for Northern Territory cattle. Can the Minister, as this State's representative on the Agricultural Council, assure this Council that all possible precautions are being taken in Darwin in regard to animal quarantine generally and specifically in regard to foot and mouth disease?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: Naturally I am also concerned at the situation, especially as all honourable members are aware of the grave consequences to be faced by the Australian beef industry if foot and mouth disease were to occur in Australia. The standing committee of the Agricultural Council has, over a number of years, prepared contingency plans to cover any possible outbreak of foot and mouth disease, or any of the other animal health risks which face Australia. These plans have been prepared in detail over a number of years and are ready to be put into operation when required. I am confident that the Australian Government's quarantine officers are taking all precautions necessary to ensure that such an outbreak does not occur in this situation. However, I will check up on this matter and make sure that this is the case.

#### **RAILWAYS (TRANSFER AGREEMENT) BILL**

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to the question I asked on August 26 concerning the railways transfer legislation?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The amendments proposed by the Opposition were, in the view of the Government, inconsistent with the spirit of the transfer as arranged between the Prime Minister and the Premier together with the Australian Government and the South Australian Minister of Transport. The two other parts of the question raised are hypothetical.

#### **OLD LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL BUILDING**

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: On behalf of the Hon. Mr. Dawkins, who is absent on Commonwealth Parliamentary Association business, I ask the Chief Secretary whether he has a reply to the honourable member's question about the old Legislative Council building.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: It is intended that the Railways Institute should move into the Railways Building when that building has been vacated by the Vehicle Registration Division of the Transport Department and when necessary building alterations have been carried out to suit the requirements of the Railways Institute. The move of the Railways Institute into the Railways Building is anticipated to be early in 1978. The old Legislative Council Building is classified by the National Trust, and it is the Government's intention that the building be retained as nearly as possible in its original form and that it should become a historical museum.

#### **MANNUM-PALMER ROAD**

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Has the Minister of Lands a reply from the Minister of Transport to my recent question about the Mannum-Palmer road?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Due to the lack of funds, rising costs and relative priority of this section of the Adelaide-Mannum road, only 2-4 kilometres has been reconstructed. No further reconstruction is programmed until 1977-78, and this will depend on funds available at that time. It is not considered the old section of this road is in a "shocking condition". It is narrow over a length of some 9 km, and considerable maintenance of the shoulders is required on this section. At present, work is being carried out to improve the shouldering and widen the seal over the kerb stones. Satisfactory maintenance will be continued pending reconstruction.

#### **TWO WELLS PRIMARY SCHOOL**

The Hon. C. M. HILL: People in the Two Wells area are concerned that, because of the announced cut-back in Loan expenditure on school buildings, the construction of the proposed Two Wells Primary School may be deferred. Will the Minister of Agriculture ascertain from the Minister of Education, first, whether this project will be deferred and, secondly, when it is expected that construction will commence?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring down a reply as soon as possible.

#### **LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARIES**

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Will the Minister of Lands ascertain from the Minister of Local Government whether the Government intends to approve of the recommendations in the third report of the Royal Commission into Local Government Boundaries and whether the Government will introduce legislation to amalgamate compulsorily councils in this State?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Until Cabinet has considered the Royal Commission's third report, we do not know exactly what the answer will be.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: When Cabinet has considered the matter and made a decision, may I have a reply to my question?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Yes.

#### PARLIAMENT HOUSE

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Will the Minister of Lands ascertain whether the Minister of Works has noticed the oil splotches on the face of this building; if the Minister

has noticed the splotches, will he have the matter investigated, see whether they can be removed, and ascertain the cause?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer the Leader's question to my colleague and bring down a reply.

#### CEREAL PROSPECTS

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my question of August 27 about cereal prospects?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: Preliminary estimates for this year's barley and oats crops are as follows:

	Area of grain	Yield/ha	Total production
Barley.....	700 000 ha	0.90 tonnes	630 000 tonnes (28 000 000 bush.)
Oats.....	150 000 ha	0.70 tonnes	100 000 tonnes (5 500 000 bush.)

South Australian production for the 1974-75 season was 1 180 000 tonnes of barley and 110 000 tonnes of oats. However, it should be recognised that the above estimates have been made at a very early stage of the season and that the ultimate production depends on conditions over the next two to three months.

#### SPORTS GRANTS

The Hon. C. M. HILL (on notice): Will the Minister of Lands supply a list of the 55 projects for which grants totalling almost \$500 000 were made in the 1974-75 year for sport and recreational facilities?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: As the reply comprises a lengthy list, I seek leave to have it incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it, and I will give the honourable member a copy.

Leave granted.

Organisation or Project Description	Estimated Cost of Project \$	State Govern- ment Grant 1974-75 \$
1. Barossa Valley Youth. Club—Erection of youth and community recreation complex	219 200	14 667
2. Blue Lakes Sports Park—Development of land for use as sports-recreation complex.....	98 666	4 284
3. Loxton Youth Centre—Construction of youth centre on site of old show hall	237 926	7 875
4. Marion Swimming Centre—Construction of new swimming centre.....	635 000	75 584
5. Para Paddocks—Establishment of a sport and recreation area.....	240 000	19 800
6. Port Augusta Leisure Centre—Construction of new basketball stadium and drop-in centre.....	173 000	4 426
7. Renmark Swimming Pool—Construction of new swimming pool.....	300 000	61 179
8. S.A. Amateur Athletics Assoc.—Laying of "tartan" surface on track at Olympic stadium.....	243 239	100 000
9. Whyalla Community Recreation and Sports Centre—Construction of sports hall, gymnasium, swimming pool, etc.....	1 323 956	100 397
10. Adelaide Y.M.C.A.—Resurfacing four courts and lighting for netball courts	7 200	5 000
11. Banksia Park Concert Band—Purchase of instruments . .	4912	3 274
12. Belair Community Centre Gymnastic Club—Gym equipment.....	708	472
13. Belair Primary School—Development of playgrounds.....	6 000	224
14. Bellevue Heights Gymnastics Club—Gym matting . . . .	350	230
15. Berri International Rules Basketball Assoc.—Scoring equipment, canteen, change-rooms, toilets and seating	27 000	1 397
16. Burnside Hockey Club Inc.—Clubrooms, furnishings, fittings, changerooms, recreational facilities.....	9 395	3 860
17. Ceduna Football Club—Ceilings in clubrooms and fenced playgrounds . . .	3 455	1 160
18. Clare Combined Netball Club—Erection of clubhouse . .	8 500	1 696
19. Clarendon Recreation Ground Committee — Resurfacing netball and tennis courts	8 545	6 197
20. Colonel Light Gardens Congregational and Presbyterian United Church—Resurfacing, lighting, fencing, drains and seating for tennis, net and basketball courts.....	2 340	1 283
21. Corporation of the Town of Hindmarsh — Adventure playground at Wright Street, Ridleyton.....	4 490	2 993
22. Crystal Brook Lawn Tennis Club—Clubhouse.....	24 000	333
23. Cummins Memorial Swimming Pool Inc.—Toilets and tiling.....	25 000	7 849
24. District Council of Barmera—Floodlighting of sports facilities.....	10 800	5 599
25. Edwardstown Football Club—New clubrooms.....	6 000	2 000
26. Elizabeth Field Primary and Infants School Council—Development of playgrounds.....	10 000	2 000

Organisation or Project Description	Estimated Cost of Project \$	State Government Grant 1974-75 \$
27. Flinders Park Methodist Sports Ground Committee—Floodlighting of courts.....	2 000	1 333
28. Forestville Hockey Club—Shed, kitchen and toilets	12 000	8 000
29. Glenlea Tennis Club—Additional third tennis court ..	2 000	1 333
30. Grange Men's Hockey Club—Three new pitches .. .	7 825	217
31. Hahndorf Tennis Club—Tennis and netball courts	5 000	1 688
32. Hatherleigh Football Club and Sport and Recreation Centre—Women's change shed.....	8 000	3 666
33. Ingle Farm Little Athletics Centre—Equipment .. .	477	450
34. Kybybolite Memorial Sports Club Inc.—Stage II of sports club.....	15 000	7 230
35. Lameroy Youth Centre—Table tennis tables .. .	810	540
36. Le Fevre Peninsula Community and Youth Centre Inc.—Gym equipment ..	2 241	1 940
37. Millicent Youth Centre—Renovation and extensions to existing facilities .. .	13 000	4 520
38. Mundooro Community Sports Club—Provision of lights	13 000	3 822
39. Mylor Baptist Camp (SA Baptist Union Inc.)—Heating equipment for indoor pool.....	2 550	1 500
40. Naracoorte Palete Club—Equipment.....	950	633
41. Naracoorte Swimming Lake Improvements Committee—Pump outlet points and stop cocks.....	10 000	3 012
42. Payneham Swimming Centre—Heating of pool.....	11 000	7 333
43. Redcliff—Survey of recreation needs .....	491	491
44. Robertstown Football Club—Changerooms, showers and general amenities.....	3 300	2 200
45. SA Amateur Fencing Assoc.—Equipment .. .	3 000	1 139
46. SA Amateur Gymnastic Assoc. Inc.—Gym mats ..	1 500	1 000
47. SA Women's Memorial Playfields—Development of oval	4 500	4 500
48. Saddleworth Netball Club—Two netball courts—surfacing, lining, lighting and fencing.....	3 250	540
49. Salisbury Little Athletics Centre—Equipment .. .	613	450
50. Somerton Surf Life Saving Club—Clubroom complex and kiosk.....	65 000	6 667
51. Victor Harbor Yacht Club Inc.—Replacement motors for rescue boat.....	1 050	250
52. Wallaby Gymnasium Club Inc.—Gym equipment	1 300	290
53. Willunga Recreation and Sporting Centre—Equipment	2 700	1 700
Totals.....	3,822,239.....	500 223

It should be noted that 53 projects received financial assistance from the South Australian Government for the financial year 1974-75, with an actual expenditure of \$500 223.

## LAND COMMISSION

The Hon. C. M. HILL (on notice):

1. Has the South Australian Land Commission sold to the public any building sites which have been developed as building sites by the commission, and which were not in any way subject to application for subdivision prior to the original purchase of the subject land by the commission?

2. If so, how many such blocks have been sold?

3. If not, when can such first blocks be expected to come on the open market?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The replies are as follows:

1. No.

2. Refer to No. 1 above.

3. October, 1975.

## AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the Auditor-General's Report for the financial year ended June 30, 1975.

## PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I remind honourable members that Parliamentary Paper No. 11a contains full details of the Treasurer's explanations of the Loan Estimates, and Parliamentary Paper No. 11 details the Loan Estimates for 1975-76. Both of these papers were distributed to members of the Council on August 14, and the Treasurer's explanations appear in *Hansard* of August 14, 1975, at pages 255 to 267. A copy of the unamended House of Assembly Bill No. 3 has been circulated to all honourable members and, in all the circumstances, I propose not to reread the Treasurer's explanations but to seek leave of the Council to have them incorporated in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

## EXPLANATION OF BILL

At the meeting of the Australian Loan Council held in June, the Australian Government agreed to support a total programme of \$1 291 000 000 for State works and services. Allowing for certain "offsets" because of the proposals for transfer of railway services in South Australia and Tasmania, this was effectively an increase of 20 per cent. South Australia's share of this programme is \$169 400 000. Of this allocation, an amount of \$112 900 000 is to become available by way of loan subject to repayment and to interest, and an amount of \$56 500 000 by way of capital grant.

In addition to the new funds of \$169 400 000, the Government had expected to receive various repayments and recoveries of about \$71 600 000. Certain discounts and premiums on Loan issues and redemptions, which form part of our Loan programme and are expected to amount to some \$500 000, will not have to be paid in cash by us as further loans will be arranged through Loan Council to cover them. Therefore, a total of about \$241 500 000 was expected to become available during the course of the year. The Government had planned to apply all of these funds to works in 1975-76 and the balance of \$1 900 000 in the Loan Account at June 30, 1975, would have been held as a small reserve from which emergency payments could be financed, if they arose.

However, the expected repayments and recoveries had included estimates of various specific purpose capital funds

from the Australian Government. In several areas the Budget allocations of that Government have proved to be less than we had expected and in two areas more. The State is reviewing the capital programme, including housing, to see how the financial problems which arise from this can be minimised.

Honourable members may find some of the bigger departmental provisions to be of interest. I shall deal with housing first. Funds made available to South Australia in 1974-75 under the Housing Agreement originally were \$38 400 000. The allocation of these funds was \$18 060 000 to the State Bank and \$20 340 000 to the Housing Trust. In the event, housing funds were increased in late 1974 and again in early 1975, so that the total available last year was \$56 360 000. The State Bank received \$22 800 000 and the Housing Trust \$33 560 000. As foreshadowed at the Premiers' Conference in June last, the welfare housing advances to South Australia in 1975-76 will remain at the same level as in 1974-75 and will be \$56 360 000. The Government proposes that the allocation of these funds between the Housing Trust and the State Bank should be the same as in 1974-75. Holding the total of welfare housing funds to the same money figures as in 1974-75 means a lesser physical programme in 1975-76. This will create some major problems. We are taking up this matter with the Australian Government and we are considering also whether it may be possible to provide some State Loan funds as a temporary supplement for housing.

**LOANS TO PRODUCERS, \$2 850 000**—An allocation of \$2 850 000 of State Loan funds is proposed for 1975-76. This amount will be augmented by semi-government borrowings of \$700 000 and by the bank's internal funds.

**ADVANCES TO STATE BANK, \$2 500 000**—Advances of Loan funds to the State Bank are made from time to time to support its housing finance services and to allow for expansion of its normal banking activities. An advance of \$2 500 000 is proposed for 1975-76. These funds will be used mainly for housing loans in cases where applicants fall outside the means test under the Housing Agreement, and for the provision of working funds to the bank's customers, including those in wine and fruit processing industries.

**OTHER URBAN DRAINAGE, \$4 100 000**—Grants towards common effluent drainage are made in accordance with local needs and the ability of councils to contribute to drainage schemes. The need for adequate drainage has led to an increasing number of requests for assistance. A total of \$4 100 000 is proposed to be made available in 1975-76: \$1 800 000 for floodwater drainage and \$2 300 000 for common effluent drainage.

**LANDS DEPARTMENT—BUILDINGS, PLANT, ETC., \$965 000**—The proposed allocation of \$965 000 to the Lands Department for plant, equipment and buildings, includes a provision of \$275 000 towards the purchase of an aircraft which is needed for survey work and aerial photography and is estimated to cost \$850 000.

**IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION OF SWAMP LANDS, \$3 700 000**—An extensive programme of works is being undertaken on rehabilitation of pumping and water distribution facilities in several irrigation areas on the Murray River. Growers are expected to benefit from these works by having a more efficient supply system, while the State will benefit from the avoidance of the waste of water the present open-channel system entails. An allocation of \$3 700 000 is proposed for 1975-76 for this purpose.

**REMARK IRRIGATION TRUST, \$525 000**—Under the Remark Irrigation Trust Act, the Government provides funds by way of grants and repayable loans towards the cost of

pumping stations, rehabilitation of the irrigation system and the provision of additional drainage and water supply in the trust area. A provision of \$525 000 is proposed for 1975-76.

**AFFORESTATION AND TIMBER MILLING, \$6 200 000**—The Woods and Forests Department carries out a capital works programme which enables it to maintain a strong position in the timber industry, to replant exploited forest plantations and to expand its activities. An amount of \$6 200 000 of Loan funds is proposed for forestry purposes in 1975-76. An additional sum of \$590 000 is expected to be drawn from the softwood forestry funds provided by the Australian Government.

**RAILWAY ACCOMMODATION, \$11 000 000**—An allocation of \$11 000 000 is proposed in 1975-76, of which \$4 500 000 is for public transport projects and \$6 500 000 for other capital works. A sum of \$6 500 000 is expected to be recovered from the Australian National Railways Commission for the capital payments on account of non-metropolitan railways. Two-thirds of expenditure on urban public transport is also expected to be recovered from the Australian Government as specific non-repayable grants.

**HARBORS ACCOMMODATION, \$7 800 000**—A provision of \$7 800 000 is proposed for the financing of construction of the bulk grain and phosphate loading berth at Port Lincoln, container ship facilities at Outer Harbor, deepening and widening of the Port Adelaide River, and various minor works.

**FISHING HAVENS, \$930 000**—Projects planned to be commenced in 1975-76 include the construction of a modern boat haven for the fishing industry at Port Adelaide and the provision of a breakwater at Port MacDonnell. The Port Adelaide fishing haven will have a steel-piled wharf, a landing jetty, wave screen, mooring pontoons, cranes, amenities, and a car park. It is estimated to cost \$1 100 000 when completed. The breakwater at Port MacDonnell will be some 1 550 metres long and will cost about \$1 700 000. It will enclose a large area of sheltered water and will give protection, not only to fishing vessels, but also to a long stretch of sandy beach making it more attractive for water sports, tourists and holidaymakers. A total of \$930 000 is proposed to be allotted to fishing havens in 1975-76.

**WATERWORKS AND SEWERS, \$59 300 000**—A provision of \$59 300 000 is proposed for 1975-76. This amount is expected to be applied to works as follows:

**METROPOLITAN WATERWORKS, \$16 608 000**—An amount of \$1 100 000 has been provided to complete the construction of a trunk water main from Darlington to Port Adelaide and a large capacity storage tank at Seacliff. A sum of \$2 077 000 will be made available for Little Para dam, which has been designed to act as a balancing storage for the Mannum-Adelaide mains system. A provision of \$8 500 000 has been made for work to continue on the water treatment project at Hope Valley and on design work for the Anstey Hill plant.

**COUNTRY WATERWORKS, \$16 572 000**—In 1974-75, work had commenced on the replacement of a section of the Morgan-Whyalla main. Because of the urgency of this work, a large proportion of it will need to be carried out during 1975-76. A provision of \$5 275 000 has been made accordingly. An amount of \$1 059 000 has been allotted for the continuation of work on the Lock-Kimba water main. Financial assistance of two-thirds of expenditure on this scheme is available from the Australian Government. Pipelaying commenced in May last for a scheme designed to supplement the supply of water to

Victor Harbor, Port Elliot, and Goolwa by pumping from Myponga reservoir. This work is to continue in 1975-76, and a provision of \$1 219 000 has been made for the purpose. Work will also continue in 1975-76 on the Uley South scheme, which will provide a large increase in the total supply of water available for Eyre Peninsula. A sum of \$2 147 000 has been provided for this project.

**METROPOLITAN SEWERAGE, \$11 495 000**—An allocation of \$946 000 has been made to continue construction of the engineering and biology building, roads, and car parks at Bolivar. A provision of \$1 134 000 has been made for the further reconstruction of sewers in north-eastern suburbs and \$431 000 for south-western suburbs. Over \$3 000 000 will also be provided for the construction of sewers in new areas at Blackwood, Hackham, Morphett Vale, Parafield Gardens, and Coromandel Valley.

**COUNTRY SEWERAGE, \$4 561 000**—This provision is required for sewerage works at Balhannah, Gawler, Hahndorf, Port Pirie, Victor Harbor, and Whyalla.

The works programme of \$59 300 000 for water supply and sewerage had assumed capital grants and special loans from the Australian Government to a total of \$13 000 000. In this area, it appears the State will receive more than we had expected. A total of \$15 500 000 is included in the Budget of the Australian Government to provide assistance towards the water treatment scheme and sewerage facilities in South Australia.

**RIVER MURRAY WEIRS, DAMS, LOCKS, ETC., \$3 600 000**—The Loan Budget had assumed that South Australia's share of the cost of construction of the Dartmouth reservoir in 1975-76 would be \$6 800 000. Of this, \$3 400 000 was expected to be advanced by the Australian Government and \$3 400 000 was to be provided from State Loan funds. The Australian Government Budget includes \$4 000 000 for each of the participating States towards the expected higher cost of the Dartmouth project.

**GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS, LAND AND SERVICES, \$107 500 000.**

**HOSPITAL BUILDINGS, \$33 000 000**—Some of the major proposals for 1975-76 are:

**FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE**—A sum of \$18 760 000 has been provided for the continuation of work on further development of the centre and \$800 000 for computer equipment.

**PORT AUGUSTA HOSPITAL**—A sum of \$910 000 has been allotted for further work on a geriatric block, physiotherapy and occupational therapy facilities, and ancillary offices.

**PORT PIRIE HOSPITAL**—A sum of \$1 138 000 is required to continue stage 1 of redevelopment works, which will cost over \$2 000 000 when completed, to provide air-conditioning at the hospital and in the nurses' home, and to start the second stage of redevelopment of the hospital, which is estimated to cost \$13 250 000.

**ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL**—A sum of \$2 540 000 has been provided for redevelopment of the Northfield Wards and for other alterations and additions.

**GLENSIDE HOSPITAL**—A sum of \$1 150 000 will be expended on the construction of a 64-bed ward for sub-acute patients.

The construction of a frozen-food factory has been planned to start in 1975-76. This facility, to cost about \$7 000 000, will service Government hospitals and subsidised institutions. Other new works cover such diversified projects as the provision of computer equipment at the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science, Modbury and Queen Elizabeth Hospitals, a diagnostic radiology department at

Mount Gambier, utility rooms at Wallaroo, additional staff recreation facilities and air-conditioning at Hillcrest Hospital, and an occupational therapy building at Strathmont Centre.

Towards the total hospital capital programme of \$33 000 000 we had expected to receive grants from the Australian Government to the extent of \$12 300 000. While it is known that Australian Government grants of \$108 000 000 will be made available for hospitals throughout Australia in 1975-76, the allocation of this amount between the States has not yet been determined. We are still hopeful of receiving over \$12 000 000 for South Australia.

**SCHOOL BUILDINGS, \$48 000 000**—It is proposed to provide \$48 000 000 for school buildings and associated works in 1975-76. The expenditure of these funds has been programmed as follows:

Primary and Secondary Schools—	\$
The continuation of work on 42 major projects in progress, estimated to cost \$40 678 000 .....	15 047 000
The commencement of 48 projects estimated to cost \$22 545 000 .....	10 820 000
Emergency classroom accommodation	2 500 000
Purchase of land, buildings and residences .....	2 800 000
Minor works and buildings, final payments on contracts .....	4 633 000
Furniture .....	1 600 000
Preliminary investigations and design .	1 300 000
	<hr/> \$38 700 000
Further Education—	\$
The continuation of work on three major projects with total value of \$12 410 000 .....	6 650 000
The commencement of two major projects estimated to cost \$3 280 000	1 190 000
Emergency classroom accommodation	100 000
Purchase of land, buildings and residences .....	500 000
Minor works and buildings, and final payments on contracts .....	310 000
Furniture and equipment .....	250 000
Preliminary investigations and design .	300 000
	<hr/> \$9 300 000

The Loan Budget had assumed grants from the Australian Government of the order of \$14 000 000. Of this \$12 500 000 was towards primary and secondary schools and \$1 500 000 for further education projects. The amount included in the Australian Government's Budget for capital works for Government schools appears to be about \$10 000 000 and the provision for technical and further education \$1 200 000, a total of \$11 200 000. Honourable members will note that no provision has been made under this line for pre-school projects. As from July, 1975, these projects are being handled separately as a part of the wider programme of the Childhood Services Council.

**OTHER GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS, \$26 500 000**—Some of the larger provisions for 1975-76 are as follows:

**ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT**—The sum of \$2 700 000 has been provided for construction to continue on the forensic science building.

**DEPARTMENT FOR COMMUNITY WELFARE**—A sum of \$667 000 has been allotted to works on community welfare centres at Enfield, Marion, Mount Gambier, Norwood, Port Augusta, and Whyalla, and for upgrading Magill Home.

**DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES**—A sum of \$371 000 is required for additions to buildings and equipment at Yatala Prison and Adelaide and Port Lincoln Gaols.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH—A sum of \$815 000 has been provided for the construction of dental clinics in 14 metropolitan and country areas, \$50 000 for the Principal School of Dental Therapy at North Terrace, and \$285 000 for additions to the Dental Therapy Training School at Somerton Park. In addition, there is a sum of \$850 000 for the principal school included in the general provision for the purchase of land. Grants from the Australian Government are expected to cover the cost of these facilities.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT—A sum of \$2 500 000 is proposed to be expended to continue construction of a new office block for this department.

NEW ADMINISTRATION BUILDING—A sum of \$6 745 000 has been included for work to continue on the Flinders Street office block and furniture.

ELECTRICITY TRUST OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA, \$5 000 000—The capital works programme of the trust in 1975-76 is expected to be \$37 851 000. Work will continue on the first stage of the Torrens Island Power Station "B", where the first steam unit is expected to be commissioned in the near future. It is expected that the second unit will start operating some 12 months later. Preliminary work will also commence on the second stage of the Torrens Island Station "B". The reinforcement of electricity supply to the South-East will be completed this year. This work includes the construction of the Para to Tailem Bend 275 000 volt transmission line and additions to the sub-station at Tailem Bend.

The reticulation system to consumers in the Kingston-Lucindale area is expected to be completed during the year. The 275 000 volt metropolitan transmission system has been completed at the cost of \$14 200 000 and the general expansion of the distribution system is expected to continue at a similar rate to that prevailing in 1974-75. At Leigh Creek, work will continue on the development of the Lobe "B" coal area and will include the installation of the crushing plant and coal storage bins and the erection of workshops and compounds. The trust's programme is financed mainly from its own internal funds. In 1974-75 an amount of \$6 000 000 was made available to the trust from Loan Account and \$5 000 000 is proposed to be allocated in 1975-76. An additional sum of \$10 000 000 will be raised by semi-governmental borrowing.

MUNICIPAL TRAMWAYS TRUST, \$5 000 000—A provision of \$5 000 000 is proposed for 1975-76 towards a continuation of the trust's capital programme of purchase of new buses, acquisition of land for depots and construction of depot buildings. Finance is also being provided by the Australian Government by way of grants under urban public transport arrangements to meet two-thirds of the cost of approved projects. The amount of such assistance to be provided in 1975-76 is not yet clear. The Australian Government's Budget provides a total of about \$7 900 000 for all urban transport projects in the State. The appropriate amount for the trust remains to be determined in consultation with officers of the Australian Government.

NON-GOVERNMENT HOSPITAL AND INSTITUTION BUILDINGS, \$8 500 000—A provision of \$8 500 000 is proposed for 1975-76. Thirty-two hospitals and institutions will receive grants of varying amounts, including: \$3 600 000 for the Home for Incurables to continue construction of a 10-storey block, which will provide domiciliary care for long-term patients; and \$1 800 000 for the Adelaide Children's Hospital towards further work on rebuilding of the old part of the hospital.

COMMUNITY HEALTH AND ASSOCIATED PROJECTS, \$2 500 000—Community health projects in 1974-75 were included under the provision for hospital buildings. In 1975-76 a separate appropriation is proposed of \$2 500 000. Grants will be made to 32 health centres and institutions for the construction of buildings and the purchase of furniture, equipment and motor vehicles. Whereas we had expected to receive \$1 800 000 from the Australian Government towards community health projects, that Government's Budget provides only \$1 300 000 for capital works in this area.

MONARTO DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION, \$1 200 000—The determination of the commission's programme for 1975-76 has been delayed because of uncertainty about the extent of support to be received from the Australian Government. At this stage, the State allocations proposed are \$1 200 000 from Loan Account and \$2 000 000 of semi-government borrowing authority. An amount of \$500 000 has been allocated for Monarto in the recently announced Budget of the Australian Government. This small contribution will assist the commission in planning, but will not allow development to go ahead.

DEPARTMENT OF TOURISM, RECREATION AND SPORT, \$950 000—An amount of \$950 000 has been provided in 1975-76 for assistance to local government and other organisations in the field of tourism, recreation and sport.

The clauses of the Bill are in the normal form. Clause 1 gives the short title in the usual way. Clause 2 specifies the operative date of the Bill. Clause 3 gives definitions, as in the past. Clause 4 sets out the moneys which make up the Loan Fund. Clause 5 provides for the borrowing of South Australia's known allocation of \$112 950 000 for 1975-76. It has additional authority in general terms to cover a possible supplementary allocation and also any increased indebtedness due to discounts. Clause 6 provides for the expenditure of \$241 475 000 on the purposes set out in the first schedule. Clause 7 authorises those advances made in 1974-75 by way of warrant pursuant to section 32b of the Public Finance Act.

Clause 8 makes the usual provision for temporary finance, if required. Clause 9 gives the normal authority for borrowing and expenditure of Loan moneys in the early months of 1976-77. Clause 10 gives the normal authority for the Treasurer to borrow against issue of Treasury bills or by bank overdraft, if necessary. This overdraft authority, which has been held at \$2 000 000 for some years, is now to be raised to \$4 000 000. Clause 11 directs that all moneys received by the State under any Acts of the Commonwealth relating to roads or transport shall be credited to special accounts to be paid out as required for the purpose of those Acts. I commend the Bill to honourable members.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): The aggregate Loan Estimates before the Council for this financial year amount to about \$241 500 000, compared with an actual expenditure last year of \$211 200 000. Although the Loan Estimates are presented to Parliament separately from the Budget, nevertheless the two documents are interwoven one with the other. It has been the practice of all Treasurers over the years to hold back from expenditure certain Loan funds as an offset against any budgetary deficit. For some years now I have drawn the attention of the Council to this somewhat unsatisfactory procedure in presenting to the Council Budget and Loan documents on a yearly basis. Whilst I appreciate the restrictions on new Government expenditure related to special lines in the Budget, at the same time



I believe we should be actively examining a more satisfactory method for the presentation to Parliament of the State's financial processes.

Although I know we have a Public Accounts Committee which looks at matters relating to Government expenditure some 18 months in retrospect, I have never been over-impressed with that procedure, especially when the Council is presented with the Auditor-General's Report some three months after the close of the financial year. Nevertheless, the Public Accounts Committee may have a worthwhile function. I suggest that that committee is one that may well look at the question of the presentation to Parliament of the annual documents, and examine whether some different system could be introduced to allow a closer scrutiny of Government expenditure by the Parliament itself.

I raise this point again on the information and statements of the Budget papers presented in the 1974-75 year. It was obvious that the predictions made in those documents were misleading. The papers predicted (as in the Loan Estimates statements incorporated in *Hansard* by the Minister) a deficit last year of some \$12 000 000, while the Treasurer's assurance was given when those papers were introduced to the Parliament that no tax increases were contemplated in South Australia in 1974-75. Within three weeks of the Budget papers having been introduced, we were told of savage tax increases to be imposed in South Australia. Even a cursory study of those papers showed that the statements made were not factual. Indeed, in this Chamber, as most honourable members will recall, we predicted that the Budget papers would show a probable State deficit of \$40 000 000, and if one refers to the statement incorporated in *Hansard* by the Chief Secretary, one sees the following comment in the Treasurer's statement:

This net adverse effect and the non-receipt of the special grant of \$6 000 000 took the estimate of deficit to about \$22 000 000. A down-turn in revenues and increased costs of supplies and services gave indications that the deficit could worsen to as much as \$36 000 000 in the absence of corrective action.

One sees now, 12 months after the presentation of the 1974-75 papers, that the predictions made by the members of this Council at that time were accurate, yet I can recall one or two Ministers in this place saying that we were talking nonsense. We saw also last year the unprecedented action of the Government in giving explanations for Bills in this Council different from those given in the Lower House. This has reduced the processes of Parliament in dealing with the financial statements of the Treasurer to a mere political exercise, rather than having Parliament exercise its necessary role as a rational check on the Executive.

I fully appreciate that, in the collection of State taxes and charges, because of the very nature of those taxes and charges, it is difficult to predict accurately in a Budget the return over 12 months. I also fully appreciate that, with the rapidly expanding power that Canberra is exercising over the financial destiny of the States, and with the growth of such devices as section 96 grants, it has become increasingly difficult for the State Treasurer to formulate a rational Budget. I fully appreciate, too, that with an inflation rate of 20 per cent the effect on State Budgets is quite dramatic. This further adds, on the same score, to the greater financial control that the Commonwealth Treasury, the Commonwealth Parliament, and the Commonwealth Executive exercise over the States from the central bureaucracy. All these factors I recognise, yet

they offer no excuse for the misleading information being presented to Parliament in the documents over the past 12 months.

In the documents presented to Parliament for 1975-76 covering the Loan Estimates, a reasonably rosy picture is presented. I make the statement now that the rosy picture will be of relatively short duration. The rosy picture is related directly to payments from the Commonwealth in respect of the transfer to the Commonwealth of the non-metropolitan railways and, indeed, the majority of the metropolitan establishments as well. The immediate payment at the end of June of \$20 000 000-odd—\$10 000 000 cash for the transfer, and \$10 000 000 brought forward from an allocation from the Grants Commission in the future—has assisted this temporary rosy picture that the Treasurer can make from his documents. By the end of the financial year a more realistic picture will emerge because, in my view, the Commonwealth will balance its proclaimed largesse in the railways field in its own way and in its own time.

I made the prediction last year, of which the Government did not take much notice, that the Budget was some \$30 000 000 out, on presentation, and I make this prediction on these Loan Estimates that, whereas they present a somewhat rosy picture at this stage, by the end of the financial year we shall be feeling the rather warm breath of Canberra directed on us as far as our financial position is concerned. This theme of which I am speaking is taken up in the document that the Minister has had incorporated in *Hansard*, and I quote from Parliamentary Paper 11A at the bottom of the page 5:

Significant increases in receipts of specific purpose capital funds from the Australian Government for hospitals, water treatment and urban public transport account for most of the balance of higher estimated repayments. I propose to comment on the special Australian Government contributions when dealing with the details of departmental programmes. At this stage, I should add that we have not received firm advice of many major expected grants and loans. In view of the difficult Budget situation which the Australian Government faces, it is possible that some of the special contributions may be held to lower limits than have been adopted for purposes of these papers. This matter will be kept under close review to ensure that commitments actually made are in line with funds available.

That is the exact point I have been making in my comments so far. The Loan Estimates this year are presented to the Parliament, in effect, as a wing and a prayer exercise, which once again highlights the theme I briefly developed at the beginning of this speech. Semi-government borrowings in 1975-76 from the South Australian viewpoint will total \$38 100 000 from a total Commonwealth allocation of \$809 700 000. As stated in Parliamentary Paper 11A, the general programme Australia-wide this year is 20 per cent up on the previous year. According to Parliamentary Paper 11A, special factors apply to two States; I quote once again from the Parliamentary Paper:

For semi-government borrowing proposals in 1975-76, Loan Council has determined an aggregate general programme 20 per cent above that of 1974-75 with special allocations to two States to take account of particular factors. Of the total programme of \$809 700 000, South Australia's share is \$38 100 000.

Will the Minister ascertain for me the two States that have received special consideration and the factors taken into consideration for those special allocations? In this State, semi-government allocations will be \$10 000 000 to the Electricity Trust, \$8 000 000 to the Housing Trust, \$5 000 000 to the Pipelines Authority, \$4 000 000 to the South Australian Meat Corporation; \$3 000 000 to the Festival Centre Trust, and \$2 000 000 to the Monarto

Development Commission. Under the Housing Agreement, total funds last year expended by the Government amounted to \$56 000 000, of which the State Bank received \$22 800 000 and the Housing Trust about \$35 500 000. The Housing Agreement between the State and the Commonwealth lays stress upon building rental accommodation. There are two aspects here that one must examine: first, the emphasis on rental accommodation and, secondly, the large draw on available funds by the Housing Trust. I do not want anyone to think I am criticising the Housing Trust, but it is time this State examined alternative approaches in the provision of housing.

I am certain that in South Australia most people desire to own their own house and, although programmes do exist to cater for the house owner, nevertheless I think our policies in this State have been oriented too much towards the rental-accommodation system. Going back about three or four years, there was quite a change in the attitude of making housing money available to the State from the Commonwealth where the emphasis moved sharply towards rental accommodation. I have previously made such comments as I make now, and I emphasise them again. But again I should like to quote from Parliamentary Paper 11A because the estimates there for housing this year make interesting reading; I read from page 7:

As to the special funds for welfare housing in 1975-76, it is not yet known what amount the Australian Government intends to allocate to the State for this purpose. Whereas in June, 1974, at the Premier's Conference, the Prime Minister announced the allocation for housing which the Australian Government was prepared to support, at the Premier's Conference in June, 1975, he stated that housing funds would be considered within the context of the overall Australian Budget. He added, however, that States could expect housing funds this year to be not less than the amounts advanced in 1974-75.

So Parliament has to deal with the Prime Minister's statement that the States could expect housing funds to be not less than the amounts advanced in 1974-75. I go back again to the first part of my speech and my comments there about the gradual, total control being assumed by the central bureaucracy over the interests of this State and the fact that this Parliament is not being provided with the necessary information. Now that the Commonwealth Budget has been presented, why cannot this Parliament be informed of the housing position? Does the Government intend informing Parliament of its housing allocations for 1975-76? That is a question the Government must answer.

If one goes back to the presentation of the Budget and Loan Estimate papers of last year, one recalls the change made in the explanation to this Council following its introduction in another place. That was unprecedented action. Why should not a different explanation be made this time when the information is already available from the Commonwealth Budget? That, too, is a question the Government should answer to this Council.

I turn now to loans to producers. Advances last year amounted to almost \$4 000 000; the allocation this year is \$2 850 000. Once again, this drop needs some explanation from the Government. It has been a mark of this Government over the past five years to cut down on expenditures in the productive areas of the State and to expand expenditures in the non-productive areas. It seems strange in the present economic climate that a reduction in allocation is being made in the line "Loans to Producers". Perhaps the Minister may like to examine this line and explain to the Council the Government's philosophy regarding it.

I turn now to afforestation and timber milling. I suppose, once again, I will have to ride my favourite forestry hobby horse. South Australia is relatively devoid of any natural

economic forest areas, and it was the foresight of the early legislators that placed this State well ahead of the rest of Australia in plantation forestry. Rather strangely, the first income derived from forestry operations in South Australia was the sum of £2 (\$4) received from the sale of dates from palms planted in the North of South Australia. Following the appointment of Mr. J. Ednie Brown as Conservator of Forests in the early 1870's, South Australia made significant progress in plantation forestry. In passing, I state that J. Ednie Brown was one of the pioneers of this State who has been sadly overlooked by its historians.

As a State, South Australia has every right to be proud of its afforestation achievements. With one per cent of the total area of economic forests in Australia, South Australia is responsible for about 10 per cent of the national forestry production. Nevertheless, although we have every right to be proud, our policies are still oriented too much to State Government dominance of timber production and processing. To reach maximum utilisation of available land and to increase the efficient operation in the use of both production and land, we need to examine radical changes in State policies on forestry.

The deterrent to greater involvement of individual farmers in wood-lot farming lies on two fronts. I refer, first, to the long wait for any return from wood-lot farming and, secondly, to the tax scales on the harvesting of a crop with a rotation of about 40 years duration. Because Governments have not offered inducements not necessarily costing the taxpayer anything in the long run, we find the Government trying to buy more and more land for afforestation purposes, while the area utilised as economic forests in South Australia could be substantially increased quickly by incentives being given to individual farmers to engage in wood-lot farming.

If some of the Loan funds at present being channelled into the purchase of land by the Government were channelled into an area of financing directly individual farmers to enable them to engage in wood-lot farming, we would see a rapid rise in the area under timber in this State. This would, I believe, produce much more efficient land usage. We see in so many parts of the State instances where the Government is buying some of the more high-class producing areas for forestry. There is available throughout South Australia a large area of second-rate grazing land that could be devoted to economic forestry. These are not necessarily large areas and do not lend themselves to Government exploitation. It is in the promotion of schemes to encourage these areas to be planted that the economic use of this land should be increased and a greater contribution made to the wealth of this State through tree farming. I seek leave to conclude my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

#### **CRIMINAL LAW (SEXUAL OFFENCES) AMENDMENT BILL**

Second reading.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It provides for a code of sexual behaviour for all adults in our community, be they heterosexual or homosexual, male or female. It also provides a penalty of life imprisonment for sexual offences against children under 12 years of age, regardless of whether the child is a girl or boy, and regardless of the sex of the offender.

Further, it provides for imprisonment of sexual offenders who are schoolteachers, guardians, or other persons of special responsibility who commit sexual offences against

their wards. An offence of homosexual rape is created, and the Bill provides that any premises to be used for the purposes of male prostitution will constitute a brothel. Other offences such as indecent interference, abduction, defilement, and so on, apply, regardless of sex or sexual orientation.

The Bill provides tight control to protect minors in these matters, and affords to boys the same protection as is now afforded to girls. It removes the sexual discrimination that exists in our present law and provides a code of sexual conduct for all members of society, regardless of their sex or their sexual orientation. The controversial clauses are, of course, clauses 29 and 30, which decriminalise homosexual behaviour between consenting adults in private. Such decriminalisation does not, of course, imply moral approval, still less encouragement, of such acts. Homosexual females, commonly known as Lesbians, are certainly not approved of by society in general, and their activities are not encouraged, yet the criminal law in Australia and the United Kingdom has never dealt with such behaviour and has never declared it to be illegal.

This Bill seeks to put homosexual activity between consenting adult males into the same category as that applying to consenting adult females. Its basis is surely that what two adults consent to do together in private is their own business and that society has no right to interfere when no-one is getting hurt. On this aspect Pierre Trudeau stated:

The State has no business in the bedrooms of the nation.

In considering this matter, we need to distinguish clearly between activities which are immoral and sinful and those which are criminal. Often these three categories coincide, for example, in the case of murder and rape. "Sinful" is a religious term implying that the action taken is against God's law; "immoral" implies that an action is against some moral code, whereas "criminal" means that an action is prohibited by secular law.

Where there is a victim of an action by a person, as in the case of murder and rape, we all agree not only that such action is immoral but also that society, through its law, must protect individuals from such actions; hence the rationale of making such actions criminal. However, acts involving sexual behaviour in private between two consenting adults of the same sex have no victim and, although most of us would regard such acts as immoral, it does not follow logically that they must therefore be criminal. I refer to the Wolfenden report, published in the United Kingdom in 1957, which was the result of a committee of inquiry into homosexuality and prostitution presented to the British Government and which states, in part:

In this field (the law's), function . . . is to preserve public order and decency, to protect the citizen from what is offensive or injurious, and to provide sufficient safeguards against exploitation and corruption of others, particularly those who are specially vulnerable because they are young, weak in body or mind, inexperienced, or in a state of special physical, official or economic dependence. It is not in our view the function of the law to intervene in the private lives of citizens, or to seek to enforce any particular pattern of behaviour, further than is necessary to carry out the purposes we have outlined.

Further on the report states:

. . . the importance which society and the law ought to give to individual freedom of choice and action in matters of private morality. Unless a deliberate attempt is to be made by society, acting through the agency of the law, to equate the sphere of crime with that of sin, there must remain a realm of private morality and immorality which is, in brief and crude terms, not the law's business. To say this is not to condone or encourage private immorality.

I contend that our present law with regard to homosexual behaviour is neither humane nor compassionate. It causes unnecessary suffering, and serves no useful purpose. Indeed, it makes criminals of thousands of otherwise law-abiding citizens, and it makes a mockery of our social value of minority and individual rights.

I do not wish to engage in a protracted speech on this occasion, as this matter has been fully aired in this Council on at least two previous occasions, many members present today having taken part in both those debates. However, I should like to make a few comments about some of the arguments commonly used against such reform. It is said by some that the practice of homosexuality will destroy our society, that it is a form of moral pollution. Such statements are certainly not based on any sound evidence, and it would indeed be difficult to prove a causal relationship between homosexual acts in private and any decay of civilisation.

The fall of Rome has sometimes been quoted as being an example of such destruction of society. However, I imagine that an argument that homosexual activity was the cause of the decay of the Roman Empire would be supported only by Hollywood: certainly not by any serious historian. I believe that such statements are unsupported assertions, which are on a par with the Emperor Justinian's belief that homosexual acts were the cause of earthquakes.

Another argument that is used in opposition to reform of the law is to say that homosexual practices are damaging to family life, yet this argument appears to ignore the facts of what homosexuality is—a condition where sexual attraction and attention and preference are directed to members of the same sex, not the opposite sex. Homosexuals vary in the degree of this preference, but for many of them heterosexual activity is as abhorrent as homosexual activity is to most heterosexuals. Whatever the state of the law, these male homosexuals will not be attracted by females and will not marry and found a family.

True, most surveys reveal that a proportion of male homosexuals are also partly heterosexual and marry and have children. I imagine social pressures applied by the heterosexual majority will mean that such men will still marry, regardless of the law, although I doubt whether forcing such a heterosexual role on one who is not predominantly heterosexual is a good basis for marriage or that such marriages are likely to provide real relationships for the people involved. I can imagine the distress of a woman who discovers that her husband is a homosexual. These marriages would probably be such that it would be better if they never occurred.

Surprisingly, in the extensive literature I have read on homosexuality there is not a single reference to the difficulties and life of the wife of a homosexual. This aspect has been omitted by all the male authors on the subject. If objectors to this Bill were really consistent in their concern for maintaining family life, they should try to have adultery and fornication made crimes, as indeed they were in medieval times. Adultery will always cause far more marriages to founder than will homosexual practices, as our divorce courts have shown only too well. It does not appear to be just or fair that homosexuals should be punished by law when other offenders against the standard sexual code, such as adulterers, are not prosecuted, although they might do at least as much harm to family life.

There is a final point to this argument, namely, that we should perhaps consider societies such as those existing in France and Italy, where homosexual acts have been legal for over 150 years. Those countries are renowned for the

strength of their family ties, much more so than exists among Anglo-Saxon communities.

There are two comments I should like to make regarding the present law on homosexual acts. The first is that the amendment to the law passed in 1972 allowing as a defence to a charge of homosexual behaviour that the act was between consenting adults in private puts the onus of proof on the defence rather than on the prosecution, and this is contrary to all the principles of British justice.

Secondly, the law as it stands encourages blackmail and physical assaults on homosexuals who hesitate to complain to police because of the fear of being charged themselves. The Wolfenden report showed that 45 per cent of all blackmail charges in the United Kingdom related to homosexual acts. Lord Jowitt, a famous Attorney-General in the United Kingdom, was of the opinion that 95 per cent of blackmail occurrences were for homosexual acts, the difference between these figures being, I presume, accounted for by the blackmail suffered by homosexuals who dared not go to the police for fear of being charged themselves:

With regard to physical assaults on homosexuals, I shall quote the following extract from the report, made 12 months ago, by the West Australian Royal Commission into homosexuality:

On the question of physical assault against homosexuals there was abundant and sickening proof that this did occur. The assaults can only be described as vicious and brutal and, as one witness put it, it was regarded as the sport of "poofah-bashing". ... A most notable example of this vicious type of assault was given by one witness. . . . He himself could not remember what happened, but the extent of his injuries was quite alarming. His eye had been kicked out, he suffered a fracture of the skull and was unconscious in hospital for 10 days.

In South Australia, let us not forget Dr. Duncan, whose death occurred only just over three years ago. With the passage of this Bill, let us hope that there will be no more such tragedies.

Honourable members present may not be aware of the legislation with respect to homosexual acts that applies in many countries. Such acts, as I have said, have not been regarded as criminal in France and Italy for more than 150 years. The Netherlands liberalised its laws in 1911, and Scandinavian countries have also long permitted homosexual acts while retaining complete protection for minors, as the present Bill does. In the United Kingdom, homosexual acts between consenting adults in private were decriminalised in 1967, and the same reforms took place in Canada in 1970. As far as I am aware, those communities have not disintegrated as a result.

West Germany and Austria followed suit in 1972, and about a dozen States of the United States of America have similarly reformed their laws, California doing so only last month. So, this Bill is part of a world-wide trend to reform the law in this area. I firmly believe that there is widespread community support in Australia for a Bill of this nature. Attitudes have been changing rapidly in recent years, as is evident by comparing recent Gallup polls with the poll recently drawn to our attention by the Festival of Light document circulated to all of us. Only eight years ago, in 1967, only 22 per cent of an Australian sample favoured decriminalisation, whereas last year (in August, 1974) this figure had changed to a majority of 54 per cent. About 12 months ago, only 26 per cent of Australians thought that homosexual acts should remain illegal.

Not only Gallup polls but also influential community groups show this support for reform. The New South Wales and Victorian State Councils of the Liberal Party have recently taken reform positions on this issue, as have the New South Wales branch of the Country Party, the Western Australian Trades and Labour Council, the Federal ALP Women's Conference, the Federal ALP Young Labor Conference, and the Victorian ALP Conference. Further, the House of Representatives in Canberra voted in favour of the Gorton-Cass motion in 1973.

Numerous church groups have also approved reform positions; for example, the Methodist Conferences in South Australia and New South Wales, the Presbyterian Assemblies in New South Wales and Victoria, the Anglican Dioceses of Melbourne and Canberra-Goulburn, the Sydney Quakers, and the Congregational Union of South Australia, among others. The Anglican Archbishop of Adelaide, Bishop Rayner, supported this Bill only last week, and the Social Concern Committee, whose document we all received yesterday, includes churchmen from the Methodist, Congregational, Anglican and Roman Catholic faiths. Less than 12 months ago the West Australian Royal Commission on matters relating to homosexuality made clear recommendations for reform of the type now before us.

Newspapers all over the country have supported reform of the law on homosexual acts; for example, the *West Australian*, the *Australian*, the *Canberra Times*, and our own *Advertiser*. Professional groups concerned with such matters have also voiced their support; for example, the Australian Psychological Society by a clear majority in 1973, and the Australian and New Zealand College of Psychiatrists, also in 1973. The medically qualified members of our own Parliament have also supported all moves for reform; that is, Dr. Tonkin, now Leader of the Opposition in the other place, and Dr. Springett, when a member of this Council.

Before considering the details of the Bill in the manner customary for the mover of the motion that the Bill be read a second time, I should like to pay a tribute to Mr. Duncan, member for Elizabeth in the other place, who has devised this just and humane legislation, and to the Hon. Murray Hill, who first attempted reform on this issue in our Parliament. In this matter at least, the Hon. Mr. Hill has shown himself to be a liberal with a small "I" as well as a large "L" and I acknowledge his efforts on behalf of a persecuted minority in our community.

In considering the clauses of the Bill in detail, clauses 1, 2 and 3 are formal. Clause 4 of the Bill amends section 5 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act by adding definitions of "common prostitute" and "rape", thus ensuring that the policy of the Bill, that the criminal sanctions for sexual behaviour shall apply to both males and females for offences involving prostitution and rape, is applied. Clauses 5, 6 and 7 are formal, merely correcting a drafting problem.

Clauses 8 and 9 expand sections 50 and 51 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act to provide offences of carnally knowing and attempting to carnally know a person under 12 years of age, regardless of sex. These sections at present only apply to female children, and the Bill introduces new offences where male children are involved. Clause 10 has the same effect on section 52, widening its ambit to include male as well as female children of 12 years of age, and providing for a new offence where the victim is a male. Clause 11 broadens the ambit of section 53 of the Act to make it an offence for any person, regardless of sex, being a guardian, teacher, schoolmaster

or mistress of any child under 18 years of age, regardless of sex, to carnally know any such child. This introduces new offences where schoolmistresses are involved and where male persons are involved as victims. Clause 12 is consequential on the amendments to sections 51, 52 and 53 of the Act.

Clause 13 seeks to amend section 55 to apply the provisions of that section to male victims of 13 years to 17 years and of unsound mind, and clause 14 seeks to amend section 56 to provide an offence of indecent assault regardless of the sex of the perpetrator or the victim. Clause 15 amends section 57 to provide that, within the ambit of the section, male victims of under 18 years of age will be unable to consent to indecent assaults upon them in certain cases. Clause 16 seeks a consequential amendment to section 57(a) to apply its provisions regardless of sex.

Clause 17 provides for the amendment of section 57(b) to introduce two new offences concerning indecent interference with males under the age of 17 years and of males over that age without their consent. Clause 18 seeks to expand section 58 of the Act to provide for an offence of committing acts of gross indecency with, or in the presence of, any male person under the age of 16 years and to provide that it is an offence for females to commit such offences. Clause 19 broadens the ambit of section 59 to include male victims of abductions.

Clause 20 broadens the ambit of section 60 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act to include male victims of forcible abductions, and clause 21 broadens section 61 to include unmarried males under the age of 16 years within the ambit of that section. Clause 22 extends the ambit of the offence created in section 62 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act to include male victims under the age of 18 years, while clause 23 seeks to amend section 63 to provide for the procuring of males to become common prostitutes to be included in the section.

Clause 24 extends the ambit of section 64 to create an offence of procuring the defilement of males by threats or fraud, and clause 25 amends section 65 to include males under 17 years as subjects of the offence created by that section. Clause 26 amends section 66 to apply the provisions of that section to all persons being unmarried and under the age of 18 years.

Clause 27 provides for the amendment of section 67 consequential on the amendments to section 65 and section 66 of the Act. Clause 28 seeks to apply the offence of permitting youths to resort to brothels contained in section 68 to all persons under the age of 17 years. Clause 29 provides for the repeal of section 68a and for the consolidation of unnatural offences, and clause 30 repeals section 69 and enacts a new section proscribing behaviour between humans and animals.

Clause 31 makes amendments to section 74 to provide consequential amendments to court procedures regarding the exclusion of the public, while clause 32 seeks a consequential amendment to section 75. Clause 33 amends section 76 to correct an error in drafting resulting from earlier amendments.

Clauses 34 and 35 amend sections 77 and 77a of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act respectively to correct errors in drafting resulting from earlier amendments of the Act. Clause 36 has a formal amendment to the Police Offences Act. Clause 37 amends section 4 of the Police Offences Act, and clause 38 amends section 25 of the same Act to include soliciting of male persons for prostitution. Clause 39 amends section 26 of the Police Offences Act to repeal the offence of soliciting in the section, as it is now covered in section 25 of the Police Offences Act, and clause 40 amends section 27 of the Police Offences Act.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 3.44 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, September 10, at 2.15 p.m.